



THE HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF

*Charles the First*

BY JOHN BURNET, BISHOP OF SALISBURY, AND JOHN HALL, ESQ.

LONDON, Printed by J. Sturges, 1704.

THE HISTORY  
OF  
MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS.

BY F. A. MIGNET,

Member of the Institute, and of the French Academy; Perpetual Secretary  
of the Academy of Moral and Political Science.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOLUME I.



LONDON:  
RICHARD BENTLEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,  
Publisher in Ordinary to Her Majesty.  
1851.

226. a. 73.

LONDON :  
BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

## PREFACE.

---

THE History of Mary Stuart has been written many times ; and each successive publication has thrown fresh light upon the subject. At the present day, the number of new documents which have been added to those already known, enable us to relate its vicissitudes in a more complete and truthful manner. In 1734, Keith inserted in his History of Scotland some very valuable papers relating to the reign of Mary Stuart, from the birth of that princess until her flight into England. In continuation of his sober narrative, and in support of his candid and sagacious opinions, Robertson published several documents which he had extracted from the national archives of England and Scotland. The extensive collections of Anderson and Goodall contained all the Acts relating to the memorable discussion which took place at York and Westminster, in 1568, before the Commissioners of the artful Elizabeth, between Mary Stuart and her subjects, regarding the assassination of Darnley. Finally, the important works of Digges, Murdin, Haynes, and Hardwicke, compiled

from the State Papers of England, together with the no less interesting publication of Jebb, and the Memoirs of Castelnau de Mauvissière, as enlarged by Le Laboureur, assisted the student to pursue the history of the captive Queen to her death.

This mass of documents has been very largely increased of late years. In Great Britain, Mr. George Chalmers has written a Life of Mary Stuart, based upon documents in the State Paper Office. Sir Henry Ellis and Mr. Thomas Wright have published a number of the letters of Queen Elizabeth and the principal personages of her time. Sir Cuthbert Sharpe has narrated, from inedited manuscripts, the progress of the Catholic insurrection in the North of England in 1569, which was occasioned by Mary Stuart's imprisonment, and intended to secure her liberation. Mr. Patrick Fraser Tytler, the last, the most voluminous, and the most learned of the historians of Scotland, has drawn from the political archives of England all the papers which escaped the notice of his predecessors, and has thus completed the histories of Keith and Robertson, and the collections of Haynes, Murdin, and Hardwicke. The despatches of the various English ambassadors and agents have enabled him to relate the whole life of Mary Stuart in more striking colours, and with greater animation of detail. In France, the Correspondence of Francis II., collected and edited by M. Louis Paris ; the Diplomatic Correspondence of Lamothé Fénelon,

extending from 1568 to 1574, during the first six years of Mary Stuart's captivity, which has been printed by Mr. Purton Cooper ; the letters of Noailles, Montluc, Paul de Foix, Du Croc, Castelnau de Mauvissière, the Baron D'Esnéval, Aubespine de Chateaufort, and others, which M. Teulet has just published, and which embrace, as it were, the existence of Mary Stuart from 1542 to 1587 ; and lastly, the Correspondence of Mary Stuart herself, in seven volumes, completed by the unwearied research and skilful care of Prince Labanoff—would have left us nothing further to desire with regard to the history of that Queen and her times, if we had possessed the Spanish documents which have reference to them both. Philip II., the great head of Catholicism in Europe, was constantly mixed up with the religious and political affairs of Scotland and England, under Mary Stuart and Elizabeth, and never ceased to take part in the long and terrible rivalry of the two creeds and the two Queens. In 1832, Don Tomas Gonzalez published for the Royal Academy of History at Madrid, some extracts from the correspondence of the Spanish Ambassadors in England between the years 1558 and 1576. I have been able to do more, by means of despatches copied from the Archives of Simancas. The confidential letters of Philip II., the Duke of Alba, and the Spanish Ambassadors, in England, at Rome, and in France, from 1558 to 1588, have enabled me more rightly to understand

the attempts of the Catholic party in Great Britain, and the plans of Mary Stuart, during the nineteen years of her captivity, when she conspired to secure her own freedom by driving Elizabeth from her throne.

Aided by these materials, and also by the numerous works published during and after the sixteenth century, upon the political events and religious changes of Scotland and England, I have composed this history. In the years 1847—1850, I published a series of articles upon this subject in the *Journal des Savants*, taking Prince Labanoff's vast collection as the basis of my work. These articles, which were similar to those that appeared in 1846 upon Antonio Perez and Philip II., have been entirely recast in the work which I now publish under the form of a continuous narrative. After a short description of the previous condition of Scotland, my narrative commences with the minority of Mary Stuart, and terminates with the expedition of the Invincible Armada, sent by Philip II. to avenge the death of that Queen, and to dispossess the Protestant Elizabeth of the throne of England. I hope I have succeeded in giving a complete sketch of this long and pathetic episode in the great revolutions of the sixteenth century.

AUGUST 8, 1851.

# CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTION.

Introductory remarks, 1; plan of the work, 2; situation and characteristics of Scotland, 3; the Highlanders and Lowlanders, 4; early Wars with England, 5; alliance of Scotland with France, 6; conflicts between her Kings and Barons, 7; Reforms effected by James I., 8; James II. crushes the Black Douglas clan, 9; Policy of James III., 10; James IV. marries Margaret Tudor, 10; he forms an alliance with England, 11; Battle of Flodden, 11; James V. defeats the Earl of Angus, 12; his measures of reform, 13; his support of the Clergy, 15; his Marriage, 16; he persecutes the Protestants, 16; his quarrel with Henry VIII., 17; his death, 18; birth of Mary Stuart, 18; state of Scotland at this period, 18; power of the nobility, 19; the Parliament of Scotland, 19; the Lords of the Articles, 20; the Lords of Session, 20; the Court of Daily Council, 20; the College of Justice, 20; power and policy of the Kings, 21; Mary Stuart's five predecessors, 22.

## CHAPTER II.

### FROM THE ACCESSION OF MARY STUART TO HER RETURN FROM FRANCE INTO SCOTLAND.

Regency of the Earl of Arran, 25; Mary Stuart's Coronation, 25; Henry VIII. demands her in Marriage for his Son, 25; failure of the project, 26; war with England, 27; death of Henry VIII., 28; Battle of Pinkie, 28; Mary Stuart is affianced to the Dauphin, 29; arrival of Monsieur D'Esse, 30; Mary Stuart is sent to France, 31; peace with England, 32; Mary of Guise appointed Regent, 34; her policy, 34; it excites the jealousy of the Scottish Nobles, 35; Mary, Queen of England, 35; her Marriage to Philip II., 35; personal appearance of Mary Stuart, 36; the Court of Francis I., 37; its splendour and gaiety, 38; its licentiousness, 39; its influence upon Mary Stuart, 40; her accomplishments and influence, 42; verses of Ronsard and Du Bellay, 43; proposals for Mary's Marriage to the Dauphin, 44; Commissioners sent from Scotland, 44; conditions of the Marriage, 45; the Marriage is celebrated, 45; Mary secretly gives up Scotland to France, 46; the Commissioners return to Scotland, 48; resolutions of the Parliament, 48; conduct of the Regent, 49; disaffection of the Nobles, 49; accession of Queen Elizabeth, 50; Mary assumes the Arms of England, 50; character of Queen Elizabeth, 51; her religious views, 54; her political advisers and



influence, 55 ; policy of Mary of Lorraine, 56 ; Mary Stuart becomes Queen of France, 56 ; Protestant Revolution in Scotland, 57 ; its origin, progress, and persecution, 58 ; George Wishart, 59 ; his assassination, 60 ; murder of Cardinal Beaton, 60 ; banishment of the leading Protestants, 60 ; John Knox, 61 ; his influence among the Reformers, 62 ; he preaches at Edinburgh, 63 ; he is obliged to retire to Geneva, 64 ; he is burnt in Effigy, 64 ; Protestant preachers in Scotland, 65 ; they are summoned before the Regent, 65 ; the first Covenant, 66 ; the Lords of the Congregation, 66 ; oppressive measures of the Regent, 67 ; Knox returns to Scotland, 57 ; War between the Protestants and the Regent, 68 ; M. de Bethencourt is sent from France, 69 ; the Protestants negotiate with Queen Elizabeth, 70 ; she sends them some assistance, 72 ; Revolutionary measures of the Protestants, 73 ; deposition of the Regent, 73 ; alliance with England, 75 ; the English troops enter Scotland, 76 ; Siege of Leith, 77 ; death of the Regent, 79 ; Treaty of Edinburgh, 79 ; the French evacuate Scotland, 80 ; proceedings of the Scottish Parliament, 82 ; the Confession of Faith, 83 ; the Book of Discipline, 84 ; dissatisfaction of Mary Stuart, 87 ; death of Francis II., 89 ; effects of the union of Scotland and France, 90 ; grief of Mary Stuart, 91 ; proposals for her second Marriage, 92 ; Embassy from Elizabeth to Mary, 92 ; the Scottish Catholics regain courage, 93 ; they send Lesly to Mary Stuart, 93 ; his propositions to her, 94 ; Lord James Stuart is sent to her, 95 ; his character and influence, 95 ; his advice to his sister, 96 ; his reception by Elizabeth, 97 ; Gilles de Noailles is sent to Scotland, 98 ; Mary applies to Elizabeth for a Safe-conduct, 98 ; it is refused—Mary's answer, 99 ; Mary embarks for Scotland, 100 ; she arrives at Leith, 102 ; her reception by her subjects, 103.

### CHAPTER III.

#### FROM MARY'S RETURN INTO SCOTLAND TO HER MARRIAGE WITH DARNLEY.

Mary's character, 105 ; she appoints a Privy Council, 106 ; she has Mass performed privately, 107 ; letter from Knox to Calvin, 108 ; Mary enters Edinburgh, 109 ; her concessions to the Protestants, 110 ; her interview with Knox, 111 ; proceedings of the General Assembly, 115 ; influence of Lord James Stuart, 116 ; he is created Earl of Mar, 116 ; conspiracy of Bothwell and others, 117 ; revolt of the Gordons, 118 ; their defeat and humiliation, 119 ; Lord James is created Earl of Murray, 119 ; Mary's claims to the Throne of England, 120 ; Murray's letter to Queen Elizabeth, 121 ; Lethington is sent as Ambassador to England, 123 ; negotiations between the two Queens, 124 ; the Court of Scotland, 126 ; Knox inveighs against its festivities, 127 ; Story of Chastelard, 127 ; suitors for Mary Stuart's hand, 130 ; her choice inclines to Don Carlos, 131 ; the Archduke Charles is proposed to her, 133 ; she rejects the Archduke, 133 ; and renews negotiations with the King of Spain, 134 ; alarm of the Scottish Protestants, 137 ; Knox's public remonstrance, 137 ; his interview with Queen Mary, 137 ; divisions among the Protestant party, 139 ; the match with Don Carlos is broken off, 140 ; Queen Elizabeth proposes Lord Robert Dudley, 142 ; Mary's indignation, 143 ; Lord Darnley is proposed as her suitor, 144 ; the Earl of Lennox is recalled to Scotland, 145 ; Elizabeth's views regarding Mary's Marriage, 145 ; Mary sends James Melvil to London, 146 ; his interviews with Elizabeth, 147 ; Lord Robert Dudley is made Earl of Leicester, 148 ; Elizabeth strongly presses his suit, 150 ; Darnley arrives in Scotland, 152 ; state of parties in that country, 153 ; Elizabeth's indecision and crooked policy, 155 ; she refuses to recognise Mary's right of succession,

156; Mary resolves to marry Darnley, 156; opposition to this Marriage, 158; Murray's remonstrance with Queen Mary, 159; his hostile proceedings, 160; Elizabeth's displeasure at the Marriage, 160; she sends Throckmorton to oppose it, 160; Mary's reply to his remonstrance, 161; she postpones her Marriage, 162; Elizabeth orders Darnley and Lennox to return to England, 162; their answers to her summons, 163; proceedings of the Protestants, 163; plot for Mary's capture, 164; it is defeated by her prudence, 164; her Marriage with Darnley, 165; rupture with Elizabeth, 167; future policy of the two Queens, 168.

## CHAPTER IV.

FROM MARY'S MARRIAGE WITH DARNLEY TO THE MURDER  
OF RICCIO.

Proceedings of the English Privy Council, 170; proposals for Elizabeth's Marriage, 172; the King of France is suggested to her, 173; negotiation of the plan, 174; Elizabeth and the Spanish Ambassador, 176; refusal of the King of France, 178; the Archduke Charles makes proposals to her, 179; Leicester's pretensions, 180; Elizabeth's views on Marriage, 181; she gets rid of all her suitors, 183; Murray raises the standard of revolt, 185; enters Edinburgh with an Army, 186; seeks aid from Elizabeth, 187; is utterly defeated by Mary, 187; Mary's Proclamation, 188; the Rebels again apply to Elizabeth, 190; Mary develops her policy, 191; negotiations with Philip II., 192; defeat and flight of Murray, 193; policy of Queen Elizabeth, 194; Murray's interview with her, 195; Mary's position and policy, 198; her letter to Pope Pius V., 200; David Riccio, 201; Darnley's character and conduct, 203; his plot for Riccio's murder, 204; covenants of the Conspirators, 207; they are communicated to Elizabeth, 208; opening of the Parliament, 211; Murder of Riccio, 212; Mary is kept prisoner in the Palace, 219.

## CHAPTER V.

FROM THE ASSASSINATION OF RICCIO TO MARY'S MARRIAGE  
WITH BOTHWELL.

Return of Murray and the Exiles, 222; Mary's reconciliation to Darnley, 223; they escape to Dunbar, 225; Mary's subsequent policy, 225; Darnley's disavowal of the Conspirators, 227; Mary's contempt and aversion for Darnley, 228; his humiliating position at Court, 229; birth of the Prince Royal, 230; it is communicated to Queen Elizabeth, 231; debates on the English Succession, 232; Elizabeth opposes the settlement of the question, 234; James, Earl of Bothwell, 235; Mary's affection for him, 236; Darnley resolves to leave Scotland, 237; his interview with Mary Stuart, 238; illness of Bothwell—Mary's anxiety, 240; illness of Mary Stuart, 241; plan for her divorce from Darnley, 243; it is communicated to her by Lethington, 244; league of the Nobles for Darnley's murder, 246; baptism of the Prince Royal, 246; pardon and return of the banished Lords, 248; progress of the plot against Darnley, 249; Darnley falls ill, 249; Mary visits him and is reconciled to him, 252; Mary's Letters to Bothwell, 255; Darnley is taken to Kirk of Field, 259; and is lodged in Balfour's house, 259; Bothwell makes preparations for Darnley's murder, 261; his conversation with Paris, 262; assassination of Darnley, 264—270; burial of Darnley, 271; conduct of Mary Stuart and Bothwell, 271; letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 274;

Mary retires to Seton Castle with Bothwell, 275; denunciation of the Murderers, 276; letters of the Earl of Lennox, and Mary's answers, 277; letter of Queen Elizabeth, 279; favours conferred on Bothwell, 281; impeachment of Bothwell, 282; his trial and acquittal, 283; opening of the Parliament, 286; indignation of the People, 287; remonstrances against Mary's Marriage, 288; Bothwell invites the Nobles to supper, 289; and makes them sign a bond in his favour, 290; plan for Mary's abduction, 292; her letters to Bothwell, 293; he takes her prisoner at Almond Bridge, 294; divorce of Bothwell, 295; Mary returns to Edinburgh, 295; conduct of John Craig, 296; Bothwell is created Duke of Orkney, 297; and marries Mary Stuart, 297.

## CHAPTER VI.

### FROM MARY'S MARRIAGE WITH BOTHWELL TO HER FLIGHT INTO ENGLAND.

Mary's quarrels with Bothwell, 299; Bothwell's behaviour towards her, 300; embassy of the Bishop of Dumblane, 301; Robert Melvil is sent to England, 302; Bothwell's letters to Charles IX., and Elizabeth, 303; confederation against Bothwell, 304; Grange demands Elizabeth's assistance, 304; his letters to the English Court, 305; conduct of the Court of France, 307; policy of Elizabeth, 308; Mary Stuart's behaviour, 309; she retires to Borthwick Castle, 310; insurrection of the Nobles, 311; they enter Edinburgh in triumph, 312; Mary collects an army at Dunbar, 313; Battle of Carberry Hill, 315; mediation of Du Croc, 316; Bothwell proposes a single combat, 320; Mary surrenders to the Nobles, 321; flight of Bothwell, 322; Mary is conducted to Edinburgh, 324; the Lords hold a Council, 327; and order her imprisonment, 328; she is taken to Lochleven Castle, 329; effect of her imprisonment on her subjects, 330; on foreign Princes, 331; on Queen Elizabeth, 332; discovery of the Silver Casket, 333; Robert Melvil arrives at Edinburgh, 334; embassy of Throckmorton, 335; his propositions for an arrangement, 336; Knox returns into Scotland, 337; league between the Presbyterians and the Nobles, 338; Mary is denounced from the pulpit, 338; plans of the confederate Lords, 340; Mary refuses to desert Bothwell, 341; the Confederates resolve to depose her, 342; the Three Acts of Abdication, 342; Mary is compelled to sign them, 344; the Hamiltons meet at Dumbarton, 345; Elizabeth's protest against the conduct of the Lords, 346; Coronation of the Prince Royal, 348; Murray sets out for Scotland, 349; his interview with Elizabeth at London, 350; proposition of the Hamiltons, 351; Murray arrives in Scotland, 352; he visits Mary at Lochleven Castle, 353; his behaviour towards her, 354; she requests him to accept the Regency, 356; he consents, and is proclaimed, 357; his oath of office, 358; Elizabeth's irritation and disappointment, 360; Murray's answer to her representations, 361; Grange goes in pursuit of Bothwell, 362; Bothwell escapes to Denmark, 363; is imprisoned at Malmoe, where he dies, 363; execution of his subaltern accomplices, 363; administration of the Regent Murray, 365; proceedings of the Parliament, 365; Mary's treatment in her captivity, 366; she attempts to escape, but fails, 367; her letters to various Sovereigns, 368; she escapes from Lochleven Castle, 370; she revokes her Abdication, 371; and collects a large army at Hamilton Castle, 372; Murray prepares to oppose her, 373; Battle of Langside, 376; defeat of Mary Stuart's army, 377; she takes refuge in England, 378.

HISTORY OF  
MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS.

---

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Scotland before the Reign of Mary Stuart—Wars with England for the Maintenance of her Independence—Conflicts of her Kings and Barons—Her Condition at the Death of James V. and Accession of Mary Stuart.

UNTIL the time when England and Scotland were united together under the name of Great Britain, no country in Europe was more disturbed by foreign invasion and domestic warfare than Scotland. Under none of her national Kings did she undergo so many revolutions, or present a series of such tragical catastrophes as under Mary Stuart. This Queen, whose life was a tissue of misfortunes from beginning to end, was scarcely six days old when she was called to the throne. Compelled ere long to fly her kingdom, she married the heir to the crown of France, who died when she was eighteen years of age. Left a widow in early youth, she returned into Scotland, where the Protestant revo-

lution had just taken place, and where she found the ancient untractableness of the feudal barons augmented by all the fanaticism which is inspired by a sudden change in religious belief. In a very short time, she was imprisoned, deposed, and proscribed ; and, in order to escape from the violence of her subjects, she fell into the power of her neighbours, who kept her in captivity for nineteen years, and finally beheaded her upon the scaffold.

In relating, after so many others, her touching and tragical history, I shall endeavour to depict its occurrences in all their reality, and to leave no uncertainty as to their true causes. To the documents which have recently been employed or discovered, I shall add others, hitherto unpublished. Thus provided with more complete materials than any of my predecessors, I shall, perhaps, be able to shed some new light upon the obscurer points of the subject. Free from all prepossession on either side, I shall be neither the apologist nor the traducer of this lovely Queen, who possesses a host of passionate admirers even at the present day. I shall not judge Mary Stuart as she would be judged by a Catholic or a Protestant, a Scotchman or an Englishman. With the calm impartiality of history, I shall strive to show how far her misfortunes were merited, and how far they were the result of necessity, by giving such an explanation of her position and conduct, as shall be devoid at once of indulgence and of harshness.

In the first place, however, it is indispensably necessary briefly to describe the political state of Scotland, and the spirit of the Presbyterian revolution, both of which exercised great influence upon the destiny of Mary Stuart.

Situated at the northern extremity of the island of Britain, with a surface diversified by mountains, lakes, and plains ; cold, poor, and warlike ; Scotland had uniformly succeeded in defending herself against the different conquerors who had successively occupied the southern portion of the island. In ancient times, she had escaped from the Roman yoke ; from the arms of the Saxons, Angles, and Danes, at the period of the Germanic invasions ; and from the dominion of the Anglo-Normans, during the feudal period. Her rude and intrepid inhabitants were divided into clans, governed by the head of the family or tribe, whom his followers served with fidelity, and for whom they would willingly sacrifice their lives. All the members of the same clan bore the same name ; and between clan and clan were entertained, for injuries inflicted, and murders committed, those hereditary feelings of vengeance, those deadly hatreds, which form one of the principal characteristics of that primitive state of society in which the family constitutes the only bond of association. A remnant of the ancient Gallic race, they possessed an enterprising character, a quarrelsome disposition, indomitable courage, changeful tastes, and almost equally changeless manners. At the time of Mary Stuart, they

still retained the language, the costume, the organisation, and, to some extent, the arms of the Celtic tribes.

During the period which elapsed from the end of the eleventh century, until nearly the end of the thirteenth, their national Kings had admitted, or allowed to penetrate into the Lowlands of Scotland, some fugitive Saxons and adventurous Normans, who had established themselves there less as conquerors than as colonists. At about the same time, the feudal system of the Germanic nations was introduced, beside the patriarchal system of the Gallic tribes, which had continued to prevail among the Grampian Mountains in the north, and the Cheviot Hills in the south, as well as throughout the marshy lands which divided Scotland from England. From this period, there existed in this small kingdom two peoples, two languages, two states of society, two forms of organisation. The old Celtic race kept to the mountainous country ; the Germanic race of the Anglo-Saxons and Normans occupied the plains. The wild *Highlanders*, as they were called, spoke Gaelic ; the armed colonists of the Lowlands spoke English. The former continued to live in clans, the latter under the institutions of feudalism ; and while the first recognised no bond but that of family relationship, the others acknowledged all the political and territorial framework of a military society.

War, so to speak, was of permanent existence in Scotland, where very few towns were built, but which

literally bristled with fortresses, into which the inhabitants of the country used to retire whenever a private feud broke out. To the quarrels, which were of continual occurrence between clan and clan, as well as between the Highlanders and Lowlanders, were added foreign wars of no mean importance. The Anglo-Norman Kings, who had invaded Ireland and conquered Wales, aspired to become the masters of Scotland also. They would thus have reduced under their sway all that portion of the British Isles in which the Gallic race still maintained its independence. Several times had they entered into Scotland victoriously, and even seemed to have completely established themselves therein under Edward I. and Edward III., in spite of the heroic efforts of Wallace, and the obstinate resistance of Robert Bruce. In all probability, they would, at this period, have annexed Scotland to England, if they had not been compelled, to employ all their forces in the defence or aggrandisement of their possessions on the Continent. The long wars which they waged against the Kings of France, for more than a century, prevented them from completing the conquest of Ireland, and consolidating that of Scotland. Thus we find, that in 1357, when David II. was restored to the throne so gloriously founded by his father Robert Bruce, the national independence of Scotland had been placed beyond dispute, and was no longer menaced by the Kings of England.



France had largely contributed to ensure this great result. Exposed to the continual attacks of the same enemy, she had contracted an alliance with Scotland, which lasted from the thirteenth century until the end of the sixteenth, and was of equal advantage to both countries, as it enabled each in turn to get rid of the English. This alliance was carefully maintained by the Kings of France, who sent assistance to the Scotch when they were in peril, and received support from the Scotch in their own wars; who surrounded themselves by a Scottish guard, gave titles and lands to several members of the important houses of Stuart, Douglas, and Hamilton; and opened their court as an asylum or a school to those of the Scottish nobility who came to the Continent in search of refuge or education. It lasted until the end of the sixteenth century, and exercised no slight influence upon the destiny of Mary Stuart, by rendering her a Frenchwoman by her birth, her education, her first marriage, and her manners; and by originating that spirit of insurrection among the high aristocracy of Scotland, which reached so inordinate a height during the minority and absence of this princess.

The five Kings who preceded Mary Stuart upon the throne, in obedience to the general tendency which prompted every State to a concentration of authority, had vainly endeavoured to subject this formidable nobility to the monarchical sway. A political struggle

had then commenced between them and the great barons, which took the place of the national conflict between the Scotch and English. The great barons, many of whom were at once heads of clans and feudal lords, had considerable forces at their disposal. The chieftain of the Black Douglas clan alone, who held the Scottish marches in the south, had from one thousand to fifteen hundred horsemen as his ordinary escort, and could at any time bring an army of forty thousand men into the field. The Kings, on the contrary, possessed neither permanent troops, nor financial resources. Their strength consisted entirely in the royal title, which was not, however, always respected; and their principal means of action was the fleeting and changeable attachment of the great families, whom they employed as checks upon each other. Notwithstanding this limited power, the daring dynasty of the Stuarts, who had succeeded, by marriage, to the throne of Robert Bruce, laboured almost incessantly, from 1423 until 1542, to diminish the influence and humble the pride of the high aristocracy.

This difficult task was commenced by James I. On his return to Scotland, after twenty years of captivity in England, he took the English government for his model, and endeavoured to establish it in his own country. In order to overawe all resistance, he made an expedition into the Highlands, and seized no fewer than forty chiefs of clans. He next attacked several of the great lords who ruled over their possessions as absolute

sovereigns,—thus striking a heavy blow at the two aristocracies whose existence hampered the exercise of the royal authority. He also interdicted the confederations of the barons; divided the Parliament of Scotland, which had previously formed a single House in which the nobility predominated, into two Houses; provided for the more vigorous administration of justice, by bringing under its cognisance, at assizes held four times a year throughout the kingdom, those disputes which it had been customary to settle by an appeal to arms; and resumed from their unlawful or rebellious possessors those counties and domains which they had either usurped from the crown or employed in opposition to its interests. But the nobles, alarmed at his innovations and severity, arrested further proceedings by an assassination. A plot was formed against him, and the conspirators, having surprised him in Perth, murdered him on the night of the 20th of February, 1436.

All the changes which he had introduced into the State disappeared during the minority of his son, James II.; who, however, resumed his father's plans as soon as he became of age. The Earl of Douglas, the most powerful baron of the south, had made a league with the Earl of Crawford, who possessed great influence in the east, and with the Earl of Ross, who was equally strong in the north. James II., having failed to induce him to renounce this confederation, stabbed him with his own hand in Stirling Castle, whither he had come

in reliance upon a safe conduct. After this act of treason and violence, an implacable war arose between the Stuarts and Douglasses, who marched against each other at the head of equal forces. The two armies, each consisting of forty thousand men, met on the banks of the river Esk. Either the Stuarts must crush the Douglasses, or the Douglasses dispossess the Stuarts. The Stuarts gained the victory, in consequence of the dread felt by the nobility of the power of that haughty and ambitious house, which, if it had been victorious, would have threatened them with a more formidable yoke than that of the reigning family. James of Douglas, abandoned by a portion of his troops, was defeated, dispossessed, and banished. With him fell the branch of the Black Douglasses; and their possessions were divided between the Red Douglasses of the Angus branch, the Hamiltons in the west, and the Scotts of Buccleuch in the south,—three families which rose upon the ruins of the conquered clan, but none of which ever obtained the same importance.

The enterprising James II. did not long survive this success, which rendered him very formidable to his nobility. He was killed in 1460, at twenty-nine years of age, by the bursting of a cannon at the siege of Roxburgh. This fate probably saved him from one similar to that which his father had experienced, and which was reserved for his son. James III., left a minor, continued the work of his two predecessors as

soon as he became old enough to govern. But he acted without discernment and energy. Surrounded by ministers and favourites sprung from the lower ranks of the people, he delegated his authority to persons who endangered, instead of increasing, it. Instead of dividing the nobility, he united them against himself, and displayed as much timidity as incapacity in meeting their attacks. In 1482, the Scottish barons deprived him of his vulgar favourites, whom they hanged upon the bridge of Lauder ; and in 1488, they gave him battle at Sauchie, and slew him in his flight.

Alarmed or admonished by their unhappy fate, James IV. did not follow the footsteps of his ancestors. He made terms with the Scottish nobility, whom they had attacked, and effected a reconciliation with the Kings of England, whom they had warred against. He then took advantage of this internal tranquillity and external peace to strengthen his kingdom and extend its civilisation. He had married the daughter of the politic Henry VII. of England, who had just brought to a conclusion the violent civil wars between the Houses of York and Lancaster, and who readily perceived the advantages which would accrue to his insecurely established sovereignty from such an alliance. The Tudors, whose dynasty was founded by Henry VII., entertained new views with regard to Scotland. They had no intention to incorporate it violently with, or subject it feudally to, England, as the Plantagenets had

previously attempted to do. But they were anxious to bring it into alliance with England by marriages and treaties, and thus to withdraw it from that connexion with France, which, for two centuries, had so powerfully contributed to frustrate the plans of their predecessors, both at home and on the Continent. To effect the political assimilation of the two countries, and thus prepare the way for their territorial junction—such was the plan which Henry VII. inaugurated by the marriage of his daughter Margaret with James IV., and by a treaty of alliance offensive and defensive, which was the first wound inflicted on the ancient union of Scotland and France. But Henry VIII., who possessed neither the skilful dexterity nor the politic foresight of his father, soon thwarted his intentions. In 1513, he compelled James IV. to form a fresh alliance with France, and to take up arms against him. The war had, it is true, an issue fatal to the King and nobility of Scotland, who, for once, acted in concert. James IV. was totally defeated. He fell on the battle-field of Flodden, with ten thousand of his troops, among whom were two bishops, two mitred abbots, twelve earls, thirteen lords, five eldest sons of peers, and many nobles of inferior rank. The kingdom fell into the greatest disorder under his young successor, James V., who was under two years of age when he ascended the throne.

During the long minority of James V., the great families of Scotland contended furiously with each

other for the supreme authority, and combats between their different factions were of frequent occurrence, even in the streets of Edinburgh. The Hamiltons and Red Douglasses, however, possessed most influence in the country. The chieftain of the former was the Earl of Arran, the nearest heir to the crown after the Stuarts; while the latter obeyed the Earl of Angus, who had married the widow of James IV., and the sister of Henry VIII. The family of the Hamiltons was, in general, faithful to the French policy; while that of the Douglasses supported, and strove to extend, English influence throughout the country. After many years of opposition, the two factions entered into a league at the expense of the monarch. The young prince was kept under such strict tutelage that he resembled an actual captive. This led him to conceive an implacable hatred for the Scottish nobility; and to the systematic project for its humiliation which had been pursued by his predecessors, he added an earnest desire to be revenged upon it. As soon as he had succeeded in shaking off the yoke of the Earl of Angus, who governed in his name, he marched against him, and compelled him to seek refuge in England, where this chieftain of the Red Douglasses lived an exile during the lifetime of James V.

The impetuous James V. displayed more boldness than his forefathers had shown in restoring the general authority of the crown, and reducing the anarchical

power of the nobility. He humbled the Red Douglases as effectually as his great-grandfather, James II. had humbled the elder branch of the family. He next made an expedition to the southern frontier of his kingdom, where the warlike clans of the Hepburns, Homes, Scotts, and Kers, were living in complete insubordination ; took their castles, seized their chieftains, and punished their disobedience. He succeeded in inspiring universal dread of his authority and rigour ; punished the murders, which were of constant occurrence among his rude and hot-headed subjects ; visited with severe penalties the house-burning and cattle-stealing, which had become a common practice in the country ; improved its judicial institutions, favoured mental cultivation, gave a stimulus to various kinds of trade, and rendered the internal peace of the nation so secure that it was said on every hand, that "the furze-bushes kept the cows."

All these changes were, however, ephemeral. Effected only on the surface of Scottish society, they were not allowed time to penetrate to its depths. Henry VIII. contributed largely to prevent this. This headstrong and imperious prince was desirous that the King, his nephew, should adopt all his plans, both political and religious. When he seceded from the Church of Rome, he urged James V. to introduce into his kingdom, the same change of religious faith which he had just accomplished in his own. He perceived that it was impossible



for Scotland to remain Catholic, at the time when England was becoming Protestant, without resuming those continental alliances which his father and himself had been so anxious to break off, and without giving rise to fresh causes of enmity which would renew and aggravate the ancient hostility of the two nations. He, therefore, made most tempting proposals to his nephew, and offered him his eldest daughter in marriage.

James V. hesitated for a moment.\* The extreme corruption of the Scottish clergy, who united to the laxity then universally charged against churchmen, the gross habits and violent manners of the Scottish nobility, made the King incline towards a reformation.

\* He felt great aversion towards the Archbishop of St. Andrews, James Beton, or Beaton, son of the laird of Balfour. Ample evidence of this is supplied by an instruction of James V., inserted by M. Teulet in the two volumes of *Pièces et documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire d'Ecosse au XVI. siècle, tirés des archives et bibliothèques de France*, recently published by the Bannatyne Club. In this instruction, which was prepared for the agents sent by James V. to the Pope, this prince states that during his minority, the Archbishop abused his power in order to enrich himself and his relations; and that, though sprung from a small and poor family, he had married his niece to the chieftain of the Hamiltons, the Earl of Arran, cousin to the King, and the nearest heir to the throne. He adds:—"Quant nous sommes venus à l'aige que nostre auctorité estoit entre nous mains, ledict archevesque, portant impatiement d'estre bouté hors de ce gouvernement et auctorité où il estoit paravant, par la richesse et soubstance qu'il avoit amassé et accumulé cidevant par l'usage de nostre auctorité et telles autres subtiles moyens, sollicitoit et convenoit (réunissoit) unge grand parte des seigneurs, barons et subjectes, et est venu, en manière de guerre, luy-mames en personne avecques eux, et nous a asseigé aprement et activelment par unge pièce de temps, dedans nostre chastiau d'Edinburgh, et nous tenoit là-dedans, jusques à ce que, pour la sauveté de nostre vie et pour éviter grandes dangiers et périlceles, nous estions forcés et compellés, contre nostre intention et voloir, de mettre nostre person, auctorité et gouvernement de nostre royaume en ses mains et aucunes autres ses collèges, estant avec luy par son solistation, a l'èvre desquelles le Comte d'Angus, son frère et oncle, estiont principaulx, lesquelles sont et ont esté par longue temps nous (nos) rebelles évèques (avec) nous (nos) énemys d'Engleterre, lesquelles sont la principale cause et occasion des grandes dommages que nous et nostre dict royaume a sustenu de par nous dictes enemys d'Engleterre." Pp. 97, 98. This document, which extends over pages 95—108, is exceedingly interesting and valuable.

The immense property possessed by the clergy also tempted him. He even permitted the poet, Sir David Lindsay, and Dr. George Buchanan, to publish satires against the monks and priests, which obtained a large share of public favour. But he quickly changed his mind. He saw, or it was explained to him, that by humiliating the clergy he would strengthen the nobility, and that the property of the former of these bodies could not be taken from it, without passing, in great measure, to the second. To act thus, would be to thwart the projects of his predecessors, and to disavow his own previous actions,—to abandon the plan which had been pursued for more than a century with regard to the nobility, in order to adopt one diametrically opposed to it. James V. further considered that the clergy, in whose ranks resided nearly all the talent in the kingdom, and who supplied the majority of men competent to exercise high civil functions, would, by their disappearance, plunge Scotland in ignorance, and deprive him of all counterpoise to the parliamentary, as well as territorial, influence of the feudal aristocracy. The primate Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, and the other bishops, furnished him with another reason for leaving them alone, by offering him, in the name of the clergy, an annual subsidy of fifty thousand crowns out of the rents of the Kirk,\* which was destined to satisfy his covetousness, and aid him to defend himself

\* *Memoires of Sir James Melvil of Halhill*, p. 4. (Lond., 1683.)

against Henry VIII., if that prince became discontented and declared war.

Compelled to choose between the ruin of the Catholic Church and the humiliation of the feudal nobility, James V. resolved to persevere in the latter course. But, in rejecting the oppressive friendship of Henry VIII., it became necessary for him to recur to the protective alliance of Francis I. He was, therefore, forced to return to the ancient policy of his family and country. In 1536, he proceeded to France in order to consummate his marriage with Magdalen, the daughter of Francis I.\* This princess dying a few months after her marriage, he took as his second wife, during the year following, Mary of Lorraine, widow of the Duke of Longueville, and sister of Duke Francis of Guise. This union was indicative of the policy which he intended to pursue, both with regard to the religious innovators, whose doctrines were secretly gaining ground in Scotland, and to the territorial nobles, who endured with impatience the pressure of his authority. He persecuted the Protestants by stringent laws and cruel executions, and extended his violence to the chief families of the kingdom. Every suspicion of a conspiracy on the part of the latter was followed by

\* M. Teulet has published a project of marriage with Mary of Bourbon, daughter of the Duke de Vendôme, whom James V. visited in September, 1536, in disguise, and whom he did not marry, because she did not please him (vol. i. pp. 109-121); and some curious documents relative to his residence and expenses in France, from the end of December, 1536, until April, 1537 (vol. i. pp. 122-126).

condign punishment. Goaded to the last degree of irritation and hatred, the nobles only awaited an opportunity for giving expression to their feelings regarding James V. Such an opportunity quickly presented itself.

Henry VIII. renewed his solicitations to the King of Scotland to unite with him in introducing the Reformation into his country. He even proceeded to York, where James V. had promised to meet him. But for six days the uncle waited in vain for his nephew, and furious at this want of respect, immediately declared war against him. This was a perilous moment for James V. He could not repulse the King of England without the armed assistance of the Scottish nobles, who were more disposed to cripple his strength than to render him victorious. This feeling was soon manifested. When the English retired into their own country, after having ravaged the frontiers of Scotland, the Scottish nobles refused to pursue them beyond the border, declaring to James V. that this war was injurious to the interests of the kingdom ; and that, moreover, the retreat of the enemy rendered its continuation useless. Their bold defection plunged the unfortunate monarch into deep dejection. He nevertheless prepared an expedition against England, entrusting the command to Oliver Sinclair, whom the nobles detested as a favourite of the King and friend of the clergy, and who advanced by the western frontier at the head of ten

thousand men. The Scottish army, having met five hundred English near the eastern extremity of Solway Frith, fled before them, preferring to humiliate the King by suffering a defeat, rather than strengthen him by gaining a victory which would turn to the advantage of his authority. The ignominious and significant defeat at Solway Moss drove James V. to despair. Fever seized him, and he died on the 14th of December, 1542, in the Castle of Falkland, in the thirty-first year of his age. A few days before his death he learned that his wife had just given birth to a daughter at Linlithgow ; and, referring to the fact that a grand-daughter of Robert Bruce had brought the crown of Scotland into the Stuart family, he said mournfully : " It came by a woman, and it will go by one."\* This daughter was Mary Stuart, born on the 8th of December, 1542.

At the time when this Queen, whose long minority was destined to restore and extend the anarchical domination of the nobility, ascended the throne, the work of transformation undertaken by the five Kings who had preceded her, had made externally little progress. The ancient condition of Scotland was hardly at all changed. Few towns had been enlarged, and very few built, although the country still bristled with fortresses. The clans and fiefs subsisted in all their

\* " It will end as it began ; the crown came by a woman, and it will go by one ; miseries approach this poor kingdom ; King Henry will labour to make it his own, by arms or by marriage."—Keith's History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland, p. 22. (Edinb., 1734.)

primitive vigour. They found no counterpoise either in the commons, who had not yet received sufficient development, or in the monarchy, which had not yet become sufficiently powerful. The Kings had, indeed, attempted to introduce into Scotland some general organisation of the state, but without the success which had attended similar efforts in other countries. The legislative power, the national forces, and the judicial authority—which last remained hereditary, not only in the domains of the barons, but also in the royal districts, where it was exercised by officers called seneschals, bailiffs, or stewards,\*—were retained in the hands of the nobility, who directed the Parliaments, sat in the tribunals of justice, composed the feudal army, and even obtained the provostship of the towns.

The Parliament of Scotland consisted of a single assembly. King James I. had for a time divided it into two Houses, like the English Parliament; but this innovation had not been continued. Restored to its ancient form, the Parliament of Scotland formed the Great Council of the country, in which the lords spiritual and temporal, the deputies of the burghs, and the officers

\* See the *Etat et Constitution du Royaume d'Escoce en Janvier, 1559*. This document is printed in pp. 223-242 of the *Négociations, lettres, et pièces diverses relatives au règne de François II.*, published by M. Louis Paris in the large collection of inedited documents respecting the history of France (Paris, 1841). It is signed by J. Makgill, clerk of the register, and J. Bellenden, justice-clerk. The barons, seneschals, bailiffs, stewards, and provosts of towns had both civil and criminal jurisdiction. (Ib. pp. 229-233.) "Tous lesquels sénéchaux ont leurs offices en héritage du père au fils, et ainsi de degré en degré." (Ib. p. 229.) "Chacuns lesdits officiers ont leurs offices en héritages." (Ib. p. 233.)

of the crown deliberated in common. The landed aristocracy greatly predominated in it. By an arrangement peculiar to Scotland, a small Council of thirty-two members was detached from the greater one, under the name of the *Committee of the Lords of the Articles*, which prepared all the business which was to be discussed during the session. This Committee directed the Parliament by which it was elected.

The Kings of Scotland had attempted to institute some general administration of justice superior to that of the feudal barons. This was at first itinerant, at assizes held every three months, in the different parts of the kingdom, by the *Lords of Session*, who were created by James I. It became stationary under James IV., by the establishment at Edinburgh of the *Court of Daily Council*. Finally, it was rendered still more complete by James V., who founded the *College of Justice*.\* But, as it was still administered by the nobles themselves, it remained in too great dependence upon their passions and quarrels. Where there is no impartial public influence, there can be no respected general justice. Justice then becomes nothing more than a form of oppression ; and the strong use it to crush the weak.

\* “ Les derniers et suprêmes juges en le royaume sont les *Seigneurs de la Session*, aultrement nommés le *Collège de Justice* . . . . Ledits seigneurs sont au nombre de quinze, sçavoir est un président et aultres sept tousjours de l'estat spirituel, et sept aultres gens laïques.” (Ib. p. 231.) If within three days after the commission of a crime, the barons, bailiffs, seneschals, and stewards, do not punish its perpetrators, “ leur jurisdiction est pour ce expirée, et partant sont tenus de mettre éswains de la suprême justice les dits meurtriers et mutilateurs.” (Ib. p. 232.)

In Scotland, at this time, the Kings had not succeeded in organising any public influence to support them. Possessed of very moderate revenues, they were not able to maintain any permanent troops.\* Their army had remained feudal. At the first signal, all those who owed military service flocked to their standards, to remain a very short time. The Kings had neither forces sufficient to crush the nobility, nor any regular administration which they could substitute for their disorderly authority. Compelled to employ the territorial barons against each other, they dispossessed those who opposed them, to aggrandise those who were favourable to them. They thus varied the distribution of the power of the aristocracy without weakening it as a whole; and instead of breaking in pieces the framework of feudalism, they filled it up in a different manner. The consequence was that they merely changed their antagonists. They had indeed endeavoured to render the royal domain inalienable, to recover the usurped rights of the crown, to abolish the hereditary guardianship of the frontiers, to diminish as much as possible the number of hereditary offices,

\* In 1551, the king's revenue amounted only to ninety thousand crowns, according to a Venetian ambassador. "Sono piu abbondanti d'huomini che di ricchezza, perche il re non ha 90<sup>m</sup> scudi d'entrata." *Relatione d'Inghilterra et Scotia di Messer Daniele Barbaro, che fu ambasciatore al re Edouardo del 1551, et poi Patriarcho eletto d'Aquileia.* (Nat. Lib. Paris, MS. Saint Germain, No. 793, fol. 29.) According to Lethington, Mary Stuart's Secretary of State, she derived, in 1563, an annual income of two hundred thousand crowns from Scotland. He made this statement to the Spanish ambassador, Quadra, who wrote to Philip II. :—"Dixome que vale dozientos mille escudos de renta, lo que su ama posee en Escocia." (Quadra to the King. MS. Despatch, March 18, 1563. (Archives of Simancae.)



and to interdict all confederations of the barons ; but, yielding to the irresistible influence of usage and necessity, they had distributed the property which they had confiscated, restored the titles which they had withdrawn, continued the hereditary offices which they had interdicted, and most of them had found themselves unable to prevent the leagues which they had condemned.\*

Of the five Kings who occupied the throne before Mary Stuart, two had been assassinated, James I. and James III. ; two had fallen in battle, James II. and James IV. ; and the last, James V., had died of despair at beholding himself deserted by his nobility, whom he had hoped to subjugate, and at finding himself defeated at the moment when he believed his triumph secure. All the five had fallen

\* The state of Scotland at the middle of the sixteenth century, is thus described by the Venetian ambassador, Barbaro :—“ In questo regno ci sono grandi dissensioni civili per la potentia et odii perticulari dei signori. Usano due lingue; una i domestici, et questa poca lontana dall' Inglese ; l'altra, i selvaggi che del tutto parlano diversamente. Governa il Re col consiglio dei principi; usano le legge civili ; fanno i parlamenti al modo Inglese. Sono piu abondanti d'huomini che di ricchezze, perche il re non ha 90<sup>m</sup> scudi d'entrata, et sono tanti che si alla sprovvista comparressa un esercito di 50<sup>m</sup> persone, non passerebbono dieci hore, che trovaria rencontro. Danosi i segni coi fumi sopra i monti. Corrono al romore armati di camiscia di maglia, di celata, lancia et spada una mano et mezza, laquale pero manegiano con una destramente. Giunti al luogo del combattere, lasciano i cavalli, quali sono del vincitore, perche non si partono di luogo finche si combatte. Hanno per ogni lega due fortezze o rocche dove ricorrono le genti a salvarsi ne primi impeti delle questioni private. Il paese non ha terra murata d'importanza. Quando il regno e sotto governatori per esser el re pupillo, il governatore e como re assoluto, tira l'entrate et commanda, et quando restituisce el regno non e obligato a render conto de cosa alcuna. . . . Li Scocesi hanno più giuste cause di venir ad assaltar l'Inghilterra che Inglesei la Scotia, perche il paese da se e poverissimo, et gli huomini di sua natura poco industriosi se diletano più presto di latrocinii che di fatiche.” *Relatione d'Inghilterra et Scotia di Messer Daniele Barbaro.* (Nat. Lib. Paris, MS. Saint Germain, No. 793, fols. 29 and 30.)

victims to the antagonism of the Scottish aristocracy, or to the hostility of England. Placed in circumstances too powerful for them to resist, they had all, while still young, lost their lives in battle or by conspiracy. The oldest of them had not completed his forty-first year, and all had left infants to succeed them. During five successive and prolonged minorities, there had been not merely a suspension of the royal work, but even a paralysis of the monarchy. The nobles regained all the power they had lost, and Scotland relapsed into her former disorders. It was thus that, in spite of their plans and efforts, these five Kings, by allowing the same state of society to subsist, handed down to each other the same dangers. These dangers were multiplied in the case of Mary Stuart, during whose minority such a revolution was effected in the religious belief of the nation, as added fresh causes of insubordination and conflict to those already in existence. The Protestant Réformation occurred to strengthen and extend the anarchy of the aristocracy.

## CHAPTER II.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF MARY STUART TO HER RETURN  
FROM FRANCE INTO SCOTLAND.

Minority of Mary Stuart—War with England—Mary is sent to France—Regency of Mary of Lorraine—Marriage of Mary Stuart—Her Pretensions to the Crown of England—Origin and Progress of Protestantism in Scotland—Treaty of Berwick—Death of the Regent—Treaty of Edinburgh—Mary Stuart becomes a Widow, and returns to Scotland.

MARY STUART was the first woman who ever occupied the throne of Scotland ; and to the weakness attaching to her sex she added that of her tender age. The regency of the kingdom, which would naturally be of long duration under a Queen who was scarcely six days old when she succeeded her father, was contended for by Cardinal Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews,\* whose rank as primate placed him at the head of the Scottish Church, and by James Hamilton, Earl of Arran, and heir presumptive to the crown, who was supported by the majority of the barons. The head of the

\* It even appears that he induced the dying King, some few minutes before he expired, to sign a blank paper, which was afterwards converted into a will, in which the Archbishop was appointed tutor to the young Queen, and Governor of the kingdom. The Earls of Argyle, Huntly, and Arran were named as his councillors and assessors in the administration. This will was published at Edinburgh, but its provisions were not carried into effect by the nobility, who would probably not have obeyed it, even if they had not doubted its authenticity. (Keith, p. 25.)

nobility gained an easy victory over the head of the clergy. The Earl of Arran was entrusted by the assembled Parliament with the regency of the kingdom, and the guardianship of the young Queen. Mary Stuart was thereupon crowned, on the 9th of September, 1543, at Stirling, by Cardinal Beaton.

From this period were formed, and called into action, those two parties which were destined to dispute with each other for the power, the person, and the inheritance of Mary Stuart, and to seek the support of England and France respectively in their undertaking. The first faction, composed originally of the greater part of the nobility who were now restored to the possession of their independence, withdrew the government entirely from the hands of the second, which consisted of the clergy, and was directed by the discontented primate,\* in concert with the Queen Dowager, at this moment perfectly powerless. Henry VIII. did not fail to seize an opportunity so favourable for the accomplishment of his designs upon Scotland. Some years before he had offered his daughter Mary in marriage to James V., and he now demanded the hand of Mary Stuart for his son, the Prince of Wales.† This proposal was as politic as it was opportune. By the union of the

\* The Cardinal, who had invited the Duke of Guise to come in arms and assume the government of the kingdom, was himself placed in custody of Lord Seton, at Blackness Castle. (Keith, p. 27.)

† This was foreseen by James V., whose last words were, "Miseries approach this poor kingdom; King Henry will labour to make it his own, by arms or by marriage." (Keith, p. 22.)

heiress of Scotland with the heir of England, the union of the two countries would be effected naturally and without difficulty. But Henry VIII. caused the failure of his own project. His fiery spirit, which could neither suffer delay, nor brook uncertainty, rendered him at once too impatient and too exacting. He claimed the guardianship of the young Queen until she had reached a marriageable age, and meanwhile he required that several of the strongest fortresses in the kingdom should be placed in his hands. This was not attempting the conquest of the kingdom, as the Edwards had done, but confiscating the monarchy, and placing Scotland under the provisional sequestration of England.

This unwise precipitancy, and an unreasonable exaction justly offensive to Scottish pride, were very injurious to Henry VIII., who soon found himself compelled to diminish his pretensions. He contented himself with requiring that Mary Stuart should be sent into England when she had attained the tenth year of her age, that she might there espouse the Prince of Wales, as soon as it was possible for the marriage to be celebrated. A treaty was concluded upon these conditions, on the 1st of July, 1543. But even this treaty was repugnant to the mind of the nation, and influenced Scotland strongly in favour of an alliance with France. The Earl of Arran, whose family had always been friends of France, and whom the interests of his ambition alone

had momentarily biassed in favour of England, now joined the Queen Dowager, from whom he as yet feared nothing, and the Cardinal Primate, who had ceased to be formidable. This junction once more produced a sudden change in the policy of Scotland. The treaty with Henry VIII. was annulled five months after it had been concluded, and a close alliance with France was signed at Edinburgh, on the 15th of December, by the Regent and Estates of Scotland, who ratified, in the name of Mary Stuart, all the treaties which had been entered into between the two countries since the time of Robert Bruce.

War with England was thus rendered inevitable. Henry VIII., furiously incensed, immediately declared it; and sent into the Frith of Forth a fleet which ravaged its coasts, and even threatened to burn the city of Edinburgh. A short time afterwards, an English army crossed the southern frontier, and repeatedly laid waste the Scottish territory. To demand Mary Stuart in marriage in this violent manner, was to render it certain that he would not obtain her. By this impolitic war, Henry succeeded only in inspiring the Scotch with an universal hatred of the English, whose party dwindled rapidly away; induced them to summon auxiliary troops from France, and excited a violent persecution of the religious reformers, who were attached to his cause, and whose leaders, already numerous, were taken in the Castle of St.

Andrews, and sent to work in chains in the French galleys. He died in January, 1547, very far from attaining the object he had so long pursued, having failed in his attempts to unite the two houses of the Stuarts and the Tudors, and thus to blend into one the two kingdoms of Scotland and England.

The Duke of Somerset, the maternal uncle of Edward VI., and Protector of the kingdom during his minority, carried on the plans of the late King with equal vigour. During the year in which Henry VIII. died, he entered Scotland at the head of an army, which he offered to lead back into England if the Scotch would promise that their Queen should not be sent to the Continent until she was of marriageable age, and if they would break off all connexion with France. But the latter preferred to fight rather than submit to English dictation, and on the 10th of September, 1547, they fought and lost the battle of Pinkie. This fatal defeat, which cost them more than ten thousand men, opened Scotland to their inveterate enemies. The English advanced as far as Leith, and subsequently established themselves in the southern part of the country, where they took up a strong position, and received the submission of the principal lairds of the warlike districts of that frontier.

Weakened, but nothing daunted, by this great reverse, the national party in Scotland had recourse to France, which alone was able effectually to protect their country

against the arms of England. In order to interest her in their cause by other than political reasons, they were ready to offer her that which the English so ardently desired,—the guardianship and the inheritance of Mary Stuart. This princess, now nearly six years of age, had hitherto resided in Stirling Castle, with her two governors, the Lords Erskine and Livingston. After the battle of Pinkie, she was removed from that fortress, which was in danger of being attacked, to the monastery of Inchmahome, situated in a little island in the lake of Menteith,\* which was less exposed to the incursions of the English army. The Queen Dowager, in concert with the Regent, then conceived the twofold plan of sending her daughter to the Continent, and affiancing her to the young Dauphin of France, who was about the same age as herself. The overtures which this politic princess made on the subject to the Scottish nobility and the court of France, were eagerly received by both parties ; † for all found their advantage in the scheme. The kingdom would acquire a protector capable of maintaining its independence ; the Queen Dowager hoped she would ere long be appointed Regent ; and the court of France expected to find, in an indissoluble alliance, the certain means of keeping England in check. But none derived greater advantages from it than the nobility of Scotland, whose turbulent predo-

\* Tyler's History of Scotland, (Edinb., 1846), vol. iv., p. 409.

† Ibid., vol. iv., p. 410.



minance could not fail to gain strength from the absence of Mary Stuart, and her marriage in a foreign land.

As soon as this project had been adopted by both parties, Henry II., who had succeeded Francis I., three months after the accession of Edward VI., sent a fleet into the Forth, manned by six thousand men, and provided with an excellent train of artillery, under the command of André de Montalembert, Lord of Essé. This leader of the auxiliary troops, when introduced into the Scottish Parliament, announced that the King his master, happy to cement the ancient union of the two countries by the marriage of their two heirs, willingly undertook to defend Scotland, and to educate the young Queen at his court, and solemnly pledged himself to respect the laws and liberties of the kingdom.\* This transaction completely disconcerted the plans of the Lord Protector, who had conquered Scotland without making her yield, and who, by devastating her territory, had only alienated her still more from England. He immediately published a manifesto, in which he disavowed any other design than that of uniting the two countries by a marriage, upon a footing of perfect equality, and under the common denomination of Britain. He declared that he was desirous thereby to put an end to the wars which had so long raged between them, to their mutual disadvantage. But his political reasonings met with no greater success than

\* Tytler, vol. iv., p. 417.

his military expeditions. The Duke of Somerset then attempted to prevent the young Queen of Scotland from proceeding to France. He despatched a fleet under the command of Admiral Clinton \* to intercept her passage, feeling certain that whichever of the two countries obtained the guardianship of her person, would be finally placed in possession of her kingdom.

The Queen Dowager, by the prudence and wisdom of her measures, preserved her daughter from this danger. She quickly conducted the young Mary from Inchmahome to Dumbarton, whither had proceeded, with no less haste than secrecy, the French Admiral Villegagnon, accompanied by four galleys, intended to convey her to France. The young princess embarked on board the royal galley with her two governors, her natural brother, Lord James Stuart, who was then seventeen years of age, and four companions of her own age belonging to the noble families of Fleming, Seton, Beaton, and Livingston. They were called the four Marys, because they all bore the same name. The little fleet, with its precious freight on board, left the western coast of Scotland on the 7th of August, a short time before the English squadron arrived at St. Abb's Head to oppose its departure. After a pleasant voyage, it arrived in safety in the harbour of Brest on the 13th of August. Mary was conducted to Saint Germain, where the court at that time resided, and was received

\* Tyler, vol. iv., p. 417.

and treated as a daughter by Henry II. He assigned her a household worthy her rank, and had her brought up with his own children.\*

All was now consummated. As the policy of union had not succeeded between Scotland and England, the old policy of rivalry and animosity was resumed, to be practised during all the rest of the century, sometimes with violence and sometimes with craftiness. After Mary Stuart's departure for the Continent, hostilities continued for two more years against her kingdom.† But the war changed its character, now that the Scotch had been reinforced by French troops. The English were defeated, lost most of the positions which they had occupied since the battle of Pinkie, and decided to evacuate the Scottish territory, and conclude a peace, which was signed at Boulogne on the 24th of March, and proclaimed at Edinburgh on the 20th of April, 1550. They were not, however, the less detested by their neighbours, all whose antipathies they had re-awakened by a war of nine years' duration.

The ten years which followed the peace of 1550 witnessed the progress, establishment, and fall of the French dominion in Scotland. The Queen Dowager,

\* Tytler, vol. iv, p. 418.

† The events of this war are related in a very lively, detailed, and interesting manner in a little book of 119 pages, 12mo., printed some years after, and entitled, "Histoire de la Guerre d'Escosse, traitant comme le royaume fut assailly et en grand partie occupé par les Anglois, et depuis rendu paisible à sa reyne, et reduit en son ancien estat et dignité. Par Jean de Beaugué, gentilhomme François. À Paris, pour Gilles Corrozet, en la grand' salle du Palais, 1556." I am indebted for this book to the kindness of M. de Montalembert.

whose ambition equalled her address, then aspired to govern her daughter's kingdom. In her efforts to obtain the regency she displayed the same ability which she had used to secure a close alliance between France and Scotland, and to contrive the marriage of Mary Stuart with the Dauphin. She had no difficulty in securing the interested support of Henry II. This prince, at whose court her two brothers, Duke Francis of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine, possessed great influence, placed the dukedom of Chatelherault at the disposal of the Earl of Arran, if the chieftain of the Hamiltons would resign the regency. Mary of Lorraine also gained over the nobility by making them offers which tempted their avidity; the Protestant party, which was already considerable, by showing great toleration for their doctrines; and the Earl of Huntly, who was the chief of the Gordons and the most powerful noble in the North, by promising to give him the earldom of Murray, and to create his eldest son Earl of Rothsay. At the same time she obtained for herself the tutelage of her daughter as the first step towards the administration of the kingdom. But it was not until after four years of intrigues and efforts that she attained her object. In the spring of 1554 the feeble Earl of Arran surrendered to her the regency, in exchange for which he received the duchy of Chatelherault and a handsome pension from France. He kept Dumbarton Castle until the Queen became of age, was

acknowledged to be the second person in the kingdom, and, in the event of Mary Stuart's death, would have succeeded to the throne. Mary of Lorraine, in the presence and with the consent of the estates of Scotland, received from her daughter, then nearly twelve years of age, the title and authority of Regent.\*

This able princess had now reached the end which she had never ceased to pursue. She had hitherto made no mistakes, which are more easily avoided when we desire than when we possess, when we aspire to rule than when we govern. When she stood in need of every one's favour, she was careful to keep on good terms with all. But this ceased to be the case as soon as she had acquired the royal authority. Influenced by a bias which it would have been difficult to avoid, she displayed too much favour towards France, to which country she owed her elevation. She conferred several of the great offices of the kingdom upon Frenchmen, giving the authority of Vice-Chancellor to M. de Rubay, the post of Comptroller to M. de Villemore, the government of Orkney to M. de Bonton, and leaving the general conduct of affairs to M. d'Oysel, who was her confidential adviser in all matters of state.† This

\* Tytler, vol. iv., pp. 429, 430.

† This was one of the principal complaints which the Scottish lords, after their insurrection in 1559, preferred against the administration of the Regent. They thus refer to the subject: "Magnum Schotie sigillum reatrix tantisper penes se esse voluit donec ex Parisiensi senatu advocatus Rubceus quidam in Schotiam est accersitus. Is postquam appulit, ad perstringendos popularium oculos, Cancellarii quidem nomen Huntlae Comiti . . . restitutum est . . . ita quidem ut titulo tenus Huntlae casset Cancellarius, re autem ipsa Rubceus. Villamoro cuidam Gallo primi ordinis magistratus

administration of Scotland by foreigners was unwise and dangerous. It excited the jealousy of the Scottish nobility, who willingly accepted assistance from France, but could not long tolerate her dominion.

The rupture did not, however, immediately break out between the French and the Scotch. The Regent still continued to treat all those with consideration whose assistance she needed to secure the marriage of her daughter with the Dauphin, and to defend Scotland against England. The situation of this latter country had totally changed since the accession of Mary Tudor to the throne. The new Queen, undoing, with as much hardihood as hatred, the religious work begun by her father, Henry VIII., and extended under her brother, Edward VI., had violently restored Catholicism. Next, by her marriage with Philip II., she had united England to the vast possessions of the sovereign of Spain, the Two Sicilies, the duchy of Milan, the Netherlands, and

demandatus est, quem nos a subducendis rationibus regis computorum rotullatorem dicimus. D'Oyzzillus, ad cuius nutum omnia gerebantur," &c. *Manifesto addressed by the Lords of the Congregation to the Princes of Christendom in 1559*, printed by M. Teulet in his *Pièces et documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire d'Ecosse*, vol. I., pp. 416-419. In page 416 it is also stated: "Visum est ut, quemadmodum regni totius habenas Galla in manibus haberet, ita etiam inferiora reipublice munera Galli obirent."

The office of *Comptroller*, bestowed upon M. de Villemore, was the most important financial office in Scotland. "Le contrôleur est général receveur des droits appelés la propriété, laquelle gist ès fruitz, rentes et revenus ordinaires des duchés, comtés, seigneuries et aultres terres propres à la couronne, soit uniz ou non uniz à ielle. . . . Aussi est ledit contrôleur receveur général de toutes les grandes coutumes, de toutes et chacunes villes, ports et havres de ce royaume." *Estat et Constitution du royaume d'Ecosse*, in page 224 of M. Paris' volume of *Negociations, &c., sous François II.*

The other financial office was that of *Treasurer*. "Le trésorier a générale intromission et charge sur les casualités, lesquelles consistent ès droitz et prouffitz qui, par accident et adventure, viennent à la couronne." *Ibid.*, p. 225. Among these were confiscations, fines, inheritances by bastardy, &c.

America. This union, which was equally alarming to both France and Scotland, could not fail momentarily to draw closer the ties which connected them with each other. It prevented the Catholico-national party from standing aloof from the Regent, and the Anglo-Protestant party from entering into communication with a Queen, who persecuted their religion in England, and with a King, who was its most implacable adversary on the Continent. It also rendered more indispensable and pressingly urgent the marriage of the Queen of Scotland to the Dauphin of France, in order to oppose one alliance to the other.

The mental and personal attractions of Mary Stuart were early developed. She was tall and beautiful.\* Her eyes beamed with intelligence, and sparkled with animation. She had the most elegantly-shaped hands in the world. † Her voice was sweet, her appearance noble and graceful, and her conversation brilliant. She early displayed those rare charms which were destined to make her an object of universal admiration, and which rendered even her infancy seductive. She had been brought up with the daughters of Catherine de Medici, and under the superintendence of the learned Margaret of France, the sister of Henry II., ‡ the

\* "Venant sur les quinze ans sa beauté commença à paroître, comme la lumière en beau plein midy." *Vies des dames illustres, Marie Stuart*, in vol. v., p. 83 of the *Œuvres complètes du Seigneur de Brantôme*, (Paris, 1823).

† *Ibid.*, vol. v., p. 86.

‡ All these princesses were learned. Brantôme says of Elizabeth of France, who married Philip II., in 1559: "Elle avoit un beau sçavoir, comme la royne sa mère

protectress of Michel de l'Hôpital, and who subsequently married the Duke of Savoy. The court, in the midst of which Mary Stuart had grown up, was then the most magnificent, the most elegant, the most joyous, and we must add, one of the most lax, in Europe. Still retaining certain military customs of the middle ages, and at the same time conforming to the intellectual usages of the time of the *renaissance*, it was half chivalric and half literary,—mingling tournaments with studies, hunting with erudition, mental achievements with bodily exercises, the ancient and rough games of skill and strength with the novel and delicate pleasures of the arts.

Nothing could equal the splendour and vivacity which Francis I. had introduced into his court\* by

l'avoit faite bien estudier par M. de Saint-Etienne son précepteur. . . Elle aymoit fort la poésie et à la lire." Vol. v., p. 140.

Of Margaret of France, who, in 1572, married the King of Navarre, afterwards Henry IV. of France, he says: "Elle se plaist fort aux lettres, . . . aussi peut-on dire d'elle que c'est la princesse, voire la dame qui soit au monde la plus éloquente et la mieulx disante. . . . Elle-mesme compose tant en prose qu'en vers. . . . Ses compositions sont très-belles, doctes, et plaisantes." Ibid., vol. v., pp. 158, 159, and 190.

Of Claude of France, who married the Duke of Lorraine, he says: "En son sçavoir et bonté elle ressembloit sa tante." Ibid., p. 242.—This aunt was Margaret of France, daughter of Francis I., who married the Duke of Savoy in 1559, and of whom Brantôme says: "Elle avoit beaucoup de science, qu'elle entretenoit toujours par ses continuelles études les après-dinées, qu'elle apprenoit des gens sçavants, qu'elle aymoit par-dessus toutes sortes de gens. Aussi l'honoroit-on comme leur déesse et patronne." Ibid., p. 230.—"Sopra tutto erudita, e ben dotta nella lingua latina, greca, et anche italiana." Narrative of Marino Cavalli, in the *Relations des ambassadeurs Vénitiens*, published by N. Tommaseo, vol. i., p. 284, (Paris, 1838).

\* Consult the lives of Anne of Bretagne and Francis I., in the fifth and second volumes of Brantôme, for information regarding the new court commenced by the one, and carried to its highest pitch of splendour by the other. Francis I. always kept open table. Brantôme says, "Il y avoit sa table, celle du grand maistre, du grand chambellan et chambellans, des gentilshommes de la chambre, des gentilshommes servans, des valets de chambre, et tant d'autres et très-bien servies que rien n'y manquoit, et ce qui estoit très-rare, c'est que dans un village, dans des forêts, en l'assemblée, l'on y estoit traité comme si l'on fust esté dans Paris." Vol. ii., p. 211. "Dans



attracting thither all the principal nobility of France, by educating as pages therein young gentlemen from all the provinces,\* by adorning it with nearly two hundred ladies belonging to the greatest families in the kingdom,† and by establishing it sometimes in the splendid palaces of Fontainebleau and Saint Germain, which he had either built or beautified on the banks of the Seine, and sometimes in the spacious castles of Blois and Amboise, which his predecessors had inhabited, on the banks of the Loire. A careful imitator of his father's example, Henry II. kept up the same magnificence at his court, which was presided over with as much grace as activity by the subtle Italian, Catherine de Medici; whose character had been formed by Francis I., who had admitted her into the *petite bande de ses dames favorites*,‡ with whom he used to hunt the stag, and frequently sport with alone in his pleasure-houses! The men were constantly in the company of the women; the Queen and her ladies were present at all the games and amusements of Henry II. and his gentlemen, and accompanied them in the chase.§ The King, on his part, together with the noblemen of his retinue, used to pass several

les festes où il avoit tournois, combats, mascarades, &c., il donnoit de grandes livrées aux hommes et aux dames." Ibid., p. 209.

\* These pages numbered one hundred and thirty under Francis I. and Henry II., and every year fifty of them left the royal service to enter the army. Henry II. used to call them "son plus beau haras." Brantôme, vol. ii., pp. 353, 354.

† "D'ordinaire pour le moins sa court estoit pleine de plus de trois cents dames et damoiselles." Ibid., vol., v. p. 66.

‡ Brantôme, vol. v., pp. 34, 35.

§ Ibid., vol. ii., pp. 354, 355, and 357.

hours every morning and evening in the apartments of Catherine de Medici. "There," says Brantôme, "there were a host of human goddesses, some more beautiful than the others; every lord and gentleman conversed with her whom he loved the best; whilst the King talked to the Queen, his sister, the Dauphiness (Mary Stuart), and the princesses, together with those lords and princes who were seated nearest to him." \* As the Kings themselves had avowed mistresses, they were desirous that their subjects should follow their example. "And if they did not do so," says Brantôme, "they considered them coxcombs and fools." † Francis I. had taken as his mistresses, alternately, the Countess de Chateaubriand and the Duchess d'Etampes; and Henry II. was the chivalrous and devoted servant of the Grand Seneschal of Normandy, Diana of Poitiers. But besides their well-known amours, they had other intrigues; ‡ and Francis I., in his unblushing licentiousness, prided himself on training the ladies who arrived at his court. § His second in this work of debauchery and corruption was Mary Stuart's uncle, the opulent and libertine Cardinal of Lorraine. || Such

\* Brantôme, vol. ii., p. 358.

† Brantôme, vol. vii., p. 538. Speaking of Francis I., he adds: "Et bien souvent aux uns et aux autres leur en demandoit les noms, et promettoit de les y servir."

‡ "Mais il ne s'y arresta pas tant," says Brantôme of Francis I., "qu'il n'en aymast d'autres." Vol. ii., p. 326.

§ Ibid., vol. vii., pp. 538, 539.

|| "J'ay ouy conter que quand il arrivoit à la cour quelque belle fille ou dame nouvelle qui fust belle, il la venoist aussitost accoster, et, l'arraisonnant, il disoit qu'il

was the court which furnished Brantôme with the majority of those examples which he has commemorated in his *Dames Galantes*, and of the laxity of which we may form some conception from the following verses, addressed to a lady by Henry II.'s own almoner, the poet Mellin de Saint-Gelais :—

“ Si du parti de celle voulez être  
Par qui Vénus de la cour est bannie,  
Moi, de son fils ambassadeur et prêtre,  
Savoir vous fais qu'il vous excommunie.  
Mais si voulez à leur foy être unie,  
Mettre vous faut le cœur en leur puissance  
Pour répondant de votre obéissance ;  
Car on leur dit qu'en vous, mes demoiselles,  
Sans gage sûr, y a peu de fiance,  
Et que d'Amour n'avez rien que les ailes.”\*

It was in this school of elegance and depravity, which produced Kings so witty and vicious, and princesses so amiable and dissipated, that Mary Stuart received her education. During her childhood she only derived benefit from it, although she could not fail to perceive what was evil, and afterwards to imitate it; for what we see, is sure eventually to influence what we do. But then she profited simply by the charms and instruction diffused throughout this agreeable and literary court, in which the King's daughters devoted themselves to the study of languages, and cultivated a taste for the

la vouloit dresser de sa main. Quel dresseur! . . . Aussi pour lors disoit-on qu'il n'avoit guères de dames ou filles résidantes à la cour ou fraîchement venues qui ne fussent desbauchées ou attrapées par son avarice ou par la largesse dudit M. le Cardinal; et peu ou nulles sont-elles sorties de cette cour femmes et filles de bien.”  
Ibid., vol. vii., p. 540.

\* Quoted by M. Sainte-Beuve, in the 44th page of his *Tableau historique et critique de la poésie Française et du théâtre Français au seizième siècle*. Paris, 1828.

arts, and every prince had his poet ; Francis I., Marot ; Henry II., Saint-Gelais ; Charles IX., Ronsard ; Henry III., Desportes.\* She resided there whilst that literary revolution was attempted, which, separating poetry from the simple form which it had assumed in the middle ages, in order to assimilate it to the classic mould of antiquity, deprived it of its originality, without imparting to it grandeur, and could not fail to be ephemeral, although it was advised by Joachim du Bellay, effected by Ronsard, favoured by the Chancellor de l'Hôpital, admired by Montaigne, and applauded by the whole court of Henry II.† Ronsard, who had lived in Scotland for three years as page to James V., was teacher of poetry to Mary Stuart, and one of her most ardent admirers.

She early displayed the varied gifts of her rich and charming nature. At ten years of age she astonished all who knew her by her maturity, and wrote to the Queen Dowager about the affairs of Scotland with delicate and precocious good sense.‡ When thirteen years old, she recited a Latin speech of her own composition in presence of the King, the Queen, and the whole court, in the hall of the Louvre.§ Fully able to exercise discretion, she never divulged the

\* See M. Sainte-Beuve's above-mentioned work, not only for details regarding the poetry of that time, but also respecting its introduction into the court.

† This revolution is admirably described by M. Sainte-Beuve, who has written its history, displayed its causes, and estimated its character, in pp. 54-108 of his book.

‡ See vol. i., pp. 5-7 of the *Lettres, Instructions, et Mémoires de Marie Stuart, publiés par le Prince Alexandre Labanoff*. London, 1844.

§ Brantôme, vol. v., p. 83.

political secrets confided to her by her mother,\* to whom the Cardinal of Lorraine thus wrote: "Your daughter has so increased, and indeed increases daily in height, goodness, beauty, wisdom, and virtues, that she is as perfect and accomplished in all things honest and virtuous as it is possible for her to be; and there is no one like her to be found in this kingdom, either among noble ladies or others, of whatever low or mean condition and quality they may be: and I am constrained to tell you, madam, that the King takes such a liking to her, that he often passes his time in chatting with her for the space of an hour; and she knows quite well how to entertain him with good and wise conversation, as if she were a woman twenty-five years of age."† Her education was attended to with extreme care and had added varied talents to her natural graces. Besides Latin, which she thoroughly understood and spoke fluently, she had considerable knowledge of history, knew several living languages, excelled in music, sang very agreeably to her own accompaniment upon the lute, and composed verses which received the praise of Ronsard and Du Bellay.‡ Lively and open in dispo-

\* "J'ay veu l'ayse que aviés de ce que je tiens les choses qu'il vous plaist me mander secrètes; je vous puis assener, madame, que rien qui viendra de vous ne sera secu par moy." *Mary Stuart to Mary of Guise, Queen Dowager of Scotland*, in Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 5, 6.

† Labanoff, vol. i. pp. 9, 10.

‡ "Elle se naturalisa si bien Française qu'on pouvoit dire qu'elle n'estoit pas seulement la plus belle, mais la plus polie de tout son sexe, dans la langue et dans la belle galanterie." *Mémoires de Castelneau de Mauvisière*, vol. i., p. 528 (Brussels, 1731). "Elle ayroit la poésie et les poëtes, mais surtout M. de Ronsard, M. du Bellay, et M. de Maisonneufleur, qui ont fait de belles poésies et élégies pour elle. Elle se mesloit d'ostre poëte, composoit des vers, dont j'en ai vu aucuns de beaux et très-

sition, amiable and insinuating in character, she was at once the ornament and the darling of the court. The Cardinal of Lorraine announced to his sister the ascendancy which she had obtained there in these words :

bien faite. Elle chantoit très-bien, s'accordant avec le luth, qu'elle touchoit bien joliment de ceste belle main blanche et de ces beaux doigts si bien façonnez." Brantôme, vol. v., pp. 84-86. The following are some of the verses which Ronsard and Du Bellay have left us regarding her :—

" Au milieu du printemps entre les liz naquit,  
Son corps qui de blancheur les liz mesme veinquit,  
Et les roses, qui sont du sang d'Adonis teintes,  
Furent, par sa couleur, de leur vermeil dépeintes ;  
Amour de ses beaux traits luy composa les yeux,  
Et les Grâces, qui sont les trois filles des cieux,  
De leurs dons les plus beaux cette princesse ornèrent,  
Et pour mieux la servir les cieux abandonnèrent."

(Ronsard, *Œuvres*, vol. viii., p. 19.)

The following are from Du Bellay, *Œuvres*, pp. 504, 507 ;—

## I.

" Toy qui as veu l'excellence de celle  
Qui rend le ciel sur l'Écosse envioux,  
Dy hardiment, Contentez vous, mes yeux,  
Vous ne verrez jamais chose plus belle.

## II.

" Celle qui est de cette isle princesse  
Qu'au temps passé l'on nommoit Caledon,  
Si en sa main elle avoit un brandon,  
On la prendroit pour Venus la déesse.

## III.

" Par une chaîne à sa langue attachée  
Hercule à soy les peuples attiroit ;  
Mais ceste-cy tire ceux qu'elle voit,  
Par une chaîne en ses beaux yeux cachée.

## IV.

" En vostre esprit le ciel s'est surmonté ;  
Nature et art ont en vostre beauté  
Mis tout le beau dont la beauté s'assemble."

All her contemporaries unite in praising the mental and personal charms of Mary Stuart. In 1554, the Venetian John Capello thus writes regarding her : " Gli (i. e. the Dauphin) fu data per moglie la regina de Scozia, che gia altre fiato fu condotta in Francia, la qual e bellissima et di maniera tale costumata, che porge maraviglia a chiunque considera la qualità sue. E anco il Delfino molto se non contenta, e prende gran piacere nel ragionare e ritrovarsi con essa lei." Tommaseo, *Relations des Ambassadeurs Vénitiens*, vol. i., p. 374.

“I can truly assure you, madam, that there is no one more beautiful or more virtuous than the Queen, your daughter; she governs both the King and the Queen.”\*

When this charming princess was nearly fifteen years of age, Henry II. began to urge her marriage with the Dauphin. On the 31st of October, 1557, he wrote to the Parliament of Scotland to invite them to fulfil their pledge on this subject. The Parliament, which met at Edinburgh on the 14th of December, acceded to his wishes, which the Regent contrived to render agreeable to them, and appointed nine Commissioners to go to Paris to sanction this marriage in the name of Scotland, and be present at its celebration. These commissioners were the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Bishop of Ross, the Bishop of Orkney, the Earls of Rothes and Cassillis; Lord James Stuart, the commandant of Saint Andrews, then twenty-six years of age; Lords James Fleming, George Seton, and John Erskine of Dun.† They were directed, in conformity with their instructions, to do nothing until they had obtained from both the Queen and the Dauphin a promise to preserve the integrity of the kingdom, and observe its ancient laws and liberties. When this formality had been gone through, the contract was drawn up on the 19th of April, 1558, on the following conditions: the eldest son sprung of this marriage was to be King of France, and, if daughters only were born,

\* Labanoff, vol. i, p. 36.

† Keith, p. 72. Tytler, vol. v, p. 26.

the eldest of them was to become Queen of Scotland, to receive 400,000 crowns as a daughter of France, and not to marry without the consent of both the estates of Scotland and the King of France ; the Dauphin was to assume the title and arms of King of Scotland, and, if he died after his accession to the throne of France, the Queen his widow was to receive a jointure of 600,000 livres.\*

Five days afterwards the marriage was celebrated with the greatest pomp in the Cathedral of Notre Dame. The Cardinal of Bourbon gave the nuptial blessing in presence of the King, the Queen, the princes of the blood royal, and the chief nobility. As soon as the ceremony was concluded, the young bride, whose example was followed by the Scottish Commissioners, hailed the Dauphin King of Scotland ; and during several days, a succession of festivities rendered Paris a continual scene of activity and joy.† All classes vied with each other in celebrating the grandeur and happiness of that brilliant princess, who seemed destined to be the fortunate possessor of two crowns, and who, in less than ten years, lost them both and fell into an abyss of calamities.

The Court of France itself contributed to produce this result by teaching her that duplicity and deceit-

\* Keith, p. 74, and Appendix, p. 17, where the contract is printed.

† *Cérémonies du mariage de monseigneur le dauphin avec la royne d'Ecosse, &c.*, extracted from the sixth volume of the Registers of the Hotel de Ville of Paris, in the national archives of France, and published by M. Teulet in the *Pièces et documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire d'Ecosse*, vol. i., pp. 292-303.



into the hands of any one of the nobles of the country, and that she is desirous *to bind, join, annex, and unite the kingdom of Scotland to the crown of France*. She adds that she is compelled to appear to submit to the conditions which her subjects exact from her, because she is far from her country, because she is not in possession of its strongholds, and because she fears that otherwise troubles would arise and cause her ruin.\*

Thus, by an act of weakness and of treason, did Mary Stuart—whom we cannot fairly charge with this fault, so young was she and submissive to the will of others,—enter upon life and royalty. But she remembered this detestable lesson only too soon. The Scottish Commissioners, far from suspecting that their Queen had utterly disregarded her oaths and arbitrarily disposed of their country, returned to Scotland to obtain sanction for the transactions of the 19th of April. They were ratified by the Parliament in December, 1558, and the matrimonial crown was bestowed upon the Dauphin. It was also decided that, in future, all acts should be published in the name of Francis and Mary, King and Queen of Scotland, Dauphin and Dauphiness of Vienne.†

This marriage marked the culminating point of French influence in Scotland; but no sooner had it

\* This was published in 1693, in Leonard's *Recueil des Traités de Paix*, vol. ii., p. 510, to which it was communicated by M. M. Godeffroy. It is also to be found in Lamoignon's *Correspondence*, vol. i., p. 429; and in Prince Labanoff's *Collection*, vol. i., p. 54.—Keith was aware of the existence of these three acts, as he refers to them in p. 73 of his history.

† Keith, pp. 76, 77. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 29, 30.

arrived at this, its furthest limit, than it began rapidly to decline. Scotland had reaped its advantages, and now perceived its inconveniences only. She felt that her independence, through protected from English aggression, was threatened by France, and she felt quite as adverse to the domination of one foreign power as of another. On her side, Mary of Lorraine, now that she had attained all her ends, having deprived the Earl of Arran of the regency, married her daughter to the most powerful prince in Europe, and placed Scotland under the protection of France,—was less careful in her conduct towards those whom she thought she no longer needed either to employ or to fear. She placed all her confidence in her fellow-countrymen, and thus offended the jealous and suspicious nobility of Scotland, who were, both by nature and education, inclined to dislike and oppose her. The principal barons, with the Duke of Chatelherault and the Earl of Huntly at their head, had already manifested their distrust during the war waged by the French and Scotch against England and Spain. Assembled at Kelso, they refused to enter the English territory, alleging that they had no interest to assume the offensive, and that they should content themselves with repulsing the enemy if he should attack their kingdom.\*

This beginning of disagreement was soon carried further. Seven months after the marriage of the Queen

\* Tytler, vol. v., pp. 24, 25.

of Scotland to the Dauphin of France, Mary Tudor died, and her death put an end to the close connection between Spain and England. It moreover caused the second fall of Catholicism in the latter country, which was then exceedingly variable in its religious opinions, and whose faith seemed to depend upon the will of its sovereigns. The daughter of Catharine of Aragon was succeeded by the daughter of Anne Boleyn, who lost no time in restoring the faith of her father Henry VIII., and her brother Edward VI. The accession of Elizabeth to the throne, in November 1558, changed both the situation of Mary Stuart with regard to England, and the dispositions as well as the relations of parties in Scotland. As Elizabeth had been declared a bastard when her mother was beheaded, the Court of France considered her incapable to rule, both on account of her birth and her religion. In the interested judgment of that Court, Mary Stuart, a direct descendant of Henry VII., through his eldest daughter, Margaret Tudor, the wife of James IV., was the legitimate heir to the crown of England. With even greater imprudence than had been displayed in the matter of the secret acts of Fontainebleau, Henry II. caused the Dauphin to quarter the arms of England \* with those of Scotland,

\* See pp. 436-459 of the documents published by M. Teulet, for the complaints of Elizabeth on this point, contained in the *Responsum ad protestationem quam orator regis Gallorum, nomine sui principis, serenissimæ Angliæ reginæ obtulit xv Aprilis, 1560.*—She bitterly complained that the injury had been done her of suspending the arms of England on the stage where sat the judges of the tournament in which Henry II. was killed, and that they were borne publicly on that day by the

and thus gave rise to the formidable conflict between her and Elizabeth.

What was the character of this princess, whose hostility the Court of France did not fear to excite against Mary Stuart, and who, from that moment, became her rival both as a Queen and a woman? High-spirited, imperious, and extremely proud, with great energy, astuteness, and capacity, Elizabeth had long been compelled to dissimulate her feelings and her religious faith during the terrible reign of her sister, who would have proscribed her but for the support given her by Philip II. She had lived at a distance

heralds of the Dauphin's band; that after the death of Henry II., Francis II. and Mary Stuart had called themselves *rex et regina Francia, Scotia, Anglia et Hibernia*; that they had quartered the arms of England with those of France in their chambers, chapels, wardrobes, &c.; and that on the entrance of Mary Stuart into Chatelherault, on the 23rd of November, 1559, a triumphal arch had been erected, upon the two gates of which these two inscriptions had been placed:—

Gallia perpetuis pugnaxque Britannia bellis  
 Olim odio inter se dimicnere pari.  
 Nunc Gallos totosque remotos orbe Britannos  
 Unum dos Maris cogit in imperium.  
 Ergo pace potes, Francisce, quod omnibus annis  
 Mille patres armis non potuere tui.

Ardebat bellis, cum te, Francisce, salutat  
 Nascentem, cunis Gallia fausta tuis.  
 Pace alitur, cum te regem, Francisce, salutat  
 Auspiciis regni faustior illa tui.  
 Nec mirum: tibi regna tuo sunt omnia jure,  
 Dote, aut eternis subdita fœderibus.

Killegrew and Jones had given Elizabeth an account of this entrance in their dispatch, dated from Blois, November 29, 1559, and printed in Forbes, vol. I., p. 266.

It is a curious fact that, at the time when the King of France and the Queen of Scotland set up these pretensions to the throne of England, Philip II., after having endeavoured to induce Elizabeth to marry him, became her advocate with the Pope, that he should not declare her a schismatic, and demanded that, in any case, her kingdom should be bestowed on no one but himself.—See the very important and hitherto unpublished dispatches on this subject, which are contained in Appendix A.

from the Court, under strict surveillance, and had thus acquired those habits of deception, which combined in her with the haughty and violent passions she inherited from her father. Giovanni Michele, the Venetian Ambassador, in 1556, thus describes this princess, then twenty-three years of age, a short time before she ascended the throne: "She is no less remarkable," he says, "in body than in mind, although her features are rather agreeable than beautiful. She is tall in person and well-made; her complexion is brilliant though rather dark. She has fine eyes; but above all, a splendid hand, which she is very fond of showing. She possesses great tact and ability, as she has abundantly proved by the wise way in which she has conducted herself in the midst of the suspicions of which she was the object, and of the perils which surrounded her. She surpasses the Queen, her sister, in her knowledge of languages. Besides English, Spanish, French, Italian, and Latin, which she knows as well as her sister, she has no slight acquaintance with Greek. She is haughty and high-spirited. Although born of a mother beheaded for adultery, she esteems herself no less highly than the Queen, her sister, and considers herself equally legitimate. It is said that she is very much like the King, her father, to whom she was always very dear on that account, and who had her as well educated as the Queen, and made an equal provision for them both in his will."\* To the

\* "Tenuta non manco bella d'animo che sia di corpo, ancora, che di faccia si può

most solid learning Elizabeth united the most agreeable accomplishments. She was an excellent musician, and danced to perfection.\* Certain gifts of person, great mental attractions,† all the adornments of a brilliant education, much originality without sufficient grace, and the resources of a lively and strong imagination rendered her remarkable as a woman, whilst her acute and penetrating judgment, her unwearied application, her haughty and politic disposition, and her active ambition destined her to be a great Queen.

On the day of her accession she displayed those qualities which characterised all the rest of her life. She took possession of the throne as a matter of course,

dire che sia più tosto gratiosa che bella. Ma della persona é grande et ben formata, di bella carne ancor che olivastra, belli ochi et sopra tutto bella mano della quale ne fa professione, d'uno spirito et ingegno mirabile, il che hà saputo molto ben dimostrare con l'esserai saputa, nei sospetti et nei pericoli nei quali s'è trovata, ben governare. Supera la regina nella cognitione delle lingue; perch' oltra che con la latina habbia congiunta non mediocre cognitione della greca. Parla di più che non fa la regina l'italiana nella quale si compiace. E superba et altiera, che se bene sà d'esser nasciuta d'una tal madre publicamente decapitata, però non si reputa ne stima manco che faccia la regina, ne si tiene per manco legitima. Se tiene superba et gloria per el padre, al quale dicono ch'è anco più simile, et per cio gli fù sempre cara, et fatta nodrire da lui come fu la regina et nel testamento così beneficata come quella." Relatione del clarissimo Giovanni Michele, tornato dalla serenissima regina Maria d'Inghilterra, l'anno 1557. MSS. of the National Library of Paris, depart. Saint-Germain Harlay, Supplement, No. 225, 4to, fol. 184 recto et verso.

\* "Elle prend grand plaisir au bal et à la musique. Elle me dict qu'elle entretenoit pour le moins soixante musiciens; qu'à sa jeunesse elle avoit fort bien dansé, et qu'elle composoit les balets, la musique, et les jouoit elle-mesme et les dansoit." Manuscript Journal of Hurault de Maisse, ambassador from Henry IV. to Elizabeth, in 1596, a short time before the Peace of Vervins, fol. 391, verso, in the archives of the French Foreign Office.—"Elle me dict que quand elle vint à la couronne qu'elle sçavoit six langues mieux que la sienne; et parceque je luy dis que c'estoit une grande vertu à une princesse, elle me dict que ce n'estoit pas merveille d'apprendre une femme à parler, mais qu' il y avoit bien de plus à faire à luy apprendre à se taire." Ibid., fol. 410, verso.

† "Elle est vive du corps et de l'esprit et adroite à tout ce qu'elle fait." Ibid., fol. 286, verso.

and passed from oppression to command without either surprise or uneasiness. Adopting the policy which was destined to constitute the glory of her reign, she pursued it assiduously, but without precipitancy. We cannot say that she was a zealous Protestant ; but she was averse to Catholicism as the religion which had oppressed her youth, and still menaced her crown. She felt more disposed to detest than to contest it. She said that she had read neither Luther nor Calvin, but St. Jerome and St. Augustine, and she considered that the points of difference between the various Christian communities were of very little importance.\* She therefore restored Protestantism rather from policy than conviction,† in order to give the direction of affairs and the government of the State to her own party, and withdraw it from her adversaries.

She immediately surrounded herself with men of great ability or entire devotion to her service. Her two principal advisers were Lord Robert Dudley, one of

\* "Elle me dict que s'il y avoit deux princes en la Chrestienté qui eussent bonne volonté et du courage, qu'il seroit fort aisé d'accorder les différends de la religion, qu'il n'y avoit qu'un Jesus Christ et une foy, et que tout le reste dont on disputoit n'estoit que bagatelle. . . Elle me jura n'avoir leu aucun des livres de Calvin, mais qu'elle avoit veu les pères antiques et y avoit prins grand plaisir, d'autant que ces derniers sont pleins de disputes et de contentions et les autres n'ont que bonnes intentions." MS. Journal of Hurault de Maise, fols. 282-284.

† A year and a half after her accession to the throne, she tried to pass herself off as a Catholic at heart to Quadra, Bishop of Aquila, the chaplain of Philip II., and his ambassador at London. She was desirous thereby to conciliate the good opinion of the Spaniards, and if necessary, to obtain their assistance against France and Scotland. "Vino à decirme," writes Quadra to Philip II., "*que ella era tan Catolica como yo, y que hacia a Dios testigo de que lo que ella creia no sea diferente de lo que todos los catolicos de su reyno creian.*" The Bishop of Aquila having asked her why she thus concealed her religion, "respondiò me que era forzada *ad tempus.*" MS. Despatch, 3rd June, 1560.

the sons of the Duke of Northumberland, whom she appointed her Master of the Horse, and who remained her favourite as long as he lived ; and William Cecil, whom she made Secretary of State, and who was her prime minister for forty years. Careful to retain those whom she had chosen, she was always well served. She never permitted her favourites to become for a single moment her masters, and her most experienced ministers were never more than her useful instruments. On all occasions, though she sought counsel, she acted upon her own decisions. Her will, guided solely by either calculation or interest, was sometimes slow, often audacious, always sovereign. In less than a month after she had succeeded Mary Tudor, the Spanish ambassador wrote to Philip II :—"She is held in incomparably greater dread than was the Queen her sister. She orders and does whatever she pleases, just as absolutely as the King her father."\* Speaking of herself, with a full consciousness of what she was, and what she could effect, Elizabeth said about this time "that she would let the world know that there was in England a woman who acted like a man, and who was awed neither by a Constable of Montmorency like the King of France, nor by a Bishop of Arras like the King of Spain."†

\* "Parace me que es muy mas temida que su hermana sin ninguna comparacion, y manda y hace lo que quiere tan absolutamente como su padre." Despatch of December 14th, 1558, from the Count of Feria, Philip II's Ambassador at London. MS. Archives de Simancas. Estado Inglaterra, fol. 811.

† This is what she said to the Marquis of Moreto, who had come in the name of the Duke of Savoy to ask her in marriage for the Duke of Nemours : "Dice Morata que le dixo la Reyna que ella havia conoecer al mundo que aqui havia una muger que



Such was the Queen whose ardent animosity Mary Stuart was ill-advised enough to provoke, and who thenceforward became the supporter of all the religious dissenters and discontented politicians of Scotland. These two classes rapidly increased in numbers and influence; as the Regent, Mary of Lorraine thought, after the marriage of her daughter with the Dauphin, that it was less necessary for her to act with tolerance towards the reformed party, and that she might with impunity neglect the high nobility. She governed according to the counsels, and aided by the soldiers, of France,\* which was then as much detested in Scotland as England had been in other times. But what chiefly emboldened Mary of Lorraine to pursue this course, was the accession of her son-in-law and daughter to the throne of France.

Henry II. died on the 10th of July, 1559, from a lance wound received in a tournament, and left the crown to the young Francis II., who was completely under the influence of Duke Francis of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine, the brothers of the Regent of Scotland. Although a general peace had been concluded three months previously (on the 2nd of April), at

obra como hombre, y que en Inglaterra no hay condestables ni obispo de Arras." MS. Despatch from Quadra to Granvella, 30th December, 1560. Archives de Simancae, fol. 815.

\* Manifesto addressed by the Lords of the Congregation to the princes of Christendom, extracted from the Archives of the French Foreign Office, Correspondence with England, vol. xxi., and published by M. Teulet, in his *Pièces et documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire d'Écosse*, vol. i., pp. 414-428.

Cateau-Cambresis, and Elizabeth had been included in the treaty, Mary Stuart had not ceased to bear the arms of England, and still retained the title of Queen of England and Ireland.\* This vain and rash usurpation determined Elizabeth, on her side, to sustain the members of the high aristocracy and the professors of the reformed religion, who re-constructed the English party in Scotland. From this moment commenced, between the barons of the country and the foreign soldiers, between the Protestants and the Catholics, the agitation of the great question whether the aristocracy or the monarch should gain the victory ; whether the old or the new faith should prevail. The absence of Mary Stuart, and the imprudence of Mary of Lorraine, largely contributed to decide it in favour of the feudal aristocracy and the Presbyterian Church, which soon became predominant in the kingdom.

This revolution must be briefly described. The Protestant party, which took so large a part in the misfortunes of Mary Stuart, had slowly gained ground in Scotland, where it had been cruelly persecuted during the lifetime of James V. This King detested it as heretical, and dreaded it as anti-national ; he perceived in it an enemy to the old Church and an auxiliary of England. Before deriving its religious constitution from Geneva, the Protestantism of Scotland had bor-

\* M. Teulet's *Pièces et documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire d'Écosse*, especially pp. 440, 441, 455, 456. *Responsum ad protestationem, &c.*, by Queen Elizabeth.

rowed its first articles of faith from Germany, and was originally inspired by the spirit of Luther. As early as 1525, an act of Parliament had prohibited the introduction into the kingdom of the writings of this formidable innovator, and had proscribed his doctrines. But neither laws nor penalties had been able to arrest the progress of these powerful and life-giving truths which had been embraced and maintained, even unto the death, by abbots, priests, Benedictine monks, canons of St. Andrews, and gentlemen of rank and influence. The King's own confessor, Seton, who had shown some disposition to approve them, was compelled to fly to England in order to avoid being burned at the stake, where, during the year 1539 alone, seven martyrs to Protestantism lost their lives. In 1541, the Parliament enacted that no person, under pain of confiscation and death, should contest in any thing the authority of the Pope.\*

But matters assumed an altogether different aspect shortly afterwards, under the regency of the Earl of Arran. This nobleman, whose interest had at first led him to act favourably towards England, agreed with the Lords of the Articles to authorise the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, and tolerate the preaching of the evangelical innovators. One of these, George Wishart, then returned from England, whither

\* For the history of this period see Keith, Appendix, pp. 1-12; the Wodrow Society's edition of the Works of John Knox, vol. i., pp. 1-76; M'Crrie's Life of Knox, 3rd edition, vol. i., pp. 1-37; and Melvil's Memoirs, vol. i., pp. 1-12.

he had fled for refuge, and spread the doctrines of the Reformation all over Scotland. Among his disciples was the famous John Knox, whose forerunner he was in the propagation and establishment of Protestantism. He was a man of elevated mind, strong affections, and rather ascetic devotion; and he combined extreme gentleness with the most earnest convictions.\* He had preached with great success at Montrose, Dundee, Perth, and Ayr against the doctrines of the Romish Church and the disorderly lives of the clergy. He had met with the zealous support of the Earl of Glencairn, the Earl Marshal; † Sir George Douglas, brother of Archibald, Earl of Angus; ‡ the Lairds of Brunston, Long Niddry, Ormiston, Calder, and Loch Norris.§ The reconciliation of the Earl of Arran with Cardinal Beaton had not arrested their progress, although the repentant head of the State no longer favoured them, and the unscrupulous head of the Church left no means untried to crush them. An attempt was even made to assassinate Wishart; but it had not succeeded, and he never after preached unless surrounded by a circle of barons and armed men. At length, however, he was surprised

\* Knox's History of the Reformation, vol. i., p. 125, *et seq.* M'Crie, vol. i., pp. 41-43.

† Alexander, fifth Earl of Glencairn, died in 1574. Knox, vol. i. p. 72, note 4, and p. 127. William, fourth Earl Marshal, died in 1581. *Ibid.*, p. 126, note 2.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 77 and p. 135, note 5.

§ Alexander Crichton, laird of Brunston, in Mid-Lothian. Hugh Douglas, laird of Long-Niddry. *Ibid.*, p. 134, note 3, and p. 136. John Cockburn, laird of Ormiston, in East Lothian. *Ibid.*, pp. 134, 135, note 3. James Sandilands, laird of Calder, in West Lothian, and Knight of St. John of Jerusalem. *Ibid.*, p. 249, note 2. George Crawford, laird of Loch Norris in Ayrshire. *Ibid.*, p. 127, note 1.

by night at Ormiston by Earl Patrick Bothwell\* with a detachment of soldiers, and placed in the hands of Cardinal Beaton, who caused him to be burned alive on the 28th of March, 1546. His death excited to the highest degree the hatred of the Protestant party against the Cardinal, whom sixteen determined men, led by Norman Lesly, the eldest son of the Earl of Rothes, † surprised in his turn in the castle of St. Andrews, murdered him with fanatical ferocity, and then hanged his body ignominiously from the battlements of the fortress. ‡

This crime excited universal horror, and did very great injury to the Protestant cause. The leaders of this party—among whom was Knox, of whom Wishart had taken an affectionate farewell just before he was captured, saying to him: “Return; one is sufficient for a sacrifice,” §—became the objects of more violent persecution than ever, shut themselves up in the castle of St. Andrews, were taken prisoners after a siege of five months, and sent over to France. There they were kept in cruel captivity, and their enfeebled party had not regained its strength until Mary of Lorraine found it necessary to show it favour in order to obtain the regency for herself, and govern Scotland undis-

\* Third Earl of Bothwell, and father of the celebrated James Bothwell, who plays so prominent a part in this history.

† George Lealy, third Earl of Rothes. The Leslies settled in Scotland as early as the twelfth century.

‡ Knox, *History of the Reformation*, vol. i., pp. 139-177. Keith, pp. 41-43.

§ “Nay, returne to your bairnes, and God blisse you: one is sufficient for a sacrifice.” Knox, vol. i., p. 139.

turbed. Then it had assumed new vigour, and Knox, who had passed several years in chains on the French galleys,\* had returned to animate it with his spirit, and inspire it with his own boldness.

This adventurous reformer was at that time in the prime of life, and had acquired, by his talents, his services, and his sufferings, immense influence in Scotland. Born in 1505, educated at the grammar-school of Haddington, and afterwards at the University of St. Andrews,—where with Buchanan, he had studied theology under John Major, who had imbibed the independent doctrines of D'Ailly and Gerson in France,—he had become the wandering disciple of Wishart, and the prisoner of Henry II. Of the three languages cultivated by the literary men and reformers of his day, he knew Latin only in his youth; and it was not until after 1534 that he studied Greek, then recently introduced into Scotland by a professor who had come from France; and in 1550 he learned Hebrew on the Continent, when the conclusion of peace had put an end to his captivity.† In possession of these three instruments of innovation, with extensive religious knowledge at his command, animated by an ardent mind, inspired by indomitable zeal, endowed with fascinating eloquence

\* “Knox, with some others, was confined on board the galleys, bound in chains, and in addition to the rigours of ordinary captivity, exposed to all the indignities with which Papists were accustomed to treat those whom they regarded as heretics.” M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, vol. i., pp. 67, 68.

† M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, vol. i., pp. 4-8.

and a dauntless character, he consecrated himself to the service of his cause wherever it stood in need of him. He had gone to England to assist in the Reformation which had been greatly promoted there by Edward VI.\* ; had left that country when Queen Mary restored Catholicism ; had gone to rule a church of English refugees at Frankfort, and had next proceeded to Geneva, where he had as his master and friend Calvin, whom he equalled in inflexibility and surpassed in energy.† The tolerant policy of Mary of Lorraine having thrown open his country in 1555,‡ he returned thither and prepared himself to become the religious organiser and moral regenerator of Scotland.

Knox's first step was to induce the adherents of the reformed religion to cease attending, as they had hitherto done, at the ceremonies of the established Church, and to separate themselves openly from the Catholics. At the same time, he gained over to his doctrines three young men of great influence, who were destined to play an important part in the affairs of their country. Lord James Stuart,§ the natural brother of the Queen, and Prior of St. Andrews, a man no less remarkable for the high qualities of his character and the vigour of his mind, than for his elevated rank,

\* M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, vol. i., pp. 78-122.

† *Ibid.*, vol. i., pp. 122-150. Tytler, vol. v., p. 34.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 34. M'Crie, vol. i., p. 176.

§ Son of James V. and Margaret Erskine, daughter of Lord John Erskine, Earl of Mar, and born in 1533.

embraced Protestantism with Lord John Erskine,\* and Archibald, Lord Lorn, son of the Earl of Argyle.† Two of these were subsequently Regents of Scotland, under the titles of Earl of Moray, and Earl of Mar. In conjunction with other powerful barons, such as the Earl of Glencairn, the Earl Marshal, Sir James Sandilands, called Lord St. John because he had been Prior of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, and Erskine of Dun,‡ they formed themselves, by Knox's advice, into religious congregations; and solemnly pledged themselves to maintain and propagate the preaching of the Gospel. The clergy, thinking to intimidate Knox, cited him to appear at Edinburgh. The bold reformer went thither, but with the intention of publicly advocating the reformed faith. During ten days, he preached both in morning and afternoon, to an immense crowd, attracted by his eloquence and pleased by his expositions; and no one ventured to oppose him.§ The people, who were greatly excited by his sermons, dispersed the annual procession in honour of St. Giles, the patron of the town, and threw the statue of the saint into the lake.||

\* Third son of the above-named Earl of Mar. He succeeded to his father's title in 1565. M'Crice, vol. i., p. 178. Knox, vol. i., p. 249.

† A member of the Anglo-Norman family of Campbell, which settled in Scotland during the twelfth century under Malcolm IV. He succeeded his father as fifth Earl of Argyle in 1558.

‡ Laird of Dun in Forfarshire, between Montrose and Brechin. He was one of the earliest and most zealous advocates of the Reformation in Scotland.—Knox, vol. i., p. 59, and p. 249, note.

§ M'Crice, vol. i., p. 183. Knox, vol. i., pp. 251-252.

|| Knox, vol. i., pp. 260, 261. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 35-36.



After having thus diffused the new doctrines amongst the nobility and people, it only remained for him to obtain their sanction by the government. Knox hoped to succeed in this, and presented a requisition to this effect to the Regent. But she received it with the most scornful disdain,\* and declared that it was time to arrest the progress of a revolution which threatened both the creed of the Church and the organisation of the State. The clergy had no difficulty in persuading her that it was necessary to use severe measures against Knox, and the innovations of which he was the seditious propagator; and she readily authorised them to prosecute and condemn this formidable adversary, whom they had attempted to have assassinated in the county of Angus.

Knox's courage consisted in braving dangers when it was advantageous to do so, but certainly not in yielding to them. He combined prudence with his enthusiasm, and exposed or withdrew himself according to circumstances. Seeing that the time for effecting the change which he desired in the religion of his country had not yet arrived; he retired from before the storm which was ready to burst over him, and proceeded once more to Geneva, where he was invited to become a pastor.† Sentence of death was passed upon him, and he was burnt in effigy at the High-Cross

\* Knox, vol. i., p. 252. M'Crie, vol. i., pp. 186-187.

† M'Crie, vol. i., pp. 189-190. Knox, vol. i., pp. 252, 253.

of Edinburgh.\* Emboldened by his condemnation and flight, the Catholic party hoped they would be able equally to intimidate the other preachers of reform, who were traversing the country in all directions. John Douglas, a Carmelite convert to Protestantism, and chaplain of the Earl of Argyle, took Knox's place as pastor of the congregation at Edinburgh : Paul Methven preached publicly at Dundee ; the Englishman John Willock was actively employed in diffusing evangelical doctrines in the counties of Angus and Mearns ; other ministers were gaining converts in other districts,† and private meetings continued to be held all over the kingdom, at which the best-informed member of the congregation used to read passages of Scripture, and follow his reading by pious exhortations. The Regent summoned all these propagators of a prohibited creed to appear before her and give an account of their conduct. They came, but accompanied by so strong a body of gentlemen of their party, that the Regent thought it wise merely to direct them to proceed to the frontier districts. This order they did not obey. One of the barons of the west, Chalmers of Gathgirth, stood up in the midst of his party, and boldly denounced the persecutions to which they were subjected by the clergy. "The bishops," he said to the Regent, "oppress us and our poor tenants to feed themselves : they trouble our ministers, and seek to undo them and us

\* M'Crie, vol. i., p. 190. Knox, vol. i., p. 254.

† Keith, pp. 64-65.

all. We will not suffer it any longer." At these words, his companions, who had hitherto stood uncovered, proudly put on their steel caps, with an air of defiance.\*

The Regent was constrained to grant them tacit toleration. But ere long, at the suggestion of Knox, who, from his retreat, continued to direct their movements, the Protestant barons and gentlemen met together on the 3rd of December, 1557; determined by a *Covenant* openly to practise their worship, and to denounce no less openly the ceremonies of the old religion; and formed an insurrectionary government in the State under the name of the *Lords of the Congregation*.†. The Earls of Glencairn, Argyle, and Morton; Lord James Stuart, the Prior of St. Andrews; Erskine of Dun, and others, were the principal Lords of the Congregation,‡ which placed the new religion under the protection of a new power.

It was some time before the two parties thus organised came into open collision. The Regent continued to temporise with the Protestants until she had married her daughter to the Dauphin, and the union of Spain with England had ceased by the death of the Catholic Mary and the accession of the Protestant Elizabeth to the throne. But then she threw off the mask. During the early months of 1559 she became

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 40.

† This first Covenant is in Keith, p. 66. Knox, vol. i., p. 273.

‡ Keith, pp. 68-69.

involved in the dangerous designs of the court of France, which was desirous to secure to Mary Stuart the possession of England as well as of Scotland, by the assistance of the Catholics of the two kingdoms. Accordingly the Regent, ratifying by her authority the decisions of a synod of bishops, condemned all the innovations which had been introduced into Scotland, and exacted the complete restoration of religious uniformity.\* To this declaration of intolerance the Protestant party replied by a threat of revolt.

The war thus declared on both sides was not long in breaking out. Several towns, and among others, Dundee, Montrose, and Perth, had openly embraced the reformed faith. Knox had hastened from Geneva at the summons of the Lords of the Congregation, and early in May, 1559,† he returned to Scotland to remain there during the rest of his life. His bold denunciations of the ceremonies and institutions of Catholicism produced such an effect that a mob of what Knox calls "the rascal multitude," began to break the images, pull down the convents, and destroy the monuments of the ancient faith. This devastation commenced at Perth,‡ and was soon imitated in other places; and the Regent, in her anger, threatened to raze that town to its very foundations, and sow it with salt.§

\* Knox, vol. i., pp. 291-294. M'Crie, vol. i., pp. 248-255.

† M'Crie, vol. i., pp. 237-246. Knox, vol. i., p. 318.

‡ M'Crie, vol. i., pp. 257-260. Knox, vol. i., pp. 321-323. Keith, pp. 84-85.

§ Knox, vol. i., p. 324. Tyler, vol. v., p. 59.

She accordingly assembled her forces and prepared to attack Perth, which the Lords of the Congregation resolved to defend. She, however, entered the town in consequence of an arrangement, the conditions of which she did not observe. Then the army of the Congregation, at the head of which were Lord James Stuart, the Earl of Argyle, and Sir William Kirkaldy, Laird of Grange,\* one of the most valiant and experienced soldiers in Scotland, advanced from St. Andrews to Perth, which they recaptured on the 25th of June. They anticipated the Regent at Stirling, of which they took possession, secured Linlithgow, and marched upon Edinburgh, into which city they entered on the 30th of June. The capital of the kingdom fell into the hands of the Protestants, and there, as in every other place through which the army of the Congregation passed, and where its ministers preached, the revolution was effected by the destruction of monasteries, the overthrow of altars, the breaking of images, and the violent cessation of the Catholic form of worship.†

During this struggle, which was destined to be decisive, the Protestants applied to Elizabeth for aid, while the Regent urged Henry II. to send her some assistance. Meanwhile, an armistice until the 10th of

\* Eldest son of James Kirkaldy of Grange, Grand Treasurer of James V. Laird William's barony was in Fife, about a mile to the N.E. of Kinghorn. He was one of the first Scottish barons who embraced the reformed faith; and he had long taken a prominent part in all the religious and warlike affairs of Scotland. He was made prisoner in the castle of St. Andrews, sent over to France, and imprisoned at Mont St. Michel. See Knox, vol. i., *passim*.

† Knox, vol. i. pp. 336-364. M'Crie, vol. i., pp. 259-276. Keith, pp. 90-94.

January, 1560, was concluded on the 24th of July,\* and both parties pledged themselves not to molest each other in the exercise of their faith. The Lords of the Congregation agreed to evacuate Edinburgh, from which they withdrew on the 25th of July, 1559, and into which the Regent promised not to introduce any French garrison. The time of the armistice was employed by both parties in organising and augmenting their forces. Henry II. was just dead, and the armies of France, rendered inactive by the peace of Cateau-Cambresis, seemed to be more than ever at the disposal of Mary of Lorraine, whose daughter had now ascended the throne of that powerful country. A small body of troops was immediately sent to her, and the court of France, which was governed by her two brothers, prepared to equip an expedition under the command of the Marquis d'Elbeuf. Francis II. despatched M. de Bethencourt to Scotland with eighty thousand livres.† He also wrote a threatening letter to the Prior of St Andrews,‡ and instructed Bethencourt to declare publicly that he would spend the crown of France rather than not reduce Scotland to obedience.§

Whilst the Regent was garrisoning Leith with the troops she had received from France, and restoring its

\* This armistice, in eight articles, is given in Keith, pp. 98-99.

† Paris, *Negotiations, &c., relatives au regne de François II.*, pp. 12-17.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 98.

§ "Lord Bettancourt bragged in his credit, after he had delivered his menacing letter to the prior (Lord James Stuart), that the King and his council would spend the crown of France, unless they had our full obedience." MS. Letter from Knox to Cecil, 15th August, 1559, quoted by Tytler, vol. v., p. 95.

fortifications so as to command the Frith of Forth and guard the approach to Edinburgh on that side, the Congregation was by no means inactive. Knox proceeded secretly to Berwick\*, to confer with Sir James Crofts, the English governor of that place, of whom he requested ships to place Dundee and Perth in safety, soldiers to resist the French troops, and money to supply the poor nobility with means to remain in the field. He moreover wrote to Cecil that their destruction would entail the ruin of his mistress, and besought him in the most pathetic language to induce her to support them: "The gentlemen in these lower parts," he said, "will put themselves in readiness to enterprise the uttermost, if ye will assist with them; and, therefore, in the bowels of Christ Jesus, I require you, Sir, to make plain answer what they may lippen (trust) to, and at what time their support shall be in readiness."†

Cecil entertained the same views as Knox, and had already expressed them to Elizabeth, before the Reformer's letter reached him. On the 5th of August, with that political sagacity which for forty years he devoted to the service of his sovereign, he drew up a *Memorial of certain points meet for the restoring of the realm of Scotland to the ancient weale*. "It is to be noted," he says in this document, "that the best worldly felicity that Scotland can have is either to

\* MS. Instructions, State Paper Office, quoted in Tytler, vol. v., pp. 85-86.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Knox to Cecil, 15th August, 1559; quoted in Tytler, vol. v., p. 95.

continue in a perpetual peace with the kingdom of England, or to be one monarchy with England. If the first be sought, then must it necessarily be provided that Scotland be not so subject, as it is presently, to the appointments of France, the ancient enemy of England. As long as Scotland is at the command of the French, there is no hope to have accord long betwixt these two realms." In order to liberate the Scotch from this influence, Cecil advised the Queen his mistress to send them some assistance, and pointed out the measures which the estates of Scotland ought to take—measures which tended to the expulsion of the French troops, the exclusion of foreigners from all public employments and military commands, the formation of a council of government independent of the Queen, and, if Mary would not accept these conditions, the transference of the sovereign authority to the nearest heir to the crown. He concluded with these words: "And then may the realm of Scotland consider, being once made free, what means may be devised through God's goodness, to accord the two realms, to endure for time to come at the pleasure of Almighty God, in whose hands the hearts of all princes be."\*

Elizabeth hesitated. A year had not yet elapsed since her accession to the throne, upon which she did not feel herself quite firmly established. She had no liking for the Presbyterian Reformation, which destroyed

\* Keith, Appendix, pp. 23-24.



all hierarchy in the Church, and introduced a spirit of faction into the State. To her dread of this subversive Protestantism was united bitter hatred of the man who was its chief promoter ; for Knox had deeply wounded her royal pride by a violent treatise which he had published against the government of women, during the reign of Mary Tudor.\* Moreover, the recent treaty of Cateau-Cambresis seemed to interdict her from any act of hostility with regard to France and Scotland. However, as she was always guided by present expediency, and as Francis II. and Mary Stuart had freed her from her obligations towards them by disallowing her right to the crown of England, and usurping her title, she determined to defend the confederated lords. She thus entered upon a course of action which she continued to pursue during the whole of her life, and which was diametrically opposed to her doctrines, though entirely in conformity with her interests.

But the first assistance which she gave to the Scottish insurgents was rendered in a very feeble and covert manner. Sir Ralph Sadler was despatched to them with a subsidy of 3000*l.* and made an agreement with them that they should transfer the supreme power from Mary of Lorraine to the Duke of Chatelherault, who had been induced to join their cause by his son, the Earl of Arran, then recently returned from France, where he

\* This treatise was entitled, "The first Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous Regiment of Women."

had been deprived of the command of the Scottish guard, in consequence of his having become a Calvinist.\* The confederates now summoned the Regent to suspend the fortification of Leith; and as she replied that her daughter, whose authority she represented, had no need of the permission of her subjects to fortify one of the ports of her kingdom,† they again took the field on the 15th of October, 1559, with an army of twelve thousand men; and on the 16th, they once more took possession of Edinburgh without opposition. They immediately established two councils, the formation of which announced their intention to govern the State and overthrow the Church. The first, or political, council was composed of the Duke of Chatelherault, the Prior of St. Andrews; the Earls of Arran, Argyle, and Glencairn; the Lords Ruthven, Boyd, and Maxwell; the Laird of Dun, Kirkaldy of Grange, Henry Balnaves, and John Haliburton, the Provost of Dundee; whilst Knox, Goodman, and the the Protestant Bishop of Galloway were members of the second, or religious, council.‡ Four days afterwards they all met in public assembly, and took a resolution of extreme boldness which was the prelude to those violent measures which characterised the reign of Mary Stuart. They deposed the Regent, whom they informed of her deposition in the following terms: "We, our Sovereign Lord and Lady's true barons and lieges,

\* Tytler, vol. v., pp. 91-92.

† Ibid., vol. v., p. 92.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., pp. 101-102.

suspend, for most weighty reasons, any authority you have by reason of our Sovereigns' commission granted unto your Grace, in the name and authority of our Sovereigns, whose council we are of native birth, in the affairs of this our common weal."\* To their disobedience they gave the name of fidelity, and to their usurpation of power the appearance of justice.

After having thus organised their plans, they marched upon Leith; but they were defeated by the French, and compelled a second time to abandon Edinburgh, during the night of the 5th of November.† Queen Elizabeth then resolved to assist them in a more formal and effective manner. William Maitland, Laird of Lethington, who had resigned his office of Secretary of State to the Regent, in order to devote his talents and experience to the service of the Congregation, was despatched to London to beseech the Queen to send a fleet and army to Scotland, unless she wished to see that kingdom speedily subjected to France, and her own right to the crown of England attacked.‡ Lethington was the most intelligent, skilful, persuasive, and versatile politician in Scotland.§ He succeeded in convincing Elizabeth of her true interest: and she accordingly sent the Duke of Norfolk to Berwick, where he concluded, in her name, a defensive alliance with Maitland, Balnaves,||

\* The whole of the document is in Keith, p. 105.

† Tytler, vol. v., pp. 106-107.

‡ Ibid., vol. v., p. 109.

§ The barony of Lethington was an old and massive tower in East Lothian, about a mile to the south of Haddington.—Knox, vol. i., p. 137, note 2.

|| Master Henry Balnaves was one of the earliest and most strenuous supporters of

Pittarow,\* and Ruthven,† who acted as commissioners of the Congregation. It was agreed that the Queen of England should furnish assistance to the Duke of Chatelherault and his party until they should have expelled the French from their country, and that the Duke of Chatelherault and his party should join their forces to those of the Queen of England, if she were attacked by France. In order that this treaty might not give grounds for a charge of rebellion against the confederates, and of disloyalty against Elizabeth, the subjects of Mary Stuart concluded it in the name of their Sovereign, and promised to preserve intact their obedience to her in all things that did not tend to subvert the ancient laws and liberties of the land.‡

This intervention of England in the affairs of Scotland excited the surprise of the Court of France, which, after having had the imprudence to provoke Elizabeth's hostility, demanded the reasons of her conduct. But Elizabeth was always able to find plausible reasons to justify actions which were advantageous to her. She boldly replied that she could not consider the nobility and people of Scotland as rebels ; that, on the contrary,

Protestantism in Scotland. He was made prisoner at the Castle of St. Andrews in 1547, taken captive into France, and confined in the Castle of Rouen. He was an advocate, and became one of the Lords of Session in 1558. He died in 1570.—Knox, vol. i., *passim*.

\* Sir John Wishart, Laird of Pittarow, was one of the principal barons of the reformed party. Mary afterwards appointed him Comptroller.—Knox, vol. i., pp. 274-337, and vol. ii., p. 311, note 1.

† Lord Patrick Ruthven, Provost-elect of Perth, from 1554 until his death in 1566. An ardent supporter of the reformed faith.—Knox, vol. i., p. 337, note 1.

‡ Keith, pp. 117-119.

she regarded them as faithful subjects of the crown, since they had run the risk of offending the King of France in order to maintain the rights of his wife, their Sovereign. "And truly," she added, "if these barons should permit the government of their kingdom to be wrested out of their hands during the absence of their Queen; if they tamely gave up the independence of their native country, whilst she used the counsel, not of the Scots, but solely of the French, her mother and other foreigners being her advisers in Scotland, and the Cardinal and Duke of Guise in France, it were a good cause for the world to speak shame of them; nay, if the young Queen herself should happen to survive her husband, she would in such a case have just occasion to condemn them all as cowards and unnatural subjects."\*

In execution of the treaty of Berwick, an English fleet entered the Forth during the spring of 1569, and an army of six thousand infantry and two thousand cavalry marched into Scotland under the command of Lord Grey. It was joined at Preston by eight thousand confederates, with the Duke of Chatelherault at their head.† The French could now no longer make head against forces so far superior to their own. They fell back upon Leith, and shut themselves up in that town,

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, 17th February, 1560, backed by Cecil: Answer made to the French Ambassador, by Sir William Cecil.—Quoted in Tytler, vol. v., pp. 115-116.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 117.

which guarded the Frith of Forth and formed the port of Edinburgh. Blockaded by sea and closely invested by land, they sustained a memorable siege in Leith. They made several vigorous sorties, and long resisted the attacks of the enemy with brilliant valour. But the court of France sent them no reinforcements. It was prevented from doing so by the impoverished state of its finances,\* and by the struggle which had just commenced in that kingdom between the Protestants and the Catholics, between the princes of the house of Bourbon and those of the house of Lorraine. The conspiracy of Amboise, discovered in the month of March, had compelled the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine to defend themselves, and had thus prevented them from succouring their sister, the Regent of Scotland. This compulsory desertion rendered the position of the besieged troops in Leith still less tenable; for all the nobility, including the Earl of Huntly, the head of the Catholic party,† had set their faces against the presence and domination of foreigners.

The Bishop of Valence Montluc, sent by Mary Stuart and Francis II. to gain time by negotiating a reconciliation between the Regent and the insurgent nobles,

\* When sending the 80,000 livres, of which Bethencourt had brought 40,000 in July, 1559, Francis II. had said that it would be out of his power to do more, on account of "les grandes et incroyables sommes de deniers qu'il estoit contrainct payer et desbourser pour l'effect et exécution des choses promises par le traicté (de Cateau Cambrésis): principalement pour payer les gens de guerre qui estoient dedans les places qui se doivent rendre, et se descharger des estrangiers, tant de pied que de cheval . . . payement aussi des mariages de mesdames ses filles et sœur." *Négociations, &c.*, relatives au regne de François II., p. 12.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 118.

failed in his mission.\* The Regent herself was not more fortunate in a conference which she had with some of the confederates, who specially insisted upon the evacuation of the kingdom by the French.† At length this princess, overwhelmed by fatigue and anxiety, fell mortally ill. She caused herself to be conveyed to Edinburgh Castle, where she was received by Lord Erskine. There, feeling that her dissolution was at hand, and that her death had been hastened by the troubles of the kingdom, the sorrows of dispossession, the cares of defence, and the grief she had felt at being placed between the opposite requirements of the Scotch, whom she wished to satisfy, and of the French, whom she was obliged to obey,—she desired to have one more interview with the leaders of the confederates before she died. The Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Argyle, Marshall, and Glencairn, and Lord James Stuart, immediately repaired to the Castle. The Regent received them with all her former cordiality and natural kindness of heart. She spoke to them in mournful language of the unhappy state of the kingdom, which she had governed for several years in union and prosperity; expressed her regret that she had been compelled to obey the orders she had received from France; advised them to send away both the French

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 26th April, 1560. Tytler, vol. v., p. 119.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 14th May, 1560. Tytler, vol. v., p. 121.

and English troops, but recommended them to prefer the alliance of that country which could not endanger their national independence. After this wise advice, which she was at liberty to give, but which she had not been at liberty to follow, she embraced and kissed them all, and extended her hand to those nobles of inferior rank who had accompanied them. These farewells of a dying Queen, nearly all whose faults were the work of others, and whose good sense and amiability led her to forget all hostility upon her death-bed, touched their hearts, and they took their leave in tears.\*

Mary of Lorraine did not long survive this affecting scene. She died on the 10th of June, 1560. After her decease, legal authority was entirely wanting to the French, as there was no longer any Regent, and the Queen was absent from the country. They were now also as devoid of means as of right to continue the struggle, hard pressed as they were in Leith, and unable to reckon on reinforcements from France, then a prey to intestine divisions and paralysed by the commencement of a civil war. Peace thus became inevitable, and it must be concluded upon such conditions as the Scottish confederates might impose.

A treaty was accordingly negotiated at Edinburgh between Cecil and Nicholas Wotton as Elizabeth's commissioners, and the Bishops of Valence and Amiens,

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 8th June, 1560. Tyler, vol. v., pp. 121-122. Keith, pp. 127-128.



La Brosse, D'Oysel, and Randan, as commissioners of Mary Stuart and Francis II. It was signed on the 5th and 6th of July, and contained the following clauses : the French troops were to evacuate Scotland ; the fortifications of Leith to be demolished ; the sovereigns of France cease to bear the arms and title of King and Queen of England ; the Duke of Chatelherault and other Scottish nobles who possessed property in France to have restored to them the lands and titles of which they had been deprived since their rebellion ; the high offices of Chancellor, Treasurer, and Comptroller to be conferred not upon ecclesiastics but upon laymen ; and the guardianship as well as the administration of the kingdom never to be again entrusted to foreign soldiers and dignitaries. The conduct of affairs was to be confided to a council of twelve members, seven of whom were to be nominated by the Queen, and five by the estates of the realm ; and this council was instructed to introduce a better system into the government of the country. It was also agreed that a free Parliament should assemble in the month of August.\*

Such were the principal stipulations of the treaty of Edinburgh, which marked the defeat of France and the triumph of England in Scotland. It changed the government from royal to aristocratic. It prepared the way for the overthrow of the ancient religion by the victorious efforts of the adherents of the Reformation,

\* All these documents are in Keith, pp. 130-143.

and thus secured to the feudal aristocracy the support of the Presbyterian democracy. The two commissioners of Queen Elizabeth perceived the great utility such a treaty would be to her, and in the letter in which they announced its conclusion, they expressed their opinion, "that the treaty would be no small augmentation to her honour in this beginning of her reign; that it would finally procure that conquest of Scotland which none of her progenitors, with all their battles, ever obtained, namely, the whole hearts and goodwills of the nobility and people, which surely was better for England than the revenue of the crown."\*

Now that the domination of strangers had been overthrown in Scotland, it remained for the confederates to consummate the religious revolution. The Lords of the Congregation closely kept up their league until this great work was accomplished. During the period which elapsed between the signature of the treaty, which had freed them from all resistance, and the assembling of the Parliament which was to end their labours, they agitated the country in order to render it universally favourable to their plans. Their preachers were sent all over the kingdom,† and when the Parliament met, an immense majority of its members declared their determination to alter the religious constitution of Scotland.‡ The inferior nobles, who

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Cecil and Wotton to Queen Elizabeth, 8th July, 1560. Tyler, vol. v., p. 128.

† Keith, p. 145.

‡ Their names are given in Keith, pp. 146-147.

had long neglected to attend, made their appearance on this extraordinary occasion, and resumed the right of voting. The ecclesiastical benches were almost deserted,\* as the greater number of the bishops and abbots who were members of the House, did not choose to be present at the destruction of their Church. The Lords of the Articles were nearly all chosen from among the Congregation, and the Parliament opened under the presidency of Lethington, whose character adapted itself to every situation, and who was destined long to employ his talents in the service of the victorious cause. The royal power was represented by the dumb and insignificant insignia of a crown, mace, and sword, placed upon the empty throne.† Absent and enfeebled, the sovereign authority had become incapable of directing and restraining that revolutionary assembly, which was commissioned to conclude the work pursued, for more than twenty years, by the Reformers, with various vicissitudes, but continual progress. A violent petition of the most zealous Reformers, approved if not composed by Knox, demanded of the Parliament to restore the primitive discipline established by the apostles, to proscribe the Romish Church, to suppress the Catholic clergy, to condemn the doctrine of transubstantiation and the adoration of the body of Jesus Christ under the form of bread, to denounce the merit of works, purgatory, pilgrimages, and prayers to

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 135.

† Ibid.

departed saints ; in a word, to abolish all those sacraments and ceremonies of the Romish Church, which were attacked by nearly all the Reformers of Europe, and to deprive the clergy for ever of the right to sit and vote in the Great Council of the Nation.\* Most of these imperious injunctions were obeyed. The Parliament satisfied the Reformers by adopting their faith, and pleased the nobility by granting them a share of the property of the clergy.

Application was then made to the reformed ministers for a Confession of Faith, which they drew up in four days. This confession was based upon the Apostles' Creed, and was very similiar to the Articles of the Church of England in the reign of Edward VI. The doctrines asserted in it were nearly the same as those held by Calvin ; and the Parliament ratified it on the 17th of August, almost by acclamation.† The only temporal lords who did not approve of it, were the Earls of Cassillis and Caithness ; and among the spiritual lords, there were only the Primate Archbishop of St. Andrews, and the Bishops of Dumblane and Dunkeld, who, without refusing to reform existing abuses, required time to effect these reforms with maturity and reflection.‡ The victorious Reformers became, as it too frequently happens, intolerant in the extreme. By successive acts, they abolished the

\* Tytler, vol. v., pp. 137, 138. Keith, p. 149.

† Knox, vol. ii., pp. 95-123. Keith, pp. 149-150.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 141..

Catholic faith and the Papal jurisdiction in the kingdom ; and enacted terrible penalties against all who should celebrate or attend mass, condemning them, for the first offence, to confiscation of their property, for the second, to banishment, and for the third, to death.\*

The ministers of the new Church of Scotland next prepared the *Book of Discipline*, which was intended to regulate their system of ecclesiastical government. They disapproved of the Anglican almost as much as of the Romish hierarchy, and called it a remnant of superstition and idolatry offensive to all godly men. Thus, whilst they prescribed obedience to princes and magistrates, and denounced, as enemies alike to God and man, all who should attempt to abolish the *holy state of civil policies*,† they did not recognise, as was the case in England, the head of the State to be the head of the Church. The religious sovereignty belonged to the people, who were the source of all ecclesiastical authority. They alone appointed the ministers by election ; but those elected by any Christian society, before they were admitted to the ministry, were publicly examined by the ministers and elders of the congregation, upon the fundamental points of faith, and the differences of doctrine between the Romish and Presbyterian Churches. After this examination, without even receiving any imposition of hands, they were introduced among the

\* These acts are given in Keith, p. 151. Knox, vol. ii., pp. 123-130.

† Trtler, vol. v., p. 141. Knox, vol. ii., chap. 24.

brethren, and took the service of that church to which they had been appointed. They administered the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper ; preached the Word of God, and read the Common Prayers as well as the Holy Scriptures. This last duty was performed by simple "readers," in places where there were no regularly-constituted pastors. Deacons were also elected to receive the revenues and distribute the alms of the Church.

The kingdom was divided into ten districts, over which ten ministers were to be placed with the title of superintendents.\* Over these districts they were appointed regularly to itinerate, for the purpose of preaching three times a week, of providing for the complete establishment of all the churches, of observing that the ordinary ministers led a regular life and received a sufficient income, of inspecting the manners of the people, and of taking care that the poor were supplied with alms, and that the young received instruction.† It was in obedience to the Book of Discipline that those parish schools were formed, to which Scotland was subsequently indebted for the general diffusion of knowledge among the inferior classes of her population, and for the prosperity which has thereby accrued to the country. "It was necessary," such are nearly the words of the Congre-

\* The stations of these superintendents were at Orkney, Ross, Argyle, Aberdeen, Brechin, St. Andrews, Edinburgh, Jedburgh, Glasgow, and Dumfries. Knox, vol. ii., pp. 203-204.

† For details regarding the organisation of the Scottish Church, see Knox, vol. ii., pp. 185-258, and Tytler, vol. v., pp. 144-146.

gation, "that care should be had of the virtuous and godly education of the youth, wherefore it was judged in every parish to have a proper schoolmaster, able to teach at least the grammar and Latin tongue, where the town was of any reputation. But," it adds, "in landward (that is, country parishes), where the people convened to doctrine only once in the week, there must either the reader or the minister take care of the youth of the parish, to instruct them in their rudiments, and especially in the catechism of Geneva."\*

A Book of Discipline, which devoted the property of the Catholic clergy to the service of the reformed faith, the education of the people, and the support of the poor, and which exposed laymen of every rank to the severe censure of the pastors, was not at all pleasing to the nobility, whom it deprived of both wealth and power. It did not, consequently, obtain the same unanimous approbation as the Confession of Faith. Several barons refused to subscribe it, and others evaded signing it although they had expressed their adherence to it.† They wished to keep the property that they had taken, and were not anxious, as they said, alone to "bear the barrow to build the houses of God."‡ But with the exception of this disagreement, the old nobility and the new church acted in concert to destroy the Romish clergy, to annul the influence of

\* Spotswood's History of the Church of Scotland, pp. 154-160.

† Knox, vol. ii., pp. 128-129.

‡ Knox, vol. ii., p. 89.

France, and to weaken the royal authority. The Treaty of Edinburgh and the Acts of Parliament passed in August, 1560, constituted Scotland a sort of Protestant republic, governed by nobles and ministers, and placed under the protectorate of England. The Lords of the Congregation did not hesitate to say: "That in providing for the security and liberty of Scotland, the realm was more bounden to her Majesty (Queen Elizabeth) than to their own sovereign."\*

In the absence of the Queen, the Parliament appointed twenty-four of the most important members of the victorious party to administer justice and govern the kingdom.† Sir James Sandilands, of Calder, Prior of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, was sent to France to communicate to Mary Stuart and Francis II. the measures which had been taken, and to request their ratification;‡ but Mary Stuart and Francis II., both as sovereigns and as Catholics, could not give their sanction to a revolution which had changed the conditions of the monarchy and the religion of the country. The usurpation of the supreme authority by the nobility of Scotland, the conclusion of an alliance with a foreign power, the deposition of the Regent, the convocation of a Parliament without the concurrence and assent of the sovereign, the change effected in the national religion by public deliberation, and the for-

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, quoted in Tytler, vol. v, p. 131.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 148.

‡ Knox, vol. ii., pp. 125-126.



mation of a council of regency by an assembly, all irritated them to the last degree. They felt they were virtually, if not actually, dethroned. The Cardinal of Lorraine complained bitterly to the English ambassador, Throckmorton, of the support which Queen Elizabeth had given to such acts of rebellion.\* "I will tell you frankly," he said; "the Scots, the King's subjects, do perform no part of their duties: the King and Queen have the name of their sovereigns, and your mistress hath the effect and the obedience."† When Throckmorton requested Mary Stuart to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh, she peremptorily refused to do so, and said with some warmth: "My subjects in Scotland do their duty in nothing. I am their Queen, and so they call me, but they use me not so. They must be taught to know their duties."‡ Throckmorton then represented to her that if she did not accept the Treaty of Edinburgh she would give Queen Elizabeth reason to suspect her intentions and those of the King her husband, and would appear to retain her pretensions with regard to England, the arms of which she still continued to bear; but she dismissed him with a very unsatisfactory answer.§

\* The court of France had already, on the 20th of April, 1560, addressed a *Protestation à la reine d'Angleterre et à son Conseil*, regarding the hostile proceedings of the English in Scotland; Queen Elizabeth, in reply, wrote a *Responsum ad protestationem*, &c. Both these documents are published in M. Teulet's Collection of *Pièces et documents relatifs à l'histoire d'Ecosse*, vol. i., pp. 429-436, and 436-459.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 17th November, 1560. Tytler, vol. v., p. 150.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., pp. 151-152.

§ *Ibid.*, vol. v., pp. 152-153.

Notwithstanding all her discontent, Mary Stuart found that she was not in a position to bring back her subjects to their former obedience by force. The French troops had evacuated Leith, and King Francis II. was too busily employed in subjugating the Huguenots and crushing the rising resistance of the Bourbons and their party, to take any vigorous measures with reference to Scotland. Her uncles, the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine, who governed in his name, thought that the chief point was to gain time, to allow the confederates to become divided amongst themselves, and meanwhile, to destroy all opposition in France. To this task they applied themselves with as much boldness as vigour. After having foiled the conspiracy of Amboise, and hanged its subordinate and ostensible leaders, they arrested the Prince of Condé, and prosecuted him as its mysterious and principal head ; they also intimidated the King of Navarre, nullified the old Constable and his son, and threatened the three brothers Chatillon. But their policy of violent compression in France, and adroit temporisation in Scotland, was disconcerted by the death of Francis II., which happened on the 5th of December, 1560. Mary Stuart was left a widow ; the Lorraine princes, her uncles, lost their authority ; and, by the separation of the two crowns of Scotland and France, the connection of the interests of the two countries also ceased. With Charles IX. commenced another system

of policy under the cautious direction of Catherine de Medici, who feared the Guises and did not like Mary Stuart; and who, anxious to avoid all appeal to force, strove to effect a compromise between the different parties and their leaders, at home; and abroad, to maintain friendly relations with foreign powers.

Thus, the marriage which had just been dissolved by death, had yielded Mary Stuart no advantage, and produced none but evil effects. In Scotland, it had weakened the monarchy by causing the absence of the royal authority. It had united the nobility, and given the predominance to their disorderly government. It had secured the triumph of the Protestant Reformation, and added to the evils which sprang from feudal turbulence those which could not fail to issue from a religious democracy, disposed to disobey their prince, under the pretext of obeying God. It had rendered the French alliance as odious as it had formerly been courted, and restored the English influence which had previously been so pertinaciously repulsed. When Mary Stuart became once more the Queen of Scotland only, she found her nobility accustomed to rebellion and in possession of the supreme power; her kingdom allied, against her wish, to a neighbouring, and long hostile state; and her people professing a different religion from her own. Habits, power, politics, creed—all wore a threatening aspect.

Left a widow at eighteen years of age, and after

twelve years of residence in France, Mary Stuart felt all that death took from her by depriving her of her husband, and making her descend from the throne of France. She remained for some time plunged in the deepest affliction.\* For several weeks she shut herself up in her room, and would admit no one but the Queen-mother, the King, his brothers, the King of Navarre, the Constable of Montmorency, and her uncles, the Princes of Lorraine.† As soon as she gave admittance

\* She herself composed a poem upon her loss and affliction, the following stanzas, of which we extract from Brantôme :—

I.  
 "Fut-il un tel malheur  
 De dure destinée,  
 Ny si triste douleur  
 De dame fortunée,  
 Qui mon cœur et mon œil  
 Voit en bierre et cercueil,

II.  
 "Qui en mon doux printemps  
 Et fleur de ma jeunesse,  
 Toutes les peines sens  
 D'une extrême tristesse,  
 Et en rien n'ay plaisir  
 Qu' en regret et désir.

III.  
 "Pour mon mal estrange  
 Je ne m'arreste en place ;  
 Mais j'ay eu beau changer  
 Si ma douleur j'efface,  
 Car mon pis et mon mieux  
 Sont les plus déserts lieux.

IV.  
 "Si en quelque séjour,  
 Soit en bois ou en prée,  
 Soit sur l'aube du jour,  
 Ou soit sur la vesprée,  
 Sans cesse mon cœur sent  
 Le regret d'un absent.

V.  
 "Si parfois vers les cieus  
 Viens à dresser ma velle,  
 Le doux traict de ses yeux  
 Je vois en une nûe ;  
 Soudain je vois en l'eau  
 Comme dans un tombeau.

VI.  
 "Si je suis en repos,  
 Sommeillant sur ma couche,  
 J'oy qu'il me tient propos,  
 Je le sens qu'il me touche :  
 En labeur, en recoy,  
 Toujours est prest de moy."

† "Immediately upon her husband's death, she changed her lodging, withdrew herself from all company, became so solitary and exempt of all worldliness, that she doth not to this day see daylight, and thus will continue out forty days. For the space of fifteen days after the death of her said husband, she admitted no man to come into her chamber, but the King, his brethren, the King of Navarre, the Constable, and her uncles."—MS. letter, State Paper office, Throckmorton to the Council, 31st December, 1560. *Tytler*, vol. v., p. 168.

to the foreign ambassadors, she had numerous offers of marriage, to which she would not listen, and the curious phases of which we shall presently point out. King Philip II., not having succeeded in his scheme of marrying Elizabeth himself, wished to obtain the hand of Mary Stuart for his son Don Carlos,\* and thus to place Spain in that position which France had hitherto occupied with regard to Scotland. The Kings of Sweden† and Denmark‡ also aspired to her hand.

Elizabeth sent the Earl of Bedford to express her condolence with the widow of Francis II. This ambassador extraordinary arrived at Paris on the 3rd of February, and, after having discharged the formal duty devolved upon him by his mistress, he requested the Queen of Scotland to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh.§ Mary expressed her desire to live with Elizabeth upon the best terms of neighbourhood and relationship. "We are both," she said to Bedford, "in one isle, both of one language, both the nearest kinswomen that each other hath, and both Queens."|| But, after having

\* This proposition came from the Cardinal of Lorraine himself, who opened the matter in these terms to the Spanish ambassador at Paris:—"El mismo Cardinal quezandose de la desgracia de su sobrina, y del poco remedio que tiene de hallar partido igual, me dixo claramente que no le avia sino era casandose con su alteza." Chantonuay to Philip II., 28th December, 1560; Archives of Simanca, series B, file 12, No. 116.

† Eric XIV., son of Gustavus Vasa, born in 1533, succeeded his father in 1560, and was dethroned in 1569.

‡ Frederic II., born in 1534, ascended the throne in 1558.

§ MS. instructions, State Paper Office, 20th January, 1561. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 167-169.

|| MS. letter, State Paper Office, the Earl of Bedford and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton to the Privy Council, 26th February, 1561. Tytler, vol. v., p. 169.

given these reasons for maintaining a close friendship, she refused to sanction the Treaty of Edinburgh in the absence of her uncle the Cardinal of Lorraine, then away from the court, and on no account before she had consulted her nobility and Parliament. She graciously requested the portrait of Elizabeth, and wished she could have an interview with her, as it would lead to a more prompt and sure understanding than all these complicated negociations could effect. Thus she eluded the ratification of the treaty, to which she was determined not to submit.\*

All her thoughts now turned towards Scotland, where the news of the death of Francis II. had been received with unfeigned satisfaction. His death, by putting an end to the fears inspired by France, naturally divided parties once more. As the national interest of independence no longer existed, private interests resumed their sway. The Catholic party regained animation and courage. It held a secret meeting, at which the Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Bishops of Aberdeen, Murray, and Ross, the Earls of Athol, Huntly, Crawford, Sutherland, and Caithness, and several other noblemen, were present. They commissioned John Lesly, then Official of Aberdeen, and subsequently Bishop of Ross, to go and assure their young sovereign of their entire devotion to her person.† Lesly found Mary Stuart, on

\* Same dispatch, in Tytler, vol. v., p. 172.

† Keith, p. 159. Tytler, vol. v., p. 165.

the 14th of April, 1561, at Vitry, in Champagne. From Rheims, where she had spent part of the winter with her aunt, the Abbess of the Convent of St. Pierre-les-Dames, she proceeded to Lorraine. Lesly proposed to her, on behalf of the Catholics, to proceed at once to Scotland; to detain in France her brother James, who had been dispatched to her by the insurrectionary Parliament, until after her return into her kingdom; and to disembark at Aberdeen, where she would find an army of twenty thousand men levied by her friends in the North of Scotland.\* Mary had the wisdom to reject this proposition. Remembering that the leaders of this party had recently proved themselves either weak or seditious, she did not think that their devotion would be very zealous, their offer very sincere, or their fidelity very lasting. Besides, she was anxious not to appear exclusive, lest she should still further add to her weakness. She sought the assistance of every one. She had already directed Preston of Craigmillar, Ogilvy of Findlater, Lumsden of Blanern, and Lesly of Auchtermuchty, whom she had sent as her commissioners into Scotland, where they arrived, on the 20th of February, 1561, to convey to her subjects the assurances of her affection, the promise to pursue a conciliatory policy, and the announcement of her speedy return.† In order

\* *De rebus gestis Sctorum, authore Joanne Leslæo episcopo Rossensi.* London, 1725, vol. i, p. 226, *et seq.* Keith, p. 160.

† These instructions, extracted from the archives of the French Foreign Office, are published in Prince Labanoff's collection, vol. i., pp. 85-88.

to restore the regular action of authority, she addressed a royal commission to the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Argyle, Athol,\* Huntly, and Bothwell, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and Lord James Stuart, to convoke a legal Parliament.†

As soon as the Parliament met, Lord James was dispatched to his sister. No envoy could have been selected better adapted than this nobleman to moderate Mary Stuart's displeasure, and induce her speedy return into her kingdom. He passed through England. Elizabeth and her ministers, with whom he had long been in constant communication, were not without fear lest the offers which the Court of France would be sure to make him should detach him from their party. He was the most important personage in Scotland, by reason of his royal descent, the position which he had taken in the affairs of the country, the influence which he exercised as the secular head of the reformed party, and the confidence with which he had inspired most of the nobility. Though still young, he had earned considerable distinction, both as a soldier and a politician. To the most undaunted courage he added the most consummate ability. Possessing great judgment, energy of character, and firmness of purpose; with less variable-ness and cunning than his astute and fickle countrymen;

\* John Stewart, fourth Earl of Athol,—a descendant of Alexander, *High Stewart* of Scotland, the common ancestor of the Stuart family,—succeeded to the earldom in 1542.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 26th February, 1561. Tytler, vol. v., p. 165.



frank and blunt, though not incapable of dissimulation and falsehood, he was always guided by that resolute good sense which seldom fails to conduct a man quickly and safely to the object he has in view.

The Prior of St. Andrews met the Queen, his sister, at St. Dizier, on the day after she had seen John Lesly, the Official of Aberdeen.\* He endeavoured to render her favourable to the Congregation, and to an alliance with England. But Mary Stuart would not allow herself to be persuaded by the reasons which he adduced in favour of a course of policy calculated to strengthen her authority and ensure her repose. She informed him of her intentions, declaring that she would not ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh, and that she would seek to dissolve the union between England and Scotland, which was very distasteful to her. She even endeavoured to gain over Lord James to her religion and plans, by offering him a cardinal's hat, and several rich benefices in France. But Lord James unhesitatingly refused all these advantages, and seemed to obtain his sister's confidence more thoroughly by this proof of his rectitude and disinterestedness. Mary promised to send him full powers to govern the kingdom during her absence; and merely desired him not to pass through England on his return to Scotland.†

Lord James would not consent to this. He continued

\* Keith, p. 160.

† MS. letters, State Paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 29th April and 1st May, 1561. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 174-179.

so strongly attached to the alliance with Elizabeth, which constituted, in his opinion, the principal strength of his party, that he communicated what had passed between his sister and himself to the English Ambassador, Throckmorton. This statesman, feeling how important it was that his Sovereign should retain the influence which she had acquired in Scotland, advised her to make sure of the most able and powerful men in the country by the annual distribution amongst them of 20,000*l.* sterling. "There should be some special consideration had," he wrote, "of the Earl of Arran, because he is the second person of that realm ; and, in like manner, of the Lord James, whose credit, love, and honesty, is comparable in my judgment to any man of that realm. . . . I do well perceive the Lord James to be a very honourable, sincere, and godly gentleman, and very much affected to your Majesty, upon whom you never bestowed good turn better than on him, in my opinion."\* The parsimonious Elizabeth thought she had sufficient hold upon him by the double bond of religious faith and political interest, and that it was unnecessary to add that of money. She received him very kindly when he came to London, but granted him nothing more than the inexpensive favour of a gracious reception.

Mary Stuart, finding that she could neither shake

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 29th April, 1561. Tytler, vol. v., p. 180.

Lord James's fidelity to the reformed party, nor destroy his attachment to England, did not grant him the powers with which she had promised to invest him. Gilles de Noailles had been despatched to request the Scottish Parliament to break off the alliance they had lately concluded with England, and renew that which had so long been maintained with France. But Noailles failed of success in his mission; and the Scottish Parliament proved as immovable as the Prior of St. Andrews had been. They replied to Mary Stuart's envoy that the assistance afforded to Scotland by Queen Elizabeth had delivered the realm from Papal tyranny and French domination; and with this answer he was forced to content himself.\* Mary Stuart, after having passed some time at Rheims and in Lorraine,† prepared to return into Scotland, taking with her an annual income of 60,000 livres as Queen Dowager of France.‡ She returned more from necessity than from choice. "I have often seen her," says Brantôme, "dread this voyage as greatly as her death, and desire a hundred times rather to remain a simple dowager in France than to go and reign in her wild country."§ She requested Elizabeth to give her a safe-conduct through her dominions; and D'Oysel, who was to go before her

\* Keith, p. 161. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 183-184.

† De Rebus gestis Scotorum, authore Joanne Lealæo, vol. i., p. 226.

‡ "Avons, suyvant les conventions matrimoniales d'icelle nostre dicte seur, résolu luy assigner son dict douaire, montant à la dicte somme de soixante mil livres tournois de revenu pour chacun an, sur le dict duché de Touraine, conté de Poictou, terres et seigneuries en dépendans." Ordinance of Charles IX., 20th December, 1560, in Teulet, vol. i., p. 734.

§ Brantôme, vol. v. p. 90.

into Scotland, was instructed to make this request.\* But Elizabeth would not allow D'Oysel to pass through her dominions, and refused to grant Mary a safe-conduct.† “Her Majesty,” wrote Cecil, “would not disguise with her, but plainly would forbear to show her such pleasure until she should ratify it (the Treaty of Edinburgh), and that done, she should not only have free passage, but all helps and gratuities.”‡

Mary Stuart was deeply wounded by this refusal. She displayed her feelings on the subject to the English Ambassador, Throckmorton, in words full of dignity and bitterness: “There is nothing, Monsieur l’Ambassadeur, doth grieve me more,” she said, “than that I did so forget myself as to require of the Queen, your mistress, that favour which I had no need to ask.” Then, calling to mind her causes of complaint against Elizabeth, she added nobly, and with a somewhat threatening vehemence: “But, Monsieur l’Ambassadeur, let your mistress think that it will be deemed very strange amongst all princes and countries that she should first animate my subjects against me, and now, being a widow, impeach my going into my own country. I ask of her nothing but friendship: I do not trouble her state, nor practise with her subjects. And yet I know there be in her realm some that be inclined enough to hear offers. I know also they be not of the

\* Keith, p. 169.

† Keith, p. 171. Tytler, vol. v., p. 186.

‡ MS. letter, Cecil to Sussex, 25th July, 1561. Quoted in Tytler, vol. v., p. 188.

same mind she is of, neither in religion, nor in other things. The Queen, your mistress, doth say that I am young and do lack experience. But I have age enough and experience to behave myself towards my friends and kinsfolks friendly and uprightly, and I trust my discretion shall not so fail me that my passion shall move me to use other language of her than is due to a Queen and my next kinswoman.”\*

When, on the next day, the 21st of July, she had one more interview with Throckmorton before her departure, she addressed him in these beautiful words, marked by melancholy forebodings, which were not destined to be realised until a later period: “I trust the wind will be so favourable as I shall not need to come on the coast of England, and if I do, then, Monsieur l’Ambassadeur, the Queen, your mistress, shall have me in her hands to do her will of me; and if she be so hard-hearted as to desire my end, she may then do her pleasure and make sacrifice of me. Per-adventure that casualty might be better for me than to live; in this matter God’s will be fulfilled.”†

After having passed a few days at St. Germain, with the royal family, she bade them farewell, and was accompanied as far as Calais by the Duke of Guise, the Cardinals of Lorraine and Guise, and a number of the Court. She embarked, on the 14th of August, with her three uncles, the Duke D’Aumale, the Great Prior,

\* MS. letter, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 26th July, 1561. Quoted in Keith, pp. 172-173.

† Ibid., p. 176.

the Duke D'Elbeuf, M. de Damville, son of the Constable de Montmorency, and many other noblemen.\* Brantôme, who was one of the gentlemen who followed her into Scotland, has left a touching narrative of her departure, some few sentences of which I will quote : "The galley," he says, "having left port and a slight breeze having sprung up, we began to set sail. . . . She, with both arms resting on the poop of the galley near the helm, began to shed floods of tears, continually casting her beautiful eyes towards the port and the country she had left, and uttering these mournful words : Farewell France ! until night began to fall. She desired to go to bed without taking any food, and would not go down into her cabin, so her bed was prepared on the deck. She commanded the steersman, as soon as it was day, if he could still discern the coast of France, to wake her and not fear to call her ; in which fortune favoured her, for the wind having ceased and recourse being had to the oars, very little progress was made during the night ; so that when day appeared, the coast of France was still visible, and the steersman not having failed to perform the commands which she had given him, she sat up in her bed, and began again to look at France as long as she could, and then she redoubled her lamentations : Farewell France ! Farewell France ! I think I shall never see thee more !"†

\* "De cent ou six vingts gentilshommes que nous estions en ce voyage," says Brantôme, vol. ii., p. 368.

† Brantôme, vol. v. pp. 92-94.

But if she experienced sorrow at leaving her adopted country, her departure caused no less poignant regret, and Ronsard thus gracefully expresses the feelings of melancholy excited in his breast by the event :—

“ Le jour que votre voile aux vents se recourbe,  
Et de nos yeux pleurans les vostres déroba,  
Ce jour-là même voile emporta loin de France,  
Les Muses qui souloient y faire demourance.”\*

Although she feared that she might be intercepted by the cruisers which Elizabeth had sent to sea, she arrived without accident in the Frith of Forth, after a passage of five days. A thick fog which arose on the evening before her arrival, kept from view the little fleet which was bringing her back to her kingdom, and which had cast anchor at no great distance from the shore. This fog cleared up on the morning of the 19th of August, and Mary Stuart entered the harbour of

\* The lines which follow are no less worthy of quotation :—

“ Quand cet yvoire blanc qui enfle vostre sein,  
Quand vostre longue, gresle et délicate main,  
Quand vostre belle taille et vostre beau corsage  
Qui ressemble au portrait d’une céleste image,  
Quand vos sages propos, quand vostre douce voix  
Qui pourroit esmouvoir les rochers et les bois,  
Las, ne sont plus ici, quand tant de beautés rares,  
Dont les graces des cieus ne vous furent avarés,  
Abandonnant la France, ont, d’un autre costé,  
L’agréable sujet de nos vers emporté,  
Comment pourroient chanter les bouches des poëtes,  
Quand par vostre départ les Muses sont muettes.  
Tout ce qui est de beau ne se garde longtems,  
Les roses et les lys ne règnent qu’un printemps.  
Ainsi vostre beauté seulement apparue  
Quinze ans en nostre France, est soudain disparue,  
Comme on voit d’un éclair s’évanouir le trait,  
Et d’elle n’a laissé sinon que le regret,  
Sinon le déplaisir que me remet sans cesse,  
Au cœur le souvenir d’une telle princesse.”

(RONSARD, *Œuvres*, vol. viii., pp. 6-7).

Leith before she was expected.\* As soon as the news of her arrival became known, the people flocked from all quarters to welcome her, and the nobility hastened to conduct her to Edinburgh, to the palace of her ancestors. This cordial reception touched, but did not rejoice, her heart. She could not refrain from instituting a mournful comparison between the poverty of the wild country to which she had returned, after an absence of thirteen years, and the magnificence of the Court in which the happy days of her childhood and youth had been spent. A palfrey had been provided for her, but the noblemen and ladies of her retinue were forced to be contented with small mountain ponies, "such as they were," says Brantôme, "and harnessed to match." At sight of them, he adds, "the Queen began to weep, and to say that this was not like the pomp, the splendour, the trappings, or the superb horses of France." She proceeded with this humble cortège to Holyrood Palace. During the evening, the citizens of Edinburgh came beneath her windows to play on their three-stringed violins, and to sing psalms, in demonstration of their joy at her return.† The sound

\* Brantôme, vol. v., pp. 94-95. This fog was regarded as a bad sign by the zealous Protestants. Knox says that the appearance of the heavens and the density of the atmosphere showed "what comfort was brought unto this country with her, to wit, sorrow, dolour, darkness, and all impiety." *History of the Reformation*, vol. ii., p. 268.

† "Et qui pis est, le soir, ainsi qu'elle se vouloit coucher, estant logée en bas, en l'abbaye d'Islebourg, qui est certes un beau bastiment, et ne tient rien du pays, vindrent sous sa fenêtre cinq ou six cents marauts de la ville lui donner l'aubade de méchants violons et petits rebecz, dont il n'y eu a faute en ce pays-là, et se mirent à chanter des pseumes, tant mal chantez et si mal accordez que rien plus!" Brantôme, vol. v., p. 95; Knox, vol. i., pp. 269-270.



of their discordant music, and the hymns of a creed which she deemed gloomy and heretical, added to the melancholy impressions experienced by Mary Stuart on returning to a country where she felt she was a stranger, whose manners she had not adopted, and whose faith she no longer shared.



## CHAPTER III.

FROM MARY'S RETURN INTO SCOTLAND TO HER MARRIAGE  
WITH DARNLEY.

Policy pursued by Mary Stuart.—Concessions to the Protestant party.—Lord James Stuart appointed Prime Minister.—Disgrace of the Hamiltons.—Rebellion of the Earl of Huntly.—Negotiations for the Queen's Second Marriage.—Her Rupture with Murray.—His Conspiracy.—Marriage of the Queen to Lord Darnley.

DIFFICULTIES of various kinds, and all of them of a very serious nature, beset the path of Mary Stuart in Scotland. How should she treat with triumphant Protestantism? How should she maintain in union and reduce to obedience her nobility, so long accustomed to division and revolt? How should she live in harmony with Queen Elizabeth, her powerful neighbour, and enemy at heart? And finally, how should she marry again without endangering her Crown, if she espoused a foreign prince, and disturbing the peace of her kingdom, if she bestowed her hand upon one of her own subjects? To steer clear of all these difficulties, she would have required a prudence beyond her years and contrary to her nature. She possessed finesse, but little circumspection; and though endowed with much ingenuity and tact, she was not capable of sustained

action. Familiar and ready, graceful and enthusiastic, reposing unbounded confidence in all who pleased her, and abandoning herself with impetuosity to the ideas which momentarily influenced her, she had all the charms of a woman, without possessing in a sufficiently high degree the vigorous qualities necessary to a Queen.

Having been warned, however, of the dangers which awaited her, she acted at first with great discretion, under the prudent direction of Lord James Stuart and Lord Lethington. She appointed members of her Privy Council,\* the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Huntly, Argyle, Bothwell, Errol,† Marshal, Athol, Morton, Montrose,‡ and Glencairn, Lord James Stuart and Lord John Erskine, together with the Treasurer of the Crown, the Secretary of State, the Clerk-register, and the Justice-clerk.§ The Earl of Huntly still retained the dignity of Chancellor, but she made Lord James Stuart her Prime Minister, and Lethington her Secretary of State.|| These two Protestant leaders thus became the confidential advisers of a Catholic Queen. Apparently resolved to offer no opposition to the religious revolution which had taken place in her kingdom during her absence, she expected nothing less than toleration

\* This Act, dated September 6, 1561, is in Keith, p. 187.

† George, sixth Earl of Errol.

‡ William, second Earl of Montrose.

§ The Treasurer was Robert Richardson, Commendator of St. Mary Isle, and appointed to the former office in 1558. Lethington was Secretary of State. The Clerk-register was James Makgill, eldest son of Sir J. Makgill, Provost of Edinburgh, who had held that post since 1554. The Justice-clerk was Sir John Bellenden, who succeeded his father Thomas, in 1547. All the four were Protestants.

|| Keith, pp. 188-189.

for herself. "I mean," she said to Throckmorton, a short time before she left France, "to constrain none of my subjects, but would wish that they were all as I am, and I trust they should have no support to constrain me."\*

But this toleration was not to be easily obtained from zealous sectaries who regarded the restoration of the mass as the re-establishment of idolatry. "One mass," said Knox, "was more fearful to him than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed in any part of the realm."† Accordingly, when, on the Sunday following Mary Stuart's arrival, mass was said in her private chapel, the Protestant party were moved almost to insurrection. The ministers threatened; the people murmured; and it was said on every hand, "That idol shall not be suffered again to take place within this realm!"‡ The fanatical Master of Lindsay, clad in his coat of mail, and followed by a troop of men as exasperated as himself, rushed into the court-yard of Holyrood Palace, crying out that "the idolater priests should die the death, according to God's law."§ Lord James Stuart, who had expected some tumult of this kind, dispersed the mob.|| Resolved not to permit any infringement of his sister's religious freedom, he had taken up his post at the door of the chapel; and,

\* Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 23rd June, 1561. Keith, p. 167.

† Knox, vol. ii., p. 276.

‡ Ibid., p. 270.

§ Knox, vol. ii., p. 270. This Patrick Lindsay of Byres, succeeded to his father's title in 1568.

|| Knox, vol. ii., p. 271. Tytler, vol. v., p. 195.

opposing his authority and energy to their tumultuary fanaticism, he protected the Queen's chaplains, who performed the Catholic ceremonies without interruption, to the great scandal of Knox and others.

A short time after the occurrence of this scene, Knox wrote to his friend Calvin :—"The arrival of the Queen has disturbed the tranquillity of our affairs. She had scarcely been back three days, before the idol of the mass was again set up. Some prudent men of great authority endeavoured to prevent it, saying that their purified conscience could not suffer that that land should again be contaminated, which the Lord, by the efficacy of his Word, had purged from idolatry. But as the major part of those who adhere to our faith thought differently, impiety gained the victory, and is now acquiring fresh strength. Those who favoured it give as a reason for their indulgence, that all the ministers of the Lord are of opinion, and that you yourself declare, that it is not lawful for us to prevent the Queen from practising her religion. Although I contradict this rumour, which appears to me very false, it has taken such deep root in men's hearts, that it will be impossible for me to dislodge it, unless I learn from you whether the question has been actually submitted to your Church, and what was the answer of the brethren. I am always troubling you with such enquiries, but I have no one else into whose bosom I can pour my cares. I confess candidly, my father, that

I have never until now felt how painful and difficult it is to combat hypocrisy when concealed under the mask of piety. I have never feared open enemies so greatly, but that, in the midst of my tribulations, I have hoped to gain the victory.”\*

The discontent of Knox plainly revealed all that new species of intolerance, threatening indications of which were displayed to the Queen when she made her public entrance into Edinburgh. On the 2nd of September, the day appointed for that ceremony, Mary Stuart, after having dined at the Castle, proceeded towards the town under a canopy of violet coloured velvet, and accompanied by the nobility and principal burgesses. A little child, six years of age, issued from a cloud as if he were descending from Heaven, and, having recited a copy of verses, presented her with the Keys of Edinburgh, a Bible, and a Book of Psalms. In order to recal to her memory the terrible punishments which, as the Scriptures inform us, God inflicted upon idolaters, among the pageants exhibited on the road were representations of the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, swallowed up by the earth at the very moment when they were offering their sacrifice, and other spectacles

\* This Latin letter from Knox to Calvin, is dated October 24th. It belongs to M. Feuillet de Conches, and has recently been printed in M. Teulet's collection of *Pièces et documents relatifs à l'histoire d'Ecosse*, vol. ii., pp. 12-14. After having declared to Calvin, "Apertos hostes nunquam sic timui, quum in mediis cerumnis victoriam sperarem," Knox concluded with these words:—"Salutat te Jacobus ille frater regine, maxime senex, qui solus inter eos qui aulam frequentant impietati se opponit; ille tamen inter reliquos fascinatur in hoc quod veretur idolum illud violenter deturbare. Salutat te Ecclesia tota, et tuarum precum subsidium flagitat. Dominus Jesu diu Ecclesie sue incolumen servet. Amen."

of equally sinister signification. The people were with difficulty induced to refrain from exhibiting a most outrageous representation of a priest, burned upon the altar during the elevation of the host. Applauded as a Queen, but menaced as a Catholic, Mary, after having witnessed these various manifestations of popular delight and religious fanaticism, returned to Holyrood.\*

The Queen, having succeeded, by her brother's firmness of conduct, in practising her worship in private, felt that it was necessary to assure her formidable Protestant subjects of the exclusive domination of their own faith. She accordingly made to them a number of concessions, which must have cost her dear. She declared in the Council, and announced to the people by proclamation, that no alteration should be made in the established religion of the country, and that every act, whether public or private, which tended to change its form, should be punished with death.† The regular authority of the Crown thus confirmed the decisions arrived at by the revolutionary authority of the Parliament. Mary next desired to see Knox, and, perhaps, hoped to mollify him, and attach him to herself. In an

\* Wright's *Queen Elizabeth and her Times*, vol. i., p. 73; Chalmers's *Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 2nd edition, vol. i., p. 80; Keith, p. 189; Knox, vol. ii., pp. 287-288.

† This proclamation, extracted from the registers of the Privy Council, and dated August 25, 1561, is contained in Knox, vol. ii. pp. 272, 273. It contains this passage: "Her Majestie ordains . . . that none of thame tak upoun hand privatly or oppinly to mak any alteratioun or innovatioun of the state of religioun, or attempt anything agains the same, quhilk her Majestie fand publicklye and universallie standing at her Majestie's arryvall in this her realme, under the pain of deyth."

interview which she had with him,\* she discussed the duties of the Christian and the subject. She pointed out to him, that, in his book against female government, he excited nations to rebel against their rulers; and she advised him to treat with greater charity those who differed from him in matters of religious belief. "If, madam," said Knox, "to rebuke idolatry, and to persuade the people to worship God according to his Word, be to raise subjects against their princes, I cannot stand excused, for so have I acted; but, if the true knowledge of God, and his right worship, lead all good subjects (as they assuredly do) to obey the prince from their heart, then who can reprehend me?" He then professed his willingness to live in all contentment under her Majesty's government, so long as the blood of the saints was not shed; and he maintained, that, in religion, subjects were bound to follow, not the will of their prince, but the commands of their Creator. "If," said he, "all men in the days of the Apostles should have been compelled to follow the religion of the Roman Emperors, where would have been the Christian faith?" The Queen, drawing a judicious distinction between conscientious dissent and rebellious insurrection, replied, "But these men did not resist." "And yet," answered Knox, "they who obey not the commandment may virtually be said to resist." "Nay," rejoined Mary, "they did not resist

\* "The Quene spak with John Knox, and had lang reasoning with him, none being present, except the Lord James." Knox, vol. ii. p. 277.



with the sword." "That," said Knox, "was simply because they had not the power." At this candid and bold declaration, that power conferred the right of insurrection, and that weakness was the only reason for submission to princes, Mary Stuart exclaimed in astonishment, "What! do you maintain, that subjects, having power, may resist their princes?" The fanatical reformer, who considered that the state should be subordinate to religion, did not hesitate to adopt these consequences of his theory. "Most assuredly, madam," he replied, "if princes exceed their bounds." Then, comparing sovereigns who, in their blind zeal, would persecute the children of God, to a father who, struck with madness, should attempt to slay his own children, whose duty it would be to bind and disarm him, Knox continued, "Therefore, to take the sword from them, to bind their hands, and to cast them into prison till they be brought to a more sober mind, is no disobedience against princes, but just obedience, because it agreeth with the word of God." Mary was utterly amazed. A doctrine so subversive of all authority, which made subjects judges of the obedience which they owed to their rulers, and which authorised them to revolt at the instigation of their spiritual leaders, filled her with alarm. She pictured to herself the terrible future which was reserved for her, a Catholic Queen, in the midst of these haughty and insubordinate Protestants, with their stern and fanatical ministers. She had no strength to answer, for she felt

reply was useless. She fell into a melancholy silence, and "stood as it were amazed, for more than a quarter of an hour." \*

Lord James Stuart was the only other person present at this strange scene, when Knox presented himself before the young and amiable Queen, just as the Jewish prophets of old used to convey the admonitions of the Most High to the Kings of Judah and Israel. He endeavoured to calm the feelings and restore the courage of his sister, and Mary Stuart at length collected herself, and said, giving an ironical assent to the factious words of Knox, in order better to display their tendency, "Well, then, I perceive that my subjects shall only obey you, and not me; they must do what they list and not what I command, whilst I must learn to be subject unto them, and not they to me." Urged to this extremity, Knox changed his tone, and anxious to regain the ground he had lost, "God forbid," he replied, "that it should ever be so; far be it from me to command any, or to absolve subjects from their lawful obedience. My only desire is, that both princes and subjects should obey God, who has in his word enjoined Kings to be nursing-fathers, and Queens nursing-mothers to his Church." Mary, who had no idea of becoming the protectress of a religion which she detested, but was obliged to support, could no longer contain herself. She gave utterance to the feelings

\* Knox, vol. ii., p. 282.

which she had hitherto repressed, and said, in anger, "Yea, this is indeed true, but yours is not the Church that I will nourish. I will defend the Church of Rome, for I think it the true Church of God."

At these words, Knox burst into furious indignation. He replied energetically to the Queen, that her will was no reason, and that her opinion respecting the Church of Rome could not change that harlot, as he called it, into the immaculate spouse of Christ. He then burst into the most violent invectives against that Church, and declared that it was full of errors, and polluted with vices. He offered to prove that its faith had more grievously degenerated than that of the Jewish Church, when they crucified Jesus Christ. The Queen, however, put an end to his vehement denunciations, and bade him farewell. He took his leave, praying God that "she might be as blessed in the commonwealth of Scotland, as ever Deborah was in the commonwealth of Israel." \*

Knox's inconsiderate zeal incurred the censure of the political leaders of the Protestant party. Lethington even wrote to Cecil, "You know the vehemency of Mr. Knox's spirit, which cannot be bridled, and yet doth sometimes utter such sentences as cannot easily be digested by a weak stomach. I could wish he would deal with her more gently, being a young princess un-

\* For a fuller account of this long interview, see Knox, vol. ii. pp. 277—286; or M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, vol. ii., pp. 31-39. Randolph also mentions it in a *Letter to Cecil*, on the 7th of September, 1561; Keith, p. 188.

persuaded. For this I am accounted too politic, but surely in her comporting with him she doth declare a wisdom far exceeding her age. God grant her the assistance of his spirit!"\* Among the twelve Earls or Lords of whom Mary had composed her Privy Council, she had given the preponderance to the adherents of the reformed faith. In a General Assembly, called to determine the condition and means of existence of the Reformed Church, it was decided that a third part of the revenues of the ecclesiastical property which still remained in the hands of the prelates, or had been seized by the nobles, should be given to the Queen for the maintenance of preachers, the endowment of schools, the support of the poor, and the increase of the revenue of the Crown. Lord James Stuart, Lord Lethington, and the Earls of Argyle and Morton, were appointed to superintend the collection and distribution of this third. The Confession of Faith was retained as the rule of belief, but the Book of Discipline was rejected by the nobility, who, though willing to submit to the teaching of the ministers, would not accept their government.† The object of these early acts of Mary's administration was to effect a sort of compromise between the various interests which held sway in the country, and kept it always on the verge of civil war. The arrangement which prevailed at the return of Mary Stuart secured the religious domination

\* MS. letter, State-Paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 25th October, 1561. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 199, 200.

† Tytler, vol. v., pp. 207, 209. Knox, vol. ii., pp. 295, 299.

of the reformed party, private liberty of conscience for the Queen, the distribution of authority in a mixed council, and the division of the ecclesiastical revenues, two-thirds of which were either retained by the Catholic clergy, or possessed by the nobility, and one-third devoted to the service of the new Church.

This arrangement was due in great measure to the increasing influence of Lord James Stuart, whom his sister created Earl of Mar on the occasion of his marriage with the daughter of the Earl Marshal, and invested with the most ample powers to reduce to submission the rebellious districts of the frontiers. He performed this task with singular energy and prompt success.\* But the favour which he enjoyed did not fail to excite the jealousy of the principal members of the high aristocracy. The Gordons, who had remained Catholics, and the Hamiltons, who greatly regretted the power they had lost, were particularly discontented by it. The latter of these two families had been deprived of a great portion of their income by the changes which had recently taken place, and which the Romish clergy charged the Queen with having sanctioned. The Duke of Chatelherault and his eldest son, the Earl of Arran, did not make their appearance at Court upon Mary Stuart's arrival.† They still held the fortress of Dumbarton, but they had lost all their influence, and a portion of the revenues of the Abbey of Arbroath had

\* Tyder, vol. v., p. 211.

† Chalmers' *Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, vol. i., p. 81.

been taken from them. The Archbishop of St. Andrews, the duke's natural brother, was compelled to give up several of his benefices ; Lord Claud Hamilton, his son, to renounce his claims to the Abbey of Paisley, of which he expected to be the future possessor ; and the Abbot of Kilwinning and other Hamiltons, to resign themselves to the sacrifices imposed upon them by the General Assembly.\* As for the Earl of Huntly, whose son, Alexander Gordon,† had married a Hamilton, he united to the general causes of discontent felt by all the barons who were not in favour, the fear of being dispossessed of the earldom of Murray. He had long enjoyed this earldom, and was desirous not to lose it.‡

It was seldom long before an union was effected among the discontented nobles in Scotland ; but in this instance, their intrigues were not carried very far. The eldest son of the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earl of Arran, a man of rather weak intellect, was seized with a sudden attack of insanity. In his frenzy, he disclosed a plot which had been suggested to him by the Earl of Bothwell and the Abbot of Kilwinning, for invading the royal palace, seizing the person of the Queen, killing Lord James Stuart, and assuming the

\* They still possessed the Monastery of Failford, in Ayrshire, and the Abbey of Crossraguel, in the parish of Kirkoswald. Knox, vol. ii., pp. 167, 168, notes.

† He had died in 1553. Knox, vol. ii., p. 360, note.

‡ This earldom was held by James Stuart, a natural son of James IV., until his death in 1544, when it reverted to the Crown. On the 30th of January, 1562, the Queen promised it to her brother James, under her Privy Seal. Chalmers, vol. i., pp. 121, 122.

government of the kingdom.\* This conspiracy, thus discovered, was immediately frustrated. The Earl of Mar arrested the Earl of Bothwell (who made his escape soon after†) and the Abbot of Kilwinning. After having thus paralysed the Hamiltons during the spring of 1562, he crushed the Gordons in the autumn.

The Gordons exercised as much authority in the Northern districts as the Hamiltons possessed in the West. Huntly‡ had plotted the death of the Earl of Mar and Secretary Lethington,§ and designed to marry his second son, John Gordon, to the Queen.|| The latter had already appeared in open rebellion. After having wounded Lord Ogilvy in the streets of Edinburgh, in consequence of a private quarrel, he disregarded the orders of his Sovereign to repair to Stirling Castle. Having collected a band of a thousand horsemen, he set the royal power at defiance. The Earl of Huntly, his father, had fortified the Castles of Findlater, Auchendown, and Strathbogie:¶ and taking up his quarters in the mountains, he awaited the arrival of Mary Stuart, who, after having visited the central parts of her kingdom during the previous

\* MS. letters, State-Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 7th and 9th April, 1562. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 212, 213.

† Knox, vol. ii., pp. 346, 347.

‡ George, fourth Earl of Huntly, had been appointed Lieutenant-General of the North in 1540, by James V., and had become Chancellor in 1547, on the death of Cardinal Beaton. One of his relatives was John Gordon, eleventh Earl of Sutherland, whom he induced to join in his rebellion. § Tytler, vol. v., p. 225.

|| MS. letters, State-Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 23rd and 28th of October, and 2nd November, 1562. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 225, 226.

¶ MS. letter, State-Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 2nd November, 1562. Tytler, vol. v., p. 224.

year,\* had determined to traverse its northern districts also. She accordingly proceeded thither at the head of a small army, under the command of the Earl of Mar. The Castle of Inverness being closed against her by the captain placed in command of it by the Gordons, she attacked it, compelled it to surrender, and ordered that its commander should be hanged.† During this royal progress, which was also a military expedition, she displayed great courage, and endured every fatigue with cheerfulness, traversing the rough country on horseback, crossing rivers, encamping on the open heath, and regretting "that she was not a man, to know what life it was to lie all night in the fields, or to walk upon the causeway, with a jack and knapsack, a Glasgow buckler, and a broadsword."‡ On her return to Aberdeen, she gave the earldom of Murray to her brother, and thus rendered a war with the Gordons inevitable. The Earl of Huntly at once advanced at the head of his troops as far as Corrichie, twelve miles from Aberdeen. But the royal army, led by the new Earl of Murray, in conjunction with the Earls of Athol and Morton, completely defeated him. He was left dead upon the battle-field, where his body remained unburied, like that of a criminal, and his defeat caused the temporary ruin of his house. Of his two surviving sons, John Gordon was condemned to be beheaded for

\* During the month of September, 1561. Chalmers, vol. i., pp. 82-86. *Diurnal of Occurrences*, p. 69.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 223.

‡ Letter from Randolph to Cecil, 18th September, 1562; in Chalmers, vol. i., p. 133.



rebellion, but his sentence was commuted into imprisonment in the fortress of Dunbar,\* and the other, Adam Gordon, was spared in consideration of his youth. This family, which was the second in the kingdom, and boasted that it could bring twenty thousand men into the field, lost its title, was deprived of its immense possessions, and fell into sudden insignificance. Lord James obtained from his sister, for his relative, the Earl of Morton,† the post of Chancellor of the kingdom, left vacant by the death of the Earl of Huntly. The disgrace of the Hamiltons and the ruin of the Gordons largely contributed to secure the triumph of Protestantism, whose political leader, Murray, now governed Scotland with as much authority as wisdom.

It was not, however, simply that she might reign more peacefully that Mary Stuart showed this deference to Murray and his party. She had other views, and her condescension covered great ambition. She aspired to be recognised by Queen Elizabeth as heir to the throne of England, and thought she would succeed in this more easily by the aid of the Protestants, as they belonged to the English party. Since the death of Francis II., she had ceased to bear the arms of England, and no longer declared herself the rival of

\* He remained there until August, 1665, when he was relieved from his forfeiture by Mary, who had quarrelled with Murray, and became fifth Earl of Huntly. Knox, vol. ii., p. 360.

† James Douglas, fourth Earl of Morton, a principal Lord of the Congregation, and one of the cleverest politicians in Scotland. He played an important part in subsequent events, and was the fourth Regent during the minority of James VI.

Elizabeth. But, though renouncing the idea of deposing her, she aimed at becoming her successor. This was the object proposed to her by Lord James when she returned to Scotland, and towards which he had never ceased to direct her attention. Desirous to reconcile the affection which he owed to his sister with the zeal which he felt for his religion, Murray tried every means to establish a close friendship between the two Queens, in order that, at some future period, it might lead the two nations to live together under the same government and the same faith.

On the 6th of August, 1561, thirteen days before Mary Stuart disembarked at Leith, Murray wrote to Queen Elizabeth a letter which does equally great honour to his head and his heart. It attests, on his part, perfect loyalty, profound judgment, and wise patriotism. Recommending the affectionate union of the two relations, and the unchangeable alliance of the two crowns, he addressed Elizabeth in language as judicious as it was kind: "You are tender cousins, both Queens, in the flower of your ages, much resembling each other in excellent and goodly qualities, on whom God hath bestowed most liberally the gifts of nature and of fortune, whose sex will not permit that you should advance your glory by wars and bloodshed, but that the chief glory of both should stand in a peaceable reign."\* He then spoke of the title which had been

\* MS. letter, State-Paper Office, Lord James Stuart to Queen Elizabeth, 6th August, 1561. Tytler, vol. v., p. 202.

assumed by his young sovereign when the two countries were at war, and expressed his regret that this circumstance should have led them to entertain a dangerous mistrust of each other. In order to change this subject of disagreement into a means of reconciliation, he suggested that, after Mary had fully acknowledged Elizabeth's present authority, her future rights should be as distinctly recognised: "What inconvenience were it," argued Lord James, "if your Majesty's title did remain untouched, as well for yourself as the issue of your body, to provide that to the Queen, my Sovereign, her own place were reserved in the succession to the Crown of England, which your Majesty will pardon me if I take to be next, by the law of all nations, as she that is next in lawful descent of the right line of King Henry VII., your grandfather; and in the meantime this isle to be united in a perpetual friendship? The succession of realms cometh by God's appointment, according to his good pleasure, and no provision of man can alter that which He hath determined, but it must needs come to pass; yet is there appearance that without injury of any party, this accord might breed us great quietness."\*

This proposition caused Elizabeth no surprise. Immediately upon the death of Francis II., Lethington had opened the subject to Cecil, who had rather favoured than discouraged it.† Mary Stuart, informed at her return of

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 203.

† Letter from Alvaro de la Quadra, Bishop of Aquila, and ambassador of Philip II. at London, dated 18th March, 1563. This letter was written immediately after a

what had taken place in the matter, had sent Lethington to London to carry on this important negotiation. She charged him at the same time to assure Elizabeth of her friendship, and to present her with several gifts, amongst which was a diamond cut in the form of a heart, as a testimony of her affection and esteem. The English Queen gave a very gracious reception to the envoy of Mary Stuart, whom she had already assured of her regard by means of her ambassador Thomas Randolph. But she was very indisposed to nominate her successor beforehand. The jealousy with which she guarded her authority would not allow her, during her whole lifetime, to appoint her heir. Without rejecting the proposals of the Queen of Scotland, she evaded compliance with them, and demanded, as a preliminary, that the Treaty of Edinburgh should be ratified. This request Mary Stuart persisted in refusing, for very good reasons. She stated that the treaty had been concluded with her husband rather than with herself, that its principal clauses had been carried into effect,

conversation which the Bishop of Aquila had had with Lethington, who had related to him all that had passed on this subject since the widowhood of Queen Mary Stuart. "Ledington propuso a Sichel (Cecil) que para concertar las diferencias y sospechas de las dos reinas, le parecia que seria bien que se procurase que la d' Escocia cediese a esta todo el derecho que podia pretender a esta corona, con condicion que muriendo esta sin hijos, la de Escocia sucediese, y que esta declaracion fuese hecha y aprovada por los del regno desde luego. La qual cosa oyda por Sichel, dice este, que se puso muy pensativo y como atonito, pero que tornando sobre si, le dixo que el pensaria en aquello que le avia dicho, y le daria la respuesta. Passados dos otros dias, y viendo el Ledington que Sichel no le dezia nada, se partio, y llegado a la primera jornada de Londres dice que le alcanço un correo, con una carta de Sichel, en que le dezia que el avia pensado en lo que le avia propuesto para la concordia de las reinas sus amas, y que le avia parecido muy bien, y mas que habiendo diestramente tentado el animo desta reyna sobre ello, la avia hallado en extremo bien inclinada al negocio."

that the French had evacuated Scotland, that the newly-constructed fortifications had been demolished, and that she had ceased to bear the arms and title of Queen of England and Ireland. She added that she could not absolutely renounce that title and those arms, as by so doing she would renounce her future rights. Finally she offered to submit the treaty to such a revision as should settle their reciprocal obligations, and conduce "to the reasonable contentment of them both, to the common welfare of their kingdoms, and to the perpetual tranquillity of their subjects."\*

The two Queens thus continued to pursue different ends, and, to terminate this conflict of pretensions, an interview was proposed as a means to dispel distrust, and to put an end to further disagreement. Accordingly, when Lethington returned to Edinburgh, on the 6th of July, 1562, with an affectionate letter from Elizabeth, who sent her portrait to Mary Stuart, declared her intention to maintain the friendly union of the two kingdoms, and offered her the agreeable prospect of a speedy meeting, she was transported with joy. With that vivacity of hope which was natural to her, and which neither age nor misfortune could ever quench, she felt the utmost confidence in both the interview and the happy results it would produce. "I trust," she said to Elizabeth's ambassador, "by that time that we have spoken together, our hearts will be so eased, that the greatest grief that ever after shall

\* Labanoff, vol. i., p. 116.

be between us, will be when we shall take leave the one of the other. And let God be my witness, I honour her in my heart, and love her as my dear and natural sister.\* In her excessive joy, she spoke of Elizabeth with a mixture of tenderness and flattery which, though adapted to please the vanity of that princess, had no influence upon her policy.

The interview, appointed to take place at York, during the autumn of 1562, never occurred.† The civil wars of the Continent, in which Elizabeth took part, by the assistance she afforded to the Huguenets of France as she had formerly done to the Reformers of Scotland, gave her a pretext for postponing it until the summer of 1563. She despatched Sir Henry Sidney to inform Mary Stuart that she regretted she would not be able to meet her yet, and left her free to appoint the time of their interview between the 20th of May and the 31st of August in the following year.‡ Mary Stuart was disappointed and grieved by this delay, which was destined to be of frequent recurrence. She did not, however, continue less steadfast to the policy which she had adopted. Although strongly urged by her uncles, the Lorraine princes, to break with Elizabeth, who had furnished auxiliaries to the

\* MS. letter, State-Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 15th July, 1562. Tytler, vol. v., p. 219.

† Letter from Mary Stuart to Elizabeth, July, 1562; in Keith, p. 221.

‡ Mary fixed the interview on any day between the 20th of August and the 20th of September, 1563, in some place situated between York and the river Trent. Letters Patent, dated Perth, 24th August, 1562. Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 150-156.

Prince of Condé, Admiral Coligny, and the Protestant nobles, she preserved a strict neutrality. Thus compelled to choose between her affections and her interests, her creed and her ambition, she interfered only to recommend peace. During the winter of 1563, she sent Lethington into England\* to endeavour to effect a reconciliation between Elizabeth and the Guises, and to assert her rights if the Parliament should enter upon the question of the succession to the crown. Lethington was instructed to defend her right, as nearest heir to the crown of England, before that Assembly; and to entreat Elizabeth not to name any other than her, if the interests of her kingdom and the wishes of her subjects should compel her to regulate the succession.

But whilst pursuing these important plans, Mary Stuart abandoned herself to the amusements befitting her age and disposition in the Court of Scotland, which she animated by her taste and vivacity, and adorned by her grace and charms. She had transferred thither the usages and pleasures of the Court of France. Surrounded by a number of young ladies belonging to some of the noblest families in the kingdom, she devoted her leisure hours to music and dancing, or sought relaxation from the cares of business in falconry, or the composition of French verses with

\* Instructions given by Mary Stuart to [William Maitland, laird of Lethington. Keith, p. 345; and Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 161-166.

those who were as fond of poetry as herself. The earnestness with which she engaged in these amusements, considered unholy and profane by the Presbyterian ministers, had exposed her to their severe reprehension.\* Many times had Knox mounted his pulpit to inveigh against the prolonged festivities of that joyous court, destined ere long to become so desolate and sad! "Princes," said he, "are more exercised in fiddling and flinging, than in reading or hearing of God's most blessed Word. Fiddlers and flatterers, who commonly corrupt the youth, are more precious in their eyes than men of wisdom and gravity, who, by wholesome admonition, might beat down in them some part of that vanity and pride, whereunto all are born, but in princes take deep root and strength by wicked education."† Dancing was denounced as bitterly as music by this rigid censor, who did not fail to refer in his remarks upon it to the tragical history of Herodias and John the Baptist.

Unhappily for the amiable and light-hearted Mary, excessive familiarity exposed her at this time to indiscreet attacks. The respect due to the Queen was forgotten in the great liberty allowed by the woman. One Captain Hepburn ventured to behave towards her with brutal indelicacy, and escaped punishment only by flight.‡ His example did not, however, serve as a warning to the unfortunate Chastelard. He was a

\* Knox, vol. ii., p. 330.

† Knox, vol. ii., p. 333.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 232.



gentleman of Dauphiny, descended on his mother's side from the Chevalier Bayard,\* highly accomplished, a good musician and an agreeable poet.† He formed one of the suite of M. de Damville, when that nobleman came into Scotland with Mary Stuart, of whom he was deeply enamoured. He had addressed verses to her, to which Mary had replied by others,‡ and he had allowed himself to fall under the influence of an imprudent passion. On his return to France, at the time of the first civil war, he had felt no disposition to march with Damville against his co-religionists, the Huguenots, or to join the Huguenots against his old master, Damville, and had consequently taken the opportunity to revisit Scotland. Mary received him very kindly, and Chastelard's passionate admiration was raised to the highest pitch by her conduct. If we are to believe the testimony of Knox, she encouraged his advances by behaviour unbecoming the decency of an honest woman. During all the winter of 1563, he was allowed more frequent access into her private cabinet than any one of her nobility. The Queen frequently leaned upon Chastelard's shoulder,§ and these dangerous familiarities intoxicated

\* "Il luy ressembloit de taille, car il l'avoit moyenne et très-belle, et maigreline, aussi qu'on disoit M. de Bayard l'avoit." Brantôme, vol. v., p. 122.

† "Il estoit gentilhomme très-accomply; et quant à l'âme, il l'avoit aussi très-belle, car il parloit très-bien, et mettoit par escrit des mieux, et mesme en rithme, aussi bien que gentilhomme de France, usant d'une poésie fort douce et gentille en cavalier." Brantôme, *ut sup.*

‡ "Et mesme luy faisoit response; et pour ce, luy faisoit bonne chère et l'entretenoit souvent." Brantôme, vol. v., p. 123.

§ "Wise men would judge such fashions (viz. the Queen's dancing of the *purpose*

him, and emboldened him to run every risk that he might satisfy his passion. One evening he concealed himself under the Queen's bed. He was discovered by Mary, who merely ordered him to quit the Court at once and for ever. Far from obeying her commands, he followed her secretly into Fife, and two days afterwards concealed himself again in her chamber. Mary again perceived him on entering the room ; uttering loud cries, she called for assistance. Her attendants hastened to her from every direction, and, in the first outburst of her indignation, she ordered Murray, who had hurried to her assistance, to poniard Chastelard on the spot. Murray calmed her excitement, and placed the unfortunate gentleman in arrest ; and two days afterwards he was sentenced to be beheaded. He walked to the scaffold, repeating his friend Ronsard's Hymn to Death,\* in which occur the following lines, adapted at once to his situation and his sentiments :

" Le desir n'est rien que martire,  
Content ne vit le desireux,  
Et l'homme mort est bien heureux,  
Heureux qui plus rien ne desire." †

When he arrived at the place of execution, he raised

with Chattelet) more like to the bordel than to the comeliness of honest women. In this dance, the Queen chose Chattelet, and Chattelet took the Queen. All this winter Chattelet was so familiar in the Queen's cabinet, early and late, that scarcely could any of the nobility have access unto her. The Queen would lie upon Chattelet's shoulder, and sometimes privily would steal a kiss of his neck ; and all this was honest enough, for it was the gentle entreatment of a stranger." Knox, vol. ii., p. 368.

\* " Ne s'aidant," says Brantôme, " d'autre livre spirituel, ny de ministre, ny de confesseur." Vol. v., p. 125.

† Ronsard's Odes, vol. ii., p. 540 (Paris, 1630). According to Knox, he died repentant : " At the place of execution, when he saw that there was no remedy but

his eyes to heaven and exclaimed, "O cruelle dame!" \*

This adventure created a great and unpleasant sensation. It furnished an additional reason why the Queen should avoid, by a new marriage, the dangers to which she was exposed by her beauty and widowhood. Besides, the necessity of giving an heir to the throne of Scotland compelled her to take this step, to which she was inclined by her youth and invited by her subjects; and her hand had long been sought by several European princes. This second marriage, the negociation of which occupied four years, provoked the intervention of the greatest potentates. Philip II., Catherine de Medici, the Emperor Ferdinand, Elizabeth, the Kings of Sweden and Denmark, were all anxious either to consummate or prevent it. As it assumed extreme importance from the interests which it called into action, the plans which it developed, and the terrible consequences which it produced, it will be interesting to explain, at some length, and with the assistance of new documents, its curious phases and melancholy termination.

Francis II. had not been dead a month before several suitors aspired to the hand of his widow. Mary Stuart at once rejected the Kings of Denmark and Sweden, and

death, he made a godly confession." Knox, vol. ii., p. 369. Randolph also says, "He died with repentance." Tytler, vol. v., p. 232.

\* Knox, vol. ii., p. 369. Brantôme says, that when he had finished reciting the Hymn to Death, "il se tourna vers le lieu où il pensoit que la reyne fust, s'écria tout haut: 'Adieu, la plus belle et la plus cruelle princesse du monde!' et puis, fort constamment tendant le col à l'exécuteur, se laissa défaire fort aisément." Vol. v., p. 125. In Appendix B. will be found the verses addressed by Chastelard to Mary before this tragical adventure.

her choice seemed to incline towards Don Carlos, the son of Philip II.\* The Cardinal of Lorraine, her uncle, proposed this match to Chantonnay, the ambassador of his Catholic Majesty at the Court of France.† Such a project excited great alarm, and met with the opposition of both Elizabeth and Catherine de Medici, who were equally interested to prevent its execution. It would have been very dangerous to them both, if the heir of Spain, the Milanese, the Two Sicilies, the Netherlands, and the Franche-Comté, had married the Queen of Scotland, and heir presumptive to the Crown of England. Catherine de Medici, who was better able than Elizabeth to throw obstacles in the way of this marriage, instructed the Bishop of Limoges, her ambassador at Madrid, and her daughter Elizabeth, who had married Philip II. after the peace of Cateau-Cambresis, to use all their influence with the Catholic King against it. "To avert this blow," she wrote, "I would blindly make any sacrifice in my power."‡ She even gained the assistance of the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine, whose views she changed by her most

\* Don Carlos was born on the 12th of July, 1545. He was fifteen years and a half old when Francis II. died, and was nearly three years younger than Mary Stuart.

† "El cardinal queixandose de la desgracia de su sobrina, y del poco remedio que tiene de hallar partido igual, me dixo claramente, que no le avia sino era casandose con su alteza. Yo no quise responderle sino que siendo ella tan hermosa y gentil princesa, no podia dexar de hallar marido conveniente a su grandeza. Por otra parte la reyna madre entiende este designo y tienece los por lo que ha siempre deseado casar a madama Margarita con el principe nuestro señor." Chantonnay to Philip II., 28th December, 1560. Archives of Simancas, series B., file 12, No. 116.

‡ Catherine de Medici to the Bishop of Limoges, 3rd March, 1561. Paris's *Négociations sous François II.*, pp. 818, 819.

politic reasons. She told them that, as their niece had claims to the kingdom of England, it might happen, if she married the Prince of Spain, that Scotland and England would be added to the already immense territories of the Catholic King, and she conjured them most urgently never to consent to a marriage which would expose the realm of France to greater dangers than it had ever before incurred.\* The Duke and Cardinal promised her their support. They gave their word that they would act in strict conformity with her wishes, because, said they, they preferred the welfare of France to the advantage of their niece.† To their credit be it spoken, they kept their promise. When Mary Stuart was about to leave France, she consulted the Duke of Guise respecting her future marriage. The Duke replied that he would give her no advice, because he could not give her that advice which was most pleasing to her, and he recommended her to make her own choice.‡ But this choice, which continued to incline towards the Prince of Spain, was some time

\* "La reyna madre habia entrada en gran sospecha del casamiento de su alteza por la pretensa de su reyna a este reyno, y llamado al duque de Guisa y al cardenal, pidiendo les con grandissima instancia, que en ninguna manera viniessen a este casamiento, porque seria el mayor daño e inconveniente y podria ser y venir al reyno de Francia ocupandose con la grandeza de V. M. estos dos reynos." This was related by Lethington in April, 1565, to Guzman de Silva, ambassador of Philip II. at London, and transmitted by Silva to Philip II., in his despatch of the 26th April, 1565. Archives of Simancas, Inglaterra, fol. 818.

† " . . . . y que ellos se lo habian prometido y dado palabra, de hacello assi, teniendo en mas el util de aquel reyno que el bien de su sobrina." Ibid.

‡ "El duque le habia dicho que en materia de casamiento no le queria dar consejo, porque no le podia dar el que le convenia, que mirasse ella por lo que mejor le estaria." Ibid.

afterwards thwarted by the Cardinal of Lorraine, who, meeting the Emperor Ferdinand at Innspruck, negotiated with him, and without his niece's knowledge, a plan of marriage between her and the Archduke Charles, the Emperor's second son.\* This plan could not fail to interfere with the other. It would inevitably inspire Philip II. with the fear of offending the Emperor, his uncle, by seeking to marry the Queen of Scotland to his own son, to the detriment of the Archduke, his cousin. This actually came to pass. As soon as he was informed of the new negociation, Philip II. withdrew his claims.

Mary Stuart was greatly disappointed at this. The Archduke possessed neither power, nor army, nor money; † as a foreigner, he would be displeasing to the Scotch, and as a Catholic, he would have irritated the Protestant Church. Mary was therefore disposed to refuse him, because he would have compromised her, without bringing her any means of defence against the discontent and factious spirit of her subjects. Neither would she accept the Earl of Arran, whom the Queen of England wished her to marry, ‡ nor the Dukes of Nemours and Ferrara, § who were proposed to her;

\* "Y que estando el mismo Ledington en este reyno (France) tuvo aviso que el de Lorena se veía con el emperador en Inspruch para tractar deste casamiento sin lo saber su reyna." Ibid.

† "Auquel elle ne trouvoit aucune commodité pour son royaume, estant estrange, pauvre et fort esloigné, et le plus jeune des frères, et mal agréable à ses subjects, et sans aucune apparence de moyens ou force de luy aider au droit qu'elle prétendoit à la succession de ceste isle." Fragment of a Memoir by Mary Stuart on her second marriage, in Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 296, 297; Letter from Mary Stuart to the Dukes of Arschot, 3rd January, 1565, in Labanoff, vol. i., p. 249.

‡ " . . . obligarla a casar con el Conde de Aren hijo del duque de Chatelerau." Quadra to Philip II., 18th March, 1563.

§ Labanoff, vol. i., p. 215.

for she considered these princes too weak and unimportant to wed with her. By a bold manœuvre, she renewed the negotiations for her marriage with Don Carlos, in spite of the opposition of her uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine. She directed Secretary Lethington, while engaged in one of his numerous missions to London, to inform Philip II.'s Ambassador at the English Court, that she was resolved neither to marry a Protestant, nor to receive a Catholic from the hands of Queen Elizabeth;\* that her position and interests would not allow her to accept the Archduke; and that if she were not united to the Prince of Spain, the only one of her suitors who entirely met her views, she had given orders to him (Lethington) to proceed to France, and propose a marriage with Charles IX., notwithstanding their relationship and the difference of their ages. This last fear would, she thought, outweigh every other consideration in the mind of Philip II.

No sooner, accordingly, had this gloomy and unstable Prince received information of the interview between Lethington and Bishop Quadra, than he wrote to the latter that, as the marriage of the Queen of Scotland and the Prince Royal, his son, "might be the means of remedying religious affairs in the kingdom of England, he had resolved to give it his sanction."† He directed

\* ". . . Que la reyna su ama jamas se casaria con Protestante, ni con Catholico, por mano de la reyna de Inglaterra." Quadra to Philip II., 18th March, 1563.

† "Y asi viendo que efectuarse este casamiento podria ser principio de remediar las cosas de la religion en este reyno de Inglaterra, me he resuelto de admitir la platica." Letter from Philip II. to Quadra, 15th June, 1563. Archives of Simancas, Negociado de Estado Inglaterra, fol. 816.

him to gain all the information he could with reference to the understanding which the Scottish Queen had with England, and to conduct these preliminaries of the marriage with the utmost secrecy, because the affair ought to be settled before it was made known,\* lest it should provoke the opposition of both the French Court and the English monarch. He added that, by this means, they would be less likely to offend the Emperor, who was not aware of the real intentions of the Queen of Scotland, but relied entirely upon the proposals of the Cardinal of Lorraine. "If I considered," said he, "that the Archduke's marriage was probable, and if I expected to derive the same advantage from it as from the marriage of the Prince my son, I would co-operate in it with the greatest pleasure, on account of the great affection which I feel for the Emperor my uncle, and for his children. The reasons which have decided me to negotiate my son's marriage are, the assurances you have given me, according to what you have heard from the lips of the ministers of the Queen of Scotland, of the little inclination which she feels for the other marriage, the little advantage which would result from it, and also the fear lest she should marry the King of France. I well remember the anxiety and disquietude which I felt whilst she was married to King Francis. If that King were still alive, we should doubtless be

\* "Y haveis de encomendar en este negocio el secreto sobre todas las cosas que del se ayan de platicar, porque desta hecho este negocio primero que entendido." Ibid.



now at war with each other, because I should have been obliged to defend the Queen of England against the invasion of her kingdom, which had been resolved upon.”\*

In obedience to these orders, Quadra sent Luis de Paz † to the Queen of Scotland to treat of her marriage with Don Carlos. He sent him through Ireland, in order that his visit might excite less suspicion. Luis de Paz had a conference with Lethington and Murray, in consequence of which he at once returned to London, ‡ and Mary Stuart despatched her secretary Raullet to Brussels, to negociate this marriage directly by the medium of her aunt the Duchess of Arschot, and of Cardinal Granvella. § At the same time Diego Perez, secretary of the Spanish embassy in England, proceeded

\* “Si yo lo viese aparienza de hacerse (the marriage with Archduke Charles), yo que del se pudiese sacar el fruto, que al presente parece que se podia sacar del casamiento del principe mi hijo, lo abrazaria y procuraria con mejor voluntad que estotro, per el grande amor que al emperador mi tio y a sus hijos tengo. Lo que me ha movido a salir a este negocio y no esperar a que el emperador se acabase de desengañar en el, ha sido el advertimiento que vos me haveis dado de la poca gana que la reyna y sus ministros tienen al casamiento del archiduque, y mas particularmente el avisarme vos de que pretendian y procuraban tratar el casamiento del rey de Francia, acordandome del trabajo y inquietud en que me tubo el rey Francisco, siendo casado con esta reyna, que sé cierto si el viviera no pudieramos escusar de estar dias ha metidos en la guerra sobre defender yo a esa reyna queriendo la el invadir como lo tenia resuelto.” Ibid.

† “Luis de Paz y Antonio de Guaras, che son como mercadores de quienes hazia el dicho obispo confianza.” Letter from Cardinal Granvella, published in Gachard’s *Correspondence de Philippe II., sur les affaires des Pays-Bas*, vol. ii., p. 14. (Brussels, 1850.)

‡ Relaciou que diò Diego Perez, secretario del Obispo Quadra. Mouzon, 4th October, 1563. Archives of Simancas, fol. 816. See Appendix C.

§ See Mary Stuart’s Letters on this subject in Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 197-214; and also a very curious letter written by Cardinal Granvella to the new ambassador at London, Don Diego Guzman de Silva, dated 20th May, 1564, and printed in Gachard’s *Correspondence de Philippe II.*, vol. ii., pp. 5-16.

for the same purpose into Arragon, where Philip II. then was.

These negotiations were not conducted so mysteriously that no rumour of them reached the ears of the Protestant ministers. These became alarmed at the proposed marriage of their Queen with a Catholic prince, and Knox, according to his custom, made it the subject of a public remonstrance. In an address to the Protestant nobility he warned them of the dangers which threatened them, and said, "I hear of the Queen's marriage. Dukes, brethren to Emperors and Kings, strive all for the best gain. But this, my Lords, will I say,—note the day, and bear witness hereafter. Whenever the nobility of Scotland, who profess the Lord Jesus, consent that an infidel (and all Papists are infidels) shall be head to our Sovereign, ye do as far as in you lieth to banish Christ Jesus from this realm, and to bring God's vengeance on the country."\*

The Queen was very indignant at this language, and, notwithstanding the uselessness of her previous remonstrances, she summoned Knox again before her. She upbraided him with his ingratitude and temerity. She told him that she had used every effort to please and satisfy him, but that she had obtained no return of kindness from his untractable nature. She then burst out against him for having dared to discuss her marriage, with which he had nothing to do ; and finally

\* Knox's History of the Reformation, vol. ii., p. 385.

bade him beware of her vengeance. Knox replied that, in the pulpit, he was not master of himself, but must obey His commands who had ordered him "to speak plain, and flatter no flesh;" that his vocation was neither to visit the courts of princes nor the chambers of ladies. "I grant it so," answered the Queen, "but what have you to do with my marriage, or, what are you within the commonwealth?" "A subject born within the same," said the undaunted Reformer, "and albeit, Madam, neither Baron, Lord, nor belted Earl, yet hath God made me, how abject soever in your eyes, a useful and profitable member. As such, it is my duty, as much as that of any one of the nobility, to forewarn the people of danger, and therefore, what I have said in public, I here repeat to your own face. Whenever the nobility of this realm shall so far forget themselves as to consent that you shall be subject to an unlawful husband, they do as much as in them lieth to renounce Christ, to banish the truth, betray the freedom of the realm, and, perchance, may be but cold friends to yourself."\* The Queen, no longer able to restrain her anger, commanded him to leave her presence. As he passed through the antechambers, in which were assembled a number of young ladies of the royal household, gaily dressed and talking merrily together, he apostrophised them with bitter irony. "Ah! fair ladies," he said, "how pleasant were this life of

\* Knox, vol. ii., pp. 387, 388.

yours, if it should ever abide, and then in the end we might pass to heaven with this gear ! But, fie on that knave, Death, that will come whether ye will or not ; and when he hath laid on the arrest, then foul worms will be busy with this flesh, be it never so fair and tender ; and the silly soul, I fear, shall be so feeble, that it can neither carry with it gold, garnishing, targating, pearl, nor precious stones.”\*

Knox had already quarrelled with Murray, who, he thought, looked with too much favour upon the plans of the Queen, his sister. He accused him of abandoning God in order to maintain himself in his authority and influence ; but he assured him that all his ambitious condescension would not preserve him from a speedy downfall.† Murray, wounded by his remonstrances, kept at a distance from him. Their long-standing friendship grew cold, and for eighteen months they hardly exchanged a word. Lethington, on his return from England, also complained of the violence and distrust of the Reformer,‡ who had exposed his sovereign to suspicion and hostility, by spreading the report that she was about to marry the Prince of Spain. Knox, nevertheless, persisted in sounding the alarm, and wrote to Cecil, with whom he had long been in correspondence, that all was lost, and that out of the twelve members who formed the Queen’s Council, nine

\* Knox, vol. ii., p. 389.

† Ibid., pp. 382, 383.

‡ Ibid., pp. 390, 391. Tytler, vol. v., p. 243.

were gained over to her side, and would support all her plans.\*

But the plan which Mary had most at heart was never realised. Her marriage with Don Carlos, which had met with the strongest opposition in Scotland, and with hindrances of a different nature, but equal force, in England, France, and Austria, was broken off by the usual dilatoriness of the court of Spain, which allowed all these interests time to act and prevail. The Emperor Ferdinand so urgently besought Philip II. to use his good offices with the Queen of Scotland in favour of the Archduke, that Philip II. wrote on the 6th of August, 1564, to Diego de Guzman de Silva, who had succeeded Quadra as his ambassador at London :—“ All these reasons oblige me to abandon the project as regards the Prince Royal. I am desirous neither to displease the Emperor, nor to interfere with the marriage of the Archduke Charles, whom I regard as my own son. I should be no less satisfied if the Queen of Scotland married him, than if she married the Prince, Don Carlos ; and I shall do all in my power to bring this affair to a favourable conclusion.”† He requested Silva to make known his relinquishment of the scheme, and

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, John Knox to Cecil, 6th October, 1563. Tytler, vol. v., p. 244.

† “ . . . . Por esto y por otras causas que hay muy bastantes, cese de la platica de mi hijo, asi por no indignar al emperador, y al rey de Romanos mi hermano, como porque tengo al Archiduque Carlos en lugar de hijo, y no estimere menos que se concluya con el que con el principe, ne dejare de hacer todo lo que en mi fuere para ayudar à la conclusion y buen suceso del negocio.” Philip II. to Guzman de Silva, Madrid, 6th August, 1564. Archives of Simanca, Inglaterra, fol. 817.

to employ all his dexterity in favour of the Archduke. Independently of his natural irresolution, Philip II. was induced to abandon his suit by the character of Don Carlos himself. This young man, whose ill-regulated mind was swayed by violent inclinations, and prone to extreme determinations, had injured his brain by a fall which had nearly cost him his life.\* On the very same day on which Philip II. transmitted his definitive intentions to Silva, he wrote to Cardinal Granvella these remarkable words regarding the heir to his dominions, who, four years afterwards, met with so melancholy a fate :—"Considering the natural disposition of my son, and other tendencies which are manifest in him, it appears to me that I should not derive from this marriage those advantages which I hoped to gain ; namely, the recovery of the kingdoms of Scotland and England to the Catholic religion, for which alone I would expose myself to all that might result therefrom."†

Obliged to renounce Don Carlos, and unwilling to marry the Archduke, who, she said, "was the husband least likely to advance her affairs both in Scotland and

\* Philip II., when informing Quadra of this accident in his despatch of June 7, 1562, dated from Aranjuez, says, that the life of the Prince was exposed to danger by "una herida que tuvo en la cabeza de una caida." Archives of Simancas, Inglaterra, fol. 815.

† "Considerada la disposicion de mi hijo y otras cosas que en ello se me representan, y parascerme que deste casamiento no se puede sacar el fruto que yo esperaba, que era reducir al reyno de Escocia y al de Inglaterra a la religion Catholica, por la qual sola, y no por otra causa me pusiera a todo lo que pudiera venir." Philip II. to Cardinal Granvella, 6th August, 1564 ; Archives of Simancas, fol. 817.

England," Mary Stuart gave up all idea of espousing a Continental Prince. They were equally disqualified for her choice, some because of their religion, others because of their withdrawal; these on account of their great power, those on account of their unimportance; and all because they excited the repugnance of her subjects, and the opposition of the Queen, her neighbour. In this situation, what could she do? "I resolved," she says, "to espouse some one from that island (England), to which both Protestants and Catholics strongly urged me, and loudly threatened never to suffer the contrary."\*

It was about this time that Elizabeth, still fearful that she would marry some foreign Prince, directed her ambassador Randolph to make a most curious proposition. She advised her to marry Lord Robert Dudley, her own favourite. Randolph at first hesitated to perform such a mission. Although Dudley was the son of the Duke of Northumberland, who had governed England with the greatest wisdom under Edward VI., after the fall of the Duke of Somerset, he was too far removed from the throne seriously to aspire to the hand of a Queen, and it did not seem possible that Elizabeth could really intend to give her lover as a husband to her cousin.† However, upon receiving renewed orders from his sovereign, Randolph formally proposed the match to Mary Stuart. She considered the

\* Labanoff, vol. i., p. 297.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 21st February, 1564. Tytler, vol. v., p. 245.

proposition offensive, and exclaimed indignantly, "Now, think you, Master Randolph, that it will be honourable in me to imbase my state, and marry one of your mistress's subjects? Is this conformable to her promise to use me as her sister or daughter, to advise me to marry my Lord Robert; to ally myself with her own subject?"\* Randolph intimated that Lord Robert Dudley would be rendered worthy of so exalted an alliance by the honours and preferments with which Queen Elizabeth intended to endow him. He thought he would thus tempt Mary by leading her to expect the succession to the throne of England as the price of this marriage. But Mary replied that even this prospect would not decide her, as Elizabeth herself might probably marry and have children. "Where is my assurance in this," said she; "and what have I then gotten?" She consented however, to speak on the subject to Murray, Lethington, and the Earl of Argyle. These noblemen would have been less opposed than Mary to this union if her right of succession to the throne of England had been recognised in consequence. They promised to use all their influence to decide their sovereign to the step, if Queen Elizabeth would declare her her heir, and by act of Parliament settle the crown of England upon the children that might spring from the marriage†.

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 30th March, 1564. Tytler, vol. v., p. 247.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 248.



But there soon appeared another suitor, half English and half Scotch, and occupying a much more favourable position than Lord Robert Dudley. The Earl of Lennox, a member of the house of Stuart, banished from Scotland for having embraced the cause of Henry VIII., had taken refuge in England, where he had married Lady Margaret Douglas, the daughter of the Earl of Angus and of Margaret Tudor, the widow of James IV. Of this marriage was born Lord Henry Darnley, who was thus closely connected with the two families which occupied the thrones of England and Scotland. He was at this time nineteen years of age. Ever since Mary Stuart's return into her kingdom, his mother had carefully kept up relations of friendship and kindred with her : and she now secretly proposed to her to take him as her husband.\* In order to dispose her in his favour, she reminded her that, like herself, he bore "the surname of Stuart, so agreeable to the Scotch ;"† that he professed the same religion as she did, and that he was, after her, the heir to the crown. In her embarrassment, Mary did not reject this overture, and authorised the Earl of Lennox to return into Scotland to resume the

\* She had had this marriage in contemplation ever since 1561.

† " Lors Madame de Lenox (comme tousjours depuis que je fus rentrée, par elle avoit esté fayt) m'envoyai visiter, et par lettres et tokenes solisiter d'accepter son filx, du sang d'Angleterre [et] d'Ecosse, et le plus prosche après moy en sucésion, Stevart de nom, pour tousjours entretenir ce surnom si agréable aux Escossois, de mesame religion que moy, et qui me respecteroit selon que l'honneur que je luy ferois en cela l'obligeoit. A cela insistoit le conte d'Athol, le Lord Lindsay, tous les Stevarts et les Catoliques." Fragment of a Memoir by Mary Stuart on her second marriage, Labanoff, vol. i., p. 297.

lands and honours of which he had been deprived since his forfeiture. But it was necessary for him to obtain Elizabeth's permission to leave England. Cecil inquired of Murray and Lethington whether Lennox's return would not produce evil results to the Protestant cause, and their party. Murray replied, on the 13th of July, 1564: "Our foundation, thanks to God, is not so weak that we have cause to fear, if he had the greatest subject of this realm joined to him, seeing we have the favour of our Prince, and liberty of our conscience in such abundance as our hearts can wish. It will neither be he, nor I, praised be God, can hinder or alter religion hereaway, and his coming or remaining in that cause will be to small purpose."\* Elizabeth, after some tergiversation, gave Lennox permission to return to Scotland, and even recommended him by letter to Mary Stuart.† She perceived the hidden purpose of this journey, and perhaps was not sorry, at the moment, that the son of the Earl of Lennox should aspire to the hand of the Queen, his cousin. Two suitors like Lord Robert Dudley and Lord Darnley were scarcely sufficient, in her opinion, to outweigh the continental rivals whom she still feared, and she doubtless expected she would easily be able to make each of these withdraw his pretensions at her will. She hoped thus to frustrate every project of marriage by her adroit manœuvres and

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Murray to Cecil, 13th July, 1564. Tytler, vol. v., p. 254.

† Keith, p. 254.

opportune opposition, and to keep Mary Stuart in that state of singleness which she had voluntarily chosen for herself.

The Earl of Lennox arrived in Scotland on the 23rd of September, 1564.\* Mary Stuart received him with marked favour, and immediately restored him to his former rank and possessions, to the great displeasure of the Hamiltons, his ancient enemies. She conferred with him upon the proposed marriage, which had been the chief cause of his return to his native country. But before taking any resolution, Mary was anxious to be informed more surely of Elizabeth's intentions with regard to her marriage, and to her eventual rights to the crown of England. This delicate mission was entrusted to James Melvil, whom she despatched to London forthwith, and who was also directed secretly to take measures with Lady Lennox to hasten Darnley's return to Scotland. An accomplished gentleman and skilful negociator, James Melvil had spent his youth on the Continent, with the interests of which he was well acquainted, and could speak its principal languages. He had lived at the court of France, visited the courts of Germany, resided for nine years in the brilliant household of the Constable de Montmorency, been the confidential adviser of the Elector Palatine, and was held in high esteem by Elizabeth,† with whom he could not fail to succeed.

\* Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 77. Tytler, vol. v., p. 254.

† Memoirs of Sir James Melvil, *passim*.

This Princess, as vain a woman as she was a politic Queen, really regarded him with singular favour. She caused him to dine with Lady Strafford, her principal confidant, in order that she might have more frequent opportunities of seeing and conferring with him. She played music and danced in his presence; dressed herself in the English, French, and Italian fashions, changing her costume several times a day in order to attract his attention and obtain his approbation; and even went so far as to ask him what colour of hair was reputed best, her own or that of the Queen of Scotland? \* Melvil, like a wary courtier, replied that there was no one in England comparable to her, and no one in Scotland so beautiful as Mary Stuart. But Elizabeth would not be satisfied with this equivocal flattery, and Melvil at length told her that she had a fairer complexion than his Queen, that she played better upon the lute and virginals, and that she danced with greater stateliness.

Delighted at these trifling superiorities, she manifested an ardent desire to see Mary Stuart, affected extreme tenderness for her, and repeatedly kissed her portrait, which she took, in Melvil's presence, out of a cabinet where she kept a number of others. These outward demonstrations on her part were only a means of disguising or exaggerating her feelings, and of serving

\* "Her hair," says Melvil, "was more reddish than yellow, curled in appearance naturally." *Memoirs*, p. 50.

her political plans. The artful Queen did not lose sight of those which occupied her attention at that time in Scotland. She inquired of Melvil if his Sovereign had instructed him to give an answer to the propositions she had received through Randolph, with reference to Lord Robert Dudley. Melvil having informed her that his mistress had no intention to enter into this marriage, Elizabeth appeared greatly displeased. "Lord Robert," she said, "is my best friend ; I love him as a brother, and I would myself have married him, had I ever minded to have taken a husband. But being determined to end my life in virginity, I wished that the Queen my sister might marry him, as meetest of all other with whom I could find it in my heart to declare my succession. For being matched with him, it would best remove out of my mind all fears and suspicions to be offended by any usurpation before my death ; being assured that he is so loving and trusty, that he would never permit any such thing to be attempted during my time. And that the Queen, your mistress, may have the higher esteem of him, I will make him, in a few days, Earl of Leicester and Baron of Denbigh." \*

These dignities were actually conferred by Queen Elizabeth upon Lord Robert, with great solemnity, at Westminster. With her own hands she placed the earl's coronet upon the head of her favourite ; and

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 47.

when the ceremony was concluded, she turned towards Melvil, and asked him what he thought of Lord Robert. Melvil replied, "that as he was a worthy servant, so he was happy who had a Princess who could discern and reward good service." "Yet," said she, pointing to Darnley, who, as nearest Prince of the blood, bore the sword of honour that day before her, and alluding to the presumed preference of Mary Stuart for him, "yet you like better yonder long lad." In order more effectually to deceive her with regard to the intentions of his mistress, Melvil replied, "that no woman of spirit would make choice of such a man, who was more like a woman than a man, for he was handsome, beardless, and lady-faced."\*

Elizabeth frequently recurred to this subject, and assured Melvil that, if her sister the Queen of Scotland would marry according to her wish, the affair of her succession should be speedily concluded. She promised that, meanwhile, the ablest jurisconsults in the kingdom should be employed to examine into this important question. She reiterated her declaration, "that it was her own resolution to remain till her death a *Virgin Queen*, and that nothing would compel her to change her mind, except the undutiful behaviour of the Queen her sister." Melvil answered, that her resolution not to take a husband was in perfect accordance with the exalted nature of her sentiments, and that she was

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 48.

too high-spirited to think of sharing the sovereign authority with any one, and to run the risk of obtaining a master. When he took his leave, he says, "she used all the means she could to oblige me to persuade the Queen my mistress of the great love she did bear unto her, and that she was fully minded to put away all jealousies and suspicions, and in times-coming to entertain a stricter friendship than formerly."\*

After Leicester's elevation, Elizabeth appeared to be animated by a greater desire than ever that he should marry the Queen of Scotland. Randolph received the most formal instructions on this subject.† Leicester himself wrote to Mary Stuart several letters full of submission and flattery. Lethington and Murray, at a conference which they had with the Earl of Bedford at Berwick, renewed their promise to ensure the success of the marriage, if an act of the English Parliament should settle the succession of England upon Mary Stuart.‡ The Queen herself, in spite of the repugnance which she had so proudly and decisively expressed, did not seem averse to the match upon this condition. At the beginning of 1565, having retired to St. Andrews for some time, to throw off the cares of State, and the restraints and formalities of her Court, she was followed

\* For an account of Melvil's embassy to the English court, see his *Memoirs*, pp. 43-52.

† MS. Instructions, State Paper Office, Draft by Cecil, 7th October, 1564. Tytler, vol. v., p. 262.

‡ MS. letters, State Paper Office, Murray and Lethington to Cecil, 3rd and 24th December, 1564. Tytler, vol. v., p. 263.

thither by Randolph, whom she received with the greatest friendship and openness. She had thrown aside all pomp, and lived with a small train in a merchant's house in that city ;\* and she had some most lively conversation with Elizabeth's ambassador, both at table, where he was always seated by her side, and during her daily rides, in which he used to accompany her. She told him that she could defer her marriage no longer without incurring great inconvenience, and that she was disposed to follow the advice of his mistress. "If," she said, "she will, as she hath said, use me as her natural-born sister or daughter, I will consider myself either the one or the other, as she please, and will show no less readiness to obey her and honour her than my mother or eldest sister. But if she will repute me always as her neighbour the Queen of Scots, how willing soever I be to live in amity, and to maintain peace, yet must she not look for that at my hands that otherwise I would, or she desireth." † At the termination of this interview, when Leicester's name was mentioned, she said to Randolph, "Marry ! what I shall do lieth in your mistress's will, who shall wholly guide me and rule me." ‡ She thus appeared

\* When Randolph ventured to speak of business, she said to him : "I see now well that you are weary of this company and treatment. I sent for you to be merry, and to see how like a bourgeois wife I live, with my little troop, and you will interrupt our pastimes with your great and grave matters." Randolph to Elizabeth, 5th February, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 267.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 269.

‡ Mary found great fault with Elizabeth's irresolution on this subject. She says : "How willing I am to follow her advice I have shown many times, and yet I can find in her no resolution or determination." Tytler, vol. v., p. 269.



to make her determination depend on the recognition of her title of legal heir to the throne of England. Her queenly pride, however, might at last have led her to reject such a marriage, even upon this condition. Indeed, when Randolph asked her what she thought of Leicester, she replied, "My mind towards him is such as it ought to be of a very nobleman, as I hear say by many; and such a one as the Queen, your mistress, my good sister, does so well like to be her husband, if he were not her subject, ought not to dislike me to be mine."\*

The negociation had reached this point when Henry Darnley arrived in Scotland. Elizabeth had given him permission to join his father, the Earl of Lennox, under the pretext of assisting him in making some family arrangements. She was not ignorant of his pretensions, and perhaps she foresaw that he would thwart the marriage with Leicester, just as Leicester had put an end to the matrimonial negociations of the continental Princes. It would appear that the real object of this crafty Princess was to prolong uncertainty, and keep all parties in suspense. Darnley met with a most affectionate reception from the Queen, his cousin.† He was a man of agreeable manners and distinguished appearance, and possessed, moreover, all the charms of youth. To these qualifications he united, when acting by the advice of his ambitious parents, considerable ability. With

\* Chalmers' *Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, vol. i., pp. 190-197. Tytler, vol. v., p. 272.

† He arrived at Edinburgh on the 12th February, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 272.

greater prudence than he displayed at a later period, he sought immediately upon his arrival to gain the favour of Murray, by placing himself under his guidance. In the morning he went to hear Knox preach; in the evening he danced a galliard with the Queen; \* and he thus manifested his desire to reassure the distrustful Church of Scotland, and to gain the good graces of the Court.

From this moment, the struggle began between the two candidates of the Reformers and Catholics;—between Leicester, who was supported by Lethington and Murray—and Darnley, who was strongly sustained by the Earl of Athol, all the Scottish barons who had remained faithful to their ancient creed, and an Italian, named David Riccio, who had succeeded Raullet as the Queen's Secretary for French correspondence, and who had already gained great influence over her. Lethington, at this time, wrote to Cecil a number of letters full of the most politic considerations in favour of a marriage which he thought might be so useful to their common cause and their two countries, and besought him to obtain from Elizabeth that concession which alone was needed to ensure its success. But Elizabeth complained that this was transforming the negotiation too much into a matter of bargain, and jocularly told Melvil, that Lethington, in his constant allusions to the succession, was, like a death-watch, ever ringing her knell in her ears.† Lethington replied that his mistress merely

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 273.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 275.

sought a probable reason to lay against the objections of foreign princes, that they might see that no vain or light conceit had moved her to yield to the Queen of England's request in her marriage. As for himself, giving way to an enthusiasm which was far from habitual in him, he reminded Cecil of the union of England and Scotland, which would be effectuated by this marriage, in language full of noble patriotism. "Such a stroke of policy," he remarked, "would secure for us a more glorious memory, a more unfading gratitude in the ages to come, than belongs to those who did most valiantly serve King Edward the First in his conquest, or King Robert the Bruce in his recovery, of the country."\*

Murray, on his part, spared no efforts to persuade Elizabeth. He entreated Cecil to use his influence with her, in order that, recognising the right of his sister to the Crown of England, she might hasten her marriage with Leicester. He told him that, unless that marriage took place, his ruin was inevitable; that the policy which, by his advice, had for four years been pursued towards England would infallibly be abandoned by his sister, who distrusted him the more because none of the hopes with which he had flattered her, and in view of which he had induced her to act, would have been realised; that the deference which she had manifested towards Queen Elizabeth would cease, and

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 1st February, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 275.

the good understanding with England be weakened ; that she would resume her connexion with her relations and the Catholic Princes of the Continent, whom she had hitherto discarded ; that the new King would be mortally offended with him (Murray), because he had promoted the marriage of a rival, and sought to prevent his own ; and that, finally, if the King were a Papist, it would be necessary either to obey him or be considered the ringleader of the disaffected, and thus expose the country to difficulties and miseries, from which it had been free for the last five years.\*

These weighty reasons ought to have decided Elizabeth, whose determination Mary Stuart seemed to await in order that she might form her own. She had repeated to Randolph that the Queen of England might, if she pleased, exercise the greatest influence over her conduct. "As to marriage," she said, "my husband must be such a one as she will give me."† But Elizabeth, swayed by contending emotions, was urged by policy to yield Leicester to the Queen of Scotland, and by affection to keep him herself. Moreover she felt an invincible repugnance to appoint her successor. Thus Cecil wrote to Sir Thomas Smith : "I see the Queen's Majesty very desirous to have my Lord of Leicester placed in this high degree to be the Scottish Queen's husband ; but when it cometh to the

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 4th March, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 274.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 274.

conditions which are demanded, I see her then remiss of her earnestness." \*

It was, however, necessary to give an answer of some kind. Elizabeth had exhausted all her artifices and delays. Compelled at length to declare her resolution, she refused to recognise Mary's right to the succession, until she were married. She directed Randolph to convey this message to her, and assure her at the same time that, if she accepted Leicester as a simple Earl, she might rely on the ulterior munificence of the Queen of England, and would have no cause to repent her confidence.† She well knew that Mary would disdainfully reject so disproportionate a marriage, now that its reward was no longer the Crown of England, and that its dishonour would not be counterbalanced by a corresponding advantage. Randolph performed the orders of his Sovereign. He communicated Elizabeth's refusal to Mary Stuart, who was deeply moved, and burst out into a passionate fit of weeping.‡ Thus deceived in the ambitious hopes she had so long entertained, what could the Queen of Scotland do? It only remained for her to turn towards Darnley. She suddenly fixed her choice upon him, and to this she was disposed as much by preference as by necessity. Darnley had pleased her exceedingly, and was not long in gaining her heart, which was as easily moved to

\* Cecil to Sir Thomas Smith, January, 1565; quoted in Wright's *Queen Elizabeth and her Times*, vol. i., p. 187.

† Keith, p. 270.

‡ MS. letter, State Paper Office, 17th March, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 276.

affection as to disgust. Mary Stuart was not long able to conceal the passion with which he had inspired her, but quickly made it manifest to every eye. Darnley had fallen ill, and she never left him by day or by night, but watched over him as anxiously as if he had been already her husband.\* The power of ardent love thus combined with the qualifications of birth and the exigencies of her position to render this marriage inevitable. It was, moreover, advocated by the Earls of Athol and Caithness, † Lord Robert Caithness, Lords Ruthven, Lindsay, and Hume, ‡ those of the Douglas clan who were connected with the Lennox family by kindred or friendship, and all those noblemen who were secretly faithful to the Catholic religion. She recalled from France the profligate Earl of Bothwell, § that she might use him, if necessary, against Murray, whose personal enemy he was, and who had compelled him to live in exile on the Continent for several years; and she proposed to restore to favour the Earl of Huntly, whose family had been disgraced and crushed by Murray.

\* "Elle use," wrote Paul de Fuix to Catherine de Medici on the 31st of March, 1565 "de mêmes offices envers le fils du comte de Lenox que s'il estoit son mary, ayant, durant sa maladie, veillé en sa chambre une nuit toute entière, et se montrant soigneuse et ennuyée de sa maladie, parce qu'il a eu quelques jours fièvre assez fâcheuse, de laquelle il est maintenant délivré." Nat. Lib. Paris, dep. St. Germain Harlay, No. 218. MS. letter, State Paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, 23rd April, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 280.

† George, fourth Earl of Caithness, a descendant of the Norman family of Sinclair, which had settled in Scotland in the twelfth century. He married the daughter of the Earl of Montrose, and died in 1582.

‡ Alexander, fifth Lord Hume, died in 1575.

§ Tytler, vol. v., p. 283.

But this marriage, nevertheless, met with great hindrances, and caused much alarm. The Protestant party, and the Lords of the Congregation, opposed it as a step towards the restoration of Catholicism. The Duke of Chatelherault, and all the Hamiltons, who had long been the implacable adversaries of the Lennox family, perceived in it the future ruin of their house. Murray, who, in Darnley's opinion, possessed too much influence,\* expected it would lead to his certain disgrace. And, finally, Queen Elizabeth was by it exposed to the speedy enmity of Scotland, whose King and Queen might obtain support from the Catholic princes of Europe, and excite against her the numerous body of her subjects who had continued attached to the ancient religion of the realm. The Earl of Lennox made no secret of these probable results; but had the imprudence to declare openly, that the King of Spain would be their friend, and that they could count on the support of the greatest part of England.†

Determined to marry Darnley in spite of these formidable opponents, Mary Stuart endeavoured to diminish their numbers and strength. She had easily gained the consent of the versatile Lethington to her marriage; and she now was anxious to make a convert of Murray, who was less accommodating, and had already withdrawn

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 21st May, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 281.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 3rd May, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 288.

from the Court. She recalled him thither, and required him, unless he would incur her severe displeasure, to sign a paper containing his approval of her marriage, and promise to promote it by all means in his power. Murray refused to do so, and told her plainly that this marriage was too precipitate ; that foreign princes would put a bad construction upon it ; that the Queen of England would be offended by it ; and that, moreover, considering above all things else the advantages which might accrue by the Queen's marriage to the true religion of Christ, he did not feel disposed to desire that she should unite herself to one who had hitherto proved himself rather its enemy than its friend.\* Mary, irritated by this refusal, used every effort to make him yield ; but her prayers and entreaties, her anger and menaces, were all in vain. She bitterly reproached Murray with his ingratitude, and put an end to the interview. She attributed to him the most ambitious intentions, and even insinuated that he aspired to become King of Scotland. "I see clearly," she said, "whereabout he goes ; he would set the crown upon his own head."†

Murray partly justified his sister's suspicions by the hostility of his proceedings. He appeared in Edinburgh, at the head of five or six thousand persons,‡ to procure

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 8th May, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 291, 292.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 3rd May, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 285.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 283.



the condemnation of the Earl of Bothwell, whom he accused of having plotted on several occasions against his life, and whom his sister had now recalled from banishment. He entered into a league with the Earl of Argyle and the Duke of Chatelherault, for mutual support and defence. When the ministers of the Protestant Church assembled at Edinburgh, he concerted measures with them to protect their liberties against all aggression ; and he applied to Queen Elizabeth, through Randolph, for that aid which she was quite disposed to afford him.\*

This Princess, in fact, had expressed her entire disapprobation of the proposed marriage with Darnley, which had been announced to her by the equivocating Lethington. Far from giving her consent to it, as she was requested to do, she had brought it before her Privy Council, who, on the 1st of May, 1565, unanimously declared it to be "prejudicial to both Queens, and consequently dangerous to the weal of both countries."† In her anger, forgetting the offers she had recently made in favour of Leicester, Elizabeth said to Paul de Foix, the French ambassador, "that she should never have imagined that the Queen of Scotland would be so base of heart as to marry her own vassal, the son of the Earl of Lennox."‡ At the same time, she directed Throckmorton to convey to Mary Stuart the opinion of the Privy Council of

\* Tytler, vol. v., pp. 286, 287.

† Keith, pp. 270-275.

‡ MS. despatch of Paul de Foix, 24th April, 1565. Nat. Lib. Paris, dep. Saint Germain Harlay, No. 218.

England, and to throw every possible hindrance in the way of the marriage. He was also to propose Leicester to her again, and if he were refused, to give her her choice of the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Arundel.\*

But when he arrived in Scotland, Mary Stuart had advanced so far that she could not retrace her steps. She had summoned a convention of her nobility at Stirling, and, on the 15th of May, had signified her intention of marrying Darnley, and the measure was sanctioned without a dissentient voice. On the same day she had created Darnley Lord of Ardmanach and Earl of Ross, and had connected with these titles large estates.† These decisive acts rendered Throckmorton's mission entirely useless. Elizabeth's envoy, however, communicated to Mary the remonstrance of the Privy Council of England, and expressed the surprise felt by the Queen, his mistress, that the Earl of Lennox and Lord Darnley, her own subjects, had dared to engage without her consent, in an affair which concerned England as nearly as Scotland. Mary's reply to Throckmorton was both sarcastic and resolute. "As to her good sister's great dislike to the match," she observed, "this was, indeed, a marvellous circumstance, since the selection was made in conformity to the Queen's wishes, as communicated by Mr. Randolph. She had rejected

\* "Et si le mariage du fils de Lenos n'est conclud, incelluy empescher, en proposant à la royne d'Escosse des parts de la royne d'Angleterre, le choix de trois, qui sont : le duc de Norfolk, comtes d'Arundel et de Lecestre." Dispatch of Paul de Foix, *ut sup.*

† Keith, pp. 276-280.

all foreign suitors, and had chosen an Englishman, descended from the blood royal of both kingdoms, and the first Prince of the blood in England; and one whom she believed would, for these reasons, be acceptable to the subjects of both realms."\* She, however, postponed the celebration of her marriage in the hope of propitiating her dangerous neighbour, and of avoiding a rupture with her. But this condescension was not enough for Elizabeth, who desired not the adjournment of the plan, but its entire abandonment, and in whose mind Mary Stuart's just reasons had no influence.

The English Queen, as passionate as she was crafty, now sent the Countess of Lennox to the Tower. She had long subjected her to strict surveillance in her own house, because she suspected her of intriguing with the leaders of the Papists in England.† She also sent a summons to the Earl of Lennox and Lord Darnley, commanding them on their allegiance, as English subjects, instantly to repair to her Court. When Randolph transmitted this order to them, Lennox refused to obey it, stating that his wife was kept prisoner in England, and that he should not venture to return thither until he were more assured of the favour of Queen Elizabeth. Darnley's refusal was less respectful, and more haughty. "I do now," said he, "acknowledge no other duty or obedience but to the Queen here, whom I serve and

\* Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 21st May, 1565. Printed in Keith, p. 278.

† Tytler, vol. v., pp. 296-303.

honour ; and seeing that the other, your mistress, is so envious of my good fortune, I doubt not but she may have need of me, as you shall know within a few days. Wherefore to return I intend not ; I find myself very well where I am, and so purpose to keep me ; and this shall be your answer.”\* At the same time that she recalled Lennox and Darnley, Elizabeth directed Randolph to assure the Scottish Protestants of her support.†

These now made a last effort to prevent the marriage. The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, convoked by Knox and the Earl of Argyle, decided that the citizens of Edinburgh should be armed and organised, and that a supplication should be presented to the Queen, to request that the mass should be abolished, not only throughout the kingdom, but also in her own palace, and that it should be made obligatory upon all persons to attend the prayers and services of the established religion. The Earl of Glencairn and five Commissioners were deputed by the General Assembly to convey this supplication to the Queen, who promised faithfully to maintain their religion, but demanded for herself the same toleration which she granted to others.‡ She succeeded in quieting the Protestants ; but failed to effect a reconciliation with Murray, who refused to appear at Perth, alleging that his life was

\* Randolph to Cecil, 22nd July, 1565. Keith, pp. 303, 304.

† Elizabeth to Randolph, 10th July, 1565. Keith, p. 296.

‡ Spotswood, p. 190. Keith, p. 289.

in danger from Darnley and Lennox.\* Murray, at this time, resorted to the extremest measures. In concert with the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Argyle and Rothes, and Lord Boyd, he formed a plot to surprise the Queen and Darnley as they rode from Perth to Callendar, a seat of Lord Livingston's. The conspirators intended either to kill Darnley or deliver him up to the English, to imprison Mary Stuart in Lochleven, and to reinstate Murray at the head of the government.† But the Queen, having been informed of their traitorous intentions, left Perth precipitately with an escort of three hundred horse under the command of the Earl of Athol and Lord Ruthven, passed the defiles of Kinross, where she was to have been attacked, two hours before the Earl of Argyle had arrived there with his men, and reached Callendar House in safety.‡

This criminal design excited the utmost indignation throughout the country, and left to its baffled projectors no resource but open revolt. This they adopted. Murray called the people and the *brethren* to arms, whilst Mary, on her side, summoned all the vassals of the Crown to meet her without delay at Edinburgh, in arms, and with the necessary provisions for a campaign. She prudently published a proclamation calculated to

\* Randolph to Cecil, in Keith, p. 287. Tytler, vol. v., p. 305.

† Randolph to Cecil, 4th July, 1565; in Keith, p. 291.

‡ Tytler, vol. v, pp. 308, 309.

reassure the Protestant Church ; and, when at Callendar, she attended, for the first time in her life, the sermon of a Presbyterian minister, in order to prevent the religious party from joining the ambitious nobles.\* Feeling how important it was to conclude her marriage in order to remove every inducement to opposition, she created Darnley Duke of Albany, on the 20th of July ; and the Bishop of Dumblane having arrived from Rome on the 22nd, with a dispensation for the marriage, she appointed Sunday, the 29th of July, as the day on which the ceremony was to take place.

On the day previous, she conferred the title of King on Darnley, who was proclaimed during the evening at the Market-cross of Edinburgh by three heralds of the Crown.† On the next day, between five and six o'clock in the morning, they were married in the royal chapel of Holyrood. She appeared at this ceremony, the consequences of which were destined to be so melancholy, in deep mourning ; and it was observed that she was habited in the dress of black velvet and the large white veil which she wore at the death of Francis II. After they had been united, according to the Catholic ritual, Darnley embraced the Queen, and left her at the foot of the altar to hear the mass alone,‡ being doubtless fearful that he would incur great suspicion

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 309.

† The Proclamation is printed in Keith, p. 306.

‡ Letter from Randolph to Leicester, Edinburgh, 31st July, 1565 ; in Robertson's History of Scotland, vol. i., Appendix 11.

by hearing it himself. He then induced Mary to renounce her widow's weeds, and assume a costume more suited to the happiness of the day. The banquet succeeded, at which, according to feudal usage, they were both served by the most important nobles of the kingdom. The Queen's server was the Earl of Athol, Earl Morton was her carver, and the Earl of Crawford\* her cupbearer; whilst the Earls of Eglinton,† Cassillis,‡ and Glencairn performed the same offices to the King. Money in abundance was scattered amongst the people, with cries of *Largesse!* and the remainder of the day was spent in dancing and festivity.§ Darnley, now solemnly recognised as King, was intoxicated with pride, and Mary, thinking she had a long future of happiness before her, experienced all the delights of gratified affection. Elizabeth's ambassador thus wrote regarding them both, "His words be so proud that he seems a monarch of the world, and that it be yet not long since we have seen and known the Lord Darnley. . . . All honour that may be attributed unto any man by a wife, he hath it wholly and fully. All praise that may be spoken of him, he lacketh not from herself. All dignities that she can endue him with, are already

\* David, eighth Earl of Crawford.

† Hugh, third Earl of Eglinton, had continued a Catholic, and proved ever faithful to the cause of Mary Stuart, for whom he fought at Laingside. He died in 1585.

‡ Gilbert, fourth Earl of Cassillis, long continued a Catholic, but became a Protestant in the summer of 1566, after having married Margaret Lyon, daughter of John, ninth Lord Glamis. Knox, vol. ii., p. 533.

§ Randolph to Leicester, July 31st, 1565.

given and granted. No man pleaseth her that contenteth not him ; and she hath given unto him her whole will to be ruled and guided as himself best liketh.”\*

This marriage put an end to the cordial union of the two Queens, which for four years had been based upon reciprocal hopes which, in both cases, had been deceived. Elizabeth had urged the ratification of the treaty of Edinburgh, but had failed to induce Mary to comply with her wish ; and Mary had claimed the recognition of her right to the succession of England, but had not been able to obtain it from Elizabeth. With the animosity which thus arose between the two Queens, hostilities between the two kingdoms could not fail to recommence.

The faults, we must confess, were not on Mary's side, they must all be attributed to Elizabeth. This crafty, proud, mistrustful and imperious princess endeavoured to guide Mary without satisfying her requirements, and to isolate her from every one else without binding her strongly to herself. She was desirous that the Queen should not marry either a Continental Prince who would have rendered her too powerful, or an English subject who would have gained for her the succession to the throne of England, or a member of the Royal Houses of Tudor and Stuart who would have prepared the way for the union of the two Crowns ; so

\* Randolph to Leicester, July 31st, 1565.



she opposed Don Carlos, rejected the Archduke Charles, refused Leicester, and would have denied Darnley. She might have married her to any one she pleased, if she had consented to appoint her her heir. By not doing so, she condemned herself to a policy of vigilance, intrigue, rivalry, treachery, and conflict. To be incessantly framing plots in Scotland, and frequently foiling them in England; to foment civil war in the kingdom of her neighbour, and repress or prevent it in her own dominions—such was the course which she was forced to pursue from 1565 to 1586, a period of more than twenty years.

On the other hand, Mary Stuart beheld the course of her mournful destiny, which had been temporarily suspended, renewed by this reasonable but fatal marriage. She was compelled to break with her brother, the ambitious Earl of Murray, who had been her prudent counsellor ever since her return from France, and had secured for her the internal tranquillity of her kingdom, peace with England, the obedience of her turbulent nobility, and the confidence, or at least, the submission of the Presbyterian party. She was about to return to her old inclinations, to resume her connection with her uncles, the greatest of whom, Duke Francis of Guise, had been assassinated not long before,\* to come to an

\* He was shot by Poltrot de Méré at the siege of Orleans, and died of his wound on the 24th of February, 1563. Mary Stuart deeply mourned his loss, although at that period she was less occupied with the interests of Catholicism than with her own rights to the succession of England. She wrote to Catherine de Medici, who had sent to

understanding with the King of Spain and the Sovereign Pontiff, to favour the Catholics, alarm the Protestants, alienate the English, and finally, be wrecked upon the quicksands of her authority and reputation.

condole with her : “ La démonstration qu’il vous a plu me faire en dépeschant Du Croc pour me consoler de la perte si grande que j’ay faite par la mort de feu monsieur le Duc de Guise, mon oncle, que aviez non seulement regret en la mort d’un si homme de bien et tant fidelle serviteur du Roy votre fils et de vous, mais aussi peine pour celle que j’en porte, me rend plus obligée à vous faire service qu’auqune autre qu’eussiez sçu faire en ma faveur.” Labanoff, vol. vii, pp. 3, 4.

## CHAPTER IV.

FROM MARY'S MARRIAGE WITH DARNLEY TO THE MURDER  
OF RICCIO.

*Effect produced in England by Mary's Marriage—Negotiations for the Marriage of Elizabeth—Coolness between Elizabeth and Mary—Murray's Revolt, Defeat, and Flight into England—Influence of Riccio—Attempts to Restore Catholicism in Scotland—Darnley's Jealousy of Riccio—Conspiracy against Riccio—League between Darnley and Murray—Murder of Riccio—First Captivity of the Queen.*

THE marriage of the Queen of Scotland caused the English Protestants great alarm. A short time before it took place, Elizabeth's Privy Council again declared it to be prejudicial to the interests of the reformed religion, and to the security of the kingdom. Cecil, the political leader of the Anglican party, displayed all its dangerous consequences in a memorial which he laid before Elizabeth. He stated, in the first place, that as the children born of this marriage would naturally be regarded as the heirs of both Crowns, "a great number in this realm of England, not of the worst subjects, might be alienated in their minds from their natural duties to her Majesty, and favour all devices and practises that should tend to the advancement of the Queen of Scots;" and secondly, that the Papists would

use this marriage, which alone offered them the means of restoring the Romish religion, "to disturb the Estate of the Queen's Majesty, and the peace of the realm."\* Reminding Elizabeth of the usurpation of the royal arms and title of England by the Queen of Scotland during her marriage with the Dauphin, he expressed his conviction that Mary Stuart would renew her pretensions, and impart new strength and vigour to the faction which supported them. "And this faction," added Cecil, "except good heed were speedily given to it, would become so dangerous in this Court, both in hall and chamber, as the redress thereof would be almost desperate. And to this purpose it was to be remembered, how of late in perusing of the substance of the Justices of Peace in all the counties of the realm, scarcely a third part was found fully assured to be trusted in the matter of religion, upon which only string the Queen of Scots' title doth hang."†

He proposed as means of avoiding these dangers : First, that Elizabeth's marriage should be no longer delayed ; secondly, that measures should be taken to advance and fortify the profession of religion both in Scotland and in England ; and thirdly, that a connection should be formed in Scotland with the party opposed to the marriage, and assistance given them from time to time. ‡ No measures could have been taken, or advice

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 296.

† Ibid., vol. v., p. 297.

‡ Ibid.

given, better calculated to secure the triumph of Protestantism. The Reform party was then particularly desirous to oppose the marriage of the Protestant Elizabeth to that of the Catholic Mary, and to consolidate the religious revolution effected by Henry VIII., by settling the throne of England upon an inheritor both of his lineage and his creed.

Elizabeth was then thirty years of age. Though not beautiful, she was of distinguished appearance and very vain. Her manners were alternately very unconstrained and very dignified, and she united the most familiar address to the most imposing majesty. Full of talent, passion, singularity, and grandeur, she governed her kingdom with a rare combination of prudence and vigour, but seemed entirely destitute of good sense in all matters relating to herself. What flattered her most, was to be asked in marriage; as such a proposal implied an admiration for her beauty and a taste for her person which she considered highly complimentary. In this respect, she had no reason to be jealous of Mary Stuart. Philip II. had requested her hand very shortly after the death of his second wife, Queen Mary.\* Most of the Princes who had aspired to the hand of the Queen of Scotland, had previously made offers to Elizabeth. Of this number were the King of Denmark, the King of Sweden, and the Archduke Charles, with the last of whom negociations had long been pending,

\* See Appendix A.

but had made very little progress. Among the Scotch, the Earl of Arran had been proposed;\* and, among her own subjects, the Earl of Arundel had endeavoured to gain her affections,† and the Earl of Leicester had succeeded in doing so.‡

Although she was accustomed to receive all sorts of propositions of marriage, one had been made to her which caused her no little surprise. Catherine de Medici, either because she was anxious to remove the Archduke Charles and prevent the Queen of England from contracting an alliance with the House of Austria, or because she was desirous to gain Elizabeth's political goodwill by flattering her vanity,—Catherine de Medici offered her Charles IX. as her husband. This strange proposal to unite a lad of fifteen with a woman of thirty, a Catholic with a Protestant, the King of France with the Queen of England, was mooted during the

\* See Keith, pp. 54, 55, for the letter written on this subject by the Scottish lords in 1560; and pp. 56, 57, for Elizabeth's answer.

† “Dicenme que el conde de Arondel trae muy altos pensamientos . . . . Todos creen que no se casara (Elizabeth) con extranjero, y no atinan a quien inclina, pero los mas dias sale grita de nuevo marido. Ya ha dexado al conde de Arondel, y dizen que se casara con hijo de Guillen Haubart (Howard).” The Count of Feria to Philip II., London, 14th December, 1558. Archives of Simancas, Inglaterra, fol. 811.

‡ “Dizen que esta enamorada de milord Roberto.” The Count of Feria to Philip II., 29th April, 1559. Archives of Simancas, Inglaterra, fol. 812. “Era tan publica la voz de que Isabel tenia relaciones estrechissimas con Robert, que en una de] las audiencias que dio ella al embajador Cuadra, trato de sincerarse manifestandole toda la disposicion de su camara y alcoba, persuadiendole que eran calumnias infundadas todos aquellos rumores. Robert por su parte hacia tambien officios para ganar al embajador, y envió perros de caza y otros regalos a Felipe.” Apuntamientos para la historia del rey don Felipe Segundo de España por lo tocante a sus relaciones con la reyna Isabel de Inglaterra, desde el año 1558 hasta el de 1576, formadas con presencia de la correspondencia diplomática original de dicha época, por Don Tomas Gonzalez, p. 72; and Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia, vol. vii., p. 284.

autumn of 1564. Catherine de Medici had just reached the conclusion of the first civil war, in which Elizabeth had assisted the Huguenots ; and had regained Havre-de-Grace, which the Huguenots had ceded to the English in return, and as a reward, for the succour they had received. The wily Italian, at the same time that she was about to secure the support of her son-in-law, Philip II., by the interview of Bayonne, was doubtless anxious to paralyse the dangerous ill-will of Elizabeth by an offer of marriage.

She instructed Paul de Foix, her Ambassador at London, formally to make the proposition to Elizabeth. "I should desire," she wrote to him, "to cement our friendship by some closer bond, and I should feel myself the happiest mother in the world, if one of my children should transform my well-beloved sister into my very dear daughter."\* Paul de Foix requested an audience with Queen Elizabeth, which she appointed for the 14th of February, 1565, just at the time when Darnley arrived in Scotland to sue for the hand of Mary Stuart. He discharged his delicate mission with dexterity, and showed Elizabeth the despatch he had received from Catherine de Medici, in which she loaded her with praises, and declared that she would find in the young King Charles IX., "enough, both of body and mind, to

\* MS. dispatch, Catherine de Medici to Paul de Foix, Nat. Lib. Paris, dep. St. Germain Harlay, No. 218. This dispatch was dated January 24, 1565, as Paul de Foix himself informs us in his account of the negotiation with Elizabeth, contained in his dispatch of the 18th February.

satisfy her desires.”\* While reading this letter, Elizabeth frequently changed colour and countenance. She appeared pleased and confused, and told Paul de Foix in reply that the offer of such an honour would inspire her, during her whole life, with as much affection for the Queen-mother as if she really were her daughter. But she added that the Queen-mother was doubtless not well-informed about her age ; that she was too old for so young a King ; and that he would neglect her as the King of Spain had neglected her sister, the late Queen Mary. “I would rather die,” she said, “than see myself despised and forsaken.”

Nevertheless, at the entreaty of the French Ambassador, who represented in glowing colours the political and commercial advantages which would accrue from such an union, the negotiation was formally entered into, and continued for several months. The grave Cecil was called on to give his advice upon, or rather against, so singular a project of marriage, and Elizabeth also brought the matter before her principal nobles. During this period Catherine de Medici and Charles IX. displayed the most impatient anxiety for its settlement, as we are informed by Sir Thomas Smith,† who had succeeded Throckmorton as the English Ambassador at the Court of France. Paul de Foix, on his side

\* MS. dispatch, Paul de Foix to Catherine de Medici, 18th February, 1565. See the unpublished documents with regard to this proposal of marriage contained in Appendix D.

† MS. dispatch from Smith, 15th April, 1565, State Paper Office.



strenuously endeavoured to weaken Cecil's strong objections, to gain over Elizabeth's most trusted advisers,\* and to overcome the repugnance of that Princess herself, whose vanity was flattered by a proposal from which her good sense revolted. This negotiation had not been long continued, before it became known to those Courts which were interested to prevent it. The marriage of the King of France to the Queen of England was as obnoxious to Spain as the recently-projected marriage of the Prince Royal of Spain to the Queen of Scotland would have been to France. We therefore find that Guzman de Silva, the Ambassador of Philip II., had an immediate interview on the subject with Elizabeth. His account of the conversation gives us an excellent picture of this vain, satirical, and clever princess.

"It is said," began Silva, "that your Majesty intends to marry the King of France." Elizabeth slightly hung down her head and began to laugh: presently she added, "I will make a confession to you, because we are now in Lent, and you are my friend. Propositions have been made for my marriage with my brother the Catholic King, with the King of France, and with the Kings of Sweden and Denmark." "And with the Archduke also," interrupted Silva. "You are right," replied Elizabeth; "your Prince Royal is the only one who has not been mentioned to me." "The reason of this is clear," said Silva; "the King, my master, must

\* See Appendix D.

consider it certain that you do not intend to marry, because, when he offered you his hand, though he is the greatest Prince in Christendom, and, as your Majesty has yourself told me, you are under great obligations to him,—you did not accept him.” “It does not appear so clear to me,” answered Elizabeth, “for at that time, I thought much less about getting married. Even now, if I could appoint such a successor to my crown as I could wish, I promise you that I would not marry. I have never been much inclined to marriage. But my subjects urge me so strongly that I shall not be able to evade compliance, unless some other means are found, which it would be very difficult to do. A woman who does not marry is exposed to the scandal of everybody. It is supposed that she remains single on account of some physical imperfection, or else bad motives are attributed to her. It was said regarding me, for instance, that I did not marry because I was attached to the Earl of Leicester, and that I did not marry the Earl of Leicester because he had got a wife already. Now his wife is dead, and yet I do not marry him. But although we cannot restrain people’s tongues, the truth prevails in the end and becomes universally acknowledged. God knows the thoughts of my heart, that they are very different from what they are supposed to be. But tell me, if this marriage with the King of France were to take place, what should you think of it?” “That the road would be neither good, nor easy to travel.

You would find very many rough places in it." Elizabeth laughed and changed the subject.\* A short time afterwards, she assured Silva that she did not intend to accept the propositions of the Court of France.

When the delay which she had required of Paul de Foix, in order to obtain the opinions of the most important personages in England on the matter, had expired, she gave him an audience on the 2nd of May, at which she prepared him for a refusal. At length, on the 12th of June, Paul de Foix was conducted to the Council-chamber at Westminster, to receive a definitive answer. There were present the Earl of Leicester, the Lord Chamberlain Howard, Cecil, Petre, and the Marquis of Northampton. The last mentioned nobleman told him, in the name of his colleagues, "That the principal difficulty in the way of the marriage of the King his sovereign and the Queen their mistress, was the inequality of their ages, and the prolonged and dangerous uncertainty with regard to an heir to the crown, as the youth of the King rendered it improbable that the Queen would have any children by him for several years."† Paul de Foix then wrote to Catherine de Medici, that there was no hope. But he added that though he could not determine the Queen of England to marry the King of France, he would take care to prevent her from wedding the Archduke

\* Guzman de Silva to Philip II., London, March 24th, 1565. Archives of Simancas, fol. 818.

† Dispatch from Paul de Foix, June 18th, 1565.

Charles, to propose whom an ambassador had been sent by the Emperor.

This ambassador, Adam Swetkowitz by name, was sent by the new Emperor Maximilian, to restore the insignia of the Order of the Garter which had been worn by his father Ferdinand I. He arrived in England on the 5th of May, and finding the attention of both the cabinet and nobility engrossed by the marriage of Elizabeth, he brought into prominent notice the pretensions of the Archduke Charles, whom the Queen of Scotland had already rejected. Cecil was not unfavourable to his suit, and he was moreover supported by the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Sussex, who were Leicester's enemies. The affair seems to have been conducted with great seriousness. Cecil saw the imperial ambassador on several occasions, showed him the contract of marriage which had been signed ten years before by the Prince of Spain and Queen Mary, and informed him that, if the marriage now proposed took place, the following conditions would be enforced : that the religion of the country should not be changed ; that the great offices of the kingdom should be bestowed on none but English ; that England should not be involved in the wars of the Empire or of Spain ; and that, if the Queen died childless, the Parliament should alone regulate all matters regarding the succession.\*

\* MS. dispatch from Paul de Foix, at the end of July, 1565. Nat. Lib. Paris dep. Saint Germain Harlay, No. 218.

Paul de Foix, feeling how injuriously this plan would affect the interests of the French Court, used the influence of the Earls of Pembroke, Shrewsbury, and Bedford, and particularly of Throckmorton and Leicester, to thwart it ; and he himself besought Elizabeth not to do his sovereign the injury and the wrong of marrying the Archduke. In order more effectually to prevent the execution of this project, Paul de Foix, in obedience to the orders he had received from his court, strenuously urged upon Elizabeth the pretensions of Leicester, who still aspired to her hand. This ambitious favourite, the object of the ardent and continued affection of his sovereign, who had established him in her court, and given him apartments close by her own,\* now sought the assistance of the King of France to promote his marriage with Elizabeth, just as earnestly as he had entreated that of the King of Spain during the early part of her reign.† In a conference which Paul de Foix had with her a short time after she had refused Charles IX., and Mary Stuart

\* "Le ha mandado la reyna dar un aposento en lo alto junto al suyo por ser mas sano que el que el tenia abajo, y esta contentissimo." Dispatch from Quadra to Philip II., April 12th, 1561. Archives of Simancas, Inglaterra, fol. 815.

† During a great entertainment which Lord Robert gave to Elizabeth on the 24th of June in the same year, the Queen, being alone with Bishop Quadra and Dudley, spoke to the Spanish ambassador regarding her marriage in a tone of pleasantry. Quadra gave Philip II. an account of this singular conversation, in his dispatch of the 30th June, in the following words : "Y se paso tan adelante en ellas (burlas) que llego milord Robert a dezirle que yo podia ser el ministro del acto del despoerio, si ella queria ; y ella (que no le pesaba de oyr aquello) decia que no sabia si yo entendia tanto Inglés. Yo les ayude a burlaz un rato, y al ultimo tornando a les veras les dije a entrambos que si me creian ellos se eximirian de la tyrannia de estos sus consejeros, que se habian apoderado de la reyna y de todos sus negocios y restituirian al reyno la paz y union que ha menester con restituirle la religion, y despues podrian hacer las bodas que decian y ser yo ministro de ellas." Archives of Simancas, Inglaterra, fol. 815.

had married Darnley, he advised her to take the Earl of Leicester as her husband, in order to ensure the tranquillity of her kingdom, and the contentment of her subjects. He told her that she had had many years' experience of the Earl's affection, and that she would receive from him an obedience proportionate to the honour which she would confer upon him by raising him to so exalted a position; that being an Englishman, he would never favour foreigners; that, not being powerful, she would never have occasion to fear him; that, moreover, she would not displease any of the princes, her neighbours, by showing preference for one to the rejection of all others; and that she would thus be sure to retain the friendship of all. Elizabeth answered, that she did not know yet whether she should marry at all; and that one of her own subjects, though not possessed of large resources, would acquire by his marriage ample power to execute any evil intentions he might entertain. She added, that she was determined, for this reason, never to confer upon her future husband either property, power, or influence, as her sole object in marrying would be to leave an heir to her throne; but, that, whenever she thought about marriage "it seemed as if some one were tearing her heart out of her bosom."\* Paul de Foix repeatedly resumed this conversation. Without binding herself by any engagement, Elizabeth bestowed great

\* MS. dispatch, Paul de Foix to Catherine de Medici; London, August 22nd, 1565. Nat. Lib. Paris, dep. Saint Germain Harlay, No. 218.

praise upon Leicester, who daily made greater progress in her good favour and affection, and regarding whom she openly declared that she could not remain a single day without seeing him.\*

Under these decisive circumstances, the confident favourite hoped to crown his good fortune by marriage. His enemies made overtures of friendship to him. The Earl of Sussex sought his society, and Cecil treated the Archduke with greater coolness. Leicester had an interview with the powerful Secretary for the purpose of explaining his plans, and seeking his assistance. He told him that he was desirous to inform him that he aspired to the hand of the Queen, and that he thought she was not likely to marry any one but himself; he therefore besought Cecil to abandon his other plans, and assured him that he would always take care that he should be not only maintained in his present dignity, but raised to a higher rank, to which he was entitled by the services which his rare prudence and skilful loyalty had rendered to the Queen and her realm. Cecil appeared moved by Leicester's representations; he expressed his gratitude for his offers of support, and, like a crafty courtier, promised to devote himself to his interests.†

Thus favoured in his ambitious designs by the support he obtained both at home and abroad, Leicester

\* MS. dispatch from Paul de Foix, September 27, 1565. Nat. Lib. Paris, dep. Saint German Harlay, No. 218.

† Ibid.

prevented Elizabeth's marriage with the Archduke, who required very unacceptable conditions, and discouraged the hopes of the Margravine of Baden, who came about this time to press the suit of the King of Sweden. Becoming more urgent in consequence of the failure of his competitors, Leicester requested the Queen, who, to all appearance, had engaged to marry him, to appoint a day for their union before the end of the year. She begged him to give her until Candlemas.\*

But Candlemas arrived, and Leicester was as far from having consummated his marriage as were the King of Sweden, the Archduke Charles, and the King of France. Elizabeth was resolved not to share her authority with any one, and was desirous at the same time to keep on good terms with all. Calculating even in her irresolution, she declined all offers of marriage without giving any formal refusal. She thus discouraged Charles IX. by means of the Archduke, the Archduke and the King of Sweden by means of Leicester, and she now repressed the aspiring views of Leicester by suddenly bestowing such extraordinary favour upon the Earl of Ormonde, who had recently arrived from Ireland, that Leicester, in disgust, left the court and retired for some time to his own residence.†

As it was not probable that the succession to the crown

\* MS. dispatch of Paul de Foix, 19th December, 1565. Nat. Lib. Paris, dep. Saint Germain Harlay, No. 218.

† MS. dispatch, Paul de Foix to King Charles IX., 20th March, 1566. Ibid.



of England would be settled by the Queen's marriage, it became necessary to determine the question by recognising an heir to the throne. The Earl of Huntingdon and the Duke of Norfolk were suggested ;\* and the members of Elizabeth's council devoted all their attention to the discussion of rival claims to this exalted dignity. But the Queen, notwithstanding all the representations made to her in favour of the step, was as determined not to appoint a successor, as she had previously been not to take a husband. By declining to give a Protestant heir to the Crown of England, she allowed the natural rights of the Catholic King and Queen of Scotland to subsist in all their force. She, at this time, even permitted her rival, Mary Stuart, to gain still greater advantage over her, by urging the discontented Scotch to revolt, without giving them such prompt and efficient aid as to prevent their defeat. This was entirely the fault of her indecision, and must not be attributed to any scruples of conscience. She used to say that her habitual slowness of determination had done her great injury, and that, although she knew that opportunity was bald and fleeting, she frequently failed to catch it in its flight.† Such a failure she experienced in this instance, and in many others.

Murray, a short time before his sister's marriage, had

\* "Il est mis quelques propos en avant pour faire déclarer aux prochains estats le comte d'Hontinton successeur de ce royaume, et pour fortifier cette déclaration, nomme après lui à ladite déclaration le duc de Norfolk."—Dispatch of Paul de Foix, end of April, 1565. *Ibid.*

† Dispatch of Paul de Foix, 10th May, 1565.

been summoned by her,\* under pain of violating the duties of fidelity, to present himself at Court, in order to prove the criminal design which he and the Earl of Argyle had imputed to Darnley and the Earl of Lennox, by asserting that they intended to attempt their murder. He refused to comply with this summons, either because he seriously feared, as he said, some attempt against his life on the part of his adversaries, or because he had resolved to have recourse to arms, the only means which remained in his power. He now prepared to enter the field. In a manifesto, intended to rouse the nobility and people to rebellion, it was alleged that the Queen was violating the rights and infringing upon the liberties of the realm, by imposing upon them a king without the advice and consent of the Parliament,—a proceeding utterly at variance with the laws and usages of the country.† He wrote at the same time to the Earl of Bedford, to “crave his comfort, as of one to whom God had granted to know the subtle devices of Satan against the innocent professors of the Gospel, to stir up the powers of the world against the same.”‡ Randolph, on his part, urged Elizabeth to assist Murray, unless she wished to see Protestantism and the English party in Scotland fall with him.§ But the enterprising Mary,

\* Keith, Appendix, p. 108. Letter from Randolph to Cecil, 21st July, 1565; in Keith, p. 304.

† Keith, p. 308.

‡ Letter from Murray to Bedford, 22nd July, 1565; in Keith, p. 306.

§ MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Elizabeth, 23rd July, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 317.

who had gathered around her person all her faithful barons, with their relatives and friends,\* marched so rapidly against Murray that she compelled him to retreat from Stirling to Glasgow, and from Glasgow into the territories of his ally, the Earl of Argyle. She at the same time replied with great energy to an English envoy, named Tamworth,† who had been sent by Elizabeth with a haughty message, and who, refusing to recognise Darnley as King, was waylaid on his return towards the frontier, and carried off prisoner to Hume Castle.‡ The Queen of England contented herself with sending a small sum of money and a large number of promises to the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Murray, Argyle, Rothes, and Glencairn, and the Lords Boyd and Ochiltree,§ who collected a force of about a thousand men, and marched upon Edinburgh.||

This city, the capital of the kingdom, was also the centre of Protestantism in Scotland. The insurgents thought that its citizens would rise as one man in their favour; but they met with a cool reception. None of the citizens joined them, and they were fired on by the cannon of the Castle.¶ Notwithstanding the tendency

\* Proclamation in Keith, Appendix, p. 107.

† See her Message in Keith, Appendix, p. 99, and Mary Stuart's Answer, *ibid.*, p. 101.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 320.

§ Andrew, second Lord Stewart of Ochiltree in Ayrshire, succeeded to this title and barony in 1558. He was one of the first and most zealous supporters of the Protestant cause. Knox married his daughter.

|| Randolph to Cecil, 31st August, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 321.

¶ Tytler, vol. v., p. 321, according to MS. letters addressed to Cecil by Bedford from Berwick, and by Randolph from Edinburgh, on September 2, 1565. Knox, vol. ii., pp. 499-501.

of the reformed doctrines to encourage civil insubordination, when there was any opposition between a man's duties to religion and his duties to the State,\* notwithstanding the insurrectionary disposition of the Scottish nobles, Mary Stuart would have needed to commit many faults and be guilty of much imprudence, before a real revolt from her authority could have occurred. Astounded at the indifference of the people, and intimidated by their own weakness, the insurgent lords sent in all haste to request assistance from Cecil, who was Elizabeth's chief political adviser, and from the Earl of Bedford, who commanded the English forces on the frontier. They entreated that three thousand men might be sent to their aid, and that some ships of war might be directed to cruise in the Forth.†

But Mary, whose energetic activity was unintentionally seconded by Elizabeth's customary dilatoriness, did not leave them time to wait for these reinforcements. At the head of a feudal army of ten thousand men, she a second time marched resolutely against Murray and his supporters, whom she had declared rebels, and who fled precipitately from Edinburgh. She swept through the county of Fife, chastised

\* Knox himself states: "There were divers bruits among the people, some alleging that the cause of this alteration was not for religion, but rather for hatred, envy of sudden promotion or dignity, or such worldly causes; but they that considered the progress of the matter, according as is heretofore declared, thought the principal cause to be only for religion." Knox, vol. ii., p. 496.

† MS. State Paper Office, Instructions given to Robert Melvil, 10th September, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 321.

the Laird of Grange and such other barons as had appeared to favour the insurgents, levied heavy fines upon Dundee and St. Andrews, and took Castle Campbell. She went through all these expeditions on horseback, with pistols at her saddle-bow, and pursued to Dumfries the defeated Earl of Murray, who had retreated with his little army towards the English frontier. In the keenness of her animosity, she declared to Randolph, who had accompanied her in her campaign, that she would rather peril her crown than lose her revenge.\*

About this time, she published a proclamation in which she unmasked the designs of Murray and his party. "Certain rebels," she said, "the authors of this uproar lately raised up against us, have given the people to understand that the quarrel they have in hand is only religion, thinking with that cloke to cover their ungodly designs, and so to draw after them a large train of ignorant persons, easy to be seduced." She then declared that, on the contrary, they were actuated only by ambition, and accused them of being as insatiable as they were ungrateful, since, although she had bestowed upon them all kinds of honours and benefits, they had rebelled against her. "Their ambition," she continued, "could not be satisfied with heaping riches upon riches, and honour upon honour, unless they retain

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 9th September, 1555. Tytler, vol. v., p. 322. Knox, vol. ii., pp. 502, 503.

in their hands us, and our whole realm, to be led, used, and disposed at their pleasure. We must be forced to govern by counsel, such as it shall please them to appoint us—and what other thing is this, but to dissolve the whole policy, and (in a manner) to invert the very order of nature, to make the prince obey, and subjects command. The like was never demanded by any of our most noble progenitors heretofore, yea, not of Governors and Regents. When we ourselves were of less age, and at our first returning into this our realm, we had free choice of our Council at our pleasure, and now when we are at our full maturity, shall we be brought back to the state of pupils, and be put under tutory? This is the quarrel of religion they made you believe they had in hand; this is the quarrel for which they would have you hazard your lands, lives, and goods, in the company of a certain number of rebels against your natural prince. To speak in good (plain) language, they would be Kings themselves, or at the least leaving to us the bare name and title, and take to themselves the credit and whole administration of the kingdom.” She concluded by promising her subjects the peaceable possession of their goods, and entire liberty of conscience, and demanded in return, their loyal obedience, and continued fidelity.\*

The insurgent nobles, feeling that they were lost

\* This proclamation, dated December 10th, 1565, is given in Knox, vol. ii., pp. 504—506.

unless prompt assistance were afforded them, transmitted to Robert Melvil, their envoy at the English Court, a paper entitled "Informations to be given to the Queen's Majesty, in favour of the Church of Christ, now begun to be persecuted in the chief members of the same." \* In this document they attributed the persecution which they suffered to the influence of foreigners. They named, as the chief of these, David Riccio, whose usurpations Murray had endeavoured to oppose, and Darnley, who, the subject of another realm, had intruded himself into Scotland, and assumed, without their consent, the name and authority of King. † They ended by conjuring Elizabeth to sustain a cause which was, in reality, her own. But this artful and cautious Queen, who, on the 12th of September, had directed the Earl of Bedford to place both troops and money at their disposal, ‡ countermanded the order three days afterwards, § on learning that the confederates were very weak and had suffered a defeat. She contented herself with informing them, through Cecil, that she was favourable to their cause, and moved by their distress. ||

After the advantages which she had already obtained over the adversaries of her authority and her faith,

\* MS. State Paper Office, 22nd September, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 322.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 323.

‡ Elizabeth to the Earl of Bedford, 12th September, 1565; in Robertson, vol. i., Appendix 13.

§ Tytler, vol. v., p. 325.

|| MS. State Paper Office, An Answer for Robert Melvil, October 1, 1565; entirely in Cecil's hand. Tytler, vol. v., p. 325.

Mary Stuart no longer concealed her predilections and projects. She had summoned to her Court Murray's implacable enemy, the young Earl of Bothwell,\* whom she confirmed in his hereditary office of High Admiral of Scotland, and appointed Lieutenant of the west and middle marches.† She liberated from prison the son of the Earl of Huntly, and gave him a post near her person. She placed at the head of her Council the Catholic Earl of Athol, the declared enemy of the Earl of Argyle, and a man of great courage, but no judgment.‡ Under the guidance of the Italian, David Riccio, she began secret preparations for the restoration of the ancient faith. In concert with Darnley, she made applications to Philip II. and the Pope for assistance in the struggle about to commence between herself and the Protestants, and grounded her application on the fact that Murray and the Protestant lords had sought aid from Elizabeth. She told the King of Spain that he was the natural protector of the Catholic religion, and that her husband and herself,—in view of the utter ruin which impended over those of the Scotch who had remained faithful to that religion, and in the fear of being themselves deprived of their crown as well as of *the rights which they claimed elsewhere*, unless they had the assistance of one of the great Princes of Christendom,—had not hesitated to have recourse to

\* He arrived from France on the 17th of September, 1565. Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 83.

† Knox, vol. ii., p. 509.

‡ Paul de Foix to Catherine de Medici, 18th September, 1565.



him. She despatched to him an English gentleman, formerly a servant of Queen Mary Tudor, and now one of Darnley's suite, to inform him of the state of her affairs, and besought him to send him back speedily in the interest of the Crown and the Church, "for the maintenance of which," she added, "we will not spare either life or estate, being supported and advised by you." \* She also requested the aid of her brother-in-law, Charles IX.

The Courts of France and Spain had both approved of her marriage. They were extremely well satisfied with it, the one, because Mary had married neither Don Carlos nor the Archduke Charles, and the other, because she had not taken as her second husband a member of that powerful house, the influence of which was universally dreaded and opposed by Philip II. This monarch, the head of Catholicism in Europe, sent Mary Stuart twenty thousand crowns, and wrote to the Pope, who also sent her eight thousand, that it was not convenient for him at the moment to send her any other succour, as such a course would certainly be dangerous and could not possibly be useful. He added that they must not, however, renounce the idea of asserting, by armed force, the Queen of Scotland's right to the succession of England.† "This project," he said, "con-

\* Letter from Mary Stuart to Philip II., 10th September, 1565 ; in Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 381, 382.

† Philip II. to Cardinal Pacheco, Segovia, 16th October, 1565 ; Archives of Simancas, fol. 818. See Appendix E.

cerns the cause of God which is mentioned by the Queen of Scotland, since it is evidently the only door by which religion can enter into the kingdom of England, for all others are now shut.”\*

Before receiving this slender and timid assistance, Mary had refused the mediation offered her, in the name of his court, by Castelnau de Mauvissiere, the French ambassador. “I would rather lose all,” she proudly said, “than treat with my subjects.”† In her warlike ardour she a third time entered the field, on the 9th of October, to expel from her kingdom the remnant of the insurgent army which was posted at Dumfries. Accompanied by the Earls of Bothwell and Huntly, with an army of ten or twelve thousand men, she easily routed Murray and his faction, who fled for refuge to England on the 14th of October. Mary triumphed. The life of activity, enterprise and conflict which she had lately led, intoxicated her. Victory was with her the beginning of vengeance. She not only intended to crush the rebel lords by causing them to be condemned as traitors, and depriving them of their dignities and possessions; her designs became every hour more bold and comprehensive. All her kingdom bowed before her. Out of twenty-one earls and twenty-eight barons, there were only five earls

\* “Pues se entiende evidentemente ser aquella la puerta por donde a de entrar la religion en el reyno de Inglaterra, viendo por el presente cerradas todas las otras.” Ibid.

† Mary Stuart to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 1st October, 1565; in Labanoff, vol. i., p. 288.

and three barons hostile to her, and they were now fugitives.\* Considering herself sure of Scotland, feeling that she was supported by the orthodox party in England, and believing that she had the countenance of the Catholic powers of the continent, she hoped to make Elizabeth herself repent that she had not recognised her as her heir, and that she had encouraged her subjects to revolt. She even allowed her intentions to creep out in her conversation. Some noblemen of her retinue having represented to her that she would fatigue herself by so much riding and by following her army during the inclement weather, she replied "That she would never cease to continue in such fatigues, until she had led them to London."†

She now assumed a haughty tone in her communications with Elizabeth. She wrote to her that she could not imagine that she would consent to assist rebels, and threatened, if she should make common cause with them, to denounce her conduct to all the foreign princes who were her allies.‡ Elizabeth was greatly embarrassed by this proceeding. She was also much perplexed by the ambassadors of France and Spain who, in the name of their masters, defended Mary Stuart's interests, and the common authority of all

\* "Sur vingt-un comtes qui sont audit royaume d'Ecosse, et vingt-huit millords, il n'y a que cinq comtes et trois millords qui ne soient du costé de la royne et prêts à faire ses commandemens, encore que la plupart d'iceulx soient Protestants." Paul de Foix to Catherine de Medici, 29th September, 1565.

† Paul de Foix to Catherine de Medici, 29th September, 1565.

‡ Mary Stuart to Elizabeth, 8th October, 1565; in Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 293, 294.

sovereigns. Moreover she was not without fears for the peace of her own realm, and had collected some bodies of troops on the Scottish border. In order to prevent any movement on the part of the English Catholics, she had summoned to London, under the pretext of asking their advice, but really because she believed several of them to be favourable to her rival, the Duke of Norfolk, the Marquis of Northampton, and the Earls of Arundel and Pembroke. The same suspicions had determined her to summon to court the Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Cumberland, who possessed estates on the confines of Scotland.\*

After having taken these precautions, she felt anxious to calm Mary Stuart's haughty displeasure, and in so doing, manifested more humility and less irritability than she usually displayed. As deceit cost her nothing, she extricated herself from the false position in which she had placed herself, by one of those scenes of audacious trickery which were familiar to her. She appeared greatly incensed at Murray's conduct, and gave him a public order to return to Newcastle, whilst she authorised him by a secret message to present himself at her court. He came, accompanied by the Abbot of Kilwinning, one of the Hamilton family. Elizabeth received them in the presence of the French and Spanish ambassadors and

\* Letter from Paul de Foix, 29th September, 1565.

the members of her council, in order that she might enact this odious comedy with more advantage to herself. When Murray entered her presence, he knelt down on one knee, and began to speak in Scotch. The Queen interrupted him and bade him speak in French, as he was acquainted with that language. Murray excused himself on account of his want of practice, and the difficulty he would feel at having to express himself in a language with which he was but slightly acquainted, and had nearly forgotten. The Queen replied that he remembered enough to speak it intelligibly, and at all events to understand it when spoken; and she then told him in French that she was astonished that they had dared, without permission, to come before her.\* “Are you not branded as rebels to your sovereign?” she exclaimed. “Have you not spurned her summons, and taken arms against her authority? I command you, on the faith of a gentleman, to declare the truth.”† Murray, in confusion, replied by repelling the charge of treason, declaring that he had been unable to go near his sovereign’s court because she was

\* “El conde habiendo pusto una rodilla en terra, comenzo a hablar en escocesa. La reyna incontinente le digo, que hablase en frances, pues sabia la lengua. El se excuso, diciendo que por el poco uso que habia tenido de habrarlo lo habia olvidado, y no podria en aquella lengua explicar su intento. Respondio le la reyna, que aunque el no la hablase expeditamente sabia que la entendia bien por lo cual en lo que ella le respondiese o preguntase, lo queria hablar en frances y asi comenzo a decirle, que ella se maravillaba de que hubiese venido a sa presencia, sin licencia, habiendo sido declarado rebelde por la de Escocia.” Guzman de Silva to Philip II., 5th November, 1565. Archives of Simancas, Inglaterra, fol. 818.

† MS., State Paper Office, Copy of the Queen’s Speech to the Earl of Murray, before the French ambassador, the Sieur de Mauvissière, and the Queen’s Council, October 23, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 327.

surrounded by his enemies, and denying that he had ever plotted to seize her person. He finally declared that the Queen of England had not encouraged him to take arms.

Elizabeth begged the French ambassador to remember these words, and then, addressing Murray with anger and contempt, she added, "It is well that you have told the truth ; for neither did I, nor any one else in my name, ever encourage you in your unnatural rebellion against your sovereign ; nor, to be mistress of a world, could I maintain any subject in disobedience to his prince ; it might move God to punish me by a similar trouble in my own realm ; but as for you two, ye are unworthy traitors, and I command you instantly to leave my presence."\*

After this shameless disavowal, Elizabeth, who thus ignominiously rejected the men whom she had excited to revolt, and discouraged the faction† of which she might soon feel the need, made very friendly advances towards Mary Stuart. She directed Randolph, who not long before had been supplied by her with money for the use of the insurgent lords, to relate to the Queen of Scotland how she had received them, and what she had said to them. "I could have wished," she wrote with her own hand to Mary Stuart, in a

\* Tytler, vol. v., pp. 327, 328. Also, Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 57.

† "All the contrary faction are discouraged, and think themselves utterly undone." MS. letter, State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 8th November, 1565. Tytler, vol. v., p. 328.

letter in which she justified herself, adroitly, as she thought, but, as we think, most basely, "that your ears had been judges to hear both the honour and affection which I manifested towards you, to the complete disproof of what is stated that I defended your rebel subjects against you ; which will always be very far removed from my heart, it being too great an ignominy for a princess, I will not say, to do, but even to suffer." \*

Mary Stuart had never before occupied so powerful a position. She possessed the obedience of her subjects, and commanded the respect of foreign powers. It now behoved her to employ all her skill in consolidating the power which she had obtained by her courage. If she had been merciful as she was victorious, if she had pardoned Murray and the other exiles, she would have gained their gratitude and fidelity. After the humiliation they had just experienced in England, they would have been only too glad to be able to return into Scotland, and, abandoning all connection with the treacherous Elizabeth, would have become devoted servants of the generous Mary. This princess would thus have dissolved the English party within her dominions, whilst she would have augmented the Scottish faction in the neighbouring kingdom. Nothing so effectually disarms enemies and gains partisans as a combination of strength and wisdom. Murray, lately

\* Elizabeth to Mary Stuart, 29th October, 1565; in Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 59.

so haughty and obstinate in his resistance, humbly returned to his allegiance. He sent a valuable diamond-ring to David Riccio, to bespeak the good offices of this all-powerful adviser of the Queen his sister, and promised him his friendship if he should restore him to her favour.\* Murray shaped his conduct in accordance with the advice given to the Queen by James Melvil and Nicholas Throckmorton, who wished to incline her to the side of mercy. Melvil, whom she permitted freely to express his sentiments, told her at Edinburgh that she must pardon if she would reign peacefully; and the same advice was sent to her from England by Throckmorton, whose jealousy of Cecil had attached him to Mary's cause.† They both urged her to be merciful, that she might promote both her power and her ambition—that she might rally all her subjects around her, leave Elizabeth no means of disturbing her kingdom, and dispose even the Protestants themselves to favour her rights in England.

But Mary was too passionate to be politic. She did not follow this prudent advice. She preferred to pursue her schemes of vengeance, and yielded to the suggestions of the court of France and the Cardinal of Lorraine, who had sent Rambouillet and Clernau into Scotland to convey to Darnley the order of St. Michael, and to inform Mary of the coalition of the Catholic Princes against the Protestant cause in Europe. Mary

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 157.

† Ibid., pp. 141-144.



signed the league ; \* and, far from listening to Melvil's representations that persons should not be urged to extremity lest they should become dangerous, she angrily told him, "I do not fear them. What would they dare, or what could they undertake ?" † After having granted a conditional pardon only to the Duke of Chatelherault, the weakness of whose character rendered him not very formidable, and having separated the Hamiltons from the other exiles, ‡ she determined to crush Murray, Argyle, and the other companions of their rebellion, by procuring their condemnation as traitors at the next Parliament.

A short time before the meeting of this assembly, which she destined to further her revenge, and was desirous to associate in her plans in favour of the ancient Church, she sent the Bishop of Dumblane to assure the new Pope, Pius V., of her devoted obedience. § She besought him to grant her both temporal and spiritual assistance, "in order to change," she wrote, "the deplorable and unfortunate state of our kingdom. The moment is propitious, because our enemies are partly banished, and partly placed within our hands. . . . If God and your Holiness, whose cause we maintain, come to our aid, with such assistance

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 331.

† Melvil's Memoirs, p. 144.

‡ The Abbot of Kilwinning returned to give up the castles of Hamilton and Druffen, and then left Scotland to join the Duke of Chatelherault on the Continent. Knox, vol. ii., p. 515, note 2.

§ Mary Stuart to Pope Pius V., 21st January, 1566 ; in Labanoff, vol. vii., pp. 8, 9.

we shall overcome all obstacles.”\* David Riccio, who was in the pay of the Pope,† and was the principal agent of the Catholic party, strongly advised the Queen to act implacably towards the exiles, and to plunge into the perilous path of a religious restoration.

This young Italian, who had acquired so much importance in Scotland, and who was destined soon to meet with so tragical a fate, had come to Edinburgh during the month of December, 1562, at about twenty-eight years of age.‡ He came thither as *cameriere* in the suite of the Savoy ambassador, the Count of Moretto. He was a man of great intelligence, and possessed a more cultivated mind than was usual among the rough retainers of the Scottish court; he was moreover an agreeable musician, and the Queen kept him as a *valet de chambre*, when the Count of Moretto returned to Piedmont. Mary Stuart was endowed with a great taste for music, and had organised a band to play on the violin, lute, and flute for her amusement; she had also three singers in her pay, with whom Riccio was sometimes joined, as he had a good bass voice.§ Finding that he was fully qualified for some

\* “Ut, auxiliis spiritualibus simul et temporalibus, miserum quidem adhuc et infelicem regni nostri statum juvet . . . . Eam spem a S. T. augendam et implendam fore certo nobis persuademus, cum jam hostes nostri partim exulent, partim in nostris manibus positi sint. Si Deus et S. T. nobis aderit (quorum causam agimus) murum his fretis transgrediemur.” Mary Stuart to Pope Pius V., 21st January, 1566; in Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 10. † Melvil’s Memoirs, p. 141. Tytler, vol. v., p. 331.

‡ “Essendo nel 1562 andato monsignor de Moretto, ambasciatore alla regina di Scotia per l’illustrissimo et excellentissimo signor Duca di Savoia, menò per suo cameriere un M. David Riccio, Piemontese, huomo di 28 anni in circa, accorto, savio e virtuoso.” Despatch to the Duke of Tuscany, 8th October, 1566; in Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 86.

§ Keith, p. 268.

higher office than that of a valet, she appointed him her private secretary, in December 1564, on the dismissal of Raullet. "He succeeded so well in this employment," says the Tuscan ambassador in a despatch addressed to Duke Cosmo I., "that the greater part of the affairs of this kingdom passed through his hands. He managed them with so much prudence, and brought them to so satisfactory a conclusion, that he was greatly beloved by her Majesty."\* It was he who had advised and effected her marriage with Darnley; † it was he whose views, in conformity with Mary's opinions, tended to draw closer the connection between the Queen of Scotland, the Pope and the King of Spain; and thus to separate her from England, and effect a rupture with the Protestant party. He assumed great state in his dress, equipage and establishment; and the extreme favour with which he was treated rendered him arrogant and presumptuous. ‡ The relation in which he stood to the Queen, and the ascendancy which he had acquired over her were very injurious to Mary's reputation. Thus Elizabeth, speaking to the French ambassador about Murray's proscription, said, "That it was all owing to an Italian named David, whom the Queen of Scotland loved and favoured, and granted more credit and authority than were authorised by her affairs and honour." §

\* Despatch to the Duke of Tuscany; Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 87.

† Ibid., p. 88.

‡ Spotswood, p. 193.

§ Despatch from Paul de Foix to Charles IX., 17th October, 1565. Nat. Lib. Paris.

Darnley, after having for some time displayed considerable friendship for Riccio, at length quarrelled mortally with him. This ambitious and vain young man, destitute alike of gentleness and courage, possessing neither talents nor humility, and with a mind utterly unequal to his good fortune, had speedily repelled Mary Stuart's affection. Her susceptible heart had been deceived, and he neglected no efforts to lose the empire which he had momentarily assumed over it. He was strongly addicted to drinking,\* spent part of his time in hunting and hawking,† and was of a haughty, surly, and imperious temper.‡ He had urged Mary Stuart to grant him the *crown matrimonial*,§ by which was meant, an equal share in the sovereign authority, which she had promised him in the ardour of her early affection, and which had been possessed by her first husband, Francis II. But she had refused to grant his request, either because she considered him incapable of governing, or because she had ceased to love him. Darnley's faults made evident to her the dangers which the kingdom would incur, and in which she would herself be involved, if she conferred on him the exercise of the royal power. In less than six months after their

\* "All people say, that Darnley is too much addicted to drinking." The Queen having remonstrated with him on his conduct, he used such language and behaviour towards her, that "she left the place with tears." Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 16th February, 1565; in Keith, p. 329.

† Keith, p. 328.

‡ "Darnley is of an insolent, imperious temper, and thinks that he is never sufficiently honoured." Randolph to Cecil, 24th January, 1566; in Keith, p. 329.

§ Randolph to Cecil, in Keith, p. 329.

marriage, Mary was disgusted with Darnley, and was as careful to shun his presence as she had previously been anxious to see him. A rupture between them was not far distant, and Darnley's discontent had prepared a grievous humiliation for Mary Stuart.

Frustrated in his ambition, and wounded in his affection, Darnley attributed the Queen's refusal and dislike to the influence of Riccio; and believed that the Italian Secretary was at once her counsellor and her lover. He even went so far as to assert that "the villain David" had dishonoured his bed;\* and he therefore determined to get rid of him. He first expressed his resolution to his cousin George Douglas, to whom he divulged his grief, and communicated his ardent desire for vengeance. He then sent his confidant to Lord Ruthven, one of the most zealous friends of his family, a bold and resolute man, to request his assistance in obtaining revenge, and executing his plans of aggrandisement. He intended, in short, to murder Riccio and seize the matrimonial crown by force.† Lord Ruthven, although he was at that time very ill, after some hesitation, joined in the conspiracy, which was also communicated to Lord Lindsay, and of which even Randolph was cognisant. Rather less than a month before its execution,

\* Ruthven's Narrative, in Keith, Appendix, p. 119; also MS. letter, State Paper Office, Ruthven and Morton to Cecil, 27th March, 1566. Tytler, vol v., p. 333.

† Ruthven's Narrative, in Keith, Appendix, p. 120.

Randolph wrote to Leicester on the 13th February, 1566 : "I know now for certain, that this Queen repenteth her marriage ; that she hateth him (Darnley) and all his kin. I know that he knoweth himself that he hath a partaker in play and game with him. I know that there are practices in hand, contrived between the father and son to come by the crown against her will. I know that if that take effect which is intended, David, with the consent of the King, shall have his throat cut within these ten days. Many things grievouser and worse than these are brought to my ears ; yea, of things intended against her own person, which, because I think better to keep secret than write to Mr. Secretary (Cecil), I speak not of them but now to your lordship."\*

The plot extended without being discovered. Ruthven, who was intimately connected with the banished lords, thought it necessary to obtain their co-operation. As it had previously been requisite that the friends of Mary Stuart and the party of Lennox should unite against Murray and his faction, so now it was found indispensable to effect a junction between the supporters of Lennox and Murray against Mary Stuart and the servants of her authority. The Lennox party alone could not have kept Murray and the other exiles in banishment, and have subjected the Queen to their will, by striking so insolent a blow at the possession of the throne itself. It was therefore determined to associate

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 334.

in the conspiracy those noblemen who had been so bitterly persecuted. The Earl of Morton, a near relation and particular friend of Murray, strongly attached to the Protestant faith, and in fear of being deprived of the office of Chancellor of the kingdom, as well as of certain Crown-lands which he had obtained, was chosen to conduct the enterprise. He performed his task with secrecy and skill. To obtain the concurrence of the principal ministers and most powerful barons of the reformed party ; to bring back the exiles, and to restore to them the authority which they had lost ; to secure the support of Elizabeth and her chief ministers, Cecil and Leicester ; to murder Riccio ; to dissolve the Parliament, about to be convoked for the purpose of legally consummating the ruin of the fugitive lords ; to imprison the Queen ; to confer the nominal sovereignty upon Darnley ; to replace Murray at the head of the Government : such was the plan conceived by Morton, and adopted in Scotland by Lords Lindsay, Ruthven, and Lethington, by Knox and Craig, the two ministers of Edinburgh, Bellenden, the justice-clerk, Makgill, the clerk-register, and the lairds of Brunston, Calder, and Ormiston. The Earl of Lennox himself proceeded to England to communicate it to Murray, Rothes, Glencairn, Grange, and Ochiltree, the father-in-law of Knox, who readily embraced it, and agreed to repair to the frontier, so as to be ready to return to Edinburgh as soon as the plot had succeeded.\*

\* Tytler, vol. v., pp. 336, 337 ; and Proofs and Illustrations, No. 15., pp.498—507.

Two solemn covenants were immediately drawn up, to bind the King, on the one hand, and the conspirators on the other, to the performance of those conditions which were thought to be for their mutual advantage. The first, which was signed by the King, Morton, and Ruthven, declared that the Queen's "gentle and good nature" was abused by some wicked and ungodly persons, specially an Italian called David, and that the King had determined, with the assistance of certain of his nobility and others, to seize these enemies of the realm, and, if they resisted, "to cut them off immediately, and to slay them wherever it happened." He pledged himself, on the word of a Prince, to maintain and defend his associates in the enterprise, though carried into execution in presence of the Queen's Majesty, and within the precincts of the palace.\* In the second covenant, the Earls of Murray, Argyle, Glencairn, and Rothes, the Lords Boyd and Ochiltree, and their "complices," promised to support Darnley in all his just quarrels, to be friends to his friends and enemies to his enemies, to give him the Crown matrimonial, to maintain the Protestant religion, and to put down its enemies. The King, on his side, engaged to pardon Murray and the banished lords, to stay all proceedings for their forfeiture, and to restore them to their lands and dignities.†

\* British Museum, Caligula, B. ix., fol. 212; Copy of the time endorsed by Randolph. - Tytler, vol. v., pp. 337, 338.

† State-Paper Office, copy by Randolph from the original:—"Conditions for the Earls to perform to their King," and "Conditions to be performed by the King of



These covenants were submitted to Randolph's inspection, who sent a copy of them to Cecil. Randolph and the Earl of Bedford at the same time wrote from Berwick, on the 6th of March, to Elizabeth's Secretary of State, enjoining him to keep the secret most religiously, and to inform none but the Queen and Leicester of "the great attempt then on the eve of being put in execution." "You have heard," they said, "of divers discords and jars between this Queen and her husband, partly for that she hath refused him the Crown matrimonial, partly for that he hath assured knowledge of such usage of herself, as altogether is intolerable to be borne, which, if it were not overwell known, we would both be very loth to think that it could be true. To take away this occasion of slander, he is himself determined to be at the apprehension and execution of him whom he is able manifestly to charge with the crime, and to have done him the most dishonour that can be to any man, much more being as he is." They then go on to detail the arrangements entered into by the conspirators, and conclude their despatch with these words: "If persuasions to cause the Queen to yield to these matters do no good, they purpose to proceed we know not in what sort. If she be able to make any power at home, she shall be withstood, and herself kept from all other counsel than her own nobility. If she seek any foreign support, the

Scots to the Earls." Endorsed in Cecil's hand, *Primo Martii, 1565* (1566, as the year still ended at Easter). Tytler, vol. v., pp. 338, 339.

Queen's majesty, our Sovereign, shall be sought, and sued unto to accept his and their defence, with offers reasonable to her Majesty's contentment. These are the things which we thought and think to be of no small importance ; and knowing them certainly intended, and concluded upon, thought it our duties to utter the same to you, Mr. Secretary, to make declaration thereof as shall seem best to your wisdom." \*

Elizabeth was thus duly informed of the plot, and offered no opposition to it. Neither Mary Stuart, thus shamefully betrayed, nor David Riccio, thus fatally menaced, had any suspicion of the conspiracy formed against the power and honour of the one, and against the life of the other, although this dark intrigue was known to so many persons. The Queen was not, however, ignorant of the deep aversion entertained by her nobility for her favourite secretary. In a paper† in which she expressed her opinions on this matter, she replied with cutting sarcasm to those nobles who, priding themselves upon the merits of their ancestors, and considering themselves, as they said, better instructed and more liberally educated than all other persons, desired to have the entire administration of the State in their own hands, under the pretext that they could devote to its service more honour and greater property than any one else. She found that in general, instead

\* MS. letter, State-Paper Office, 6th March, 1566, Bedford and Randolph to Cecil. Tytler, vol. v., p. 340.

† Printed in Labanoff's Collection, vol. vii., pp. 297-299.

of being valiant and wise like their ancestors, they were sticklers for their family, careless of their honour, rash and traitorous, loving only to command, and setting at nought the monarch and the laws. She asked herself whether, under these circumstances, it would be right to allow them to disregard or diminish the royal authority, and to respect none but their own; and she added: "If the Sovereign finds a man of low estate, poor in means, but generous in mind, faithful in heart, and well adapted to fill an office in his service, he will not dare to entrust him with any authority, because the nobles who already possess power are ever craving for more!"\* She had therefore firmly resolved to support Riccio against them, as he was a man of low condition, but generous mind, and faithful heart.

Riccio, on his part, reckoning on the energetic support of the courageous Queen, was utterly devoid of fear. He had, however, been warned to be on his guard by an astrologer, named Damiot, whom he was in the habit of consulting. But the mysterious hints of this person, who bade him, it is said, beware of the bastard, (evidently alluding to George Douglas, the natural son of the Earl of Angus,) pointed, as he thought, to Murray.† But as Murray, then in banishment, had recently besought Riccio's influence to obtain his pardon, the too confident favourite derided this equivocal

\* Printed in Labanoff's Collection, vol. vii., p. 299.

† Knox, History, vol. ii., pp. 521, 522.. Spotswood, p. 194. Tytler, vol. v., p. 342.

admonition. He took no precautions, and continued to live in imprudent familiarity with the Queen.\*

Mary Stuart, having discovered that the English Ambassador had furnished Murray with a supply of money at the time of his rebellion, gave Randolph orders, on the 17th of February, to quit Scotland, and he had accordingly retired to Berwick. She had convoked her Parliament to ratify the condemnation of Murray and the banished lords. She opened it in person on the 7th of March, appointed the Lords of the Articles on the same day, and restored to the spiritual estate of the realm the place in Parliament which it had occupied before the occurrence of the change in the national religion, in order, as she states herself, "to have done some good anent restoring the auld religion, and to have proceeded against our rebels according to their demerits."† The act of forfeiture to be passed against the exiles was drawn up, and was to be voted on Tuesday, the 12th of March. But the conspirators did not delay so long, and chose Saturday, the 9th of March, for the execution of their plan, which was vigorously seconded by the Presbyterian ministers.

On the 3rd of March commenced the week of the great general fast of the Reformed Church, which had

\* "This David Rizio was so foolish, that not only had he drawn unto him the management of all affairs, the King being set asidde, but also his equipage and train did surpass the King's; and at the Parliament that was to be, he was ordained to be Chancellor." Knox, vol. ii., p. 521.

† Mary Stuart to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 2nd April, 1566; in Labanoff, vol. i., p. 343; and Keith, p. 330.

brought all the most zealous Protestants to Edinburgh. Knox and Craig, who were both privy to the conspiracy, chose subjects for sermons calculated to inflame the public mind, and prepare it for what was about to happen. The Bible abounded in startling examples of punishment. The death of Oreb and Zeeb, the defeat of the Benjamites, the history of Esther, and the execution of Haman, all impressed upon these alarmed and violent men the duty of inflicting swift and summary vengeance on the enemies of the people of God.\* At this time the enemy of the people of God was the poor Italian secretary, who was detested as a foreigner, envied as a favourite, and feared as a Catholic; and whom the nobles engaged in the conspiracy had resolved to sacrifice in the presence of the Queen herself.

On the Saturday evening, as it had been agreed, Morton, Ruthven, and Lindsay proceeded, with about two hundred armed men, to Darnley's apartments in Holyrood Palace, which were situated below those of Mary Stuart.† He had supped earlier than usual, and was quite ready to receive them. At eight o'clock he went up to the Queen's chamber by a secret staircase, followed at a short distance by Ruthven, George

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 343. See also his *Historical Remarks on Knox's Implication in the Murder*, Appendix, vol. v., pp. 498—507.

† “*Comparvero circa ducento homini bene armati alle camere del Re, il quale era appunto alloggiato sotto la camera stessa della Reina, or dissero queste medesime parole: 'Sire, noi siamo qua pronti.' Et senza dir altro, il Re s'incaminò per una lumaga segreta verso la camera della Reina.*” *Memoir addressed to Cosmo I., Grand Duke of Tuscany*, extracted from the Archives of the Medici, and published in *Labanoff*, vol. vii., pp. 63-80.

Douglas, Andrew Ker of Faudonside, and Patrick Bellenden;\* whilst Morton and Lindsay, with their men, occupied the court-yard, and seized the gates of the palace. Darnley was the first to enter the Queen's cabinet, a little room of about twelve feet square, where he found Mary Stuart at supper with her natural sister, the Countess of Argyle,† and attended by David Riccio, who had "his cappe upon his heade,"‡ the Commendator of Holyrood,§ the Laird of Creich, Arthur Erskine,|| and some others of her household. He took his seat behind the Queen, who turned towards him, and embraced him affectionately.¶

A minute had scarcely elapsed before Ruthven, clad in complete armour, and pale and haggard with disease, broke into the room. He was followed almost immediately by George Douglas, Faudonside, and Patrick Bellenden, armed with daggers and pistols. This invasion of her private apartments, at such an

\* Labanoff, vol. i., p. 333. Tytler, vol. v., p. 344. Ellis's Original Letters, first series, vol. ii., p. 213.

† Lady Jane Stuart, natural daughter of James V. and Elizabeth, the daughter of Lord John Carmichael. She married the Earl of Argyle in 1554, and was separated from him in 1564.

‡ Despatch of Bedford and Randolph to the Council, 27th March, 1567; in Wright's Elizabeth and her Times, vol. i., p. 227.

§ Lord Robert Stuart, the natural son of James V. and Euphemia Elphinstone, whom the King his father appointed Commendator of the Abbey of Holyrood. He joined the Reformers in 1560. In 1569, he exchanged his abbey for the temporalities of the bishopric of Orkney, which was made an earldom on the 28th of October, 1581. Knox, vol. i., p. 458, note 4.

|| Erskine of Blackgrange, cousin-german of Lord John Erskine, and captain of the Queen's guard. Knox, vol. ii., p. 288.

¶ "El Re se puso dietro la sedia della Reina, la quale subito rivoltata si bacciorno insieme." Memoir addressed to Cosmo I., Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 73.

hour and with such weapons, left Mary Stuart no doubt of the sinister design of the King and the conspirators. She demanded of Ruthven what was his business, and by whose permission he had ventured to enter her presence.\* Ruthven replied, pointing to Riccio, "Let it please your Majesty that yonder man David come forth of your privy-chamber, where he hath been over long." "What offence hath he done?" said the Queen. Ruthven answered, "That he made a greater and more heinous offence to her Majesty's honour, the King her husband, the nobility and commonwealth."† The Queen then said that if any one had any charge to bring against David, she would cite him before the Lords of Parliament, and she ordered Ruthven to retire under pain of treason.‡ Ruthven, however, paying no attention to her commands, approached Riccio to seize him. But he took refuge behind the Queen, crying out in his broken language, "Madame, je suis mort! Giustizia, giustizia! Sauve ma vie, Madame, sauve ma vie!"§ In his attempts to avoid the danger which threatened him, the table was thrown down upon the Queen, who was six months gone with child, and who strove to defend him from the

\* "La Reina li disse chi lo facesse andare in quel luogo in quell' hora, et chi gliene haveva data licentia?" Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 73.

† Ruthven's Narrative, in Keith, Appendix, p. 123.

‡ "Also we commanded the Lord Ruthven, under the pain of treason, to avoyd him forth of our presence; declaring we should exhibite the said David before the Lords of Parliament, to be puniaht, if any sorte he had offended." Letter from Mary Stuart to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 2nd April, 1566; in Labanoff, vol. i., p. 344.

§ Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 74. Birrel's Diary, p. 5.

assassins, whose short swords and pistols were for a moment turned against herself.\* Riccio had seized the pleats of her gown, and clung tightly to them. Darnley, however, loosed his hands; and whilst the rest were carrying off their victim, he held the Queen in his arms,† that she might make no farther efforts to save him.

Alarmed at the danger of her unfortunate servant, and not altogether without fear for herself,‡ Mary implored the pity of the conspirators for Riccio,§ who, while he was being dragged away, reminded Darnley of the good services which he had rendered him.|| Darnley hypocritically assured the Queen that they would do him no harm.¶ The poor and trembling Italian was dragged from her cabinet, and through her bedroom to the entrance of her presence chamber,

\* "Notwithstanding Lord Ruthven perforce invadit him in our presence (he then for refuge took safeguard, having retired him behind our back), and with his complices cast down our table upon ourself, put violent hands on him, struck him over our shoulders with whinzeards, one part of them standing before our face with bended daggs." Letter from Mary Stuart to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 2nd April, 1566; Labanoff, vol. i., p. 344.

† "David took the Quene by the blyghtes (pleats) of her gowne, and put himself behynde the Quene, who wold gladly have saved him; but the King havinge loosed his hands, and holdinge her in his arms, &c." Despatch from Bedford and Randolph to the Council, Ellis, vol. ii., p. 210. "Il Re la prese, et l'abbraciò tenendola in modo che non si poteva muovere." Despatch to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, 8th October, 1566; Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 93.

‡ "In doing whereof, we were not only struck with great dreadour, but also by sundrie considerations was most justly induced to take extream fear of our life." Letter from Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow; Labanoff, vol. i., p. 345.

§ "La Regina gridava che non dovessino farli male per amor di lei." Despatch to Cosmo I.; Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 93.

|| "Dicendo anco al Re se voleva comportare che l'ammazassino davanti li suoi ochi, sovvenendoli li buoni et fedeli serviti che gl' haveva fatto." Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 93.

¶ "Lasciatelo andare, Madama, disse, che non le sarà fatto alcun male." Ibid.



which was close at hand.\* He found there most of the conspirators, waiting for their victim. Morton and Lindsay wished to keep him until the next day, and then to hang him; † but George Douglas, more impatient than they, struck him, while on the staircase, with the King's dagger, which he had got hold of, and called out that that was the royal blow. ‡ The others immediately rushed upon him, nor did they think their work complete until the body was mangled with fifty-six wounds. His corpse was thrown out of window into the court-yard, and carried thence to the porter's lodge. §

On being informed of the completion of the murder, the Queen, full of sorrow and anger, gave utterance to her feelings with regard to Darnley. She reproached him with having authorised so cowardly an action, and with having inflicted such a disgrace upon her, who had taken him from his humble condition, and raised him to the throne; and she called him a traitor, and son of a traitor. || Darnley, in his turn, reproached her

\* He was not murdered in the Queen's cabinet and in her presence, as it has frequently been asserted. Testimonies are unanimous on this point. The Queen herself states the fact in her letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow: "They most cruelly took him forth of our cabinet." Labanoff, vol. i., p. 345. "Presero David nel collo, per trascinarlo fuori del camerino." Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 74. "Fu preso davanti li suoi occhi, et menato fuori del gabinetto." Despatch to Cosmo I., in Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 93. "He was not slayne in the Queen's presence, as was said, but goinge downe the stayers owte of the chamber of presence." Despatch of Randolph and Bedford, in Ellis, vol. ii., pp. 210, 211. † Ellis, vol. ii., p. 210.

‡ "Fu uno che arditamente mise la mano all'estesso pugnale del Re . . . et diede un colpo a David, lasciendogli il pugnale nelle schiene, et dissegli esser quello il colpo del Re." Memoir addressed to Cosmo I.; Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 74.

§ Narrative of Morton and Ruthven, in Keith, Appendix, p. 126.

|| "Allora voltata la Reina verso il Re gli disse: 'Ha traditore, figliuolo di traditore, questa è la ricompensa che hai dato a colui che t'ha fatto tanto bene et honor

with having avoided his company for several months, with having frequently refused to remain with him any longer than while David was present, and with having at last admitted Riccio to her society more often than himself. "It is for this reason," he added, "for your honour and my own contentment, that I gave my consent that he should be taken away."\* "My lord," replied Mary, "all the offence that is done me, you have the wite thereof, for the which I shall be your wife no longer, nor lie with you any more, and shall never like well till I cause you to have as sorrowful a heart as I have at this present."† At this moment, Ruthven, faint from sickness, and reeking from the scene of blood, entered the room. He desired her Majesty's permission to sit down, and asked for a cup of wine. He then roughly told the Queen that they had put Riccio to death, because he was a disgrace to herself, and a curse to her kingdom; and because the pernicious influence which he exercised over her, had induced her to tyrannise over the nobility, to banish the exiled lords, to maintain close and blameworthy connections with foreign princes, in order that she might restore the ancient religion, and to admit into her council the Earls of Bothwell and Huntly, who were both of them traitors. Mary Stuart,

*così grande; questo è il riconoscimento che dai a me per haverti inalzato a dignità così alta!*" Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 75. "She blamed greatly her howsbonde, that was the autor of so fowle an acte." Ellis, vol. ii., p. 211.

\* Ellis, vol. ii., p. 211.

† Ruthven's Narrative, in Keith, Appendix, p. 124.

thus humiliated, wept bitterly, and answered him with bitter menaces. "Well," she said, "it shall be dear blood to some of you." Ruthven, whose rude energy was excited by the disease under which he sank in less than two months afterwards, added, "God forbid! for the more your Grace shows yourself offended, the world will judge the worse."\* Deprived of a dear and devoted servant, wounded in her honour, and despoiled of her power, Mary Stuart was now a prisoner in the hands of her enemies.

The Earls of Huntly and Bothwell† having heard that Murray and Argyle were expected on the next day, and believing that they were in as much danger as Riccio, escaped out of one of the palace windows by means of a cord, which enabled them to descend into the fields. The Earl of Athol, the Lords Fleming and Livingston,‡ and Sir James Balfour, who were in Holyrood when the conspirators invaded the palace and Riccio was killed, also took to flight. On being informed of the tumult in the palace, the inhabitants of Edinburgh were greatly alarmed. The Provost of the city, at the information of Sir James Melvil,§ had sounded the tocsin, and at the head of a

\* Ellis, vol. ii., p. 212. See Appendix E, on the connection between Mary Stuart and Riccio.

† Letter from Mary Stuart to the Archbishop of Glasgow; in Lehanoff, vol. i., pp. 345, 346. Ellis, vol. ii., p. 212.

‡ John, fifth Lord Fleming, hereditary Lord High Chamberlain of Scotland, succeeded to his title in 1558. William Livingston was fifth Lord of Callendar. Both remained constantly attached to the cause of the Queen.

§ Melvil's Memoirs, p. 150.

body of armed citizens, had presented himself at the palace gates to enquire what was going on, and demanded to be admitted to the presence of the Queen. But the conspirators refused to admit him, and threatened, if she attempted to see and speak to them, to put the Queen to death, and throw her over the walls.\* As the citizens insisted on an explanation, the King went out and informed them that the Queen was in safety, that no harm had happened to her, and that only the Italian Secretary had been put to death, because he had conspired with the Pope and the King of Spain to introduce foreign troops into the country to conquer it and restore the ancient religion.† Darnley then commanded them on their allegiance to go home.‡ His orders were instantly obeyed; and the Queen, hopeless of receiving any assistance, remained captive in her room during the whole of this terrible night, and was not even allowed the company of her servants and gentlewomen.§ She felt it was necessary to control her feelings, to dissimulate her intentions, and to divide her enemies, that she might first escape from their hands, and then take vengeance upon them. And this she did with patient artifice and well-planned hatred.

\* "Who in our face declared, if we desired to have spoken them, they should cut us in collops and cast us over the walls." Letter from Mary Stuart to the Archbishop of Glasgow; Labanoff, vol. i., p. 346.

† Despatch to Cosmo I.; in Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 94.

‡ Knox, vol. ii., p. 522. Labanoff, vol. i., p. 346.

§ Labanoff, vol. i., p. 346.

## CHAPTER V.

FROM THE ASSASSINATION OF RICCIO TO MARY'S MARRIAGE  
WITH BOTHWELL.

Mary's Reconciliation with Darnley—Pardon of Murray and the other Exiles—Punishment of Riccio's Murderers—Birth of the Prince Royal of Scotland—Mary's Aversion to Darnley—Her Attachment to Bothwell—Her Illness—Plots against Darnley's Life—His Alarm and Illness—Pardon of Riccio's Murderers—Murder of Darnley—Public Indignation—Trial and Acquittal of Bothwell—His Marriage with the Queen.

THE Queen's marriage with Darnley had once more involved Scotland in civil warfare ; the assassination of Riccio plunged it in conspiracies and murders. The history of this distracted kingdom, for several years, presents one unvarying scene of treason, violence, and intrigue. All persons took their part in these proceedings ; the King, the Queen, and three Regents, were all mixed up with them at different periods, and to a greater or less extent. Assassination, imprisonment, and the scaffold were their lot. Such is the ordinary fate of persons of unbridled passions, or unregulated interests. They find their punishment where they had sought their satisfaction.

During the fearful night which followed Riccio's murder, Mary Stuart was plunged in the deepest affliction.

She was a prisoner in her palace, which was closely guarded by Morton and the other conspirators. On the next day, Darnley spoke and acted as King. He pronounced the dissolution of the Parliament, and commanded its members, on pain of treason, to leave Edinburgh within three hours.\* He also wrote, with his own hand, to enjoin the Provost of the city to keep a vigilant watch, and suffer none but Protestants to leave their houses. When he went into the Queen's chamber, he found her in a state of the most painful agitation. The tragic spectacle which she had witnessed, the threatening recollections which rang in her ears, the image of the terrible Ruthven, who seemed ready to strike her down, and the dark designs which she feared were entertained against her by a nobility accustomed not to respect their monarchs, had thrown her into a sort of delirium. At the sight of her anguish, pity revived affection in Darnley's heart. He obtained permission from the confederates that her gentlewomen should go to her assistance ; but none of them, however, were allowed to pass "muffled" from her chamber, lest the prisoner should escape under the disguise of one of them.† From that moment Mary Stuart, expecting deliverance from herself alone, employed all her address and all her dissimulation to obtain it.

When Murray, to meet whom she had despatched

\* Keith, Appendix, p. 126. Lehanoff, vol. i., p. 346.

† Ruthven's Narrative, in Keith, Appendix, pp. 126-127.

Sir James Melvil, arrived on Sunday evening with the other banished lords,\* she summoned him at once to her presence. On seeing him she threw herself into his arms in an agony of tears, and exclaimed, "Ah! my brother, if you had been here, you never would have suffered me to have been thus cruelly handled."† Murray appeared moved. But, nevertheless, on the next day all the conspirators met together, and deliberated upon the course they intended to take. They seemed disposed to confer the matrimonial crown and the government of the kingdom on Darnley, to complete the establishment of Protestantism, and to confine the Queen in Stirling Castle until she had given her sanction to all their deeds.‡ This plan, which is attributed to them by Mary Stuart, and which they did not realise until the year following, was at this time foiled by the ability of the Queen and the weakness of Darnley.

During the numerous private interviews which Mary had with her husband, she represented to him the miserable position in which he would be placed with regard to the nobles if he permitted them to conquer her, and the danger to which he would be exposed by the princes, her allies, if he suffered any further

\* Ellis, vol. ii., p. 213. Labanoff, vol. i., p. 347.

† Melvil's Memoirs, p. 151.

‡ "In their council they thought it most expedient we should be warded in our castle of Streviling, there to remain while we had approved in Parliament all their wicked interprizes, establish their religion, and given to the King the crown matrimonial, and the hail government of our realme; or else, by all appearance, firmly purposed to have put us to death, or detained us in perpetual captivity." Letter from Mary Stuart to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 2nd April, 1566. Labanoff, vol. i., p. 347.

alterations in the religious state of the realm.\* She had no difficulty in gaining him over to her side. Darnley was vain and weak, with an ambitious mind, but a timorous heart. Notwithstanding the harsh and humiliating explanations which the husband and wife had lately interchanged, Darnley forgot the injury which he pretended had been done to his honour, and Mary passed over the outrage which had just been inflicted on her reputation, and the violence with which her authority had so recently been attacked. Abandoning his friends and their projects, Darnley consented to procure the Queen's escape, and to accompany her in her flight.

This escape could be effected only by deceiving the other conspirators. On Monday, therefore, Darnley announced to them that the Queen had been seized with fever, and was threatened with miscarriage, unless she were allowed a change of air. He assured them at the same time, that she was ready to pardon all that they had done, to satisfy them personally of her forgiveness, and to sign such acts as they might judge necessary for their safety. The conspirators at first declared that this proposition was a mere artifice, and advised Darnley to be on his guard. But Darnley reiterated his perfect confidence in the Queen's good faith, and led Morton, Ruthven, and Murray into her presence. Mary told them that she had never desired to take away the life or lands of any of her nobility ; and that, continuing to

\* Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 347, 348.



act as she had done ever since her return to Scotland, she would restore the exiles to favour, pardon the murderers of Riccio, and forget all that had occurred. She sent them away to draw up, for her signature, such articles as they might consider necessary for their security.\* Then, taking Darnley by one hand, and Murray by the other, she walked with them for some time in a confiding and friendly manner.

Forced to yield to the wishes of the King, who was about to desert them, and to comply with the Queen's request, the conspirators drew up the act which was destined to provide for their security, and gave it to Darnley, who promised to obtain the Queen's signature. He also requested them to leave her under his guardianship alone, that she might appear free to act, and to give such orders as she might please; and assured them that he would answer for all that happened. On Monday evening, therefore, they left Holyrood Palace with their men, not however, without giving the King to understand that they feared he was playing them false, and that they expected the Queen and himself would retire, either to the Castle of Edinburgh or Dunbar. "And the Lord Ruthven protested that what bloodshed or mischief should ensue thereon, should fall upon the King's head and his posterity, and not upon theirs."†

The suspicions of the conspirators were realised. At

\* Ruthven's Narrative, in Keith, Appendix, p. 128. † Keith, p. 128, 129.

midnight, on the 11th of March, Mary Stuart, accompanied by Darnley and Arthur Erskine, her captain of the guard, secretly left Holyrood, mounted on fleet horses, and fled to Dunbar.\* As soon as she had arrived there, she convoked her nobility to meet her in arms. On Tuesday morning, when the confederated lords discovered that she had escaped without signing the articles which she had promised them, they sent Lord Semple after her to demand the performance of her promise. But she made him wait for three days without an answer. Then, finding herself at the head of an army which had been collected for her by the Earls of Bothwell, Huntly, Athol, Marshall, and Caithness, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and the Lords Hume and Yester, she abandoned all further disguise.† On the 16th of March she published a proclamation ‡ against the rebels who had dared to shed blood in her palace, and to hold herself in captivity. Wisely bent on dividing her enemies, she effected a reconciliation with Murray, Argyle, Glencairn, and Rothes, on condition that they should not join the murderers of Riccio.§ She pursued all these with implacable resentment. Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, George Douglas, Andrew Ker of Faudonside, and sixty-five other

\* Keith, Appendix, p. 129. Labanoff, vol. i., p. 348. Ellis, vol. ii., p. 214.

† Ruthven's Narrative, in Keith, Appendix, p. 129. Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 348, 349. Wright, vol. i., p. 230.

‡ Printed in Keith, Appendix, p. 130.

§ Melvil's Memoirs, p. 66. Labanoff, vol. i., p. 348.

lairds or gentlemen\* were cited to appear before her to answer for their share in the crime; and she marched upon Edinburgh, where they still remained, but whence they fled to England on her approach. Mary Stuart returned into the city, where she had been outraged and made prisoner, with an earnest desire for vengeance, and full power to gratify her wish.

She ordered the Earl of Lennox never again to appear at her Court.† Lethington was deprived of his office of Secretary of State, and directed to retire to Inverness.‡ Joseph Riccio was appointed the Queen's Private Secretary in the place of his brother David, § to whose remains great honours were done. || The principal authors of the murder having taken flight, Mary ordered that several of the subaltern accomplices, who had guarded the gates of the palace during its perpetration, and who thought their obscurity would save them from punishment, should be seized and put to death. ¶ In the violence of her animosity, she imprisoned the Laird of Drumlanrig and his son, the Provost of Glenkonden, who were not in Edinburgh at the time of Riccio's assassination, but who had refused

\* Keith, Appendix, pp. 129-131. A list of their names will be found annexed to the despatch of Bedford and Randolph to the Council, in Wright, vol. i., p. 231; and Ellis, vol. ii., pp. 220-222.

† Wright, vol. i., p. 234. Ellis, vol. ii., p. 222.

‡ Ellis, vol. ii., pp. 216-217. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 67.

§ Keith, Appendix, p. 129.

|| Laing's History of Scotland, 3rd edition, vol. i., p. 50, note 8.

¶ Keith, p. 334. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 67.

to join a league formed for the purpose of discovering and punishing all those who had been concerned in the conspiracy.\*

Darnley, on his part, had been obliged to disavow all connection with the plot in a public declaration which was proclaimed at Edinburgh on the 20th of March. He therein contradicted the calumnious reports by which wicked persons had dared to associate him in what he termed "the late cruel murder committed in presence of the Queen's Majesty, and treasonable detaining of her Majesty's most noble person in captivity." "His Grace," he added, "for the removing of the evil opinion which the good subjects may be induced to conceive through such false reports and seditious rumours, hath, as well to the Queen's Majesty as in the presence of the Lords of Secret Council, plainly declared upon his honour, fidelity, and the word of a Prince, that he never knew of any part of the said treasonable conspiracy whereof he is slanderously and falsely accused, nor never counselled, commanded, consented, assisted, nor approved the same." † He confessed, however, that he had, without the Queen's knowledge, consented to the return of the Earls of Murray, Glencairn, and Rothes, and the other exiles from England.

This disavowal did not restore him to the favour of the Queen, to whom he even went so far as to denounce

\* Wright, vol. i., p. 233. Ellis, vol. ii., pp. 217-221-222.

† Ellis, vol. ii., p. 222.

the Secretary Lethington, the Justice-clerk Bellenden, and the Clerk-register Makgill, as having been concerned in the conspiracy.\* But his conduct brought him nothing but dishonour, and completely ruined him in the opinion of his accomplices. They could not learn, without the utmost indignation, the breach of faith of which he had been guilty. To have incited them to conspire for the defence of his honour and the increase of his power, and then to separate from them and betray them to the vengeance of the Queen, appeared to them the basest treason. In revenge for his faithlessness, therefore, they communicated to Mary Stuart the two bonds † which he had signed, and by which it had been determined to confer on him the matrimonial crown, and to murder Riccio. The Queen had previously thought that, blinded for a moment by jealousy, he might have acted without due reflection. But now, informed of the whole extent of his criminality, she for ever withdrew from him her confidence, and regarded him with feelings of unmitigated disgust. He was evermore considered by her as an ungrateful husband, a perfidious conspirator, and a cowardly liar.

From this time forth she manifested an insurmountable aversion to him. Already, before her return to Edinburgh, she had displayed the real feelings which

\* MS. letters, State Paper Office ; Forster to Cecil, 16th May, and Randolph to Cecil, 13th May, 1566. Tytler, vol. v., p. 359.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office ; Randolph to Cecil, 4th April, 1566. Tytler, vol. v., p. 352.

she entertained concerning him, although it was still her interest to dissimulate them. She often expressed her views to James Melvil, who had temporarily succeeded Lethington as Secretary of State. "The Queen," says Melvil in his Memoirs, "lamented unto me the King's folly, ingratitude, and misbehaviour; I excused the same the best I could, imputing it to his youth, which occasioned him to be easily led away by pernicious counsel, laying the blame upon George Douglas, and other bad counsellors; praying her Majesty, for many necessary considerations, to remove out of her mind any prejudice against him, seeing that she had chosen him herself against the opinion of many of her subjects. But I could perceive nothing from that day forth but great grudges that she entertained in her heart."\* Mary's hatred of Darnley increased with her contempt. She withdrew him more than ever from any share in public business, which she conducted with the assistance of the Earls of Bothwell, Huntly, and Athol, and the Catholic Bishop of Ross, who possessed her entire confidence; and she condemned him to a life of isolation in the midst of her Court. Melvil, who beheld with grief and alarm the progress of her antipathy, vainly advised her to pardon her husband, and become reconciled with him; but his interference

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 66. Randolph informs us, "The King is not loved by the Queen, on account of the said murder. The people hated him, because he had broken his oath to the conspirators." Letter from Randolph to Cecil, 4th April, 1566; in Robertson, Appendix 16.

was considered importunate and troublesome, and he was obliged to desist.\* The Queen called him a traitor and flatterer, because he had given a spaniel to the neglected king, † and she forbade him to hold further converse with him. "He went up and down all alone," adds Melvil, "seeing few durst bear him company." ‡

Mary Stuart did not proceed to further extremes against Darnley, until her passion for another was added to her increasing repugnance to himself. The time of her confinement was now at hand. Rendered mistrustful by the plots which had been laid in so short an interval, with the intention of seizing her person in the defiles of Kinross, and of overthrowing her authority in the palace of Holyrood, she proceeded to Stirling Castle, that she might be brought to bed there in perfect safety. On the 19th of June, between nine and ten o'clock in the morning, § she gave birth to that royal infant, of whom the Scottish nobles made use, thirteen months afterwards, to dispossess her of the throne, and who, after having reigned thirty-five years in Scotland under the title of James VI., succeeded Elizabeth on the English throne as James I. As soon as he was born, Melvil was dispatched to inform the English Queen of the event, which so closely concerned both kingdoms, and to request her to act as godmother

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 67.

† Letter from the Earl of Bedford to Cecil, 3rd August, 1566; in Robertson, Appendix 17.

‡ Melvil's Memoirs, p. 67.

§ Keith, p. 338. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 69.

to the Prince of Scotland. Elizabeth was at Greenwich, giving a ball to her Court, when Cecil, the Secretary of State, and Mary Stuart's envoy, arrived. Cecil went up to her while she was dancing, and whispered the news into her ear. She was filled with sudden melancholy by the intelligence. Interrupting the dance, she sank dejectedly into an arm-chair, and said to the ladies who surrounded her, "That the Queen of Scots was mother of a fair son, while she was but a barren stock."\*

But although Elizabeth sometimes gave impetuous flow to her feelings, no one was better skilled in subduing and disguising them. At the audience which she granted Melvil on the following day, she received him with a smiling countenance, and appeared rejoiced at the event, though it really caused her great grief, and gave her a successor in spite of all her wishes to the contrary. She thanked him for bringing her such good news, and "gladly condescended to be a gossip to the Queen."† She immediately sent Sir Henry Killebrew to congratulate the Queen of Scotland on her behalf, to assure her of her friendship, and to express her approbation of her conduct towards Riccio's murderers, whom she had nevertheless granted an asylum in her dominions.

The birth of the Prince of Scotland revived the question of the English succession. Melvil had received

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 70.

† Ibid.



orders to renew his solicitations to Elizabeth on this subject. Mary Stuart skilfully effected a junction between Murray, Argyle, and Lethington\* on the one hand, and Bothwell, Huntly, Athol, and the Bishop of Ross on the other; in the hope that they would have sufficient influence, the former on the Protestant party, and the latter on the Catholic party in England, to aid her in obtaining that which she had so ardently sought after for so many years. But at the same time that she was effecting a reconciliation between the principal personages of her realm, and was treating with favour the Lairds of Brunston, Ormiston, Hatton, and Calder, the leaders of the Presbyterian body†—the extreme Catholics thwarted her plans by recalling attention, at this moment, to her rights to Elizabeth's crown. A Scotchman, named Patrick Adamson, published at Paris a Latin work in which he recognised Mary Stuart as Queen of England, and designated her son Prince of Scotland, England, and Ireland.‡

Melvil's adroit suggestions led to no decisive result. Elizabeth, as usual, refused nothing, and promised as little. But the English Parliament ere long took up this important question. The Commons wished to settle it to the advantage of Protestantism, and con-

\* On the 2nd of August, five months after the murder, Lethington was pardoned and admitted to the Queen's presence. Cecil's Abstract, p. 169.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office; Forster to Cecil, 19th September, 1566. Tytler, vol. v., p. 356.

‡ Letter from Elizabeth to Mary Stuart, 2nd December, 1566. Labanoff, vol. vii., pp. 99, 100.

sequently, to the detriment of Mary Stuart. In spite of all the repugnance of Elizabeth, who would not consent to appoint her successor, for fear of thereby weakening her authority, the two Houses met on the 2nd of October, and debated the question of the transmission of the crown, which they thought to render pacific by making it legal. The debate was continued for some time, until the Queen of England, in great irritation, resolved to put an end to it, and summoned the members of Parliament before her. She explained to them her egotistical, but prudent, policy in the most imperious language; and told them that several among them, during the reign of her sister, had offered her their assistance, if she were desirous to obtain the crown, and that persons would not be wanting,\* under her own government, to disturb the general peace by similar intrigues, if she were to appoint her successor beforehand. "I am your natural Queen," she added in conclusion, "and although you show yourselves so adverse to my will in this affair, I will not consent to its being carried further." †

This injunction stopped the proceedings of the House of Lords; but had no such effect upon the Lower House, which continued the debate it had begun.

\* ". . . Entre los cuales havia havido algunos que, reinando su hermana, le ofrecian à ella ayuda y la querian mover à que quisiese procurar, en su vida, la corona; por lo cual se podia bien dare conocer que nombrandose sucesor no faltaria quien le andiese con semejantes platicas por turbar la paz comun." Gusman de Silva to Philip II., 11th November, 1566. Archives of Simancas, Inglaterra, fol. 819.

† ". . . Si aunque soy vuestra reyna natural os mostrais tan contrarios à mi voluntad en este negocio, el cual non consentire que pase adelante." Ibid.

Elizabeth was greatly irritated by this, and complained that the Commons were so strongly attached to their liberty that they forgot the submission which was due to their Prince. She sent them a positive order to cease all deliberation upon this subject, unless they would become guilty of disobedience to their sovereign.\* To this command the Lower House yielded submission, although it considered that such an order was an infringement of its freedom of discussion.† Elizabeth, who had thus vigorously opposed the choice of a Protestant heir, repressed, with no less vehemence, the desires of the Catholic aspirant to the succession. She intimated to Mary Stuart her extreme displeasure at Patrick Adamson's temerity, and pressed her to disavow, by some public act, a book, which, she said, "is so scandalous to you, so injurious to me, and so foolish in itself."‡ She added that this publication would be sufficient to procure her condemnation "as ungrateful to her who daily acted as her advocate against all her traducers." "You know, madam," she continued, "that there is nothing in the world which so much concerns my honour as that there should be no other Queen of England but myself." §

\* ". . . Y cuan aficionados estavan a su libertad sin mirar a la obediencia que devian a sus principes. . . Dixo me que les havia embiado un mandato, en que les ordenava que no tratasen mas dello, so pena que incurririan en caso de los que contraviener al mandato y obediencia del principe et que todos havian obedido." Gusman de Silva to Philip II., 11th November, 1566. Archives of Simancas Inglaterra, fol. 819.

† Silva to Philip II., 13th November, 1566. Ibid., fol. 819.

‡ Letter from Elizabeth to Mary Stuart, 2nd December, 1566. Labanoff, vol. vii., p. 100.

§ Ibid.

Notwithstanding Mary Stuart's ardent desire, the English succession remained in the same state of uncertainty as before. She still retained her claims, but had not succeeded in obtaining their recognition. She soon, however, compromised them, and, moreover, exposed herself to the loss of the crown of Scotland. After the birth of the Prince Royal, the misunderstanding increased between her husband and herself. A fatal passion, at this period, took possession of her heart. The object of this passion was the Earl of Bothwell, the most enterprising and dangerous man in Scotland. James Hepburn, fourth Earl of Bothwell, was then thirty years of age.\* He had succeeded his father in 1556, was possessed of large property, and held important offices in the kingdom. By his marriage with Lady Jane Gordon,† he had become the brother-in-law of the Earl of Huntly, and had united one of the most powerful families of the South with the most powerful family of the North. He was distinguished for great bravery, consummate audacity,‡ boundless and unscrupulous ambition. Equally undisguised in his plans

\* "James, fourth Earl of Bothwell, was served heir to his father, 3rd November, 1556. The retour bears, that his father died five weeks or thereabouts preceding; therefore the date of his birth may be fixed to 1536 or 1537, as Queen Mary describes him as in his very youth at his first entry into this realm, immediately after the decease of his father." Douglas's Peerage of Scotland, vol. i. p. 229.

† During the month of February, 1566, he had married Lady Jane Gordon, second daughter of George, fourth Earl of Huntly.

‡ When Bothwell returned from France to Scotland for the first time, Throckmorton wrote thus to Queen Elizabeth concerning him, on the 28th November, 1560: "He is a glorious, rash, and hazardous young man; and therefore it were meet his adversaries should both have an eye to him, and also keep him short." Hardwicke's State Papers, vol. i., p. 149.

as in his vices, \* he aspired first to gain the affection of the Queen, and afterwards to marry her. Although he was far from handsome, † his martial bearing, his taste for pleasure, the undaunted resolution of his character, his air of chivalrous devotion, and the easy and elegant continental manners beneath which he concealed the wild and extravagant passions of his country, charmed the imagination of the Queen, and gave Bothwell great influence over her. Mary Stuart sought to render Bothwell a faithful and useful servant; but she speedily found in him a lover and a master.

His progress in the royal favour, ‡ towards the end of the summer of 1566, was manifest to all. He arranged everything at his pleasure in the Court of Scotland, and was the sole director of his sovereign's will. The power which he wielded, and the reconciliation which had been effected between him, Huntly, Athol, Murray, Argyle, and Lethington, caused great alarm to the young King, whom Mary Stuart avoided and detested more and more. When he saw the Queen surrounded by men whom he considered were all his personal enemies, Darnley felt not merely offended, but

\* "I assure you Bothwell is as naughty a man as liveth, and much given to the detestable vices." Letter from Randolph to Cecil, 6th April, 1566; in Chalmers, vol. ii., p. 26.

† Brantôme, vol. v., p. 98.

‡ "Bothwell is still in favour, and has a great hand in the management of affairs." Bedford to Cecil, 9th August, 1566. "Now the Earl of Bothwell's favour increased, which discontented many." Melvil's Memoirs, p. 67. "The Earl Bothwell, whom the Queen preferred above all others, after the decease of David Rizio." Knox, vol. ii., p. 528.

believed that he was menaced. He turned towards the Catholic party in the hope of gaining their support ; wrote secretly to the Pope to denounce the Queen as lukewarm in the cause of religion ; and, in the excess of his fears, which were still premature, suspected that a plot had been formed against his life.\* He even formed the idea of retiring to the Continent. He had a ship in readiness to convey him to France, and, towards the end of September, his father having come to see him at Stirling, he informed him of his intention. The Earl of Lennox immediately wrote to Mary Stuart, who was then at Edinburgh, to acquaint her with her husband's determination, and to report the failure of his attempts to change his purpose.†

On the 29th of September, the very same day that the Queen received the Earl of Lennox's letter, which led her to believe that Darnley had already sailed from Scotland, he arrived at Holyrood Palace.‡ The weak-minded Prince formed plans, but never executed them ; after threatening a departure, he came to attempt a reconciliation. But the scene which occurred between the Queen and himself did not at all contribute to such a result. Mary at once assembled the members of her Council, and invited the French ambassador, Du Croc,

\* " When his letters were intercepted, and his practices discovered, he accused the nobles of a plot against his life." Tytler, vol. v., p. 356.

† Du Croc to Catherine de Medici, 17th October, 1566 ; in Labanoff, vol. i., p. 375. Letter from the Lords of the Council to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 8th October, 1566 ; in Keith, p. 348.

‡ Labanoff, vol. i. p. 376. Keith, p. 348.

to join them. In their presence she had an explanation with Darnley. She asked him plainly why he was desirous to leave Scotland, and what cause she had given him for wishing to take such a step? Darnley, who had come to seek an amicable meeting,\* and who did not expect to be thus closely questioned, was struck dumb with amazement. He had, doubtless, no inclination to enter upon the discussion of his grievances, and, at the same time, of his wrongs. The Lords of the Council repeated the question, but he still remained silent. Du Croc then told him that his departure involved the Queen's honour as well as his own, and that the blame would fall upon her Majesty or himself, according as she had given him some good reason for the step, or he had undertaken it without due cause; he, therefore, earnestly entreated him to explain himself. Thus urged, Darnley at length avowed that the Queen had not given him any cause for his conduct. This was all that Mary Stuart wished; she had extracted from her husband a declaration which fully justified her behaviour, and freed her from all reproach regarding him, whether he left the country or remained in it; accordingly she said that "she was satisfied." †

After this interview, which had not answered Darnley's expectations, and in which neither party had

\* "Je vois bien qu'il ne sçait où il en est, il voudroit que la reine le redemandast."  
Du Croc, in Labanoff, vol. i., p. 377.

† Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 376, 377. Keith, p. 349.

acted with sincerity,—for the King had been unwilling to declare the causes of his discontent, and the Queen had shown no disposition to put an end to them,—they were on less amicable terms than ever. The melancholy and inconsiderate young man, who could neither endure his fate nor free himself from it, who had lost the affection of the Queen, awakened her resentment, and deserved her contempt by his vulgar tastes, his unfounded pretensions, his listless pride, his resultless plans, his odious participation in Riccio's murder, and his cowardly desertion of those whom he had induced to perpetrate it, coldly took leave of Mary, and returned to Stirling, after having told her that she would not see him again for a long while.\* He wrote to her from thence that his motives for quitting Scotland were but too well-founded, and he based them upon the little confidence which she reposed in him, his deprivation of all authority, and the contempt and desertion which he experienced from the nobility, who had ceased to honour him when they perceived he was neglected by her Majesty.† No mention, however, was made in his letter of the fears which he had entertained for his life. He then continued his preparations for a departure which he was continually threatening,‡ but which, to his own

\* "Sy est que, en ce desespoir, sans occasion comme il déclara, il s'en alla et dist adieu à la royne, sans la baiser, l'assurant que sa Majesté ne le verroit de longtems." Du Croc, in Labanoff, vol. i., p. 377.

† Letter of the Lords of the Council to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 8th October, 1566; in Keith, p. 350.

‡ Labanoff, vol. i., p. 377.



and the Queen's misfortune, he never had the courage to carry into effect.

Far from offering any opposition to his departure, Mary Stuart proceeded about this time, and without inviting him to accompany her, towards the south-eastern frontier of her kingdom, which was disturbed by the quarrels of the insubordinate Borderers. The Armstrongs, Elliots, and Johnstones, three powerful families of Liddesdale, were then engaged in war with each other. On the 6th of October,\* the Queen had sent thither the Earl of Bothwell, with the title of Lord Lieutenant, to repress these disorders, and restore tranquillity. On the 8th, she repaired in person to Jedburgh to hold her assizes,† and to add the sanction of justice to that of armed force. On that same day,‡ Bothwell had, with great bravery, engaged in a personal conflict with John Elliot of Park, a notorious freebooter. In the scuffle Bothwell was severely wounded, and it was found necessary to convey him without loss of time to the neighbouring Castle of Hermitage. His illness furnished most conclusive proofs of Mary Stuart's attachment to him. "Understanding the certain report of this accident," says Crawford, "the Queen was so highly grieved in heart, that she took no repose in body until she saw him."§

\* Chalmers, vol. i., p. 294.

† "On the 8th of October, the Queen went out of Edinburgh to Jedburgh to hold a *justice aïre*." Birrel's Diary; in Chalmers, vol. i., p. 295.

‡ "On the same day, Bothwell was wounded in the hand by Elliot of Park." Ibid.

§ Crawford's Memoirs, quoted in Keith, p. 352.

The discharge of her judicial functions detained her at Jedburgh until the 15th of October; but, no sooner was she at liberty than she took horse and hastened to the Castle where her favourite lieutenant was lying wounded. She was accompanied on her journey by Murray and some other nobles. Although Hermitage was eighteen miles distant from Edinburgh, she went and returned on the same day.\* She spent an hour with Bothwell; and, notwithstanding the fatigues of the day, she sat up until late at night † writing to him whom she had just left. The prostration of strength which ensued, and, adds Crawford, “the great distress of her mind for the Earl of Bothwell,” ‡ threw her, the next day, into a most dangerous illness. She fell into a swoon, and remained for some hours at the point of death. She was then seized with a violent fever, and continued insensible for several days. When she had somewhat recovered from this apparently desperate state, § she thought her end was approaching, requested the nobles who were present to pray for her, confided her son to the guardianship of the Queen of England, || and sent to inform her husband of her precarious condition. ¶ Bothwell, now convalescent, \*\*

\* Keith, p. 352.

† Letter from Lethington to the Archbishop of Glasgow, in Laing's History of Scotland, vol. ii., p. 74; and Sharon Turner's History of the Reigns of Edward the Sixth, Mary, and Elizabeth, 2nd edition, vol. iv., pp. 68—73.

‡ Crawford's Memoirs, in Keith, p. 352.

§ See various letters to the Archbishop of Glasgow, in Keith, Appendix, pp. 133—135; and Laing, vol. ii., p. 73.

|| Keith, pp. 352—354.

¶ Keith, Appendix, p. 133.

\*\* “My Lord Boythwell is heir, quha convalescis weil of his woundis.” Letter  
VOL. I. R

had hastened to her with the other members of her Privy Council, and many of the most important nobles of the kingdom. Darnley did not arrive at Jedburgh until the 28th of October, two days after a favourable crisis had placed the Queen's life out of danger. Finding her so much recovered, he remained at Jedburgh only one night, and returned immediately to Glasgow.\* This tardy and hurried visit, equally devoid of cordiality and solicitude, was not calculated to restore good feeling between the Queen and her husband.

Mary Stuart's recovery was slow, and she was unable to leave Jedburgh for Kelso until the 8th of November. She travelled by short stages along the coast to Dunbar, and thence to Craigmillar Castle, about a league from Edinburgh, where she arrived on the 20th of November, and remained for nearly a fortnight.† She appeared careworn and melancholy, ready to sink under the weight of her trials and of the contradictory feelings which agitated her bosom. She still suffered from pains in her right side, and her liver also was disordered. "The Queen is not at all well," wrote the Ambassador Du Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow. "I do believe the principal part of her disease to consist of a deep grief and sorrow. Nor does it seem possible

from the Bishop of Ross to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 27th October, 1566; in Keith, Appendix, p. 136.

\* Chalmers, vol. i., p. 297. Sharon Turner, vol. iv., p. 68.

† Letter from Du Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 2nd December, 1566; in Keith, Preface, p. vii. On the 18th, Mary was still at Dunbar, whence she wrote to Cecil and to the English Council. See Labanoff, vol. i., pp. 380-382.

to make her forget the same. Still she repeats these words, 'I could wish to be dead.'"\* Her feelings were too manifest to escape the notice of any round her, and the clear-sighted Lethington describes the true cause of her trouble when he says: "It is an heart-break for her, to think that he should be her husband, and how to be free of him she sees no outlet."†

This knowledge of Mary Stuart's private feelings originated a number of fatal ideas in the minds of those who surrounded her. The members of her Privy Council, who were united by ties of kindred or friendship to Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, and the other murderers of Riccio, hoped, if we are to believe an account which was prepared under the inspiration and in the interest of Mary Stuart, to obtain their pardon by pandering to the Queen's present passion, before which all past resentments dwindled into insignificance. The astute Lethington organised this plan with consummate skill and perversity. Scrupulous in nothing, suiting his policy to the circumstances in which he was placed, now assisting Darnley against Riccio, and now plotting with Bothwell against Darnley,—he negotiated the return of the exiles at the price of a divorce, and if necessary, of a murder. He communicated his plan to Bothwell, who joined in it with all the ardour of his headstrong ambition, and made it known to Argyle and

\* Keith, Preface, p. vii.

† Letter from Lethington to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 24th October, 1566; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 74.

Huntly, who promised their co-operation. According to the statement of the Queen's friends, he mentioned it also to Murray, who offered no opposition to the scheme. After having concerted the matter among themselves, the new confederates repaired to Mary Stuart.\*

Lethington addressed her in their name. He reminded the Queen of the great and intolerable injuries that she had received from her husband, laying much stress upon the ingratitude which he had displayed towards her, and upon the offences of which he continued daily to be guilty. He then added that, if Her Majesty would be pleased to pardon the Earl of Morton and the Lords Ruthven and Lindsay, they, in concert with the rest of her nobility, would find means to separate her from her husband by a divorce, so that she would no longer be involved in disagreement with him. This proposition caused her no surprise. She at first gave her consent upon condition that the divorce should be legal, and should do no prejudice to the rights of her son.† But a divorce was not to be so easily obtained, since it would be necessary to allege

\* \* "The Protestation of the Eries of Huntley and Argyll, touching the murthour of the King of Scots," in Keith, Appendix, pp. 136-138. This Protestation was sent either by the Queen, or in her name, to the Earls of Huntly and Argyll, ready drawn up for their signature. Laing says, "During the subsequent conference at Westminster, (1568-69), she sent a Protestation touching the King's murder, to be signed again by Argyll and Huntly, and again returned." Vol. i., p. 20. Murray utterly denies having taken the part which was attributed to him at Craigmillar. After having said that his enemies calumniated him in his absence, he adds, that during the month of November, at Craigmillar, nothing was proposed in his presence, "tending to any unlawful or dishonourable end." See his Answer to the aforesaid Protestation, in Keith, Appendix, p. 138.

† Keith, Appendix, p. 137.

as the reason for it their near relationship, in reference to which the Pope had granted them a dispensation, or to bring Darnley to trial for adultery, or else to prosecute him on a charge of treason.

These difficulties could not escape Mary's notice, and she knew that she would be exposed either to the delays of an uncertain negotiation, or to the scandal of a disgraceful trial. She accordingly affected scruples, and said that she would willingly retire into France and leave Darnley in Scotland until he acknowledged his faults. But Lethington replied to her that the nobles of her kingdom would not allow her to do so; and he even ventured, in mysterious terms, to inform her of their dark designs. "Madam," he said, "soucey ye not, we are here of the principal of your Grace's nobility and Council, that shall find the means well to make your Majesty quit of him without prejudice of your son; and albeit that my Lord of Murray here present, be little less scrupulous for a Protestant than your Grace is for a Papist, I am assured he will look through his fingers thereto, and will behold our doings and say nothing to the same."\* The Queen understood the full meaning of this insinuation, and replied, that it was her pleasure nothing should be done "by which any spot might be laid upon her honour;" but she displayed no great indignation at the idea, and

\* Anderson's Collections, relating to the History of Mary, Queen of Scotland, vol. iv., p. 192. Keith, Appendix, p. 138.

contented herself with saying, "Better permit the matter remain in the state it is, abiding till God in his goodness put remedy thereto." Lethington took no heed of this slight opposition, and answered, "Madam, let us to guide the business among us, and your Grace shall see nothing but good, and approved by Parliament."\*

Such was this extraordinary conference. It was followed, on the part of the promoters of the homicidal league, by an act which gave its full signification to their last overture. They swore, by a bond or agreement, to cut off the King as a young fool and tyrant, who was an enemy to the nobility, and had conducted himself in an intolerable manner to the Queen. They also pledged themselves to stand by each other, and defend the deed as a measure of state. Sir James Balfour, a devoted partisan of Bothwell, drew up the bond, which was signed by Huntly, Lethington, Argyle, and himself, and placed in the hands of Bothwell. †

A month had not elapsed since the formation of this plot against the life of Darnley, when the baptism of his infant son took place at Stirling Castle. The Queen of England, who had consented to be his god-mother, appointed the Countess of Argyle to act as her representative, and despatched Bedford with a font of

\* Anderson's Collections, relating to the History of Mary, Queen of Scotland, vol. iv., p. 192. Keith, Appendix, p. 138.

† See the Laird of Ormiston's Confession, in Laing, vol. ii. pp. 321, 322. Tytler, vol. v., p. 368.

gold,\* to be used at the ceremony. It was performed on the 17th of December with much magnificence; and the Comte de Brienne, as well as the Ambassador Du Croc, attended on behalf of the King of France. Although the ceremony was performed according to the Roman Catholic ritual, by the Archbishop of St. Andrews,† its arrangement was committed to the Protestant Bothwell.‡ Darnley was not present, although he was then residing in Stirling Castle. At once irritated and ashamed, he had threatened two days before to leave the country. He remained, however, but shut himself up in his own apartments during the baptism and the festivities which succeeded. He requested an interview with the French ambassador, who refused to see him, because he was not upon good terms with the Queen. Du Croc himself tells us that he even went so far as to inform him, "that as it would not be very proper for him to come to my lodgings, so he might know that there were two passages to it; and if he should enter by the one, I should be constrained to go out by the other."§

What humiliation could have been greater than this? The King was contemned in the midst of the Court,—the father had no place at the baptism of his son. But this state of things, though intolerable to Darnley, was

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 369.

† Letter from Du Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 23rd December, 1566; in Keith, Preface, p. vii.

‡ MS. letter, State Paper Office; Sir John Foster to Cecil, 11th December, 1566. Tytler, vol. v., p. 369.

§ Keith, Preface, p. vii.



overwhelming to the Queen. Though she seemed to have thrown aside her sadness, and had momentarily recovered her natural amiability and grace while presiding over the festivities of the occasion, Mary soon relapsed into her former melancholy. She became pensive and mournful as before. Du Croc was one day sent for by her, and he found her "laid on a bed, weeping sore," and complaining of a violent pain in her side. He augured most alarming results from the increasing hostility of the King and Queen. In a letter which he wrote to the Archbishop of Glasgow, a few days after the baptism, he says: "I can't pretend to foretell how all may turn, but I will say that matters cannot subsist long as they are, without being accompanied with sundry bad consequences."\*

These consequences developed themselves with tragic rapidity. At the earnest entreaty of Lethington and Bothwell, Mary Stuart, laying aside her animosity against the principal murderers of Riccio, pardoned Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, and seventy-six other exiles. She excepted, indeed, from this act of mercy, two marked delinquents, George Douglas and Andrew Ker of Faudonside, because the former had stabbed Riccio over the Queen's shoulder, and the latter had presented a pistol to her breast.† On being informed of the speedy return of those who had once been his most steady

\* Keith, Preface, p. vii.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, 9th January, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 372.

adherents but were now his implacable enemies, Darnley was greatly terrified. He imagined that dark designs were intended against him, and in his alarm he abruptly left the Court and took up his residence with his father, the Earl of Lennox, at Glasgow. Shortly after his arrival there, he fell ill. Popular rumour, fully aware of the dangers to which he was exposed, though mistaken as to the cause of his indisposition, affirmed that he had been poisoned. The disease threw an eruption over his body, and proved to be the small-pox.\*

Meanwhile the plot against his life was steadily pursued. Bothwell continued to seek and obtain new accomplices. He had already gained the concurrence of Lord Caithness, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and the Laird of Ormiston ; and, no sooner had Morton returned to Scotland, in the beginning of January, 1567,† than Bothwell used every endeavour to obtain the co-operation of a man of such great resolution and importance. He paid him a visit at Whittingham, the seat of Archibald Douglas, his near relation. He informed him of his projected enterprise, and pressed him to join the plot, adding that the Queen had given her consent.‡ Morton was neither surprised nor

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, 9th January, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 372.

† Morton arrived at Berwick on the 10th January. MS. letter, State Paper Office, Morton to Cecil from Berwick, 10th January, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 377.

‡ Morton's Confession, in Laing, vol. ii., pp. 354-362, Appendix. Letter from Archibald Douglas to Queen Mary, April, 1568 ; in Robertson, Appendix 47 ; and Laing, vol. ii., pp. 363-369, Appendix.

disgusted by this proposition ; he was well aware of, and shared in, the excitable, interested, and violent passions of the Scottish nobles. But the banishment which he had just suffered had rendered him more circumspect, and he replied that he would have nothing to do with the matter, unless they brought him "the Queen's hand-writ for a warrant." Bothwell determined to try a second interview, to which Lethington was admitted, but not having been able to extort from Morton anything more than this conditional promise, he returned to Edinburgh to endeavour to obtain the Queen's written consent. He failed in this attempt ; and Lethington sent Archibald Douglas to inform Morton that the Queen "would receive no speech of the matter appointed unto him."\* Had Bothwell gone too far in making unauthorised use of Mary's name ? or did prudential motives alone induce Mary to refuse to give her sanction to the plot ?

However this may be, she still retained feelings of distrust and animosity towards Darnley, whom she now accused of conspiring against her life. According to statements attributed to William Hiegate and William Walcar, two servants of the Archbishop of Glasgow, but which they denied when they were interrogated and confronted, the King had resolved to seize the person of the young Prince his son, to have

\* Morton's Confession, in Laing, vol. ii., pp., 354-362, Appendix. Letter from Archibald Douglas to Queen Mary, April, 1568 ; in Robertson, Appendix 47 ; and Laing, vol ii., pp. 363-369, Appendix.

him crowned without delay, and to govern in his name. Out of fear of this chimerical plot, the Queen removed the Prince Royal from Stirling to Edinburgh, on the 14th of January, 1567, so as to guard against any surprise.\* The weak and impotent young man to whom this plot was attributed, possessed neither authority, adherents, nor character. He lived in the isolation and powerlessness of disgrace, and had been confined to his bed by his malady ever since the 5th of January. Mary nevertheless accused him of conspiracy, and after having mentioned his pretended designs in a letter which she wrote to the Archbishop of Glasgow, on the 20th of January, she added: "His behaviour and thankfulness to us is equally well known to God and the world; especially our own indifferent subjects see it, and in their hearts, we doubt not, condemn the same. Always we perceive him occupied and busy enough to have inquisition of our doings; which, God willing, shall always be such as none shall have occasion to be offended with them, or to report of us any ways but honourably, however he, his father, and their fautors speak, which we know want no good will to make us have ado, if their power were equivalent to their minds. But God moderates their forces well enough, and takes the means of the execution of their pretences from them."†

\* Deposition of Thomas Crawford, a gentleman in the service of the Earl of Lennox, M.S. State Paper Office, endorsed by Cecil, but without date. Tytler, vol. v., p. 378. Labanoff, vol. vii., pp. 396, 397.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 373.

On the day after she had expressed herself with such suspicious severity of Darnley, she set out for Glasgow, to lavish marks of the strongest affection upon him whom she judged so unfavourably, and detested so thoroughly. Darnley, who was still an invalid, was greatly surprised at this unexpected visit. He knew that Mary Stuart had recently spoken of him in very harsh terms, and he had received some vague warnings of the Craigmillar conspiracy. He did not conceal his apprehensions from the Queen, but told her that he had learned from the Laird of Minto, that she had refused to sign a paper which had been presented to her, authorising his seizure, and if he resisted, his assassination.\* He added that he would never think that she, who was his own proper flesh, would do him any hurt; and then, with more vanity than confidence, he declared that if any others should intend to injure him, he would sell his life dear, unless they took him sleeping.† Mary in her turn reminded him of his intention to retire to the Continent, and of the project attributed to him by Hiegate and Walcar. He affirmed that he had never been serious in his threats of departure, and denied the second charge with vehemence.

\* Deposition of Crawford, to whom Darnley related this conversation between himself and the Queen, and who immediately wrote it down, and communicated it to Elizabeth's Commissioners at York, 9th December, 1568. Tytler, vol. v., p. 379.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 379. This deposition conforms in this, as in many other points, to the first secret letter written by Mary Stuart, and found in the famous silver casket. See Anderson's Collections, vol. ii., p. 115; and *Mémoires de l'Etat de la France sous Charles IX.*, vol. i., p. 160, (Midlborough, 1578). See Appendix G, in reference to Mary Stuart's letters and sonnets to Bothwell.

After having reproached him with his fears and suspicions, and evinced more gentleness and less aversion towards him than usual, Mary had no difficulty in regaining all her former influence over him.\* At heart, Darnley had always been strongly attached to her; and his unrequited affection, and wounded pride, had been the causes of his withdrawal from the Court. He professed sincere repentance for his errors, ascribed his faults to his youth and inexperience, and promised to act more prudently in future. He also expressed his extreme delight at seeing her once more by his side, and begged her never to leave him again.† Mary then proposed to convey him in a litter to Craigmillar, as soon as he was strong enough to travel; and he declared his readiness to accompany her, if she would consent that they should again live together as husband and wife. She promised that it should be as he had spoken, and gave him her hand; but added, that he must be thoroughly cleansed of his sickness first. She also requested that he would keep their reconciliation secret, lest it should give umbrage to some of the lords.‡

This change of tone and conduct on Mary's part was very extraordinary. Had she passed, suddenly and sincerely, from feelings of aversion towards her husband,

\* *Mémoires de l'Etat de la France*, vol. i. p. 163.

† Letters from Mary Stuart to Bothwell, in the *Mémoires de l'Etat de la France*, vol. i., p. 159. Mary Stuart's letters and sonnets are also printed in Anderson's *Collections*, vol. ii., pp. 115-159.

‡ *Mémoires de l'Etat de la France*, vol. i., pp. 159-162.

to tender solicitude for him—had her disgust changed into fondness? It is impossible to believe this when we consider that Darnley's murder, which was perpetrated a few days afterwards, caused her no grief, inspired her with no regret, called forth in her no desire for vengeance, and induced her to take no means for bringing the assassins to justice;—when we know that at the very moment when she appeared to have become reconciled to him, her criminal intimacy with Bothwell still continued,\* and that she became shortly afterwards the wife of her husband's murderer. But then, how are we to explain this reconciliation? Must we believe that, blinded by passion, and obedient to the ferocious and ambitious will of her lover, Mary Stuart went to Glasgow to gain Darnley's confidence by manifesting an hypocritical interest in his condition, that she might bring him to Edinburgh, and place him in the hands of his enemies? Such perfidy appears incredible, and yet both moral probability and written evidence rise up against Mary Stuart with crushing force.

Bothwell had placed in her service, as valet, a Frenchman named Nicolas Hubert, who had been his own servant for very many years, and who was usually called Paris, from the place of his birth. This Paris, who was one of the agents employed by his old master in the execution of the plot against the King's life,

\* *Mémoires de l'Etat de la France*, vol. i., p. 161.

accompanied the Queen from Edinburgh to Glasgow, when she paid Darnley her late visit.\* Two days after her arrival, Mary Stuart sent him back to Bothwell with a letter which attests at once the affection which she felt for Bothwell, and the part which she took in his sinister designs. "Being departed from the place where I left my heart," she said, "it is easy to be judged what was my countenance." After having given him an account of her journey to Glasgow, and having described to him Darnley's fearful mistrust and affectionate demonstrations, as they are mentioned in the deposition of Thomas Crawford, (a gentleman in the service of the Earl of Lennox, to whom Darnley communicated his interview with the Queen,) she went on to say: "I have never seen him better, or speak so humbly, and if I had not known from experience that his heart is as soft as wax and mine as hard as diamond, I should almost have taken pity on him. However, fear nothing." She was nevertheless disgusted at the perfidy which her passion induced her to practise, and which she called her *hateful deliberation*. "You constrain me so to dissimulate," she added, "that I am horrified, seeing that you do not merely force me to play the part of a traitress; I pray you remember that, if desire to please you did not force me, I would rather die than commit these things; for my heart bleeds to

\* Second deposition of Nicholas Hubert, named Paris, 10th August, 1569. British Museum, Caligula, B. i., fol. 318; quoted in Laing, vol. ii., p. 308; and Anderson's Collections, vol. ii., pp. 192-205.



do them. In brief, he will not come with me, unless upon this condition, that I shall promise to use in common with him a single table and the same bed as before, and that I shall not leave him so often, and that if I will do this, he will do all I wish, and will follow me." Carried away by the violence of her love, she told Bothwell that she would obey him in all things; and begged him not to conceive a bad opinion of her; "because," she continued, "you yourself are the occasion of it; I would never act against him, to gratify my own private revenge." She did not conceal the object she had in view—an object which was attained two months after the murder of Darnley, by Bothwell's divorce from Lady Jane Gordon, and marriage to herself. In order to gain this end, she did not fear to expose her honour, to burden her conscience, to endanger her person, to forget her dignity, and to sacrifice, against her own inclination, the man who obstructed the gratification of her wishes. No wonder that she cried with remorse; "God forgive me!"\*

At the same time that he conveyed this letter to

\* This letter from Mary Stuart to Bothwell is printed in Anderson's Collections, vol. ii., pp. 131-144, and in the *Mémoires de l'Etat de la France*, vol. i., pp. 158-164. Towards the end she says: "Now seeing to obey you, my dear love, I spare neither honour, conscience, hazard, nor greatness whatsoever; take it, I pray you, in good part, and not after the interpretation of your false brother-in-law (the Earl of Huntly), to whom I pray you give no credit against the most faithful lover that ever you had, or ever shall have. See not her (Lady Jane Gordon) whose feigned tears should not be so much praised nor esteemed as the true and faithful travails which I sustain for to merit her place, for the obtaining of the which, against my natural [disposition], I betray them that may hinder me. God forgive me."

Bothwell, Paris was charged to deliver to him a purse containing three or four hundred crowns, and some bracelets which Mary Stuart had just completed for him.\* The Queen also directed Paris to learn from Lethington and Bothwell, whether, on the King's return, he was to be lodged at Craigmillar or Kirk of Field, that he might have the benefit of good air, as it was not advisable that he should take up his residence at Holyrood Palace, lest the Prince Royal should catch the disease.† In reference to this matter Mary wrote to Bothwell, "Let me know what you have determined to do touching you know what, that we may understand each other, and that nothing may be done otherwise."‡ Paris fulfilled all the commissions with which he had been entrusted. He saw Bothwell and Lethington, who were both of opinion that it would be better to take the King to Kirk of Field. This was a large open space adjoining the gates of Edinburgh, and near an old Dominican convent of Black Friars. It was airy and pleasant, occupied by gardens and houses; among others, by the town residence of the Duke of Chatelherault, and by that of Robert Balfour, one of Bothwell's creatures, and a relative of Sir James Balfour, who had drawn up the bond for the murder.§ Balfour's house,

\* Second deposition of Nicolas Hubert, named Paris, in Anderson's Collections, vol. ii., p. 192, and Laing, vol. ii. p. 368; and also Mary Stuart's first letter to Bothwell, in the *Mémoires de l'Etat de la France*, vol. i., pp. 162, 163.

† Laing, vol. ii., p. 281. Anderson's Collections, vol. ii., p. 193.

‡ *Mémoires de l'Etat de la France*, vol. i., p. 161.

§ "Quhilk writing, as said Earl (Bothwell) shew unto me, was devysit be Sir

though less spacious, was more isolated than the Duke's, and the conspirators accordingly selected it as more convenient for the execution of their project.\* Paris twice perceived Bothwell in conference with James Balfour, and was finally sent back with the following message: "Return to the Queen, and recommend me very humbly to her grace, and tell her all will go well, for Mr. James Balfour and I have not slept the whole night, so we have set all things in order, and have got ready the house. And tell the Queen that I send to her this diamond by your hands, and that if I had my heart I would send it to her very willingly."†

Darnley was soon well enough to travel in a litter. The Queen, whom he overwhelmed with caresses, but who was always attacked by a pain in her side whenever she entered his room,‡ announced their speedy departure to Bothwell. "According to the commission which I have received," she wrote, "I shall bring the man with me on Monday."§ The original plan of conducting the King to Craigmillar had been abandoned, because he had evinced great repugnance for the place. But he had consented to remain at Kirk of

James Balfour," &c. Confession of the Laird of Ormiston, who was executed for Darnley's murder in 1573; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 294.

\* Laing, vol. i., pp. 31, 32.

† Paris's Second Deposition: in Anderson, vol. ii., pp. 194, 195.

‡ "He puttis me in remembrance of all thyngis that may make me beleve he luffis me. Summa ye will say that he makes love to me: of the quhilk I take sa greit pleasure, that I entir nevyr quhair he is, but incontinent I take the sickness of my sore side, I am sa troublit with it." Mary's second letter to Bothwell; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 185.

§ Ibid.

Field until his health should be completely restored. Meanwhile, notwithstanding Mary's affectionate behaviour and his great fondness for her, Darnley's alarm was not entirely dispelled. "I have fears enough," he said to Thomas Crawford, "but may God judge between us. I have her promise only to trust to, but I have put myself in her hands, and I shall go with her, though she should murder me."\* With these feelings he left Glasgow, and travelled to Kirk of Field by easy stages. Bothwell came to meet Mary and Darnley at a short distance from the capital; and on the 31st of January, the young King, still an invalid, and rendered melancholy by his fears, entered the fatal house, in which he was, ere long, to meet his death.

This house had formerly belonged to the prebendaries of the Kirk of Field, and was not at all adapted for the reception of a King and Queen. Small, confined, and ill-furnished, it consisted only of two stories, one of which contained a cellar and another room, and the other, a gallery which extended above the cellar, and a bed-chamber, which corresponded with the room on the ground-floor.† Nelson, Darnley's servant, when he arrived at Kirk of Field, was about to prepare the Duke of Chatelherault's house for the reception of his master. But the Queen prevented him, and directed

\* Deposition of Thomas Crawford, MS. State-Paper Office. Tytler, vol. v., p. 380.

† Laing, vol. ii., p. 18.

him to Balfour's house,\* whither the necessary furniture was conveyed, and which Bothwell had evidently chosen that he might carry out his murderous intentions with greater facility. Darnley was established on the first floor, where his three servants, Taylor, Nelson, and Edward Simons occupied the gallery, which served at once as a wardrobe and cabinet. The cellar on the ground-floor was transformed into a kitchen, and the Queen had a bed prepared for herself in the room immediately below that in which the King slept. She also directed that the door at the foot of the staircase, which communicated between the ground-floor and the upper rooms, should be removed.† Thus installed, though very uncomfortably, by Darnley's side, she passed several nights under the same roof with him. Her assiduity, her attention, and the manifold proofs which she gave him of her affection, were all well calculated to dispel his fears.

Whilst Mary Stuart seemed to have returned to her former affection for Darnley, Bothwell was occupied in

\* "It was dewysit in Glasgow, that the King suld haif lyne first at Craigmyllare; bot becaus he had na will thairof, the purpos was alterit and conclusioun takin that he suld ly besyde the Kirk of Field, at quhilk tyme this deponir belevit evir that he suld haif had the Duikis hous, thinking it to be the lugeing preparit for him; bot the contrare was then schawin to him be the Quene, quha convoyit him to the uthir hous, and at his cuming thairto the schalmir wes hung, and ane new bed of black figurat welwet standing thairin." Evidence of Thomas Nelson, concerning the murder of King Henry Darnley; in Anderson, vol. iv., part 2, p. 165, and Laing, vol. ii., Appendix 25.

† Laing's History of Scotland, vol. i., pp. 31-33, and vol. ii., pp. 17-19. Laing's narrative is based upon the depositions of Nelson, Paris, and Hay of Tallo, and the letter written by the Scottish Council to the Queen-mother of France, in reference to Darnley's death.

making all due preparations for the murder. In addition to those accomplices of high rank, whose co-operation he had secured at Craigmillar, and on subsequent occasions, in order that he might carry out his design with impunity, he had procured a number of subaltern assistants to put it into execution. His chamberlain Dalgleish, his tailor Wilson, his porter Powrie, Laird James of Ormiston and his brother Robert, and two men-at-arms, Hay of Tallo and Hepburn of Bolton,\* whose courage and devotedness he had amply tested during his border warfare, were admitted into his confidence, and unhesitatingly became his instruments. He had false keys made,† by means of which easy access could be gained into Balfour's house ; and he sent to Dunbar for a barrel of gunpowder,‡ which was to be placed underneath the King's apartment, and to destroy the house and its inmates by its explosion.

The assistance of the Frenchman Paris, whom he had placed in Mary Stuart's service, was indispensable to him for the purpose of ascertaining whether the false keys were exactly similar to those in use, and of placing the powder in the room occupied by the Queen below Darnley's bed-chamber. But when he revealed his

\* Examinations and depositions of George Dalgleish, William Powrie, the Laird of Ormiston, John Hay, and John Hepburn, before the Privy Council of Scotland ; in Laing, vol. ii., Appendix, pp. 268-319 ; and Anderson's Collections, vol. ii., pp. 165-192.

† First deposition of Paris ; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 275.

‡ Depositions of Hepburn, and John Hay ; in Laing vol. ii., pp. 253, 257.

plan to Paris on Wednesday, the 5th of February, the poor man displayed great hesitation to serve him, fearing that he would thus ensure his own destruction. In the narrative which he gave to his judges, two years after the murder, when he was captured and hanged for his complicity, he relates in terms of striking simplicity, the conversation which he had with Bothwell, on being made acquainted with the terrible secret. "On hearing him," he says, "my heart grew faint; I did not say a word, but cast down my eyes?" Bothwell, who was not pleased at his silence and consternation, looked at him with impatience, and asked him what he thought of the plan. "Sir," he replied, "I think that what you tell me is a great thing." "What is your opinion of it?" reiterated Bothwell. "Pardon me, sir, if I tell you my opinion according to my poor mind." "What! are you going to preach to me?" "No, sir, you shall hear presently." "Well! say on." Paris then reminded him of the trouble and misfortunes of his past life, and sought to dissuade him from this murder, which would destroy his present tranquillity, and endanger the extraordinary favour which he had attained. He concluded by telling him: "Now, sir, if you undertake this thing, it will be the greatest trouble you ever had, above all others you have endured, for every one will cry out upon you, and you will be destroyed." "Well," said Bothwell, "have you done?" "You will pardon me, sir," answered Paris, "if you

please, if I have spoken to you according to my poor mind." "Fool that you are!" said Bothwell, "do you think that I am doing this all alone by myself?" "Sir," said Paris, "I do not know how you are going to do it, but I know well that it will be the greatest trouble that you ever had." "And how so?" said Bothwell; "I have already with me Lethington, who is esteemed one of the most prudent men in this country, and who is the undertaker of all this; and I have also the Earl of Argyle, my brother Huntly, Morton, Ruthven, and Lindsay. These three last will never fail me, for I have begged for their pardon, and I have the signatures of all those I have mentioned to you. We were desirous to do it the last time we were at Craigmillar; but you are a fool and poor of mind, unworthy to hear anything of consequence." \*

Paris finally consented to do what Bothwell required. He was entirely in his power, and very probably was not so long in giving his promise as he would have us believe. He enabled Bothwell to compare the keys of the house with the false ones he had had made, and promised to introduce Hay of Tallo, Hepburn, and Ormiston, into the Queen's chamber, on the evening appointed for the execution of the murder, that they might deposit the powder there, whilst the Queen was with Darnley. Bothwell had forbidden Paris to place the Queen's bed immediately under that of the King,

\* First deposition of Paris; in *Laing*, vol. ii., pp. 271, 272.



because he intended to have the powder strewed there. Paris did not attend to this, and when Mary Stuart came into the room in the evening, she herself ordered him to change the position of the bed.\*

The night of Sunday, the 9th of February, was fixed for the execution of this horrible design. Mary Stuart's conduct, when the time for the murder drew near, is but too well calculated to confirm the accusations which result from the depositions of the witnesses, the confessions of the perpetrators, and her own letters. Nelson says that she caused a bed of new velvet to be removed from the King's apartment, and substituted an old one in its place.† Paris declares that she also removed from her own chamber a rich coverlet of fur,‡ which she was, doubtless, desirous not to leave there on the evening of the explosion. On the Sunday, she came to spend the evening with the King, whom she

\* Paris thus relates this incident, which, if true, is of itself sufficient to place Mary's complicity beyond doubt: "The Queen said to me, 'Fool that you are, I will not have my bed in that place,' and so made me remove it; by which words I perceived in my mind that she was aware of the plot. Thereupon I took the courage to say to her, 'Madam, my Lord Bothwell has commanded me to take to him the keys of your chamber, because he intends to do something in it, namely, to blow up the King with gunpowder.' 'Do not talk about that, at this hour,' said she, 'but do what you please.' Upon this, I did not venture to say anything more." Second deposition of Paris; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 285.

† Nelson, who was found beneath the ruins of the house, relates in these terms the opening of the door which communicated between the Queen's chamber and that of the King, and the removal of the bed of new velvet: "Sche (the Queen) causit tak down the uttir dour that cloist the passage towart baith the chalmeris . . . and sua ther was naething left to stope the passage into the saidis schalmeris, bot only the portell durris; as alsua sche causit tak down the said new blak-bed, sayand it wald be sulzeit with the bath, and in the place thairof sett upe ane auld purple bed." Laing, vol. ii., p. 267.

‡ On the Saturday evening. First deposition of Paris; in Laing, vol. ii. p. 276.

had assured that she would remain in Balfour's house during the night.\* Whilst she was talking familiarly † with him in the room upstairs, the preparations for his death were actively going on below. On the previous evening, Hepburn had brought the barrel containing the powder into the nether hall of the lodging occupied by Bothwell in Holyrood Abbey. ‡ Before evening, on Sunday, Bothwell had assembled all his accomplices in that same room, had concerted his plan with them, and had allotted to each the part he was to perform in the nocturnal tragedy. § At about ten o'clock in the evening, the sacks of powder were carried, across the gardens, by Wilson, Powrie, and Dalgleish, as far as the foot of Blackfriars Wynd, where they were received by Hay of Tallo, Hepburn, and Ormiston, and conveyed into Balfour's house by the assistance of Paris. || As soon as the powder had been strewed in heaps over the floor of the room, just beneath the King's bed, Ormiston went away, but Hepburn and Hay of Tallo remained with their false keys in the Queen's bed-chamber. ¶ When all was ready, Paris went up into the King's

\* She had already slept there twice, and, according to Nelson's deposition, had promised the King that she would remain there on Sunday night also: "The chalmere quherin sche lay the saids tua nytie, and promist alsua to haif bidden thair upoun the Sunday at nyt." Laing, vol. ii., p. 276.

† "Bot efter sche had tareit lang, and intertenit the King veray familiarlie, sche tuk purpose, and departit." Ibid.

‡ Powrie's second deposition; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 248.

§ Depositions of Powrie, Dalgleish, and Hay of Tallo; in Laing, vol. ii. pp. 243, 249, 252.

|| Depositions of Powrie, Hay of Tallo, and Hepburn of Bolton; in Laing, vol. ii., pp. 243, 253, 257.

¶ Ibid.

room, and the Queen then recollected that she had promised to be present at a masquerade, given in Holyrood Palace, in honour of the marriage of her servant Bastian with Margaret Carwood, one of her favourite women.\* She therefore took farewell of the King, left the house with her suite, including Bothwell, and proceeded by torchlight to Holyrood.† Darnley beheld her departure with grief and secret fear. The unhappy Prince, as though foreboding the mortal danger by which he was threatened, sought consolation in the Bible, and read the 55th Psalm,‡ which contained many passages adapted to his peculiar circumstances. After his devotion, he went to bed and fell asleep, Taylor, his young page, lying beside him in the same apartment.§

Bothwell remained for some time at the ball, but stole away about midnight to join his confederates. He changed his rich costume of black velvet and satin, for

\* "Paris passes to the Kingis chalmer, quhair the King, the Quene, and the Erle Bothwell and uthers were . . . and as the deponar believes, Paris shew the Erle Bothwell that all things were in readines, and syno sone yareftir, the Quene and the lordis returnet to the abbay." Deposition of Hay of Tallo; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 255. After what is said by Hay of Tallo, who remained concealed in the Queen's chamber, read the statement of Nelson, who was in the King's room: "Sche (the Queen) tuk purpose (as it had bene on the sudden), and departit as sche spak to gif the mask to Bastiane, quha that nyt wes mariet her servand." Nelson's Deposition; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 267.

† "The Quene's grace was gangand before yame with licht torches." Powrie's Deposition; Laing, vol. ii., p. 244.

‡ MS. letter, State-Paper Office, Drury to Cecil, 18th April, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 383.

§ "The Quene being departit toward Halyrud hous, the King within the space of ane hour past to bed, and in the chalmer with him lay wmqhill William Taylyour." Nelson's deposition; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 268.

a dress of common stuff ;\* and left his apartments, followed by Dalgleish, Paris, Wilson, and Powrie. In the hope of attracting less attention, he went down the staircase which led from Holyrood into the Queen's garden, and directed his course towards the southern gate. The two sentinels on guard, seeing a party of men coming along this unusual path at so late an hour, challenged them : " Who goes there ? " " Friends ! " answered Powrie. " Whose friends ? " demanded one of the sentinels : " Friends of Lord Bothwell ! " was the answer.† On this they were allowed to proceed, and going up the Canongate, found that the Nether-bow gate, by which they intended to leave the city, was shut. Wilson immediately awoke John Galloway, the gate-keeper, calling to him to " open the port to friends of Lord Bothwell." Galloway, in surprise, inquired what they were doing out of their beds at that time of night.‡ They made no answer, but passed on. Bothwell intended to have taken up Ormiston as they

\* " Immediately tuk aff his claythes yat wer on, viz., a pair of blak velvet hoise, trussit with silver, and ane doublet of satin of the same maner, and put on ane other pair of black hoise and ane doublet of canwes, and tuk his side rideing cloak about him." Powrie's deposition ; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 244.

† " As yai came by the gait of the Quene's south garden, the twa sentinellis yat stude at the zet yat gangis to the utter cloiss, speirit at yame, Quha is yat ? and yai answerit, Friends. The sentinel speirit, Quhat friends ? and yai answerit, My Lord Bothwell's fiends." Powrie's deposition ; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 245. Dalgleish gives a similar account. Ibid., pp. 249, 250.

‡ " Yai come up the Canongate, and to the neither bow, and findand the bow steikand, Pat Willson cryet to John Galloway, and desirit him to opin the port to friends of my Lord Bothwell, quha came and oppenit the port." Powrie's deposition ; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 245. Dalgleish gives the same account, and adds : " Galloway came down to let yame in, and speirit at yame, Quhat did yow out of yair beds yat time of night." Ibid., p. 250.

passed ; but the Laird, though he had assisted in conveying the powder into the King's house, had gone to bed and would not answer the summons, as he feared his participation in the murder might bring him to the scaffold, which it actually did a few years after.\* Continuing his route as far as Blackfriars Wynd, Bothwell left Powrie, Wilson, and Dalgleish at this point, and proceeded with Paris alone to Kirk of Field, where he waited for Hepburn and Hay of Tallo in Balfour's garden.†

It was at this moment, we have every reason to

\* Laing, vol. ii., pp. 245-250.

† This version of Darnley's murder does not conform to the depositions of the murderers, who were doubtless to make sure of Darnley's death by other means than the uncertain effect of an explosion, and were perhaps afraid to admit that they had laid hands on the person of the king ; but we have based our narrative on a despatch from the Pope's Nuncio to Cosmo I., which has been copied from the archives of the Medici by Prince Labanoff. This despatch, moreover, is the only document which explains how it was that the bodies of Darnley and his page, Taylor, were found at such a distance from Balfour's house, and that they bore no marks of injury by the explosion, or by the falling of the house. This despatch is printed in Prince Labanoff's Collection, vol. vii., pp. 108, 109, and contains the following passage : " Quanto al particular della morte di quel Re, il detto signor di Muretta ha ferma opinione che quel povero principe sentendo il rumore delle genti che attornivano la casa, et tentavano con le chiave false apprir gl'uscii, volese uscir per una porta che andava al giardino, in camiscia con la pelliccia, per fugir il pericolo ; et quivi fu affogato, et poi condotto fuori del giardino in un piccolo horto fuori della muraglia della terra et che poi con il fuoco ruinassero la casa per amazzar il resto ch'era dentro ; di che se non fa congettura, perciocchè il Re fut trovato morto in camiscia con la pelliccia a canto, et alcune donne che alloggiavano vicino al giardino, affermano d'haver udito gridar il Re : ' Eh fratelli miei ; habiate pietà di me per amor di colui che hebbe misericordia de tutto il mondo ? ' " This despatch was communicated to Mr. Tytler by Prince Labanoff, and the Scottish historian has framed his narrative of Darnley's death in accordance with its statements ; see Tytler, vol. v., pp. 383, 384. This was also the prevalent belief in Scotland, as is proved by a proclamation published on the 20th June, 1567, in which Bothwell is accused not only of having conspired against the life of the King, but of having killed him with his own hands : " Of the quhilk murder, he is found not onlie to have bin the inventor and devyser, but the executor with his awin handis, as his awin servantia, being in companie with him at that unworthy deid, has testifiet." Anderson's Collections, vol. i., p. 140. Buchanan and Laing also hold this opinion.

believe, that the two murderers concealed within the house perpetrated their crime. By the aid of their false keys they gained access into the King's apartment. On hearing the noise, Darnley jumped out of bed in his shirt and pelisse and endeavoured to escape. But the assassins seized and strangled him. His page was put to death in the same manner; and their bodies were carried into a small orchard near at hand, where they were found on the next morning, unscathed by fire or powder, the King covered by his shirt only, and the pelisse lying by his side. After the execution of this dark deed, Hepburn lighted the match which communicated with the gunpowder in the lower room, and the house was blown up in order completely to obliterate all traces of the murder. Bothwell, Hepburn, Hay of Tallo, and the other bandits went to a little distance to await the explosion, which occurred about a quarter of an hour afterwards, between two and three o'clock in the morning, with a fearful noise.\* The confederates immediately ran back to Edinburgh as fast they could; and Bothwell, having been prevented by his wounded arm from clambering over a breach in the ramparts of the city, was constrained, with most of his band, to return home through the Netherbow gate, and awake John Galloway once more. On reaching Holyrood Palace they were again challenged by the sentinels†, and suffered, to pass on.

\* Laing, vol. ii., pp. 245, 250, 255, 258.

† Laing, vol. ii., pp. 246, 251, 258.

Bothwell hurried to his apartments, drank some wine to calm his agitation, and hastened to bed.\*

He had scarcely been half an hour in bed, when George Hacket, one of the servants of the palace, knocked loudly at his door and demanded admittance. The door was opened and Hacket came in, but his terror was so great that he could not speak a word. Bothwell, with extreme coolness, asked him what was the matter. "The King's house," said Hacket, "is blown up, and I trow the King is slain." At these words Bothwell started up in well-feigned astonishment, and shouted, "Treason!" † He then dressed himself, and having meanwhile been joined by the Earl of Huntly, the two noblemen went to communicate the intelligence to the Queen. ‡

Bothwell, with consummate audacity, soon repaired with a body of soldiers to the scene of his crime. The people of Edinburgh, who had been awakened by the explosion, had crowded to the Kirk of Field at day-break. They gathered in multitudes around the ruins of the house, beneath which Nelson had been found alive, § and filled the orchard in which the bodies of the King and his page, Taylor, were lying. Bothwell dispersed the horror-stricken crowd, and conveyed his

\* "My lord come into his ludgeing, and immediately callit for ane drink, and tuk off his cloathes incontinent, zeid to his bed." Depositions of Powrie and Dalgleish; in Laing, vol. ii., pp. 246, 251.

† Depositions of Powrie and Dalgleish; in Laing, vol. ii., pp. 246, 251.

‡ Ibid.; and Hepburn' deposition, p. 259.

§ Nelson's deposition; in Laing, vol. ii. p. 268.

two victims into a neighbouring house, without suffering any one to approach or examine them. But it had escaped the notice of none of the spectators that the bodies displayed no wounds, and had not been mutilated by the gunpowder ; that the King's pelisse, which lay by his side, was not even scorched by the fire ; and that the two corpses could not have been hurled to so great a distance by the explosion of the house, without great external injury.\* A few days afterwards Darnley was buried with great privacy in the chapel of Holyrood.†

What was the effect produced upon Mary Stuart by this terrible occurrence, which filled Edinburgh with indignation and mistrust ? She appeared overwhelmed with sorrow, and fell into a state of silent dejection. She manifested none of that activity, anger, resolution, and courage which she had displayed after Riccio's murder : but shut herself up in her room, and would communicate with her most faithful servants by the medium of Bothwell alone.‡ Darnley's murderer was the only person admitted to her presence. Even were we not furnished with the most unquestionable proofs of

\* MS. letter, State-Paper Office, 11th February, 1567 ; enclosure by Drury to Cecil. Tytler, vol. v., p. 385.

† Chalmers, vol. ii., p. 556. Tytler, vol. v., p. 386.

‡ Melvil's Memoirs, p. 78 ; and Paris's second deposition. " Le lundy matin (après le meurtre), entre neuf et dix heures, le dict Paris dict qu'il entre dans la chambre de la Roynne, laquelle estoit bien close, et son lit là tendu de noyr en signe de deuil, et de la chandelle allumer dedans ycelle, là ou Madame de Bryant luy donnoyt à desjeuner d'ung œuf frais, là ou aussy Monsieur de Boduel arryve et parle à elle secrètement soubz courtine." Second deposition of Paris ; in Laing, vol. ii., pp. 287, 288.



her complicity by the confessions contained in her letters, the authenticity of which we have established elsewhere,\* as well as by the declarations made in presence of their judges and upon the scaffold, by the subaltern actors in this tragic drama, her conduct both before and after the murder would suffice to convince us that she was a party to the crime. Her journey to Glasgow, at a time when she was loudest in her expressions of distrust and hatred of Darnley; the marks of tenderness and hopes for reconciliation which she had displayed towards him, in order to induce him to come with her to Edinburgh; the selection of Balfour's house, which was convenient only for the commission of a crime, and wherein she consented to reside that he might not refuse to remain in it; the care with which, on the evening before the murder, she removed from it all the furniture of any value which it contained; the conveyance of the powder and introduction of the two principal assassins into her own room, where neither the powder could have been strewn nor the murderers concealed without her connivance, as she might otherwise have come down stairs and discovered all; and finally, her departure from Balfour's house, where she had promised to pass the night, a few hours before Darnley was killed and the house blown into the air—prove only too conclusively that she was acquainted with the whole plot.

\* See Appendix G.

But if her conduct previous to the commission of the crime thus deeply criminales Mary Stuart, what must we think of her proceedings after its perpetration? \* Her behaviour, both as a wife and a Queen, render her guilt all the more flagrant, because, far from avenging the husband upon whom she had so recently lavished her hypocritical caresses, she rewarded his murderer, and eventually married him. It will now be our task to unveil the sad picture of her errors and her punishment. Horror-struck as she appeared to be, Mary Stuart left the task of communicating this catastrophe to the French Court to her Privy Council, which was almost entirely composed of accomplices in the murder, and the secretary and guide of which was Lethington, one of its principal instigators. The despatch of the Council, addressed to Catherine de Medici, was intrusted to Clarnault, † who was at the same time the bearer of a letter from the Queen to the Archbishop of Glasgow. In this letter, which she wrote two days

\* Paris gives the following account of the Queen's feelings on the subject, thirty hours after the murder:—"Mardi au matin elle se leue, et le dict Paris estant entré en sa chambre, la Roynne luy demande: Paris, qu'as tu? Heias! ce dict-il, Madame, je voys que chascun me regarde de costé. Ne te chaille, ce dict-elle, je te feray bon vynage, et personne ne t'oseroyt dire mot. Cependant, elle ne le dict chose de conséquence jusques a ce qu'elle vouloyt aller à Seton; alors elle luy demandast de prendre une cassette ou il y avoyt des corcelets d'escus que le thrésorier luy avoyt aporté de France, pour la porter à la chambre de Monsieur de Boduel, qui estoit à cette heure-là logé dedans le pallays, au dessus de la chambre là ou ce tenoyt le conseil; et puis après luy commandast de prendre son coffre des bagues, et le faire porter au chasteau, et le delyvrer entre les mains du Sieur de Skirling, pour lors cappitaine soubz Monsieur de Boduel, chose qu'il feist; en après elle voyant le dict Paris tout fâché, elle pressoyt souvent de faire service à Monsieur de Boduel." Second deposition of Paris; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 288.

† Labanoff, vol. ii., p. 2.

after the murder to her Ambassador in France, Mary Stuart deploras "that mischievous deed" which had struck terror throughout all Scotland, and says, "the matter is horrible and so strange, as we believe the like was never heard of in any country." She further declares that a lucky chance alone saved her from being a victim to the conspiracy, which was directed against herself as well as the King. "By whom it has been done," she adds, "it appears not as yet; but the same being discovered by the diligence our Council has begun already to use, we hope to punish the same with such rigour as shall serve for example of this cruelty to all ages to come."\* After having thus endeavoured to conciliate the favourable opinion of the Court of France, she at length decided, on Wednesday, the 12th of February, to offer, by proclamation, two thousand pounds reward to any who would come forward with information regarding the perpetrators of the crime.† Scarcely was this made known, when public opinion gave utterance to its convictions, and a paper was fixed during the night on the door of the Tolbooth, or common prison, in which Bothwell, James Balfour, and David Chambers (another of Bothwell's intimates) were denounced as guilty of the King's slaughter. Voices, too, were heard in the streets of Edinburgh at dead of night, arraigning the same persons. A second placard charged the Queen's ser-

\* Labanoff, vol. ii., pp. 3, 4.

† Keith, p. 368.

vants with the crime, and mentioned the names of Signor Francis, Bastian, John de Bourdeaux, and Joseph, David Riccio's brother.\* The Queen took no steps to secure the subaltern conspirators, and kept the greatest criminal of them all by her side.

Far from adopting any vigorous measures, she left Edinburgh, and removed to the residence of Lord Seton.† Bothwell followed her thither, and remained with her, guarded by Captain Cullen, one of his most devoted adherents, and in the company of Huntly, Argyle, Lethington, and the Archbishop of St. Andrews, who had all approved of his plan for Darnley's assassination.‡ Did Mary pass her time at Seton Castle in mourning and affliction? No: this is the account given of her residence there by Mr. Fraser Tytler, who is inclined, by hereditary feelings, to be very favourable to Mary, and who is the most recent, and in many respects the most trustworthy of the historians of Scotland:—"It did not escape attention," he says, "that scarce two weeks after her husband's death, whilst in the country and in the city all were still shocked at the late occurrences, and felt them as a stain on their national character, the Court at Seton

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 387.

† Seton Castle was the property of George, sixth Lord Seton, whose daughter had accompanied the Queen into France, and was one of the four Marys. He was descended from a Norman family, and remained constantly attached to the Queen and her cause.

‡ MS. letter, State Paper Office; Drury to Cecil, 17th February, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 386.

was occupied in gay amusements. Mary and Bothwell would shoot at the butts against Huntly and Seton ; and, on one occasion, after winning the match, they forced these lords to pay the forfeit in the shape of a dinner at Tranent."\*

While engaged in these recreations, Mary Stuart was besieged by the accusing distrust of her people, and the bitter complaints of the Earl of Lennox. At Edinburgh, which had been disturbed, on the fatal night of the 9th of February, by the band which had left Holyrood Palace, reports were current which denounced by name the deviser of the assassination, and vaguely indicated his accomplices. A bill fastened on the Tron in the market-place declared that the smith who had furnished the false keys to the King's apartment would, on due security, come forward and point out his employers.† Two new placards were also hung up, on one of which were written the Queen's initials, M.R., with a hand holding a sword ; and on the other Bothwell's initials with a mallet painted above, as having been the instrument with which the murder was committed.‡ The whole city was in a state of extreme agitation. The Presbyterian ministers preached with sombre vehemence, exhorting all men to fasting and prayer, and calling on God "to reveal and revenge."§ The Queen

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 390.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office ; Drury to Cecil, 28th February, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 389.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 390.

§ MS. letter, State Paper Office ; Killigrew to Cecil, 8th March, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 393.

was included in the suspicions of the populace, and the idea of her complicity daily gained ground. Bothwell became furious, and attempted to intimidate public opinion. Accompanied by fifty armed men, he rode into Edinburgh and publicly declared that if he knew who were the authors of the placard, he would "wash his hands in their blood." But, animated by suspicion as much as by anger, whenever he spoke to any one, of whose friendship he was not assured, he watched his movements with a jealous eye, and always kept his hand on the hilt of his dagger.\*

The unhappy father of the murdered King, seeing that Mary Stuart remained inactive, conjured her, in the most pathetic language, to direct vigorous search to be made after the assassins. "I am forced by nature and duty," he wrote to her on the 20th of February, "to beseech your Majesty most humbly, for God's cause, and the honour of your Majesty, and this your realm, that your Highness would, with convenient diligence, assemble the whole nobility and estates of your Majesty's realm, and they, by your advice, to take such good order for the perfect trial of the matter, as I doubt not but, with the grace of Almighty God, his Holy Spirit shall so work upon the hearts of your Majesty and all your faithful subjects, as the bloody and cruel actors of this deed shall be manifestly known.

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office ; Drury to Cecil, 28th February, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 389.

And although I know I need not put your Majesty in remembrance thereof, the matter touching your Majesty so near as it does, yet I shall humbly desire your Majesty to bear with me in troubling your Highness therein, being the father of him that is gone.”\*

On the following day, Mary wrote an affectionate but evasive answer to the Earl of Lennox. She informed him that she had already convoked her Parliament, before the receipt of his letter, and that its first business would be to inquire thoroughly into “the King her husband’s cruel slaughter.”† But the Parliament was not to meet until Easter; and, in the meanwhile, Joseph Riccio, Bastian, and Signor Francis, the Queen’s Italian steward, whose names had been mentioned in one of the placards, took their departure from Scotland;‡ whilst Powrie and Wilson were sent by Bothwell to the Castle of Hermitage, close by the English border.§ The Earl of Lennox, surmising the reasons of this long delay, renewed his entreaties on the 26th of February, and represented to the Queen that this was not an ordinary matter for discussion in Parliament, “but of such weight and importance, which ought rather to be with all expedition and diligence sought out, and

\* Keith, pp. 369, 370.

† Ibid., p. 370.

‡ They were accompanied by six other persons. MS. letter, State Paper Office; Drury to Cecil, 19th February, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 388. On the 20th, Mary gave Signor Francis a pension of 400*l.* Scots, out of the revenues of the bishopric of Ross. Laing, vol. i., p. 50. She also gave a pension and the post of master of the wardrobe to the Prince her son, to Darnley’s porter, a man named Durlam, who had abandoned or betrayed his master on the day of his murder. Privy Seal Records, Book 36, fol. 15; quoted in Laing, vol. i., p. 33.

§ Powrie’s deposition; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 246.

punished to the example of the whole world." He therefore besought her to order the arrest of those persons who had been denounced in the placards.\* She replied that the placards contradicted each other, and that she was at a loss on which to proceed: but, she said, "if there be any names mentioned in them that you think worthy to suffer a trial, upon your advertisement we shall so proceed to the cognition-taking: as may stand with the laws of this realm; and, being found culpable, shall see the punishment as vigorously executed, as the weight of the crime deserves." †

Whilst Lennox was thus loudly crying for justice, Elizabeth dispatched a letter, by Sir Henry Killigrew, in which she hinted her suspicions of Mary's implication in the murder, and displayed the passionate hatred which she entertained against her, in the vehemence of her ill-concealed reproaches, and the feigned character of her hypocritical condolence. "Madam," she wrote, "my ears have been so astonished, and my mind so grieved, and my heart so terrified at hearing the horrible sound of the abominable murder of your late husband and my deceased cousin, that I have even now no spirit to write about it; and although my natural feelings constrain me greatly to deplore his death, as he was so near a relation to me, nevertheless, boldly to

\* Keith, p. 371.

† Letter from Mary Stuart to the Earl of Lennox; written from Seton, March 1, 1567; in Keith, p. 371.



tell you what I think, I cannot conceal from myself that I am more full of grief on your account than on his. O madam! I should not perform the part of a faithful cousin or an affectionate friend, if I studied rather to please your ears than to endeavour to preserve your honour; therefore I will not conceal from you what most persons say about the matter, namely, that you will look through your fingers at taking vengeance for this deed, and have no intention to touch those who have done you this kindness, as if the act would not have been perpetrated unless the murderers had received assurance of their impunity. Think of me, I beg you, who would not entertain such a thought in my heart for all the gold in the world." She then went on to urge her, in the strongest terms, not to leave so great a crime unpunished. "I exhort you," she adds, "I advise and beseech you to take this thing so much to heart, as not to fear to bring to judgment the nearest relation you have, and to let no persuasion hinder you from manifesting to the world that you are a noble Princess, and also a loyal wife."\* The same advice was given her by the Archbishop of Glasgow, her ambassador at the Court of France, where it was believed that she was the cause of her husband's death. He informed her, with courageous honesty, of the unfavourable opinion which was entertained in foreign countries of the miserable state of her kingdom, and

\* Labanoff, vol. vii, pp. 102, 103.

the shameful conduct of her nobility. "Yourself," he added, "is greatly and wrongously calumniated to be the motive principal of the whole ;" and he conjured her to take a rigorous vengeance for the crime, observing, "that rather than it be not actually taken, it appears to me better, in this world, that you had lost life and all."\*

A month had now elapsed since Darnley's assassination, and yet Mary had taken none of the steps required by the law of the land, and due to her own innocence. On the contrary, she had not left Bothwell for a moment. Instead of ordering his arrest, which had been demanded by the Earl of Lennox in a third letter,† she loaded him with new favours. She invested him with the command of the Castle of Edinburgh, which had previously been held by the Earl of Mar, governor of the Prince Royal ; and soon after, she conferred upon him the Castle of Blackness, the Inch, and the Superiority of Leith.‡ At length, however, the blunt, and somewhat offensive counsels of Elizabeth, the deep displeasure of her relatives in France, the energetic remonstrances of the Archbishop of Glasgow, and the reiterated entreaties of the Earl of Lennox, determined her to quit her dangerous and humiliating position. She resolved to screen herself by a show of justice, and shelter her favourite by a judicial acquittal.

\* Keith, Preface, p. ix.

† On the 17th March, 1567 ; Keith, p. 372.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 393. Robertson, vol ii., p. 334.

In a Council held on the 28th of March, at which she presided, and which was attended by the Earls of Bothwell, Huntly, Argyle, and Caithness, and the Bishops of Ross and Galloway, it was decided that Bothwell should be brought to a public trial.\* Mary now became as anxious to hasten, as she had previously been to prevent, her favourite's impeachment. The Earl of Lennox received orders to appear at Edinburgh, on the 12th of April, to prefer and maintain his charges against Bothwell.†

Public notoriety alone denounced this great criminal. No one dared to bear witness against him, or had even been requested to do so. The smith who had manufactured the false keys to the King's apartments, had not been provided with the security he claimed in order to state what he knew. "The suspected persons," wrote the Earl of Lennox to the Queen on the 11th of April, "continuing still at liberty, being great at Court, and about your Majesty's person, comforts and encourages them and theirs, and discourages all others that would give an evidence against them." He therefore demanded that they should be placed in arrest, conformably to the usages of the realm, and that a delay should be granted sufficient for the collection of the necessary evidence ; adding that, otherwise, a fair and just trial would be impossible. ‡ Elizabeth, on her side, advised Mary Stuart to allow the father and

\* Laing, vol. i., p. 58.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 394.

‡ Keith, pp. 374, 375.

friends of the deceased King time enough to obtain such evidence as might bring the guilt home to its authors. She warned her that a refusal would excite strong suspicions against her, and urged her to give the world occasion to declare her guiltless of so base a crime; for, otherwise, she would be shunned by all princes, and hated by all peoples; "and rather than this should happen to you," she says, in her nervous language, "I would wish you an honourable burial more than a sullied life. I pray the Lord to inspire you to do what may most conduce to your own honour and the consolation of your friends."\*

Mary Stuart would yield neither to Lennox's just request, nor to Elizabeth's prudent advice. She consented that everything should be done according to the arrangement of Bothwell and his friends.† On April 12th, the day appointed, the assize opened at the Tolbooth, before a jury of noblemen, Bothwell's peers and partisans.‡ The tribunal was presided over by one of the fautors of the murder, the Earl of Argyle, then hereditary Lord High Justice, and guarded by two hundred hackbutters; while four thousand of Bothwell's armed adherents mustered in the streets and squares of Edinburgh. § The law officers of the Crown

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office; Queen Elizabeth to Mary Stuart, 8th April, 1567. Robertson, vol. ii., Appendix 19.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 396. Anderson's Collections, vol. i., p. 50.

‡ Their names are given in Keith, p. 377.

§ MS. letter, State Paper Office; Drury to Cecil, 15th April, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 395, and Proofs and Illustrations, vol. v., No. 19.

were either bribed or intimidated into silence : no witnesses were summoned. The accuser, the Earl of Lennox, who was on his road to the city, surrounded by a large force of his friends, received orders not to enter Edinburgh with more than six in his company ; and he, therefore, declined to come forward in person.\* The accused, the Earl of Bothwell, presented himself before the Court of Justice with a confident and careless air. Mounted on the late King's favourite horse, † and surrounded by guards, he was escorted to the Tolbooth, with base obsequiousness, by a large number of gentlemen. As he passed before the Queen, who was standing, with Lady Lethington, at one of the windows of Holyrood Palace, he turned towards her, and she gave him a friendly greeting for a farewell. ‡ She expressed her sympathy with his position, even more publicly, by sending him, rather from impatience than anxiety, a token and message whilst he was before his judges. §

It was quite impossible for her to feel any uneasiness about the result of this judicial farce. The session of the Court of Justiciary was neither long nor uncertain. After the indictment, which inculpated Bothwell, but brought no direct charge against him, had been read, the Earl of Lennox was called upon to make good his

\* MS. letters, State Paper Office ; Forster and Drury to Cecil, 15th April, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 397. Anderson, vol. ii., pp. 98, 107.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 398.

‡ Ibid, p. 396.

§ MS. letters, State Paper Office ; Drury to Cecil, April 19th, and April (undated), 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 398.

accusation. Upon this a gentleman named Robert Cunningham stood forward, explained the reasons which had prevented the Earl his master from appearing in person, and declared that he was sent by him to reiterate the charge of murder against the Earl of Bothwell, but to request delay for the purpose of obtaining the necessary evidence. On this being refused, Cunningham protested against the validity of any sentence that should acquit "persons notoriously known to be," as he said, "the murderers of the King, as my lord, my master alleges."\* The Crown lawyers were silent, to the great disapprobation of the people; and Bothwell having pleaded not guilty, a unanimous verdict of acquittal was pronounced in the absence of all evidence.† He then had the audacity to challenge his accusers by a public cartel, and offered to maintain his innocence by arms, against any gentleman who should still brand him with the murder.‡

After this scandalous and premeditated acquittal, Mary Stuart, adding new favours to those which she had so recently lavished upon Bothwell, gave him the lordship and castle of Dunbar, and extended his powers as High Admiral.§ No one of the nobility had sufficient power, or seemed indeed to have any desire, to compete with him. Lennox took refuge in England;|| Murray,

\* His protest is given in Keith, p. 376.

† Keith, p. 377. Tytler, vol. v., p. 397.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 397.

§ MS. letter, State Paper Office; Drury to Cecil, 19th April, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 400.

|| Keith, p. 378, note.

who was the most powerful person in Scotland, had withdrawn from the Court some time before the King's assassination, and left Scotland for France three days before Bothwell's trial at the Tolbooth.\* No one remained to check the Queen and her triumphant favourite. Accordingly when—two days after the trial—Parliament assembled, Mary selected him to bear the crown and sceptre before her at its opening.† The three estates of Scotland ratified the sentence of the jury, and condemned and suppressed the placards which had been posted up in Edinburgh.‡ All Bothwell's partisans were rewarded for their connivance. Five of the jurors obtained confirmation of their respective grants from the crown.§ Huntly consented to the divorce of his sister from Bothwell, and the whole of his property, which had been under confiscation for several years, was restored to him.|| The Catholic Mary, blinded by her passion for the Protestant Bothwell, consented to abolish all laws affecting the lives of her subjects, on the score of their religion, and passed an act securing a provision to the poorer ministers.¶ She thus hoped to gain the support of the nobility, and to conciliate the favour of the Presbyterian Church.

\* On the 9th April; Laing, vol. i., p. 59. MS. letter, State Paper Office; Drury to Cecil, 9th and 10th April, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 400.

† "He was appointed on Monday, the second day after his trial, to carry the crown and sceptre at the opening of Parliament." Laing, vol. i., p. 72. Keith, p. 378.

‡ Keith, p. 380.

§ "Crawford, Rothes, Caithness, Herries, Semple, Ogilvie of Boyne, obtained ratifications." Records of Parliament, quoted in Laing, vol. i., p. 73, note.

|| Laing, vol. i., p. 74. Keith, pp. 379, 380.

¶ Keith, p. 379. Tytler, vol. v., p. 399.

But the Presbyterian Church would not be bribed to alter its unfavourable judgment of her ; and the people, seeing her daily become more intimate with Bothwell, ere long included her in the same condemnation as himself. Even the lowest classes entertained suspicions of her culpability ; and the market-women, as she passed, would cry out, " God preserve your Grace, if you are sackless (innocent) of the King's death."\* Unfortunately for Mary Stuart, the cry of public conviction could not stem her passion.

Bothwell was not satisfied with impunity. The high favour of a subject, the transitory power of a lover, were not sufficient to content him. He had aimed higher, when he slew the King. His object was to marry the Queen, and thus to raise himself to the throne by less unproductive and more audacious designs than those of the ambitious and unfortunate Darnley. Two obstacles opposed the execution of his plans, and these were his recent marriage to Lady Jane Gordon, and the life of the young Prince Royal. A divorce from Lady Gordon would remove the first of these hindrances ; and he hoped that when he had married the Queen he would have her son at his mercy, and thus get rid of the second. Public opinion again proved correct, and believed that Bothwell, to secure the fruit of his first crime, would commit many others.

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office ; Drury to Cecil, April, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 398.



“The marriage of the Queen to Bothwell,” wrote Drury to Cecil, “and the death of the Prince, is presently looked for.”\*

This language is employed not only by the sagacious agent of Queen Elizabeth, but also by one of Mary Stuart’s most faithful servants. “The bruit began to rise,” says Sir James Melvil, “that the Queen would marry the Earl of Bothwell. Whereat every good subject that loved the Queen’s honour and the Prince’s safety, had sore hearts; and thought her Majesty would be dishonoured, and the Prince in danger to be cut off by him that had slain his father.”† Few, however, ventured to dissuade the Queen from this step, as Bothwell’s power and anger were held in universal dread. One gentleman, indeed, with more courage than the rest, Lord Herries,‡ travelled express to Edinburgh, threw himself at Mary’s feet, and implored her not to marry the man who was considered by all her subjects to be the murderer of her husband, or she would compromise her honour, endanger her son’s life, and ruin herself. The Queen appeared surprised, and told him, with her accustomed dissimulation, that she did not understand the meaning of the rumour, and “that there was no such thing in her mind.” After

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 519.

† Melvil’s Memoirs, p. 78.

‡ Sir John Maxwell, second son of Robert, fourth Lord Maxwell, and head of a powerful family in the south of Scotland. He married Agnes, eldest daughter and co-heiress of William Herries of Terreigles, and took the title of Lord Herries, in right of his wife. He joined the Lords of the Congregation in 1559, and generally espoused the cause of the Queen.

having given her this salutary but useless advice, Herries hastened home by relays of horses which he had stationed along the road, in order to escape Bothwell's pursuit and revenge.\*

Melvil was urged by similar feelings of loyalty to give the same advice, but his interference was very ill received by the Queen, who informed Bothwell of it. The prudent Lethington blamed Melvil for his dangerous candour. "So soon," said he, "as the Earl Bothwell gets word, as I fear he will, he will not fail to slay you. I pray you retire with diligence." "It is a sore matter," replied Melvil, "to see that good Princess run to utter wreck, and nobody to forewarn her." "You have done more honestly than wisely," said Lethington. He was not mistaken with regard to the danger which Melvil had just incurred. Bothwell declared that he would have his life, and Melvil was obliged to conceal himself for several days until the Queen had succeeded in allaying her lover's anger.†

Bothwell's imperious audacity was now manifested by a most extraordinary proceeding. He was determined to secure the consent of the leading nobility to his marriage with the Queen. Accordingly, on the evening of the 19th of April, the day on which the Parliament rose, he invited the Earls of Morton, Argyle, Huntly, Cassilis, Glencairn, Rothes, Sutherland, Caithness, and Eglinton, with Lords Boyd,

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 78.

† Ibid., p. 79.

Seton, Sinclair, Semple, Oliphant, Ogilvy, Ross Haccat, Carlile, Hume, Invermeith, and others, to supper in a tavern kept by a person named Ansley. During the entertainment a band of two hundred hackbutters surrounded the house and overawed its inmates. Bothwell then rose, told his guests that the Queen had consented to marry him, and produced, according to the testimony of some of the witnesses of this strange scene, her written warrant empowering him to propose the matter to her nobility. In the confusion which ensued, the Earl of Eglinton made his escape. The others, with disgraceful cowardice, affixed their signatures to a bond, in which they declared their conviction of Bothwell's innocence, promised to defend him against all traducers, and recommended "this noble and mighty lord" as a suitable husband for the Queen, whose continuance in solitary widowhood was, they said, injurious to the interests of the commonwealth.\* They further engaged to maintain Bothwell's pretensions to the Queen's hand with their lives and fortunes; and if they failed to perform their promise, to pass for men devoid of honour and loyalty, unworthy and infamous traitors. The Bishops of St. Andrews, Aberdeen, Dumblane, Brechin, Ross, Orkney, and others, signed this bond;† which constituted the shame of all those Scottish nobles who subscribed or submitted to it, and hastened the destruction of Mary Stuart, by

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 401.

† Keith, pp. 382, 383.

encouraging her to pursue her fatal plan of marriage to Bothwell.

She was more passionately fond of him than ever, although his violent temper sometimes led him to act offensively towards her. He seemed to distrust her affection and fidelity; displayed his bad opinion with injurious brutality; and substituted his sister, Lady Coldingham, in the place of Lady Reres, her confidante.\* The unfortunate Queen was compelled to write to him, with all the weakness and humility of love: "I will take such (servants) as shall content you for their conditions. I beseech you that an opinion of another person be not hurtful in your mind to my constancy. Mistrust me but when I will put you out of doubt, and clear myself. Refuse it not, my dear life, and suffer me to make you some proof by my obedience, my faithfulness, constancy, and voluntary subjection."† Bothwell was supreme at Court, and disposed of everything at his pleasure. Murray, the only man who, up to a certain point, could have resisted him, had left the country without waiting for his sister's marriage, which he foresaw, but could not prevent.

However incredible it may appear, this marriage had been decided upon by a contract signed by Mary Stuart herself on the 5th of April, seven days before

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 520.

† Fourth letter from Mary Stuart to Bothwell; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 194.

Bothwell's acquittal.\* It was prepared with mysterious precipitation. Bothwell could not openly claim, or the Queen voluntarily consent to, its fulfilment so soon after the death of Darnley, who had been murdered by the one only two months and a half before, and for whom the other would long have to wear mourning apparel. What was to be done? They determined that he should carry her off by force—a proceeding which would place Mary, in some measure, under the constraint of necessity, and would explain the resignation of the Queen, by the violence done to the woman. Here, again, she was unhappily Bothwell's accomplice, as we have abundant evidence to demonstrate. She agreed with him that he should meet her, with a force more numerous than her own retinue, as she was returning from a visit to the young Prince her son, at Stirling Castle, and that he should, with a show of violence, make himself master of her person and will. Bothwell at once departed to complete his preparations. During his absence, Mary wrote to him several letters which betray her anxiety, her jealousy,† her unchangeable resolution, and the impatience which she felt at the objections of Bothwell's own confidants. Huntly had been let into the secret, and endeavoured to dis-

\* This contract was found in the silver casket, with Mary's secret letters and sonnets to Bothwell.

† "I would I were dead, for I see all goeth ill. You promised other manner of matter of your foreseeing, but absence hath power over you, who have two strings to your bow." Mary's fifth letter to Bothwell; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 198.

suade the Queen from carrying out the plan. She immediately conceived great suspicion of him, and wrote to Bothwell: "He preached unto me that it was a foolish enterprise, and that with mine honour I could never marry you, seeing that being married you did carry me away, and that his folks would not suffer it, and that the lords would unsay themselves, and would deny that they had said. I told him that, seeing I was come so far, if you did not withdraw yourself of yourself, that no persuasion, nor death itself, should make me fail of my promise."\*

In another letter she explains the part which she was to act in the abduction. "As for the handling of myself," she says, "I heard it once well devised. Methinks that your services, and long friendship, having the good will of the lords, do well deserve a pardon, if above the duty of a subject you advance yourself, not to constrain me, but to assure yourself of such place nigh unto me, that other admonitions, or foreign persuasions, may not let (hinder) me from consenting to that that you hope your service shall make you one day to attain; and to be short, to make yourself sure of the lords, and free to marry; and that you are constrained for your safety, and to be able to serve me faithfully, to use an humble request, joined to an importunate action."† When the moment of execution arrived, difficulties arose on the part of those who were to form her escort. The Earl of

\* Laing, vol. ii., pp. 196, 197.

† Laing, vol. ii., p. 200.

Sutherland declared that he would rather die than suffer the Queen to be carried off whilst she was under his protection. The Earl of Huntly, filled with grief, and apprehensive of a conflict, was afraid of being accused of ingratitude towards the Queen, and of appearing to have betrayed her. "I have thought good," wrote Mary Stuart to Bothwell, "to advertise you of the fear he hath that he should be charged and accused of treason, to the end that, without mistrusting him, you may be the more circumspect, and that you may have the more power ; for we had yesterday more than three hundred horse of his and of Livingston's. For the honour of God, be accompanied rather with more than less ; for that is the principal of my care."\*

Bothwell consequently augmented his forces. On Monday, the 21st of April, Mary Stuart went, as she had promised, to visit her son at Stirling Castle ; but was not allowed to enter the royal apartments with more than two of her ladies, for the Earl of Mar, from some suspicion which he entertained, refused to admit the rest of her suite. She left Stirling three days afterwards, on Thursday the 24th, to return to Edinburgh ; but when she reached Almond Bridge, six miles from the city, Bothwell met her, accompanied by six hundred horsemen. He took her horse by the bridle, made

\* Laing, vol. ii., p. 202. A letter was written at the same time from Scotland to Cecil, informing him of all that was about to happen : Bothwell's divorce from Lady Gordon, and Mary Stuart's abduction. "He is minded," said the writer, "to meet the Queen this day called Thursday, and to take her by the way and bring her to Dunbar. Judge you if it be with her will or no ?" Tytler, vol. v., p. 404.

himself master of her person without opposition, and conducted her to his Castle of Dunbar, which he had fully prepared for her reception. Lethington, Huntly, and Melvil were among the captives; and when Melvil remonstrated against such usage, he was informed by Captain Blacater that all had been done with the Queen's own consent.\* Mary Stuart passed some time under the roof and in the public possession of Bothwell; but her abduction was only the prelude to her marriage. Bothwell hurried his divorce from Lady Jane Gordon through the Court of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, who obtained as the price of his complaisance, the restoration of his consistorial rights; and also through the commissariat, or ecclesiastical court of the Presbyterians.† The two jurisdictions of the ancient and the modern Church gave their consent, one on behalf of the Catholic Jane Gordon, and the other on behalf of the Protestant Bothwell, and the sentence of divorce ‡ was pronounced on the 3rd of May. On that day, Mary returned from Dunbar to Edinburgh. As she entered the city, Bothwell respectfully took the Queen's horse by the bridle, and his soldiers cast away their spears, as if to prove that Mary Stuart was completely free, and that Bothwell was only her obedient and unarmed servant. The Queen, on her side, declared that she pardoned Bothwell, and announced her intention to marry him.§

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 80.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 406.

‡ Robertson, vol. ii., Appendix 20. Laing, vol. i., pp. 82, 83.

§ Anderson, vol. ii., p. 276. Laing, vol. i., p. 84.



Although this had long been expected, its announcement excited the greatest indignation. The Reformed Church received orders to publish the banns of marriage, but refused to do so. In the absence of Knox, who had left Scotland after Riccio's murder, Craig, one of the leading Presbyterian ministers, alleged as his excuse that the Queen had sent no written command, and stated the common report that she was held captive by Bothwell. Upon this, the Justice Clerk brought him a letter from the Queen, enjoining the publication of the banns, and contradicting the report of her captivity. Craig still resisted, and desired to be confronted with the parties, in presence of the Privy Council. There, with courageous vehemence, he laid to Bothwell's charge the dreadful crimes of which he was suspected, rape, adultery, and murder. Having thus exonerated his conscience, he did not deem himself justified in longer refusing to obey the injunctions he had received, but added from the pulpit, and in presence of the congregation, these words: "I take heaven and earth to witness, that I abhor and detest this marriage, as odious and slanderous to the world, and I would exhort the faithful to pray earnestly that a union against all reason and good conscience, may yet be overruled by God, to the comfort of this unhappy realm."\*

The infatuated Mary was not aroused to the folly of

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office; Drury to Cocil, 14th May, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 412.

her conduct by this universal reprobation ; she braved every danger that she might satisfy her passion, and raise her favourite to her own rank. On the 12th of May, she came in person to the High Court at Edinburgh, and declared to the assembled magistrates and nobility of Scotland, that she was free, that she pardoned Bothwell the offence he had committed against her, in consideration of his subsequent good conduct, and that she meant to promote him to still higher honour.\* On the same day, accordingly, she created him Duke of Orkney and Shetland, and placed the coronet on his head with her own hands.† Two days afterwards, she signed her contract of marriage with “this noble and mighty lord,” in order that she might put an end to her solitary widowhood, and increase the number of her descendants. And, finally, on the 15th of May, at four o’clock in the morning, the marriage ceremony was performed in Holyrood Palace according to the Catholic ritual, and afterwards after the rite of the Protestant Church, by the Bishop of Orkney, in presence of Craig.‡

Few of the Scottish nobility were present at the disgusting ceremony,§ which, three months after the King’s assassination, united his widow in marriage to his murderer. The people received the intelligence with gloomy silence and sombre disapprobation. On

\* Anderson, vol. i., p. 87. Tytler, vol. v., p. 413.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office; Drury to Cecil, 16th May, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 413.

‡ Ibid.

§ Tytler, vol. v., p. 413.

the following morning, a paper was found on the palace gates, with the following verse :—

*“ Mense malas Maio nubere vulgus ait.” \**

The ominous prognostics, drawn from a union thus generally condemned by the public conscience, were destined too soon to be realised.

\* Ovid. *Fast.*, lib. v., l. 490. Keith, p. 386.

## CHAPTER VI.

FROM MARY'S MARRIAGE WITH BOTHWELL TO HER FLIGHT  
INTO ENGLAND. .

League of the nobility against Mary and Bothwell—Applications to Queen Elizabeth for assistance—Attack of Borthwick Castle—Mary's flight to Dunbar—Entry of the confederates into Edinburgh—Mary levies an army—Her defeat at Carberry Hill—Her separation from Bothwell—She yields to the confederates, is led captive to Edinburgh, and finally imprisoned in Lochleven—Government of the Lords of the Secret Council—Arrest and confessions of Bothwell's accomplices—Deposition of the Queen—Coronation of James VI.—Murray is appointed Regent—Conduct of Queen Elizabeth—Behaviour of Murray—Convocation of Parliament—Flight and fate of Bothwell—Mary escapes from Lochleven, and collects an army at Hamilton Castle—Battle of Langside—Defeat of the Queen's army—Her flight into England.

It was not long before Mary Stuart paid the penalty of her imprudent marriage. Even on her wedding-day she had a violent quarrel with Bothwell. The French ambassador, Du Croc, who had refused to be present at the nuptials, wrote to Catherine de Medici and Charles IX. : "Your Majesties could not do better than be very displeased with the marriage, for it is a very unfortunate one, and already is repented of. On Thursday (May 15th) her Majesty sent for me to inquire whether I had perceived any strangeness between her and her husband ; which she wished to excuse to me, saying that, if I saw she was sorrowful,

it was because she would not rejoice, as she says she never will again, and desires only death. Yesterday (May 16th) being both in a closet with the Earl of Bothwell, she called out aloud for some one to give her a knife that she might kill herself. Those who were in the adjoining room heard her. They think that unless God aids her, she will fall into despair."\* Melvil confirms this account of the speedy disagreement of the Queen and her new husband. "The Queen," he says, "was so disdainfully handled, and with such reproachful language, that Arther Erskine and I being present, heard her ask a knife to stick herself, 'or else,' said she, 'I shall drown myself.'"+

Bothwell displayed the most offensive suspicions of her conduct, and humiliated her by his coarse requirements. His real or affected jealousy made him forbid the Queen to indulge in those innocent familiarities which she was wont to use towards her friends. Doubtless afraid that she would as soon become disgusted with him as she had with Darnley, he tortured her heart in order to occupy it, and rendered her unhappy that he might prevent her from being inconstant. "Ever since the day after her marriage," wrote Du Croc to Catherine de Medici, "she has passed her time in nothing but tears and lamentations, as he (Bothwell) will not give her liberty to look at any one, or allow any one to look at her, although he knows that she

\* Labanoff, vol. vii., pp. 110, 111.

+ Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 80.

loves to take her pleasure and pass her time agreeably as much as any one.”\*

Mary Stuart, though thus tormented by Bothwell, was still attached to him, and endeavoured to induce foreign Courts to recognise him as her husband. She accordingly despatched the Bishop of Dumblane to France and Rome, with an adroit apology for her new marriage. It had been rendered inevitable, she said, by the written and, so to speak, unanimous wish of the nobility of Scotland; and its reason, as well as its excuse, was to be found in the noble qualities and eminent services of Bothwell. Therefore, after having read the pressing request of the principal lords of her kingdom, and having heard Bothwell's explanations, she had pardoned the violence which his ardent love and the exigencies of his position had emboldened him

\* In a letter from Du Croc to Catherine de Medici, dated Edinburgh, 17th June, 1567. In May, 1848, I published this despatch, which I extracted from vol. 218 of the Saint-Germain-Harlay MSS., in the National Library at Paris, and which has since been printed in Teulet's *Pièces et Documents relatifs à l'histoire d'Ecosse*, vol. ii., p. 170.—Some lines by Mary Stuart, found, together with her marriage-contract and some letters, in the famous silver casket, give eloquent expression to her complaints in this respect:—

“ Et vous doutez de ma ferme constance,  
O mon seul bien et ma seule espérance,  
Et ne vous puis assurer de ma foy.  
Vous m'estimez légère que je voy,  
Et, si n'avez eu ma nulle assurance,  
Et soupçonnez mon cœur sans apparence,  
Vous défiant à trop grand tort de moy.  
Vous ignorez l'amour que je vous porte,  
Vous soupçonnez qu'autre amour me transporte,  
Vous estimez mes paroles du vent,  
Vous dépeignez de cire mon las, cœur,  
Vous me pensez femme sans jugement,  
Et tout cela augmente mon ardeur.”

to commit against her person. The Bishop of Dunblane was to add that, as the factious turbulence of her rebellious nation, which would neither submit to the authority of a woman, nor suffer her to marry a foreign Prince, had compelled her to espouse one of her own subjects, she had been unable to find amongst them any one who could be compared to the Earl of Bothwell for the reputation of his family, his own merits, his wisdom, and his valour, and that she had, therefore, assented without repugnance to the desire of the three estates of her realm.\* She despatched Robert Melvil to England, with similar instructions. If the Queen of England considered it strange that she should have espoused the man who was suspected of having murdered her husband, and whose first wife was still living, Melvil had orders to remind her, in the first place, that the Earl of Bothwell had been acquitted by the justice of his country, and had moreover offered to maintain his innocence by arms; and in answer to the second objection, he was to say, that a legal divorce had rendered Bothwell perfectly free to marry again. Mary begged the Courts of France and England to excuse her if she had consented to a precipitate marriage, and requested them, now that it had become irrevocable, to extend to her husband that friendship which they had so long manifested towards herself.†

\* See the instructions given him by Mary Stuart, in Keith, pp. 388-392, and Anderson's Collections, vol. i., p. 89.

† These instructions, also, are printed in Keith, pp. 392-394, and Anderson's Collections, vol. i., pp. 102-107.

Bothwell, on his side, wrote a short and submissive letter to Charles IX.,\* whilst he offered his services to Elizabeth in a bold and almost kingly tone. He protested against the bad opinion which that Queen appeared to entertain regarding him, and added : " Men of greater birth might have been preferred to the high station I now occupy, but none could have been chosen more zealous for the preservation of your Majesty's friendship, of which you shall have experience at any time it may be your pleasure to employ me."† Before seeking the assistance of those foreign powers which were most intimately connected with the affairs of Scotland, he had taken into his own hands all the authority of the kingdom, and had ensured to himself the full exercise of royal power, by composing the Privy Council of his friends and partisans. He had introduced into that body the Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Lords Oliphant, Boyd, Herries, and Fleming, and the Bishops of Ross and Galloway ; and he had appointed Master of Requests Hepburn, the parson of Auldhamstocks, who had conducted his divorce from Lady Gordon.‡

Whilst Mary and Bothwell thought they were providing for their safety by these precautions, severe

\* Letter from Bothwell to Charles IX., 27th May, 1567 ; in Teulet's *Pièces et Documents relatifs à l'histoire d'Ecosse*, vol. ii., p. 156.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Bothwell to Elizabeth ; 6th June, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 418.

‡ Laing's *History of Scotland*, vol. i., p. 95.



trials and terrible punishments were in preparation for them elsewhere. A formidable confederation had been formed against Bothwell, and consequently against Mary Stuart. This league, which was long thought to have been subsequent to the marriage, existed before its consummation, as has been proved by the valuable correspondence recently extracted by Mr. Patrick Fraser Tytler from the English State Paper Office.\* Immediately after the famous supper at Ansley's tavern on the 19th of April, the principal nobles, whom Bothwell had forced to subscribe to his propositions, entered into a secret league to oppose him. Argyle, Athol, Morton, and Kirkaldy of Grange, feared that the Queen, being no longer the mistress of her actions, but carried away by her passion for Bothwell, would deliver up her son into his hands, and that he would get rid of him, as he had previously got rid of Darnley. The Laird of Grange, in their name, demanded Elizabeth's assistance against Bothwell, whose power would become irresistible when he had added the authority of the Crown to his own natural audacity. On the 20th of April, he wrote to this effect to the Earl of Bedford, and told him that the Queen had become so shamelessly enamoured of Bothwell, that she had been heard to say, in presence of several persons, "She cared not to lose France, England, and her own country, for him, and shall go

\* These letters have been used by him in the preparation of his account of Queen Mary's reign, in his History of Scotland.

with him to the world's end in a white petticoat, before she leave him." \*

Two days after Mary's Stuart's abduction, the Laird of Grange wrote a second letter to Bedford. "This Queen," he said, "will never cease, unto such time as she have wrecked all the honest men of this realm. She was minded to cause Bothwell ravish (seize) her, to the end that she may the sooner end the marriage whilk she promised before she caused Bothwell murder her husband. There is many that would revenge the murder, but they fear your mistress. I am so suited to for to enterprise the revenge, that I must either take it upon hand, or else I must leave the country, the which I am determind to do, if I can obtain licence. I pray your lordship let me know what your mistress will do, for if we will seek France, we may find favour at their hands." † On the 8th of May, he wrote again in a still more precise and urgent manner to Bedford, and told him that most of the nobility who, before the last Parliament and for fear of their lives, had subscribed to matters equally opposed to their honours and consciences, had since met together at Stirling, and entered into a league. "The heads, that presently they agreed upon," he continued, "is, first, to seek the liberty of the Queen, who is ravished and detained by the Earl of

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Grange to Bedford, 20th April, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 403.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Grange to Bedford, 26th April, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 405.

Bothwell, who was the ravisher, and hath the strengths, munitions, and men of war at his commandment. The next head is, the preservation and keeping of the Prince. The third is, to pursue them that murdered the King. For the pursuit of these three heads, they have promised to bestow their lives, lands, and goods. And to that effect their lordships have desired me to write unto your lordship, to the end they might have your sovereign's aid and support for suppressing of the cruel murderer Bothwell, who, at the Queen's last being in Stirling, suborned certain to have poisoned the Prince; for that barbarous tyrant is not contented to have murdered the father, but he would also cut off the son, for fear that he hath to be punished hereafter. The names of the lords that convened in Stirling was the Earls of Argyle, Morton, Athol, and Mar. . . . . There is to be joined with the four forenamed lords, the Earls of Glencairn, Cassillis, Eglinton, Montrose, Caithness; the Lords Boyd, Ochiltree, Ruthven, Drummond, Gray, Glamis, Innermeith, Lindsay, Hume, and Herries." He added that the confederates had dispersed to raise troops in their respective districts.\*

A striking proof of the general feeling which united the nobles against Bothwell is to be found in the fact that Robert Melvil, who possessed Mary Stuart's entire

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Grange to Bedford, 8th May, 1567. Tytler, vol. v. pp. 407-409.

confidence, and who was sent by her shortly afterwards on a mission to Elizabeth, had joined the confederacy. In a letter which he wrote about the same time to Cecil, he demanded the assistance of England to set the Queen at liberty, and to punish the murderers of the King; and, as the Laird of Grange had done, he intimated that, if England refused her aid, France was ready to grant them succour. In fact, the Court of France, seeing that Mary Stuart multiplied the commission of degrading disorders and destructive errors, and fearing that Scotland might thereby fall under the dominion of England, had preferred to abandon the Queen rather than lose the kingdom. Charles IX. sent Villeroy to Du Croc, with secret instructions, from which we extract the following curious passage:—"The said Sieur de Villeroy will say, that his Majesty having made known to him the opinion which he entertains of the pitiable success of the affairs of the Queen of Scotland, seeing what has been written to him of her behaviour by the said Sieur du Croc, and the strange news which he has received from other quarters; and being also concerned that the enterprize of the said lords is secretly assisted and favoured by the English—whose charity would only entail their ruin—the King wishes the said Sieur du Croc to know, that the desire and principal intention of his Majesty is to keep the kingdom of Scotland in its attachment to himself, without permitting it, under the pretext of the many follies which are committed, to

rebel and alienate itself from its attachment to himself, as it is certain it would do towards the said English, whom the said lords would seek as their protectors in this affair, if they saw they would have no assurance from the King."\* It appears that Du Croc, in conformity with these instructions, offered the confederate lords a company of men-at-arms, and pensions to several noblemen and gentlemen.†

But the confederates preferred to have the support of Elizabeth, who hesitated what course to pursue in the matter, as she would have to choose between the interests of her tortuous policy, and her theories of royal prerogative. On the one hand she feared, by refusal, to compel the Scottish lords to an alliance with France; and on the other, she felt a great repugnance to countenance so dangerous a proceeding as the rebellion of a nation against its sovereign. She had been incensed by the letters of the Laird of Grange,‡ and had said that a subject was never justified in making known to the world the weaknesses and faults of his prince. She declared that the coronation of the Prince Royal during the lifetime of his mother would be sanctioned neither by herself, nor by any other monarch.

\* Instructions to M. de Villeroi, ambassador to Scotland. Harlay MSS., No. 218, Nat. Lib. Paris; published in Teulet's *Pièces et Documents*, &c., vol. ii., pp. 182-185.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Robert Melvil to Cecil, 7th May, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 407.

‡ Upon this point a remarkable conversation took place between her and Randolph, in the palace garden. See Tytler, vol. v., pp. 410, 411.

She added, however, that to prevent him from being given up to the French by Bothwell, she would be disposed to assist the confederates, if they would place him in her hands. But as her actions rarely corresponded with her words, she gave them every encouragement, although she had not obtained from them what she required. That able and steadfast politician, Cecil, undertook to make her feelings subordinate to her interests, and to lead her, slowly but surely, to adopt those resolutions which were least agreeable, but most advantageous. Robert Melvil, who was sent by Mary Stuart to inform her of her marriage, and who had joined the confederacy out of hatred for Bothwell, obtained an assurance not long afterwards, notwithstanding Elizabeth's monarchical scruples and high-flown sentiments, that the Queen of England would assist the lords in their honourable enterprise.\*

The league of the nobility increased daily in numbers and importance. Lethington, having become suspected by Bothwell, who had attempted to kill him in the Queen's own chamber,† had taken refuge with his friend the Earl of Athol, with the intention of joining the confederates. Mary Stuart was not entirely ignorant of the designs of her enemies, who had all withdrawn from her Court. She did not seem to fear them, and treated their leaders with the utmost disdain. In allusion to their character and position, she observed

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 438.

† *Ibid.*, vol. v., p. 415.

sarcastically : “ Athol is but feeble ; for Argyle, I know well how to stop his mouth ; as for Morton, his boots are but new pulled off [alluding to his recent return from banishment] and still soiled, he shall be sent back to his own quarters.”\* She discovered ere long that they were far more formidable than she imagined. Bothwell had quickly manifested the intentions attributed to him, by making an imperious demand for the Prince Royal. The Earl of Mar, when summoned with threats to deliver him up, replied that he would not consent to do so unless the young Prince were placed in Edinburgh Castle under the care of a governor without reproach, and on whose fidelity all could rely.† But instead of pursuing his attempts to gain possession of Darnley’s son, Bothwell was now obliged to defend himself.

The Queen had left Edinburgh shortly after her marriage, as the citizens had not appeared very favourably disposed towards her, and had retired to Borthwick Castle, a seat of the Laird of Crookston’s, about ten miles from the capital.‡ She had summoned her nobles to attend her with her feudal forces on an expedition against the borderers of Liddesdale ;§ but no one had responded to the summons, and Bothwell, who had been appointed to command the army, had

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Drury to Cecil, 20th May, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 416.

† Melvil’s Memoirs, p. 80.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 420.

§ This proclamation, dated May 28, is in Keith, p. 395.

returned to the Queen at Borthwick very much disconcerted.\* The confederates seized this opportunity, not only for refusing their obedience, but also for manifesting their insurrection. The Earls of Morton, Mar, Glencairn, and Montrose, and the Lords Hume, Lindsay, Ruthven, Sanquhar, Semple, Kirkaldy of Grange, Tullibardine, and Lochleven collected two thousand horsemen, and advanced towards Borthwick Castle.† Lord Hume was the first to arrive with eight hundred men. On the 10th of June he hoped to surprise Bothwell, who had been informed of his coming, and had made a precipitate escape. On the same evening the Queen, disguised in man's apparel, left the castle on horseback, joined Bothwell at a short distance from it, and rode with him to Dunbar, where they arrived at about three o'clock in the morning.‡

Disappointed in their attempts against Borthwick,

\* "Mais lui (Bothwell) venu audit lieu ne trouva personnes; pourquoi se voiant dépourveu de son entreprise, retourna trouver la royne à Borthik, où ils furent advertis, avant couché, qu'ils seroient assiégés audit lieu." Narrative of Events from the 7th to the 15th June, 1567, by the Captain of Inchkeith, in Teulet's Pièces et Documents, vol. ii., pp. 159, 160. This Captain of Inchkeith, a small island opposite Leith, made this short campaign in the Queen's army.

† Keith, p. 398.

‡ "A dix heures au soir, la royne print habillemetz de homme, et privément monté sur un courteau, estant à Borthik, et prent son chemin vers Donbar; et avant avoir fait grand chemin, rencontre le duc son mari; et s'en alèrent au château de Donbar ensemble, et arrivèrent à trois heures du matin, et fait tout le chemin en une selle d'homme." Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith, in Teulet, vol. ii., pp. 161, 162.—"Hir Maiestie in mennis claihs, butit, and spurit, departit that saming neicht of Borthwick to Dunbar, quhairof na man knew saif ma lord Duk and sum of his servants, quha met hir Maiestie a myll of Borthwick, and convoyit hir Hiencas to Dunbar." Letter from James Beton to his brother, the Archbishop of Glasgow, dated Edinburgh, 17th June, 1567; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 107. See also a letter from Du Croc to Charles IX., 17th June, 1567; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 172.



the confederates marched towards Edinburgh, where they arrived on the 11th of June. Their little army had meanwhile been increased, by reinforcements, to three thousand men. The people of Edinburgh declared in their favour. Accordingly the Earl of Huntly, Lord Claud Hamilton, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Abbot of Kilwinning, and the Bishop of Ross, who had been left in the city by the Queen, took refuge in the castle,\* which had been left by Bothwell under the command of James Balfour, who was now ready to join the confederates, and would not point his artillery against them. An hour after the confederates had entered Edinburgh, they published the following proclamation : “ That whereas the Queen’s Majesty, being detained in captivity, was neither able to govern her realm, nor try the murder of her husband, we of the nobility and council command all the subjects, specially the burghers of Edinburgh, to assist the said noblemen and council in delivering the Queen and preserving the Prince, and in trying and punishing the King’s murderers. And we command the Lords of Session, commissaries, and all other judges, to sit and do justice according to the laws of this realm, notwithstanding any tumult that may arise in the time of this enterprise ; with certification to all who shall be found acting contrary to these proceedings, that they shall be reputed as fautors of the said murder

\* Keith, p. 398, note.

and punished as traitors.”\* On the following day, being joined by Athol and Lethington, they ordered the Queen’s lieges to be ready within three hours to march against the Earl of Bothwell, who, they said, “having put violent hands on the Queen’s person, having proceeded to a dishonest marriage with Her Majesty, and having already murdered the late King, was now attempting by his gathering together of forces to murder the young Prince also.” †

Bothwell, in truth, had lost no time. As soon as the Queen arrived at Dunbar she published a proclamation, in which the confederate lords were arraigned as traitors, and all her faithful subjects were summoned to her standard. An army of two thousand five hundred men having been gathered together in two days, Mary Stuart and Bothwell marched at once against the insurgents, lest delay should render them more powerful. They left Dunbar on Saturday, the 14th of June, and slept at Seton, whilst their troops passed the night at Preston. ‡ On the following day they resumed their march, and on their arrival at Gladsmoor the Queen caused a proclamation to be read to her little army, to the effect, “That a number of conspirators having discovered their latent malice, borne to her and the Duke of Orkney, her husband, after they had failed in apprehending their persons at Borthwick, had made a seditious proclamation to make the people

\* Keith, pp. 398, 399.

† Ibid., p. 399.

‡ Ibid., p. 400.

believe that they did seek the revenge of the murder of the King, her late husband, and the relieving of herself out of bondage and captivity, pretending that the Duke her husband was minded to invade the Prince her son ; all which were false and forged inventions, none having better cause to revenge the King's death than herself, if she could know the authors thereof. And for the Duke, her present husband, he had used all means to clear his innocence, the ordinary justice had absolved him, and the Estates of Parliament approved their proceedings, which they themselves that made the present insurrection, had likewise allowed. As, also, he had offered to maintain that quarrel against any gentleman on earth undefamed, than which nothing more could be required. And as to her alleged captivity, the contrary was known to the whole subjects, her marriage with him being publicly contracted and solemnised with their own consents, as their hand-writs could testify. Albeit to give their treason a fair show they made now a buckler of the Prince, her son, being an infant and in their hands ; whereas their intention only was to overthrow her and her posterity that they might rule all things at their pleasure and without controlment."\* Finally, in order to encourage her troops to fidelity, and to increase the number of her adherents, she promised them, "in recompense of their valorous service, the

\* Keith, p. 400.

lands and possessions of the rebels, which should be distributed according to the merit of every man."\* Mounted on horseback, preceded by the royal standard of Scotland, and dressed in a red gown which reached only to her knees,† the Queen, who had been joined by the Lords Seton, Yester, and Borthwick,‡ led her army, to Carberry Hill, six miles from Edinburgh, on the eastern side of which she intrenched herself.

The confederate nobles, having been informed of her march at midnight on Saturday, left Edinburgh between two and three o'clock on Sunday morning,§ with the intention of giving her battle. In place of the lion of Scotland,|| a banner was displayed, on which was painted the body of the murdered King, lying under a tree, with the young Prince kneeling beside it, and underneath the motto, "*Judge and avenge my cause, O Lord!*"¶ The sight of this lugubrious banner had greatly moved the people of Edinburgh, and strongly excited the confederate soldiers. The two

\* Keith, p. 400.

† Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith, in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 162.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 422.

§ "Les seigneurs estant advertis et craignant que la royne ou se duc se présentassent devant le château de cette ville, qui promettoit toujours de tenir bon si elle faisoit gens, commençèrent à desloger dimanche à deux heures après minuit, pour aller combattre près de Seiton." Letter from Du Croc to Charles IX., in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 173.—"Upon the morn, at twa hours of the morning, thair trumpet blew, and they for the maist pairt maid thame till thair horses." Letter from James Beton to the Archbishop of Glasgow, in Laing, vol. ii., p. 109.

|| "La royne en sa bandière portoyt un lion, qui sont les armes de ce royaume." Du Croc to Charles IX., 17th June, 1567; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 177.

¶ Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith, in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 164; and letter from Du Croc to Charles IX., 17th June, *ibid.*, p. 177.

armies were soon in presence of each other ; that of the lords took up its position on the heights of Musselburgh, about a mile from the Queen's encampment.\* Separated by a little brook, and both occupying positions difficult of access, they were nearly equal in point of numbers, but very different in spirit and quality. On the Queen's side scarcely any of the nobility were to be found,†—her servants wavered in their fidelity, and her soldiers were dispirited by the unpopularity of her cause ; on the opposite side were the most powerful barons in the kingdom, with troops animated by enthusiastic ardour, burning to overthrow an ambitious upstart, and to punish a hateful murderer.

Whilst the two armies were lying opposite each other, the French ambassador, Du Croc, made an attempt at mediation in the name of the King, his master. He repaired first to the camp of the confederates. To his offers of reconciliation the lords replied that, in order to avoid bloodshed, they were ready, if the Queen would separate herself from "the wretch who held her captive,"‡ to acknowledge her sway, to serve her faithfully, and to continue her very obedient subjects ; that, if Bothwell would come out between the armies, he would be met by some one from among

\* Inchkeith's Narrative, in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 163.

† *En nostre armée il n'y avoit ni comte, ni grand seigneur, n'est milord Ross, et milord Borthiko.*" The Captain of Inchkeith's Narrative ; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 166.

‡ Letter from Du Croc to Charles IX., 17th June, 1567 ; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 173.

their ranks who would maintain against him that he was the real murderer of the late King ; and that if he required two, four, ten, or twelve opponents, they would be forthcoming. Du Croc expressed his repugnance to be the bearer of these two propositions. The first was an abandonment of Bothwell, to which the Queen, in his opinion, would never consent ; and the second, a single combat, which she would never permit. But the lords firmly replied that nothing else could be done, and that they would rather be buried alive than suffer the truth regarding the death of the King to remain longer concealed.\*

The French ambassador left them with but little hope, and, having been escorted to the outposts of the royal army, went in search of Mary Stuart. He found her sitting on a hillock, very resolute and animated. After having kissed hands, he tried to mollify her resentment against those who, though now opposed to her, had not ceased to be her subjects, and proclaimed themselves still her very humble and affectionate servants. Interrupting him at these words, she said vehemently : “ They show their affection very ill, by running counter to what they have signed, and by accusing the man whom they acquitted, and to whom they have married me.” She added, however, that if they returned to their duty, and begged her pardon, she was ready to receive them with open arms. At this moment Bothwell

\* Letter from Du Croc to Charles IX., 17th June, 1567 ; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 174.

came up. "Is it of me that they complain?" he said to Du Croc in a voice loud enough to be heard by his army. "I have just been speaking to them," replied Du Croc as loudly, "and they have assured me that they are the Queen's very humble subjects and servants; and your mortal enemies," he added in a lower tone, "since you will know it." "What have I done to them?" answered Bothwell in the same tone, as if desirous to communicate his own assurance to those who heard him, and did not feel so bold as himself: "I have never caused displeasure to a single one of them; on the contrary, I have sought to consult them all. What they are doing is out of envy for my greatness. Fortune is free to any who can receive her; and there is not a man among them who would not like to be in my place." He then proposed, in order to prevent bloodshed, to fight between the two armies, although he had had the honour to espouse the Queen, any of his enemies who might leave their ranks, provided he were a gentleman. The Queen opposed this proposition, saying that she would not allow anything of the kind, and that his quarrel was hers also.\*

During this conversation, the confederate army had put itself in motion, and passed the brook which separated it from the royal troops. Bothwell left Du Croc to place himself at the head of his men, and Du Croc,

\* Letter from Du Croc to Charles IX., 17th June, 1567; in Teulet, vol. ii., pp. 175, 176.

having taken leave of the Queen, returned to the confederates, for the purpose of making a last attempt. He promised Morton and Glencairn the pardon of their sovereign, on condition that they should return to their duty. "We have not come here," said Glencairn, "to solicit pardon for ourselves, but rather to give it to those who have offended." "We are in arms," added Morton, "not against our Queen, but against the Duke of Orkney, the murderer of her husband. Let him be delivered up, or let her Majesty remove him from her company, and we shall yield her obedience."\* They then put on their casques, and refused to pay further attention to Du Croc, who thereupon returned to Edinburgh.†

In both armies, the men had dismounted to do battle, and left their horses behind, according to the custom of the country.‡ As the confederates drew near, a cry arose among the royal troops that some means must be found to avoid a conflict.§ The Duke was surprised, and the Queen alarmed, at this demonstration.

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Scrope to Cecil, Carlisle, 17th June, 1567; and Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 18th and 19th June, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 423.

† Letter from Du Croc to Charles IX., in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 177.—"De fashion que Monsieur du Croc ne pouvoit trouver fasson ne aulcun moyen d'accord. Ce voyant, nous lesse l'ung et l'autre, et s'en va à Liallebourg." Inchkeith's Narrative, in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 163.

‡ Du Croc's letter of the 17th June. Teulet, vol. ii., p. 178.

§ "Et nous les voyons marcher, nous-mesmes les nostres en ordre de bataille; mais je trouvois les nostres qu'ils cherchoient plusot moyen d'appointement plusot que de combattre." Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith, in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 165.—"A la fin il se fit ung bruit dedans l'armée de la roynée, qu'il valloit mieulx chercher quelque expédient; ce qui estonna grandement la roynée et le due, connoissant ce qu'il avoyt toujours craint." Du Croc to Charles IX., 17th June, 1567; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 178.



It was immediately demanded that the Duke should decide the quarrel single-handed with a champion from the other side. Bothwell consented without hesitation; and the Queen, observing that her troops were falling away, could no longer refuse her permission. The Laird of Tullibardine accepted the defiance on behalf of the confederates, but was rejected by Mary Stuart, as not being of sufficiently high rank. Bothwell then singled out Morton, who prepared to fight him on foot, and with two-handed swords. Upon this, the intrepid Lindsay interfered, and contended that the honour belonged of right to him, as the servant of the murdered King. Morton yielded to his request, and armed him with the famous sword which had belonged to his renowned ancestor, Archibald Bell-the-Cat;\* and Lindsay, kneeling down in presence of the whole army, prayed aloud to God that he would strengthen his arm, "and that it would please His mercy to preserve the innocent, and His justice to vanquish the vicious murderer who had shed the blood of the King."†

But before Bothwell could obtain from Mary Stuart—who feared to expose her husband to so dangerous a conflict—permission to enter the lists with the fanatical champion of the confederates, it became evident that desertion was spreading rapidly in the royal army.

\* Tyler, vol. v., p. 424. Bell-the-Cat was the surname given to Archibald, Earl of Angus, who was the first to attack the favourites of James III., who were finally hanged upon the bridge of Lauder.

† Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 164.

During all these parleys, the soldiers of both parties had mingled with each other, and the Queen's troops had lost courage. The Laird of Grange, taking advantage of the disorder which prevailed in the enemy's ranks, wheeled round Carberry Hill with a strong body of his men, so as to cut off all possibility of Bothwell's retreat upon Dunbar. At sight of this, the panic became general—nearly all the royal army disbanded, and the Queen and Bothwell were left with only sixty gentlemen, and the band of hackbutters.\*

In this extremity the Queen, no longer able to fight, and deprived of almost every hope of escape, determined at least to save the man whom she loved, and sent the Laird of Ormiston to demand an interview with the Laird of Grange.† Sir William Kirkaldy advanced towards her, and told her that the lords would return to their allegiance if the man who stood near her, and was guilty of the King's murder, were dismissed, and if she would consent to follow them to Edinburgh. The Queen then promised to leave the Duke, and surrender herself into the hands of the lords, if they would promise faithfully to perform their duty towards her. The confederates solemnly assured her that, on such conditions, they were ready to receive and obey her as their sovereign.† Then, Mary had a short private conversation with Bothwell on Carberry Hill, to induce him to withdraw.

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Scrope to Cecil, 17th June, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., pp. 424, 425. Keith, p. 401.

† Keith, p. 401. Tytler, vol. v., p. 425.

What passed between them at this last interview? They were observed to speak together with much agitation, and then to separate "with great anguish and grief."\* "At last," says an eyewitness of the scene, "the Duke asked the Queen whether she would keep the promise of fidelity which she had made to him. Of which she assured him, and gave him her hand upon it. Thereupon he mounted his horse, with a small company of about a dozen of his friends, and went off at a gallop, taking the road to Dunbar."† Bothwell had seen Mary Stuart for the last time.

After this sacrifice, which she did not think was so great as it proved to be, Mary, full of sorrow and confidence, advanced towards the Laird of Grange, and said that she surrendered to him on the conditions he had specified in the name of the lords. She then gave him her hand, which he kissed respectfully, and, taking her horse by the bridle, he led her into the midst of the confederates, who received her with great deference and submission. "My lords," she said, "I am come to you, not out of any fear I had of my life, nor yet doubting of the victory, if matters had gone to the worst; but I abhor the shedding of Christian blood, especially of those that are my own subjects; and therefore I yield to you, and will be ruled hereafter by your counsels, trusting you will respect me as your born Princess and Queen."‡ She thus made her first appearance among

\* Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith; in Teulet, vol. ii., pp. 165-166.

† Ibid.

‡ Keith, p. 402.

them as their sovereign, and was received by them on their knees. "Here, madam," said Morton, "is the true place where your Grace should be, and here we are ready to defend and obey you as loyally as ever nobility of this realm did your progenitors."\* The lords, who complained more of Bothwell's power than of his crimes, being now satisfied with having vanquished and removed him, conducted themselves towards the Queen in a manner which quite accorded with her hopes, and their own promises. The soldiers, less accommodating than their leaders, gave vent to their coarse fanaticism, and malignant reprobation, by bursting out into invectives against the Queen. The Laird of Grange, however, drew his sword, and compelled them to silence.†

But the behaviour of the nobles soon underwent a change, and their actions became, ere long, utterly at variance with their words. Whilst James Balfour, Bothwell's creature and accomplice, who had remained neutral during the struggle, declared in favour of the victorious confederates, after having had three hours' conference with Lethington in Edinburgh Castle‡—the Hamiltons, faithful to Bothwell and the Queen, had collected in arms,

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 426. † Keith, p. 402.

‡ James Beaton, brother of the Archbishop of Glasgow, had conveyed the Queen's orders to Balfour in an interview which he had with him on Sunday morning, the same day that the encounter took place at Carberry Hill. This is his account:—"Betwix 5 and 6 hours (in the morning) I passit . . . to the Castell quhair, being arryvit, I doit my commission as was commanded me by the Queinis Majestie . . . I found the Captain very cauld in his answering to her Majestie's commandments. . . . That saming day my lord Secretair (Lethington) cam to the Castell, at twa hours efter none, and spak with the Captain the space of three hours." James Beaton to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 17th June, 1567; in Laing, vol. ii., pp. 109, 110.

and advanced, in considerable force, to Linlithgow.\* Mary Stuart, supposing that her will was still sovereign, and that she might continue to act as she pleased, was desirous to communicate with them. The lords refused to allow her to do so, fearing that she might contrive some means for renewing the war, and rejoining Bothwell. Their refusal made her aware of the imprudence of the resolution which she had taken, and she burst into reproaches against the confederates, who, she said, had broken their promise, and treated her not as a Queen, but as a prisoner. In the excess of her anger, she called for Lindsay, and bade him give her his hand. He obeyed. "By the hand," said she, "which is now in yours, I'll have your head for this."† This imprudent threat, combined with her declaration to the Earls of Morton and Athol, that she would have them both hanged,‡ only served to aggravate her unfortunate position.

From this moment she was a captive in the hands of the confederate lords, who conducted her at once to Edinburgh. She entered the city at ten o'clock in the evening, preceded by the banner on which was painted the murdered King, and was received with yells and

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Drury to Cecil, 18th June, 1567; in Tytler, vol. v., p. 426.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 427.

‡ "Le soir mesme elle commença à tancer au conte de Athol, et après encontre le conte de Morton." Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 166.— "Après qu'elle fut prise, en venant à Lislebourg, ne parla jamais que de les faire tous pendre et crucifier, et continue toujours; ce qui augmente leur désespoir, car ils voient que, s'ils la mettent en liberté, elle ira incontinent trouver le duc son mari, et ce sera à recommencer." Du Croc to Catherine de Medici, 17th June, 1567; in Teulet, vol. ii., pp. 168, 169.

execrations by the populace.\* At first she was taken to the Provost's house, and deprived of the company of her serving-women. Although she had eaten nothing for twenty-four hours, she refused to take any refreshment.† She was in despair. During the night, she frequently opened the window of her room, and cried aloud for help. The next morning, with pitiless barbarity, the soldiers held up before her window the banner representing the sad picture of her son crying for vengeance on the murderers of her husband. At this sight, she fell into an agony of despair and delirium, and rushed to the window like a maniac, partially clothed and with dishevelled hair, uttering loud cries, and imploring the people, for the love of God, to deliver her from the hands of her tyrants. "No man," says a narrator of this piteous spectacle, "could look upon her, but she moved him to pity and compassion."‡

The lords, fearing that the changeful disposition of the people might effect a reaction in her favour, now endeavoured to calm the agitation of the unfortunate Queen, by leading her to hope that she would soon be set at liberty and restored to her palace of Holyrood.

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 427. Keith, p. 402.

† Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 166.

‡ "Sche cam yesterday to ane windo of hir chalmers that lukkit on the Hiesgait, and cryit forth on the pepill quhow she was holden in prison, and keepit be her awin subjects quha had betrayit hir. Sche cam to the said windo sundrie tymes in a miserable a stait, her hairs hingand about her logges, and her breist, yea the maist part of all her bodie, fra the waist up, bair and discoverit, that na man could luk upon hir bot sche movit him to pitie and compassion." James Beaton to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 17th June, 1567; in Laing, vol. ii., p. 114. Du Croc to Charles IX., 17th June, 1567; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 179.

But their real intentions were of a very different nature. The unalterable attachment which Mary displayed for Bothwell had inspired them with no slight alarm.\* According to Melvil, they had intercepted a letter which she had written to Bothwell, whom she still called her "dear heart," and entrusted to one of her guards, whom she had bribed to forward it to Dunbar. She told Bothwell, in this letter, that she would never forget or abandon him; and that, though forced momentarily to separate from him, in order to preserve him from the evils by which he was menaced, she besought him to take consolation, and keep well on his guard.† She manifested the ardour of her affection for Bothwell in a conversation which she had with Lethington on that same day. She bitterly reproached the lords for having separated her from her husband, "with whom she would be happy to live and die," and entreated them "to put them both together into a ship, to send them whithersoever fortune might lead."‡ Her unshaken passion for Bothwell, the certainty that she would join him, and recommence the war, as soon as she was set at liberty, and her threat "to have them all hanged and crucified" § as soon as she had regained her power, rendered the lords merciless, by depriving them of all hope. They determined, therefore, to imprison and dethrone her.

\* Du Croc to Catherine de Medici, 17th June, 1567; in Teulet, vol. ii., pp. 168, 169.

† Melvil's Memoirs, p. 83.

‡ Du Croc to Catherine de Medici, 17th June, 1567; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 170.

§ Ibid.

At eight o'clock in the evening, they conducted her from the Provost's house to Holyrood Palace. She went thither on foot, between Athol and Morton, accompanied by the ladies Semple and Seton, and escorted by three hundred hackbutters.\* The lords then assembled in council, and took their determination. In their order for the Queen's imprisonment, they related all that had occurred since "the shameful and horrible murder of the late king:" "the ungodly and dishonourable marriage" of the Queen to the Earl of Bothwell, its principal author; the necessity that existed for the nobility to rise in arms to avenge this crime, save the life of the Prince Royal, prevent their own ruin, and avert the entire overthrow of the State; the voluntary surrender of the Queen at Carberry Hill; and the flight of Bothwell, without having given battle. They then went on to say that, "after they had opened and declared unto her Highness her own estate and condition, and the miserable estate of this realm, with the danger that her dearest son the Prince stood in, requiring that she would suffer and command the said murder and authors thereof to be punished, they found in her Majesty such untowardness and repugnance thereto, that rather she appeared to fortify and maintain

\* "Le jour ensuyvant, à huit heures du soir, elle fut ramenée au château de Hallrudes (Holyrood), conduite de trois cens harquebouziers, le comte de Merton de l'ung costé et le comte d'Atheul de l'autre; et alla à pied, deux haquenées menées devant elle; et adonc estoit accompagnée de madamoyselle de Sempel et Seton, avecques quelques autres de la chambre, abillée d'une robe de nuit de couleur variable." Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 167. Du Croc to Charles IX., 17th June, 1567; Ibid, p. 179.



the said Earl Bothwell and his accomplices in the said wicked crimes, nor to suffer justice to pass forward; whereby, if her Highness should be left in that state, to follow her own inordinate passion, it would not fail to succeed to the final confusion and extermination of the whole realm. So that, after mature consultation, by common advice, it is thought convenient, concluded and decreed, that her Majesty's person be sequestered from all society of the said Earl Bothwell, and from all having of intelligence with him or any others, whereby he may have any comfort to escape due punishment for his demerits. And finding no place more meet or commodious for her Majesty to remain in, than the house and place of Lochleven, ordains, commands, and charges Patrick Lord Lindsay of the Byres, William Lord Ruthven, and William Douglas of Lochleven, to pass and convoy her Majesty to the said place of Lochleven, and the said lords to receive her therein, and there they and every one of them to keep her Majesty surely, within the said place, and in nowise to suffer her to pass forth of the same, or to have intelligence from any manner of persons, or yet to send advertisements or directions for intelligence with any living persons, except in their own presence and audience, or by the commandments and directions of the lords undersubscribing, or part of them representing the council at Edinburgh, or otherwise where they shall resort for the time, as they will answer to God, and upon their duty,

to the commonweal of this country, keeping these presents for their warrant." \*

By virtue of this order, which was signed by Athol, Glencairn, Morton, Mar, Grahame, Sanquhar, Semple, and William Ochiltree, the unfortunate Mary, during the night of the 10th of June, was taken from the palace of her ancestors, mounted on a sorry hackney, and conducted to Lochleven Castle, by Lindsay and Ruthven, † men of savage manners, even in that age. This castle, by reason of its strong position and complete isolation, was exactly suited to the designs of the confederates. It stood in the midst of a lake, and was surrounded by water on every side half a mile in breadth. It belonged to William Douglas, half-brother of the Earl of Murray. The royal captive was to be kept there under the charge of her most implacable enemy, Margaret Erskine, mother of William Douglas, and formerly mistress of James V. She had once been beautiful, but had retained, in her old age, her proud and imperious spirit, and was wont to boast that the son whom she had borne to Mary Stuart's father was the rightful heir to the throne of Scotland. She was the daughter of Lord Erskine, and, in the license of

\* Order of Council for Queen Mary's imprisonment in Lochleven; in Laing, vol. ii., pp. 116-118.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Drury to Cecil, 18th June, 1567; Tytler, vol. v., p. 428. "Et bientôt après, elle fut convoyée aut Petit-Liet (Leith) en grande compaignye, où on luy fait passer l'eau du Forthe, et après on la conduit en bonne compaignye jusques à Laucheloven; et là sont demeurés milord Lindsey et milord Reven, et plusieurs." Narrative of the Captain of Inchkeith; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 167. Du Croc to Catherine de Medici, 17th June, 1567; Ibid, p. 169.

Scotch morals, claimed to have been the King's lawful wife. She, therefore, considered that Mary of Lorraine had robbed her of the heart of James V., and that Mary Stuart had dispossessed Murray of the rank and inheritance which were his due.\* To the resentment aroused by wounded pride and disappointed ambition, she added the stern vehemence of intolerant piety. She was a zealous Presbyterian. Her daughter had married Lord Lindsay, and her son William was next heir to the Earl of Morton. Her character and creed united with her parentage and hatred to render her an inexorable jailor of the captive Queen.

The detention of a Queen by her subjects was an extraordinary circumstance, even in that age of civil wars and religious revolutions. Insurrection against authority had rarely been carried so far as the imprisonment of those who were considered its sacred depositaries. But notwithstanding its enormity, this bold deed aroused no strong disapprobation, or serious resistance, in Scotland. The unwise, passionate, and blameworthy conduct of Mary Stuart had deprived her of all devoted adherents. The murder of Darnley, and her marriage to Bothwell, had destroyed her reputation; and the unshaken attachment which she displayed to this proscribed murderer precluded the possibility of a reconciliation with the confederate lords. Crushed by her victorious adversaries, her intimidated partisans

\* Keith, p. 403, note. Tytler, vol. v., p. 437.

took no vigorous steps for her defence. They met together at Dumbarton, ostensibly to concert measures for her deliverance ; \* but far from making any demonstration in her favour, they exhibited, as we shall presently see, † the utmost readiness to betray her. Thus deserted by her own subjects, what hopes had she of assistance from foreign powers ?

Her cause, as a Queen, was the cause of every Prince. The imprisonment of a sovereign by her subjects presented a terrible example for the consideration of crowned heads ; and it produced the same effect in every court of Europe. But nearer and more pressing interests soon diverted attention from this distant and abstract occurrence. Philip II. had not yet entered into such close relations with Mary Stuart as made that persecuted and dethroned Queen the religious client of his crown, and the political auxiliary of his ambition. Moreover, he was then busy in crushing the rising revolt of the Netherlands, whither he had sent the Duke of Alva with a large army, at very great expense. Catherine de Medici and her son, Charles IX. were once more engaged in the civil wars of France. Even had they been willing, they could not have come to Mary Stuart's assistance. But they had little disposition to help her ; for, although not callous to her misfortunes, they were offended by her inconsistency, and deterred by her vagaries. Queen Elizabeth only

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 433.

† See the proofs of this assertion, given in Tytler, vol. v., pp. 447-453.

remained. The exalted ideas which that princess entertained with regard to the inviolability of royal prerogative could not but lead her to feel the utmost indignation at what she considered the sacrilegious audacity of the confederate lords. But, on the other hand, her mistrustful dislike of a Queen who had laid claims to her crown, and who still possessed the affection of her Catholic subjects, made her hesitate to restore to her throne the unfortunate sovereign whom she had largely contributed to overthrow. Thus she wavered undecidedly between her doctrines and her animosities, speaking sometimes as a monarch, but more frequently acting as a rival.

She despatched Robert Melvil, who had been accredited to her by Mary Stuart, but who had acted as the secret envoy of the confederates,\* and consented to serve the tortuous policy of Elizabeth, to Scotland with a letter expressive of friendship and consolation to the prisoner of Lochleven, and assurances of support to the rebel lords.† He arrived at Edinburgh on the 29th of June, twelve days after the imprisonment of Mary Stuart, whose danger had been augmented by a recent discovery. On the 20th of June, George Dalglish, Bothwell's chamberlain, had been arrested with a casket which he was, doubtless, conveying to Dunbar, and which contained some private papers that furnished

\* MS. letters, State Paper Office, quoted in Tytler, vol. v., pp. 417, 432, 437, 440.

† MS. letters, State Paper Office, Robert Melvil to Cecil, June and July, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 440.

decided proofs of Mary's guilt. This casket was made of silver, overgilt with gold and surmounted with the cypher of Francis II., who had given it to Mary. Mary in her turn had given it to Bothwell, who had enclosed in it some letters which she had written to him in her own handwriting both before and after the murder of the King, some sonnets breathing the most passionate affection for him, and a contract of marriage which she had signed some time before the premeditated surprise at Almond Bridge.\* Bothwell had, doubtless, preserved these papers as guarantees against the possible inconstancy of the Queen. He had left the casket in Edinburgh Castle, under the care of two of his accomplices, George Dalgleish and James Balfour. Either by chance, or by the perfidy of the odious Balfour,†

\* "Ane silver-box overgilt with gold, with all missive letteris, contractis or obligationis, for marriage-sonetis or luif-balletis, and all utheris letteris contenit thairin, send and past betwix the Quene our said Sovereane Lordis moder, and James, sumtyme Erle Bothuile; quibilk box and haill pieces within the samyn were takin and fund with umquhill George Dalgleisch, servand to the Erle Bothuile, upon the xx day of June, the zeir of God, 1567 zeiris." Discharge to my Lord Morton, given on the 16th of September, 1568, by Murray to Morton, (who ever since the 22nd of June, 1567, had kept possession of the silver box,) in presence of Lord Lindsay, the Bishop of Orkney, the Commendator of Dunfermline, the Commendator of Balmerinoch, Mr. Secretary Lethington, the Justice Clerk, and Master Henry Balnave. See Keith, Appendix, p. 140. In a letter from Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth, dated Edinburgh, 25th July, 1567, allusion is made to the discovery of these papers in the following terms: "They mean to charge her with the murder of her husband, whereof they say they have as apparent proof against her as may be, as well by testimony of her own hand-writing, which they have recovered, as also by sufficient witnesses." See Keith, p. 426.

† "Bothwell sent a servant to Sir James Balfour to save a little silver cabinet which the Queen had given him. Sir James Balfour delivers the cabinet to the messenger, and under-hand giveth advice of it to the Lords. In this cabinet had Bothwell kept the letters of privacy he had from the Queen; thus he kept her letters to be an awe-bond upon her, in case her affections should change. By the taking of this cabinet, many particulars betwixt the Queen and Bothwell were clearly discovered.

who, like many others, had joined the confederacy under the pretext of punishing a crime to which he had been a party, Dalgleish had been seized, and the papers secured. Powrie, Bothwell's porter, met the same fate. When examined before a Court of Justice on the 23rd and 26th of June,\* they had both confessed how the plot against the King's life had been contrived and executed. The depositions of these two servants of Bothwell had furnished a surer basis for the prosecution of that great criminal; and the Lords of the Secret Council commanded that he should be seized in his Castle of Dunbar, and conducted to Edinburgh to be punished as the murderer of the King.† But whilst the confessions of Powrie and Dalgleish placed Bothwell's culpability beyond doubt, the papers found in the silver casket furnished terrible weapons against the Queen to those who wished to accuse and destroy her. Such was the position of affairs when Robert Melvil rejoined the confederates.

Melvil, who had communicated to Elizabeth the intention of the Lords of the Secret Council to depose the Queen, announced to them that Elizabeth approved of their plan, and would sustain them in "their honourable enterprise."‡ He then proceeded to

These letters were after printed; they were in French, with some sonnets of her own making." Knox's *History of the Reformation*, vol. ii., p. 562.

\* Anderson's *Collections*, vol. ii., pp. 165-173. Laing, vol. ii., pp. 243-249.

† Proclamation of the 26th June, 1567; in Keith, p. 408.

‡ MS. letter, State Paper Office, Robert Melvil to Cecil, 1st July, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 440.

Lochleven. On the 1st of July, he delivered the letter of the English Queen to Mary Stuart, who was allowed to see him only in presence of Lindsay and Ruthven. Believing him still to be her faithful and devoted servant, Mary expressed her bitter regret that she was not permitted to converse with him in private.\* Melvil's mission was rather suddenly followed by one of a very different nature, which Elizabeth had entrusted to Nicholas Throckmorton. This new envoy was charged to negotiate Mary Stuart's deliverance, and conditional restoration to authority. The wary Elizabeth doubtless perceived that she had acted in a manner too directly opposed to her views and interests. What she most urgently required was, that Scotland should remain in a state of disturbance and powerlessness. She ought not to desire either that the Queen should entirely recover her authority, or that the Lords, who now governed the kingdom in the name of their infant Prince, should gain a complete triumph. In the former case, the Queen of Scotland might again assert her claims to the English crown; and in the latter, the lords might do without English assistance. What, then, was her most advantageous policy? She proposed to place the Queen and the lords once more in a position of equality; doubtless in order that their conflicts might render her intervention continually indispensable in

\* Hopetoun MSS., Robert Melvil's Declaration. Also MS. letter, State Paper Office, Sir J. Melvil to Drury, 8th July, 1567. Tytler, vol. v., p. 442.



Scotland, and that their weakness might consolidate her own security in England.

Throckmorton was ordered to blame Mary Stuart for her marriage, and the lords for their rebellion. He was then to propose, as the basis of an arrangement between them, that the Queen should be divorced from Bothwell, and restored to liberty and power; that Bothwell and his accomplices should be punished; that the Castles of Dunbar and Dumbarton should be entrusted to the keeping of those nobles who were hostile to Bothwell; that a Parliament should be assembled, which should appoint the wardens of the marches, and the governors of Edinburgh, Stirling, Inchkeith, and the other strongholds of the kingdom; that a great council should be established, at which five or six of its members should always be present, without whose advice and consent the Queen should be unable to pass any act or make any appointment; and, finally, that a general amnesty should be proclaimed.\* This proposition divided the government between the Queen and the high nobility. Elizabeth would thus have constituted disunion in Scotland, whither she would have been summoned, sometimes to support the Queen in virtue of her opinions about royal prerogative, and sometimes to sustain the high nobility in behalf of her political advantage.

\* Instructions given on the 30th June, 1567, by the Queen of England to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, her envoy into Scotland regarding the questions to be treated of with the Queen and the Lords; in Keith, pp. 411, 414. See also Proposals delivered to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton at his going into Scotland in July, 1567. *Ibid.*, 416.

But the victorious lords were not disposed to enter into her views upon the subject. Her ambassador, Throckmorton, perceived this as soon as he arrived in Scotland. In the fortalice of Fastcastle,\* he had a conversation on this subject with Lethington, Sir James Melvil, and Lord Hume, who had all three come to meet him. The Scottish secretary explained to him the position and designs of the confederates. He loudly complained of the political inconstancy of the English Queen, who, he said, "would leave them in the briars, if they ran her fortune," and who now proposed to ruin them by demanding the liberation of Mary Stuart. On his entrance into Edinburgh, on the 12th of July, accompanied by the three above-named gentlemen and a numerous escort,† Throckmorton found that city in a state of strong excitement, which greatly increased three days afterwards, when the general assembly of the Church was held.

Knox had again made his appearance in his native land. Immediately after the assassination of Riccio, he had taken refuge in England; but he at once returned to Scotland on hearing of the imprisonment of the Queen.‡ He had offered the confederate lords

\* "Very little and very strong; a place fitter to lodge prisoners than folks at liberty." Such is Throckmorton's description of this stronghold, which resembled most of the fortresses that were scattered over the Scottish territory. It belonged to Lord Hume, who came thither to receive Throckmorton, with Melvil and Lethington. Throckmorton to Cecil, from Fastcastle, 12th June, 1567; in Robertson, Appendix 21; and Tytler, vol. v., p. 443.

† Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 14th July, 1567; in Robertson, Appendix 22.

‡ M'Cric's Life of Knox, vol. ii., p. 150; and Tytler, vol. i., p. 434.

the support of the Presbyterian party if they would adopt as laws of the kingdom those Acts of the Parliament of 1560, which Mary Stuart had refused to ratify. His proposition was accepted, and it was determined to abolish the last remains of Catholicism ; to restore the patrimony of the Church to the Presbyterian clergy ; to entrust to their care all universities, colleges, and schools for the instruction of youth, into which none should be admitted " but after due trial, both of capacity and probity ;" to give the Prince Royal a Protestant education ; to pursue and punish the murderers of the King ; and to make all future sovereigns of the country swear, before their coronation, " to maintain the true religion now professed in the Kirk of Scotland, and suppress all things contrary to it." \* On these terms, a close connection was established between the heads of the Church and the leaders of the nobility. Knox denounced the royal prisoner with the most violent severity. † The pulpit became a place of accusation, from which Mary Stuart was publicly declared guilty of adultery and murder, and deserving of the most rigorous punishment. The Presbyterian ministers urged against her the moral equality of all Christians, and maintained that her sovereign rank did

\* This agreement, in eight articles, was adopted and subscribed by a large number of the nobles. See Knox, vol. ii., pp. 563—565.

† " This day being at Mr. Knox's sermon, who took a piece of the Scripture forth of the Books of the Kings, and did inveigh vehemently against the Queen, and persuaded extremities towards her by application of his texte." Letter from Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 19th July, 1567 ; in Keith, p. 422.

not give her the privilege of impunity. In support of their doctrines, they quoted the examples which the Old Testament furnishes of the deposition of Kings, and took the Jewish democracy for their model, and the Bible for their law. Under the influence of their persuasions, the people became cruel and fanatical, and openly declared that "their Queen had no more liberty nor privilege to commit murder or adultery, than any other private person, neither by God's laws nor by the laws of the realm,"\* and that she ought to be punished with as much severity as any other malefactor. To those rigid moralists who, like Knox, disavowed the doctrine of royal inviolability, were added men like the celebrated Buchanan, who, taking their stand on precedents, in their own history, of similar severity exercised by subjects against their sovereigns, declared the right of revolt to be a part of the law of Scotland, and subordinated the power of the monarch to the will of the people.† A party of gloomy reasoners was thus formed, of men of strict morality and unbounded audacity, detesting the faith of the Queen, despising her conduct, revolting from her authority, and loudly demanding her judgment, her deposition, and even her death. The Assembly of the Presbyterian Church became the organ of their wishes, as Throckmorton informs us, by presenting a request that the murder of

\* Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 18th July, 1567; in Robertson, Appendix 22, and Tytler, vol. v., p. 448.

† Buchanan *De Jure Regni*, in vol. i. of the folio edition of his Works.

the late King might be severely punished, "according to the laws of God, according to the practices of their own realm, and according to the laws which they call *ius gentium*, without respect of any person."\*

Fortunately for the Queen, the confederate lords were not all disposed to adopt such terrible resolutions. The most moderate of them desired that she should be divorced from Bothwell, and restored to the administration of the kingdom; this was the wish of Lethington and Melvil. † Others rather less indulgent, such as the Earls of Athol and Morton, wished to restore her to liberty without reinstating her in authority, and to compel her to retire to France, after she had abdicated the crown in favour of her son. ‡ Lastly, there were some even more severe, who demanded that she should be brought to trial, condemned for murder, publicly deposed, and detained in perpetual captivity. § Attempts were first made to induce her to consent to a

\* Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 25th July, 1567; in Keith, p. 426.

† Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 19th July, 1567; in Keith, p. 420.

‡ "The next and second degree is, that the Queen shall abandon this realm, and remain either in France or in England, with assurance of the Prince where she remaineth, to perform the conditions ensuing; that is to say, to resign all government and regal authority to the Prince her son, and to appoint under his authority a council of the nobility and others to govern this realm, and she never to return hither again, nor to molest or impeach the authority of her son, nor the government in his name. To this opinion I find the Earl of Athole and his followers only inclined; albeit the Earl of Morton doth not seem to impugn it." Throckmorton to Elizabeth; Keith, p. 421.

§ "The third end and degree is, to prosecute justice against the Queen, to make her process, to condemn her, to crown the Prince, and to keep her in prison all the days of her life within this realm. To this opinion there doth lean, as far as I can understand, both the most part of the counsellors and a great many others." Ibid.

divorce from Bothwell, which, by diminishing the fears, might possibly have modified the severity of the Lords of the Secret Council.

Robert Melvil was sent to Lochleven Castle on two occasions, the 8th and 15th of July, to endeavour to gain her consent to this step. Having received permission to speak to her in private, he conjured her, as she valued her crown, her safety, and her honour, and with the most urgent and affectionate entreaties, to abandon Bothwell and sanction his prosecution. But she peremptorily refused to do so. She told Melvil that she would rather renounce her throne than give up Bothwell—that she believed herself to be pregnant, and that she would never consent, by nullifying her marriage, to render her child illegitimate.\* Notwithstanding the known desire of the Court of France, whose ambassador, Villeroy, had not been admitted to an audience of her; notwithstanding the salutary advice which had been sent her by Throckmorton, who had also been refused permission to see her; and notwithstanding the reiterated intreaties of Melvil, Mary Stuart continued immoveable in her attachment to Bothwell. She, however, stated her willingness to commit the government of the realm either to her brother, the Earl of Murray, or to a council composed of the principal nobles. She wrote a letter to this effect to the leaders

\* Hopetoun MSS., Robert Melvil's Declaration; Tytler, vol. v. p. 449. Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 18th July, 1567; in Robertson, Appendix 22.

of the confederates, beseeching them to transfer her to Stirling Castle, where she might have the comfort of seeing her son ; and imploring them, if they would not obey her as their Queen, not to forget that she was the mother of their Prince, and the daughter of their King. Before Melvil took his leave, she produced a letter, and requested him to convey it to Bothwell. This he declined to do, upon which she threw it angrily into the fire.\*

The Queen's obstinate determination not to desert Bothwell,† alarmed and irritated the Lords of the Secret Council. They resolved to preclude the possibility of her doing them any future injury, by deposing her. This deposition was prepared under the form of a voluntary abdication, which would deprive her of power without degrading her. Three acts were accordingly drawn up for Mary Stuart's signature.‡ By the first, she renounced the government of the kingdom, declaring that it was a burden of which she was weary, and which she no longer had strength or will to bear ; and authorised the immediate coronation of her son. The second and third conferred the regency on the Earl of Murray, during the minority of the young King ; and

\* Tytler, vol. v., p. 450.

† "She will not consent by any persuasion to abandon the Lord Bothwell for her husband, but avoweth constantly, that she will live with him ; and saith that if it were put to her choice, to relinquish her crown and kingdom or the Lord Bothwell, she would leave her crown and kingdom to go as a simple damsel with him, and that she will never consent that he shall fare worse, or have more harm than herself." Letter from Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 14th July, 1567 ; in Robertson, Appendix 22.

‡ These acts are in Keith, pp. 430—433.

appointed the Duke of Chatelherault, with the Earls of Lennox, Argyle, Morton, Athol, Glencairn, and Mar, regents of the kingdom till the return of Murray from France, with power to continue in that high office, if he refused it. In case Mary Stuart should refuse to sign these acts, the assembled lords had determined to prosecute and condemn her for these three crimes—"first, for breach and violation of their laws; secondly, for incontinency as well with the Earl Bothwell, as with others; and thirdly, for the murder of her husband, whereof, they say, they have as apparent proof against her as may be, as well by the testimony of her own handwriting, as also by sufficient witnesses."\*

On the morning of the 25th of July, † the ferocious Lindsay, and the insinuating Melvil, left Edinburgh on their way to Lochleven. One was the bearer of the three acts which were to strip her of her authority; the other was directed to warn the Queen of the dangers to which she would expose herself by refusing to sign them. Melvil saw her first, and told her all. That a public trial would be substituted for an abdication—that the hostility of the lords towards her would become implacable—that her defamation would be certain, and the loss of her crown inevitable,—and that her life would

\* Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 25th July, 1567; in Keith, p. 426.

† "The Lord Lindsay departed this morning from this town to Lochleven," says Throckmorton in his letter to Elizabeth on the 25th of July; printed in Keith, p. 425; and yet the three above-mentioned acts are dated on the 24th of July, only the day before. See Keith, pp. 431—433.



probably be endangered—were some of the consequences which Melvil assured Mary Stuart would result from refusal ; whilst he did not fail to insinuate on the other hand, that any deed signed in captivity, and under fear of her life, would be invalid. He did not, however, succeed in convincing her. The royal prisoner found it a hard and humiliating thing thus to condemn and depose herself ; and she passionately declared, that she would sooner renounce her life than her crown. But the dangers by which she was threatened had shaken her firmness of mind, and she passed from expressions of generous courage to demonstrations of timid depression. She was still wavering between submission and resistance, when Lindsay entered with the three acts of the Secret Council. He placed them silently before the Queen, and presented them for her signature. Mary Stuart, as if terrified by his presence, took the pen without uttering a single word ; and with eyes filled with tears, and a trembling hand, put her name to the papers.\* Lindsay then compelled Thomas Sinclair to affix the privy seal beside the royal signature, notwithstanding his protest that, as the Queen was in ward, her resignation was ineffectual.†

After having thus forced their sovereign to abdicate, the lords hastened to crown her son. They convoked all those who were willing to assist at his coronation,

\* Spotswood, p. 211. Tytler, vol. v., p. 452.

† Blackwood's Magazine for October, 1817. Tytler, vol. v., p. 453.

and to swear allegiance to him, to meet at Stirling on the 29th of July; and despatched Sir James Melvil to invite the Hamiltons and their adherents to be present at the solemnity.\* These last now formed a powerful party. They had held a convention at Dumbarton, and had expressed their determination to set the Queen at liberty in a bond signed by the Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Earls of Argyle and Huntly, Lord Arbroath, the Bishops of Galloway and Ross, the Abbot of Kilwinning, the Lords Fleming, Herries, and Skirling, and Sir William Hamilton of Sanquhar.† No active measures, however, had followed this declaration, and they had done nothing to deliver the prisoner and prevent her deposition. They would not consent to sanction the coronation of her son by their presence, but they assured the confederates that they would offer no opposition, provided nothing was done to prejudice the title of the Duke of Chatelherault as next heir to the Crown.‡ The English Ambassador peremptorily refused to proceed to Stirling.§ He had been unable to see the Queen, and the prudent advice which he had transmitted to her, as well as the threatening admonitions which he had addressed to the Lords of the Secret Council, had failed to prevent the overthrow of her

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 85.

† This bond is printed in Keith, p. 436.

‡ MS. letter, State Paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 31st July, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, illustrating the reign of Mary, Queen of Scotland, p. 258. Tytler, vol. v., p. 453. Keith, pp. 435, 436.

§ MS. letter, State Paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 26th July, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 251. Tytler, vol. v., p. 453.

authority. Foreseeing the anger which his mistress would feel when she learned that her influence had been thus utterly contemned, and the royal prerogative thus audaciously violated, he held himself aloof, and awaited further orders from his Sovereign.

Elizabeth did not long delay to send them. On the 27th of July\* she wrote to her ambassador in a strain of the greatest vehemence and indignation against the project which the lords entertained of deposing the Queen, and crowning the Prince Royal of Scotland. She declared that they had "no warrant nor authority, by the law of God or man, to be as superiors, judges or vindicators over their Prince and Sovereign. What warrant," she added, "have they in Scripture, being subjects, to depose their Prince ; but contrary, and that with express words in St. Paul, who to the Romans, commanded them to obey *potestatibus supereminioribus gladium gestantibus*, although it is well known that rulers in Rome were then infidels ? Or what law find they written in any Christian monarchy, how and what sort subjects shall take and arrest the person of their Princes, commit and detain them in captivity, proceed against them by process and judgment, as we are well assured no such order is to be found in the whole civil law ? And if they have no warrant by Scripture or Law, and yet can find out for their purpose some examples, as we hear by seditious ballads they

\* This letter is printed in Keith, pp. 428—430.

put in print, they would pretend ; we must justly account those examples to be unlawful, and acts of rebellion ; and so, if the stories be well weighed, the success will prove them. You shall say that this may suffice to such as do pretend to be carried in their actions by authority either of religion or of justice. And as to others that for particular respect look only to their own surety, it were well done, before they proceeded any further, if they did well consider how to stay where they be, and to devise how to make surety of their doings already past, than to increase their peril by more dangerous doings to follow. We detest and abhor the murder committed upon our cousin their King, and mislike as much as any of them the marriage of the Queen our sister with Bothwell. But herein we dissent from them, that we think it not lawful nor tolerable for them, being by God's ordinance subjects, to call her, who also by God's ordinance is their superior and Prince, to answer to their accusations by way of force ; for we do not think it consonant in nature the head should be subject to the foot." Finally, Elizabeth charged Throckmorton to inform the Lords of the Secret Council, that "if they shall determine anything to the deprivation of the Queen their sovereign lady of her royal estate, we are well assured of our own determination, and we have some just and probable cause to think the like of other Princes of Christendom, that we will make ourselves

a plain party against them, to the revenge of their sovereign, and for example to all posterity.”\*

But these reasons and menaces neither persuaded nor intimidated the Scottish lords. They boldly carried out their designs, and, in company with many members of the Parliament, repaired to Stirling on the day appointed for the coronation.† The ceremony took place with great solemnity in the High Church of the city. In the procession, Athol bore the crown, Morton the sceptre, and Glencairn the sword, whilst Mar carried the infant Prince in his arms into the church. After the deeds of resignation by the Queen had been read, and Lindsay and Ruthven had sworn that Mary's demission was her own free act, Morton, laying his hand upon the Gospels, took the oaths on behalf of the new monarch, James VI. The Bishop of Orkney then crowned the baby-king, the lords swore allegiance, placing their hands on his head, and Knox inaugurated his stormy reign by a sermon.‡ This revolution, which had been entirely accomplished by a few of the nobility, whose supremacy it ensured during the long minority of a sovereign only thirteen months old, met with the hearty concurrence of the people, who manifested their joy by

\* Keith, pp. 428, 429.

† The names of the nobles present at the ceremony are given in “An Authentick Account of the whole progress of the King's Coronation,” printed at-length in Keith, pp. 437—439, from the registers of the Privy Council.

‡ Keith, p. 438. Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 31st July, 1567; in Stevenson's Selections, p. 257. Calderwood's MS. History, p. 684; quoted in Tytler, vol. v., p. 454.

bonfires, dances, and illuminations.\* It encountered no opposition in any part of the kingdom, which the leaders of the confederates continued to govern, until the return of Murray, who had been informed without delay of his appointment as Regent of Scotland.

Murray, who had spent the last four months in France, had been successively informed of the pretended abdication of Mary Stuart, her disgraceful marriage, her speedy defeat, her harsh captivity, and the rapid succession of her follies and misfortunes. He had been touched with compassion for her, and had not yet lost all feelings of fidelity towards her. Thus, notwithstanding the care which the confederate lords had taken to write to him, in order to gain him to their cause, he had disapproved of their violent proceedings, and had sent Elphinstone to remonstrate severely with them for having imprisoned the Queen.† On being informed not long afterwards of the deposition of his sister, the coronation of his nephew, and his own elevation to the Regency, he had set out for Scotland with views still favourable to the captive Queen. He had, however, declined to give any pledge to the Court of France, which had offered him high bribes, and appointed M. de Lignerolles to accompany him and watch his proceedings. The avowed object of this

\* Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 31st July, 1567; Tytler, vol. v., p. 454.

† Tytler, vol. v., pp. 445, 461.

envoy was to carry a message from Charles IX. to the Lords of the Secret Council, and to advocate the interests of Mary Stuart, and the maintenance of the alliance between the two countries.\* Murray's feelings underwent a change upon his journey. He met Elphinstone† coming back from Scotland, where the confederate lords, in order to justify their conduct, had endeavoured to convince him of the Queen's culpability by means of the papers found in the silver casket. Elphinstone assured Murray that he had seen and read a letter from the Queen to Bothwell, which proved that she was privy to her husband's murder.‡

Either from ambition, or from more exact information upon the state of Scotland, Murray was less ardent for his sister's liberation when he arrived at London. Elizabeth, who took great interest in Mary's position on this occasion, did not act wisely towards him. Irritated by the blow which had been struck at the sovereign authority in Scotland, she haughtily expressed her determination to restore Mary Stuart to her throne, and

\* MS. letters, State Paper Office, Morris to Cecil, 2nd and 16th July, 1567; Stevenson's Selections, p. 243. Tytler, vol. v., p. 462.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 463.

‡ "Mostró sentir mucho que la junta de Edimburg hubiese preso á la Reyna, pero que á el siempre la habia parecido mal lo de Bodwel; que el sabia de cierto de una carta, toda de mano de la Reyna Maria de mas de tres pliegos, escrita á Bodwel, en que le apresuraba á poner en obra lo que tenian concertado sobre la muerte del Rey, dandole algun bebedizo, ó en todo apuro, quemando la casa, que aunque él no habia visto la carta, lo sabia per persona que la habia leído." Gonzalez, Apuntamientos, in the Memorias de la Real Academia, vol. vii., p. 323. Throckmorton to Cecil, 2nd August, 1567, in Stevenson's Selections, p. 263.

to punish the audacious subjects who had deposed her.\* Murray was offended at the menacing and dictatorial tone which Elizabeth had employed, with so little success, in her communications with the Scottish lords by means of Throckmorton. Far from being thereby useful to the unfortunate prisoner, she had only added to the dangers of her position ; and it would seem that she was destined to injure her even by her efforts to do her service. In fact, the confederates who had dethroned Mary Stuart had not entirely renounced the idea of bringing her to trial. With monstrous treason and sanguinary calculation, the Hamiltons had proposed that she should be put to death, as the only certain method of reconciling all parties. By getting rid of the Queen, who might otherwise marry again and have many children, the Hamiltons hoped to reach the throne, from which they would then be separated only by a weakly infant. The Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Abbot of Kilwinning, and the Earl of Huntly accordingly offered to make an agreement with the confederate lords upon these terms. The Comptroller Murray of Tullibardine, and Secretary Lethington both informed Throckmorton of this horrible negotiation. Indeed, when Elizabeth's ambassador mentioned the threatening designs of his mistress, Lethington said to him : " My Lord Ambassador, I assure you, if you should use this

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, 10th August, 1567, after his interview with Murray at Berwick. Tytler, vol. v., p. 463.



speech unto them (the confederates) which you do unto me, all the world could not save the Queen's life three days to an end." \*

Such was the imminent danger to which Mary Stuart was exposed when Murray, after having left London very dissatisfied with Elizabeth, arrived in Scotland on the 11th of August. His return and future policy were the objects of universal expectation. At Berwick he was met by two envoys from the lords of the confederacy, Sir James Makgill, the Clerk-register, and Sir James Melvil. The first was the representative of the fanatical section among them, and was to entreat him, in the name of Glencairn, Morton, Lindsay, Ruthven, and the Presbyterians, to act inexorably towards the Queen, and not allow himself to be influenced by her misfortunes. The second, who shared the more moderate sentiments of Athol, Mar, Lethington, Tullibardine, and Grange, who had joined the league in order to overthrow Bothwell, and save the Prince Royal, had been deputed by them to urge him to adopt no extreme measures, but, whilst keeping the Queen in captivity until her liberation could produce no dangerous results, to treat her mercifully and respectfully. † Murray listened to them both, but refused to give any pledge.

\* MS. letter, State Paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 9th August, 1567; Tytler, vol. v., p. 458. From this previously unpublished despatch, Mr. Tytler has constructed the very full account of this negotiation which will be found in his History, vol. v., pp. 456—459.

† Melvil's Memoirs, p. 87. Tytler, vol. v., p. 464.

He even appeared to have no desire to become Regent.\* Pursuing his journey, he crossed the Scottish frontier, where he was met by a troop of four hundred gentlemen.† He entered Edinburgh, surrounded by the nobility, and amid manifestations of the delight and enthusiasm of the citizens. For two days he remained uncertain, questioning everybody, examining into the charges brought against the Queen, and observing that public opinion regarding her wore a threatening aspect. Before accepting the office which had been conferred on him, he requested that he might see her, in order to learn from her own lips whether it were true that her abdication had been voluntary, and would not vitiate his title to the Regency. In spite of their fears about the result of the interview which was to determine his answer, the lords were obliged to consent;‡ and on the morning of the 15th of August he proceeded to Lochleven with Morton, Athol, and Lindsay.§

Prudent in his ambition, Murray was desirous to receive the power offered him by the confederates, from the hands of her whom the confederates had robbed of her crown. He had taken no part in the recent occurrences, and if the Queen conferred the supreme authority upon him, he hoped to be able to administer the government of Scotland without difficulty, as he had obtained it without revolt. He secured his object

\* Keith, p. 443. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 87.

† Tytler, vol. v., p. 464.

‡ Tytler, vol. v., p. 466.

§ Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 20th August, 1567; Keith, p. 445.

with cruel craftiness. On seeing him enter her prison, Mary thought that her brother had come to be her friend and protector. She burst into a flood of tears, and passionately complained of the unjust treatment she had experienced. Murray listened to her in silence, and neither commiserated nor consoled her. The suppliant Mary then said, turning towards Athol and Morton: "My lords, you have had experience of my severity, and of the end of it; I pray you also let me find that you have learned by me to make an end of yours, or, at least, that you can make it final."\* But they were as taciturn and gloomy as Murray. Alarmed at a visit that seemed to confirm the sinister reports which had been spread concerning her, Mary took her brother aside before supper, anxiously questioned him as to the intentions of the lords, and in vain endeavoured to fathom his own projects; but for two hours Murray continued silent and impenetrable. When the bitter meal had passed away, Mary again desired to converse with her brother, "and everybody being retired, they conferred together until one of the clock after midnight."† In this second interview Murray threw off his premeditated reserve, and spoke to the Queen with terrible frankness and inexorable severity. He told her what he thought of herself and her misgovernment, pitilessly reminded her of her improprieties of conduct, and laid before her, one by one, all the actions which, he said, had violated

\* Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 20th August, 1567; in Keith, p. 446.

† Ibid., p. 445.

her conscience, sullied her honour, and compromised her safety. The unhappy Queen was plunged into despair by this terrible accusation, and she lost all courage. "Sometimes," says Throckmorton, in his narrative of this painful scene, "she wept bitterly; sometimes she acknowledged her unadvisedness and misgovernment; some things she did confess plainly; some things she did excuse; some things she did extenuate."\* After having crushed her with the weight of these dreadful recollections, Murray left his sister in an agony of fear; she thought that her fate was sealed, and that she must expect nothing but from God's mercy. In this state of mind she passed the remainder of the night.

The next morning she sent for her brother, and Murray once more entered her room. Perceiving the impression he had made, he assumed a milder mood, changed his tone, threw in some words of consolation, and assured her that he desired to save her life, and, if possible, to preserve her honour. "But," he added, "it is not in my power only; the lords and others have interest in the matter. Notwithstanding, Madam, I will declare to you which be the occasions that may put you in jeopardy. For your peril, these be they:—your own practices to disturb the quiet of your realm and the reign of your son; to enterprise to escape from where you are, to put yourself at liberty; to animate any of your subjects to troubles or disobedience; the Queen

\* Keith, p. 445.

of England or the French King to molest this realm, either with their war, or with war intestine, by your procurement or otherwise ; and your own persisting in this inordinate affection with the Earl Bothwell.”\*

At these words, Mary, who had remained under the dreadful impressions of the previous night, discerned a gleam of hope. She threw herself into her brother's arms, and expressed her satisfaction at his assurance that he would protect her life, and the hopes he allowed her to entertain that her honour would be saved. In order to arrive more surely at this desired result, she conjured him not to refuse the Regency, “for by this means,” she said, “my son shall be preserved, my realm well governed, and I in safety.”† Murray hesitated ; and alleged reasons, the sincerity of which we cannot suspect, against undertaking so arduous a task. Always hurried away by irresistible impulses, Mary only entreated him the more urgently to sacrifice his own repugnance to the welfare of his sister. She suggested that he should make himself master of all the forts in the kingdom, requested him to take her jewels and other valuables into his custody, and offered to give to his Regency the support of her letters and the authority of her name. Murray at length assented, appearing to accept with resignation what he doubtless most ardently coveted. Before leaving his sister he enjoined the Lords Lindsay, Ruthven, and Lochleven, “to treat the

\* Keith, p. 446.

† Ibid., p. 445.

Queen with gentleness, with liberty, and with all other good usage." He then bade her farewell, "and then began another fit of weeping, which being appeased, she embraced him very lovingly, kissed him, and sent her blessing unto the Prince her son by him."\*

On this, as on so many other occasions, Mary Stuart yielded to one of those rapid momentary impressions which so frequently guided her conduct, and set at nought the dictates of prudence. At Lochleven she displayed the same character as at the Kirk of Field, Almond Bridge, Carberry Hill, and shortly afterwards at Carlisle, always yielding to invincible passions or deceptive opinions. After having been terrified into signing her deed of abdication, she had been surprised into giving her consent to it. This consent, which she ere long repented, had been obtained from her by the cold and astute Murray, whilst her troubled heart was passing from intense alarm to buoyant hope.

Assured of her important approbation, Murray proceeded to Stirling to visit the infant monarch, in whose name he was to govern, and returned to Edinburgh on the 19th of August. † Three days after he was declared Regent in the Council-chamber at the Tolbooth. Laying his hand upon the Gospels, like a true sectary and ardent supporter of the liberties of the realm, he took the following oath: "I, James, Earl of Murray, Lord Abernethy, promise faithfully, in the presence of the Eternal,

\* Keith, p. 446.

† Ibid., p. 446.

my God, that I, during the whole course of my life, will serve the same Eternal, my God, to the uttermost of my power, according as He requires in His most holy word, revealed and contained in the New and Old Testaments; and, according to the same word, will maintain the true religion of Jesus Christ, the preaching of His holy word, and due and right administration of His sacraments, now received and practised within this realm; and also will abolish and withstand all false religion contrary to the same; and will rule the people committed to my charge and regiment during the minority and less-age of the King, my sovereign, according to the will and command of God revealed in his aforesaid word, and according to the loveable laws and constitutions received in this realm, noways repugnant to the said word of the Eternal, my God; and will procure to my uttermost, to the Kirk of God and all Christian people, true and perfect peace, in all time coming. The rights and rents, with all just privileges of the Crown of Scotland, I will preserve and keep inviolate; neither will I transfer nor alienate the same. I will forbid and repress in all estates and degrees, reif, oppression, and all kind of wrong. In all judgments I will command and procure that justice and equity be kept to all creatures without exception, as He be merciful to me and you, that is the lord and father of all mercies; and out of this realm of Scotland, and empire thereof, I will be careful to root out all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God,

that shall be convicted by the true Kirk of God of the aforesaid crimes. And these things above-written I faithfully affirm by this my solemn oath." \* The seventy-third psalm was then sung, † and Murray was proclaimed Regent at the Market Cross, amid the acclamations of the people. ‡

The revolution which had dethroned Mary Stuart, and transferred the government to other hands, had now reached its consummation. Most of the dissident nobility submitted to the new ruler. The Earls of Rothes and Crawford, the Masters of Menteith and Errol, the Lords Drummond, Ogilvy, Oliphant, Somerville, Borthwick, and Yester, assured the Regent of their obedience and fidelity ; and the Lords Fleming, Boyd, and Livingstone ere long followed their example. § The Hamiltons attempted no resistance, although Elizabeth had given them every encouragement to do so. || Murray encountered as little opposition abroad as at home. The Court of France, pre-occupied with its own difficulties, and wearied by the faults of Mary Stuart, was unwilling to break with the new government, for fear of throwing Scotland entirely into the arms of England. Accordingly M. de Lignerolles, in some measure abandoning the Queen, assured the confederates that he had not been sent to do them any

\* Anderson, vol. ii., pp. 252, 253. Keith, p. 453.

† "Après il mist la main sur la Bible, puis fut chanté le 73<sup>e</sup> psaume." Teulet, vol. ii., p. 194.

‡ Keith, p. 454.

§ Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 20th August, 1567 ; in Keith, p. 447.

|| Elizabeth to Throckmorton, 29th August, 1567 ; in Keith, pp. 452, 452.



injury, and that France was the ally not of any particular Prince, but of the established government in Scotland.\* He departed without even complaining that he had not been allowed to visit the Queen, and authorised to confer with the Hamiltons.†

As for Elizabeth, although greatly irritated at the changes effected by the lords, and accepted by Murray, in spite of her admonitions to the contrary, she had neither means nor reasons for restoring Mary to her throne, and overthrowing the Regent. This was perfectly understood by the confederates. They took no notice of her anger, and when the English ambassador, Throckmorton, left Scotland after the proclamation of the Regent, he had a last interview with Murray and Lethington. He found them both full of resolution, and ready for resistance. "If there be no remedy," said Lethington, "but that the Queen your Sovereign will make war, and nourish war against us, we can but be sorry for it, and do the best we may. But to put you out of doubt, we had rather endure the fortune thereof, and suffer the sequel, than to put the Queen to liberty now in this mood that she is in, being resolved to retain Bothwell and to fortify him, to hazard the life of her son, to put the realm in peril, and to forfeit all these noblemen. You must think, my lord ambassador, your wars are not unknown to us ; you will burn our borders, and we will do the like to yours ; and whensoever you

\* Melvil's Memoirs, p. 87. Keith, p. 443.

† Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 20th August, 1567; in Keith, p. 444.

invade us, we are sure France will aid us." Then, to show his resentment of the imperious tone which Elizabeth had assumed towards them, he finished by telling Throckmorton: "Much strange language has been used, but it is enough to reply that we are another Prince's subjects, and know not the Queen's majesty to be our sovereign." Murray was more brief, but quite as peremptory. He told Elizabeth's ambassador, who had attempted to separate his cause from that of the confederates, by reminding him that he was a stranger to what they had done: "Though I were not here at the doings past, yet surely I must allow of them; and seeing the Queen and they have laid upon me the charge of the Regency, (a burden which I would gladly have eschewed,) I do mean to ware my life in defence of their action, and will either reduce all men to obedience in the King's name, or it shall cost me my life."\*

The intention which he thus proudly declared, was carried into effect by him with great vigour. Like a true disciple of Knox, well-versed in the narratives of the Bible, "he went stoutly to work," says Throckmorton, "resolved to imitate those who had led the people of Israel."† The Lairds of Grange and Tullibardine were instantly despatched by the Privy Council in pursuit of Bothwell, who had been outlawed by proclamation on the 26th of June, and had fled to

\* Keith, p. 449.

† Throckmorton to Cecil, 20th August, 1567; in Stevenson's Selections, p. 282; and Tyler, vol. vi., p. 20.

Orkney.\* Murray's next care was to secure to himself all the fortresses in the kingdom.† Balfour delivered the Castle of Edinburgh into his hands. But this infamous accomplice of Bothwell's crimes would not give up the keys of the fortress until he had received the sum of five thousand pounds, and an assurance of impunity ; and had stipulated that an annuity should be given to his son, and the Priory of Pittenweem to himself.‡ Murray, who had soon gained possession of Dunbar, Inchkeith, and other strongholds,§ determined to commit the guard of Edinburgh Castle to Laird Kirkaldy of Grange.|| who was then in pursuit of Bothwell. The bold Kirkaldy had sworn to capture this public enemy, and very nearly succeeded in doing so. Of the three or four vessels which Bothwell had equipped, and with which he attempted to maintain a footing in the Orkney and Shetland Isles, two fell into the hands of the Laird of Grange, who was in hot pursuit of the one commanded by Bothwell himself, when his own ship, one of the largest in the Scottish navy, struck upon a sand-bank.¶ Bothwell succeeded in making his escape ; and leaving a locality where he was no longer safe, sailed into the Northern Ocean, and was driven by a tempest to the coast of Norway. Here

\* Anderson's Collections, vol. i., pp. 139—145. Keith, p. 442. Tytler, vol. vi., p. 20.

† Tytler, vol. vi., p. 21.

‡ Keith, p. 455. MS. letter, State Paper Office, Throckmorton to Cecil, 26th August, 1567 ; Tytler, vol. vi., p. 21.

§ Keith, pp. 456, 459.

|| Ibid., p. 455.

¶ Labanoff, vol. ii., p. 59. Robertson, vol. ii., p. 233. MS. letter, State Paper Office, Murray to Cecil, 11th September, 1567 ; Tytler, vol. vi., p. 23.

he fell in with a Danish man-of-war, and not being able to produce his papers, was arrested as a pirate, and taken to Denmark. Frederic II., who then occupied the throne of that country, would not give him up either to Murray or Elizabeth, but imprisoned him in the castle of Malmoe. His captivity was an expiation of nine years, which he passed in the dread of being surrendered to the governments of Scotland or England, which were unceasingly demanding his extradition, and in the despair of interminable solitude.\*

Several of his subaltern accomplices were, however, brought to punishment. In addition to Powrie and Dalgleish, Hay of Tallo, and Hepburn of Bolton, the chief actors in the crime at Kirk of Field, had been arrested.† They all confessed their guilt, and were condemned to death. On the scaffold they acknowledged the justice of their punishment, and Hepburn of Bolton addressed the people. "Let no man," he said, "do evil by the counsel of great men, or their masters, thinking they will save them; for surely I thought, on that night that the deed was done, that although it might become known, no man durst have said it was evilly done, seeing the hand-writings of those who approved it, and the Queen's consent thereto."‡

But those to whom Hepburn thus alluded were too

\* See a small quarto volume of 31 pages and an appendix, entitled *Les Affaires du Conte de Boduel, l'an 1568*, printed in 1829, by the Bannatyne Club at Edinburgh, from the original in the Royal Collection at Drottningholm, in Sweden. See also Appendix H.

† These four men were executed on the 3rd of January, 1568. Keith, p. 467.

‡ Anderson's Collections, vol. ii., p. 160.

powerful to be punished. The bond which they had signed, and which constituted the evidence of their guilt, had been left by Bothwell in the custody of Sir James Balfour, who had committed it to the flames.\* Neither Lethington, Huntly, Argyle and Balfour, who had signed their concurrence in the crime; nor the Archbishop of St. Andrews, who had verbally consented to its perpetration; nor Morton, who had been informed of the intentions of the conspirators, although he had not joined in their league, were brought to trial before the justice of their country, which was inexorable or inactive, according to the rank and position of the culprit. The Regent did not dare to act with severity towards them. They had raised him to power, and his tenure was still so insecure that a new revolution would easily have overthrown him. He was therefore obliged to bestow favours, instead of punishment, upon several of their number. Argyle remained Lord Justice-General, Huntly continued a member of the Privy Council, Lethington was appointed Sheriff of Lothian, and Morton was promised the Lord High-Admiralship of Scotland, vacant by the forfeiture of Bothwell. †

In this land of violence, treason, inconsistency, and political iniquity, the Regent was determined at least

\* "The writings which did comprehend the names and consents of the chief for the murdering of the King, is turned into ashes, the same not unknown to the Queen; and the same that concerns her part kept to be shown, which offends her." MS. Letter, State Paper Office, Drury to Cecil, 28th November, 1567; Tytler, vol. vi., p. 30.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, Drury to Cecil, 4th January, 1568; Tytler, vol. vi., p. 34.

to enforce the observance of the common laws of the realm, and to maintain the safety of the state with strenuous vigour. "He took great pains," says Melvil, "to steal secret roads upon the thieves on the borders, tending much to the quieting thereof: he likewise held justice-ayres in the in-country."\* The Parliament, which he had convoked for the 15th of December, was extremely numerous. Four bishops, fourteen abbots, twelve earls, sixteen lords and eldest sons of lords, and twenty-seven commissioners of burghs were present.† This Parliament enacted religious uniformity by ratifying the Confession of Faith of 1560, and sanctioning the entire abolition of Catholicism; it resumed from the laymen a third of that ecclesiastical property which they had seized, and applied it to the support of ministers and schools belonging to the Reformed Church;‡ it recognised the legal elevation of the young King to the throne of Scotland,§ sanctioned the appointment of the Regent,|| and keenly debated the course to be pursued with regard to the Queen—some wishing to bring her at once to trial, while others desired merely to retain her in captivity.¶ The more moderate party gained the victory; but, in order to justify the confederate lords for having taken arms, imprisoned, and dethroned their sovereign, the Parliament passed an act, by the terms of which Mary Stuart

\* Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 90.

† Keith, pp. 465, 466.

‡ Spotswood, p. 214. Tytler, vol. vi., pp. 26—28.

§ See the Act of Parliament, in Anderson, vol. ii., p. 206.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 215.

¶ Tytler, vol. v., p. 28.

was seriously criminated. It contains the following clause : "That the cause, and all things depending thereon, were in the Queen's own default, in so far as by divers her privy letters, written wholly with her own hand, and sent by her to James, sometime Earl of Bothwell, chief executor of the said horrible murder, as well before the committing thereof, as thereafter ; and by her ungodly and dishonourable proceeding to a pretended marriage with him, suddenly and immediately thereafter, it is most certain that she was privy to it and part of the afore-named murder of the King her lawful husband, committed by the said James, sometime Earl of Bothwell, his complices and partakers."\*

This harsh expression of opinion, tantamount to a condemnation, rendered Mary Stuart's captivity more stringent, although by Murray's orders she was treated with respect and consideration. She was more closely watched, lest she should write to request the assistance of any foreign power, or should devise a plan for her escape with her friends in Scotland. She was able to write only while her keepers were at their meals or asleep, for the daughters of the castellan slept with her.† But all these precautions proved insufficient.

\* Anderson's Collections, vol. ii., pp. 221, 222.

† "Je suis guescée de si près, que je n'ay loisir que durant leur dîner, ou quand ils dorment, que je me resleve : car leurs filles couchent avecques moy." Mary Stuart to Catherine de Medici, Lochleven, 1st May, 1568 ; Labanoff, vol. ii., p. 69.—"Je n'ai ni papier ni temps pour écrire davantage, sinon prier le Roi, la Reine, et mes oncles de brûler mes lettres : car si l'on sait que j'ai écrit, il coûtera la vie à beaucoup et mettra la mienne à hasard, et me fera garder plus étroitement." Mary Stuart to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Lochleven, 31st March, 1568 ; Labanoff, vol. ii., p. 66.

Her beauty, grace, and misfortunes exercised an irresistible influence upon all around her. One of Margaret Erskine's sons, George Douglas, a half-brother of the Regent, became smitten by her beauty and touched by her afflictions. Soon he fell deeply in love with his seductive prisoner, who did not check his hopes,\* and he resolved to deliver her. On one occasion, eluding the vigilance of his mother, he conducted Mary Stuart from the castle in the garb of a laundress, who was in the habit of bringing her clothes to Lochleven.† In this disguise the captive passed all the gates undiscovered. She had entered the boat which was to convey her to the other side of the lake, where George Douglas, Semple, and Beton awaited her arrival.‡ She thought her escape was now certain; but, when they were about half way across, one of the boatmen, not suspecting who she was, came near her, and jocularly attempted to raise her veil. Mary hastily raised her hand to prevent him from seeing her face, and the boatman, on seeing her beautiful white hand, at once guessed that it was the Queen he had on board.§ Thus discovered, Mary put a bold face on the matter, and commanded the boatmen, on pain of death, to carry

\* Letter from Drury to Cecil, 3rd April, 1568; in Keith, p. 469.

† "There cometh in to her the landress early as other times before she was wonted, and the Queen putteth on her the weed of the landress, and so with the fardel of cloaths and her muffler upon her face, passeth out." Keith, p. 470.

‡ Ibid.

§ "After some space, one of them that rowed said merrily: 'Let us see what manner of dame this is,' and therewith offered to pull down her muffler, which to defend she put up her hands, which they spied to be very fair and white, wherewith they entered into suspicion whom she was." Ibid.



her to the other side ; but they, fearing the severity of the Laird of Lochleven more than the threats of a deposed princess, took her back to the castle.

After this unsuccessful attempt on the 25th of March, George Douglas was sent from the Castle, but he did not, however, leave the neighbourhood of the lake.\* The prisoner, now almost hopeless of regaining that liberty which she had so nearly attained, passed the end of March and the whole of April in all the anguish and discomfort of captivity. She sought aid on every hand, and wrote to Catherine de Medici :—" I have with great difficulty despatched the bearer of this to inform you of my misery, and entreat you to have pity upon me." † On the 1st of May, she addressed Queen Elizabeth in terms of the most earnest supplication, assuring her that if she would come to her assistance, she would never have a more affectionate relation in the world. " You may also consider," she added, " the importance of the example practised against me." In conclusion, she called upon God to preserve the English Queen from all misfortune, and to grant herself the patience of which she stood in need. ‡ On the same day she wrote to invoke the support of Catherine de Medici and Charles IX., telling them : " Unless you deliver me by force, I shall never leave this place." §

\* Keith, p. 471. Tytler, vol. vi., p. 36.

† Mary Stuart to Catherine de Medici, Lochleven, 31st March, 1568 ; in Labanoff, vol. ii., p. 64.

‡ Mary Stuart to Queen Elizabeth, 1st May, 1568 ; Ibid, p. 68.

§ Mary Stuart to Catherine de Medici, 1st May, 1568 ; Ibid, p. 69.

But while she deemed herself thus irrevocably doomed to imprisonment for life, the hour of her deliverance was close at hand. George Douglas devoted himself to her cause with all the ardour and ingenuity of a lover, and busied himself with plans for her escape. Remaining in the immediate vicinity of Lochleven, he kept up constant communication with the castle, by means of one of his mother's pages, called Little Douglas. In concert with this page, who was only sixteen years old, he made his preparations for the Queen's escape; and he arranged that Lord Seton and the Hamiltons should be in readiness to receive her as soon as she had left the castle. Sunday, the 2nd of May, was the day appointed for the execution of this second flight, which, as it was better contrived than the first, had a more successful issue. All the household took their meals together at Lochleven, and whilst they were at table, the doors of the fortress were all closed, and the keys placed on the table, beside the castellan. At the evening meal on the day appointed,\* Little Douglas, in placing a plate before the laird, contrived to drop his napkin over the keys of the castle, and carried them off unperceived. He immediately hastened to inform the Queen of what he had done, and she at

\* Mary escaped from Lochleven at nine o'clock on Sunday evening, according to the account given two days afterwards to Villiers de Beaumont, the French ambassador, by John Beton, who was a party to her escape, and who was sent immediately by Mary into France to request assistance. "Elle se sauva Dimanche, à neuf heures du soir, comme vous le dira le sieur de Béthon, présent porteur." M. de Beaumont to Charles IX., 5th May, 1568; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 203, note.

once joined him, in the dress of one of her serving-women. They got out of the castle without difficulty, and the young page locked the gate behind them, to prevent pursuit. They then threw themselves into a little boat, unmoored it with all speed, and rowed across the lake. On reaching the shore, Mary, springing out with the lightness of recovered freedom, was received first by George Douglas, and almost instantly after by Lord Seton and his friends, who had remained concealed in a neighbouring village.\* Once more in possession of her liberty, and hopeful that she would soon regain her power, she sprang lightly and joyously on horseback, and rode off at full speed towards the west. She galloped on till she came to Niddry Castle, Lord Seton's residence in West Lothian. Here she took a few hours rest, and then pursued her journey to the strong fortress of Hamilton, where she was received by the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and Lord Claud Hamilton, the latter of whom had met her on the road with fifty horse.†

On arriving at this place of safety, she issued an appeal to all her partisans. She despatched Hepburn of Riccarton, one of Bothwell's servants, to Dunbar, with the hope that the castle would be delivered to

\* "Modo che la Regina di Scotia ha usato per liberarsi dalla prigione." This narrative, annexed to a despatch addressed, on the 21st May, 1568, by Petrucci, the Tuscan ambassador at Paris, to his master the Grand Duke, Cosmo I., was derived from information supplied by John Beton, on his arrival at the French Court. It was extracted from the Medicean Archives at Florence by Prince Labanoff, and will be found in his Collection, vol. vii., pp. 135—138.

† Tytler, vol. vi., p. 37.

her, and commanded him to proceed afterwards to Denmark and inform his master that she was again at liberty, and would doubtless soon recover her lost authority.\* At the same time that her first thoughts were turned towards him from whom she had been separated by adverse circumstances, but whom she had never ceased to love, Mary Stuart despatched John Beton,† brother of the Archbishop of Glasgow, into France to request assistance in the struggle which was now about to recommence, but which she did not expect would reach so speedy a termination.

The news of her escape flew rapidly through the kingdom, and was received with joy by a large portion of her nobility. All those who had stood by her on former occasions, all those who had forgotten her errors in their compassion for her misfortunes, and all those who had been offended by Murray's stern and haughty administration, crowded round her with devoted offers of homage and support. The greater number of the nobility declared in her favour. Before many days had elapsed, nine earls, nine bishops, eighteen lords, twelve abbots and priors, and nearly a hundred barons, had signed a league to restore her to her throne.‡ She now assembled her Council, revoked her abdication as having been extorted by the imminent fear of death,

\* MS. Memoir towards Riccartoun, State Paper Office; Tyler, vol. vi., p. 37.

† Keith, pp. 472, 473.

‡ This bond, signed on the 8th May, is printed in Keith, pp. 475—477, with the names of those who subscribed it.

and declared all the acts, by which Murray had become Regent, treasonable and of none effect. The Earls of Argyle, Cassillis, Eglinton, and Rothes; the Lords Somerville, Yester, Livingstone, Herries, Fleming, Ross, Borthwick, and many other barons of power and note, joined the Hamiltons and Setons with their vassals, and Mary soon found herself at the head of an army of six thousand men,\* determined to defend her person and restore her authority. The French ambassador, Villiers de Beaumont, who had just been sent into Scotland by Charles IX.,† repaired to her camp, saying that he recognised in her the real sovereign of the country. Queen Elizabeth, on her part, sent Dr. Leighton to congratulate her on her deliverance, and to offer to compel her subjects to obedience, if she would place her affairs in her hands, and abstain from calling in any foreign aid.‡

Mary was not overwhelmed by this return of fortune. She preferred an accommodation to a conflict with her adversaries, for she was fully aware that a victory, by force of arms, was not only uncertain, but might be dangerous. If conquered, she would fall again into the formidable hands of the Regent; if victorious, she would remain at the mercy of the Hamiltons, who

\* Keith, p. 472.

† He arrived at Edinburgh on the 22nd April, 1568, and gave letters from Charles IX. to several Scottish lords, "Que j'ay trouvés," he says, "fort affectionnés à son service, et (à celui) de la Roynne sa sœur, leur prisonniere, leur naturelle princesse." M. de Beaumont to the Queen Mother, 4th May, 1568; in Teulet, vol. ii., p. 203.

‡ MS., State Paper Office, "Instructions for Mr. Thomas Leighton, sent into Scotland;" Tytler, vol. vi., p. 40.

intended to marry her to one of their family, and to govern in her name.\* She therefore judged it more prudent, if possible, to effect a reconciliation between the two parties, and by counterbalancing one by the other, to avoid being subject to either. She therefore sent to Murray to propose an amicable arrangement, to be negotiated by the French ambassador and the two brothers, Robert and James Melvil, the former of whom had joined the Queen, whilst the latter remained with the Regent.†

Murray was at Glasgow, alone, with no other escort than his personal suite, and engaged in holding a Court of Justice, when his sister escaped from Lochleven, and arrived at Hamilton Castle, not eight miles from the place where he was. Any other man would have left the city, in fear of being attacked and surprised by forces so far superior to his own. This he was urgently requested to do, but he absolutely refused; ‡ feeling that his retreat from Glasgow would be a mark of fear, and would act as a signal for all his followers to desert him. He therefore remained at his post with unflinching courage. He requested time to reflect upon Mary Stuart's overtures, § in order that he might collect his troops and fight a battle which should settle the question between himself and his sister, between the

\* Keith, p. 478.

† Letter from Drury to Cecil, 7th May, 1568; in Keith, p. 474.

‡ Tytler, vol. vi., p. 38.

§ Letter from Drury to Cecil, 7th May, 1568; in Keith, p. 474.

lords of the King's party and those who adhered to the Queen. Under these difficult circumstances, he displayed that rapid decision and clearness of judgment which mark a great man. He hastily summoned his friends to the standard of the young King. His resolution gave courage to those who would have wavered if he had been inactive or undecided, and most of the old confederate barons, and the soldiers of the Presbyterian towns, rapidly joined him. Dunbar remained faithful to him; \* Edinburgh furnished him with four hundred hackbutters; and Glasgow armed in his cause. † The Earl of Mar despatched reinforcements and cannon from Stirling; ‡ the valiant Alexander Hume brought him six hundred lances from the Merse country; the energetic Morton, the ardent Glencairn, and the veteran Kirkaldy speedily arrived with their vassals, and, in ten days after the escape of the Queen, the Regent found himself at the head of an army of four thousand resolute men. § He therefore proposed to attack the Queen's army without delay, before she received the reinforcements which the Earl of Huntly and Lord Ogilvy were bringing from the northern districts of the kingdom.

But if Murray had good reasons for wishing to fight,

\* Tyler, vi., p. 39.

† Letter from Drury to Cecil, 7th May, 1568; in Keith, p. 475.

‡ Letter from Drury to Throckmorton, 9th May, 1568; in Teulet, vol. ii., pp. 208, 209.

§ MS., State Paper Office, Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, 16th May, 1568. Tyler, vol. vi., p. 39.

it was equally the Queen's interest to refuse a battle. If she could only gain time, her success was certain. Either from distrust or prudence, she was anxious to retire to the impregnable fortress of Dumbarton,\* which was not far from Glasgow, and whose governor, Lord Fleming, was one of her staunchest adherents.† But the Hamiltons, finding themselves the strongest party, were determined to fight. They confidently expected a victory, and hoped, by the same blow, to crush their ancient enemy, the Regent, and to secure their own ascendancy over the Queen and government. So far, however, Mary's influence prevailed, that they consented to march from Hamilton to Dumbarton, and to accept a battle if the enemy should attack them on their march. This was the worst course they could have pursued, for it exposed them to the chance of having to fight whilst in retreat, which is always very dangerous, as it is then impossible to select either opportunity or position. Mary Stuart had fatal experience of this, on the 13th of May, eleven days after her escape from Lochleven.

Her army, which lay on the left bank of the Clyde, had to pass to the south of Glasgow, on its way to Dumbarton. In order to guard this road, the Regent sent a strong body of his troops to occupy an advantageous position on that side of the river. In accordance with the advice of the experienced Laird of

\* Keith, pp. 475—477. Tytler, vol. vi., p. 40.

† Robertson, vol. ii., p. 243. Tytler, vol. vi. p. 40.



Grange, he occupied the heights of Langside with the main body of his forces, and posted an ambush of hackbutters in a lane through which the Queen's army would have to pass before it could reach the hill. In this defile, which was intersected with hedges, and studded with houses and plantations, the Queen's cavalry, though infinitely more numerous than those of the Regent, would not be able to act to advantage, whilst her infantry would be exposed to inevitable defeat. Accordingly when the Hamiltons, at the head of the vanguard, two thousand strong, attempted to carry the lane, a close and deadly fire from the ambushed hackbutters threw them into confusion. They then pressed forward up the steep of the hill, and reached the top, exhausted by the ascent and harassed by the enemy's fire. Here they were met by the Regent's fresh troops, who gave them a warm reception. A desperate combat ensued, and the pikemen on both sides especially distinguished themselves by their intrepidity. But, in three quarters of an hour, the able manoeuvres of the Laird of Grange, who hastened with reinforcements to every weak point, the cool courage of Morton, the dashing bravery of Hume, and a decisive movement on the part of Murray, who charged the Queen's wavering troops with his own main battle, had gained a complete victory. Only three hundred men of the Queen's army were left dead on the battle-field of Langside, for the Regent would not allow the fugitives to be slaughtered

after the victory. Ten pieces of brass cannon were taken, and many prisoners of note.\*

Fortune had once more declared against Mary Stuart. The unfortunate Queen, stationed on an eminence, † had watched with breathless eagerness the vicissitudes of the battle which was to decide her fate. She had beheld the march, the attack, the disorder, and the defeat of her army. She had seen her last hopes fall together with her last defenders. After Carberry Hill, she still retained the strong party of the Hamiltons ; after Langside, no adherents were left to her. It only remained for her to fly ; and she fled in a state of the deepest consternation. Descending in all haste from the hill on which she had been the unhappy witness of this irremediable disaster, she mounted on horseback, and followed by a few servants, rode at full speed in the direction of Dumfries ; nor did she draw bridle until she had ridden sixty miles towards the south. On arriving at Dundrennan Abbey, near the Solway Frith, she would be able either to embark for France, or take refuge in England. Of these two courses, the former was the most safe, and the latter the most easy. Relying on the marks of interest which Elizabeth had

\* Keith quotes three different accounts of the battle of Langside, by Crawford, Melvil, and Calderwood ; pp. 477—480. Tytler also quotes, from a manuscript in the State Paper Office, a narrative of the battle, under the title of "Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland;" vol. vi., pp. 469—472. See further, Teulet, vol. ii., pp. 215, 216.

† "When the Queen, who stood on an eminence to view the armies, perceived that her friends had lost the day, she lost courage, which she had never done before." Keith, p. 481. Tytler, vol. vi., p. 43.

shown for her whilst she was in captivity, and trusting to the offers of friendship which that Queen had renewed to her since her escape, she resolved to place herself under her protection. Lord Herries, who accompanied her, wrote in her name to Lowther, the deputy-governor of Carlisle, desiring to know whether his royal mistress might come safely to that city;\* but without waiting for an answer, without obtaining any pledge of security from Elizabeth, the inconsiderate fugitive, with lamentable precipitation, crossed the Solway Frith, on the 16th of May, in a fisherman's boat, and landed at Workington, on the coast of Cumberland. To escape from Murray she placed herself at the mercy of Elizabeth. She believed herself sure of an asylum in England; she was destined to find only a prison.

\* Anderson, vol. iv., pp. 2, 3. Letter from Mary Stuart to Queen Elizabeth, Workington, 17th May, 1568; in Labanoff, vol. ii., pp. 73—77.

END OF VOL. I.

LONDON :  
BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

THE

# STANDARD NOVELS AND ROMANCES.

PRICE THREE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE EACH VOLUME.

1. The Pilot—*Cooper.*
2. Caleb Williams—*Godwin.*
3. The Spy—*Cooper.*
4. Thaddeus of Warsaw—*Miss J. Porter.*
5. St. Leon—*Godwin.*
6. Last of the Mohicans—*Cooper.*
7. The Scottish Chiefs. Vol. I.—*Miss J. Porter.*
8. The Scottish Chiefs. Vol. II.—*Miss J. Porter.*
9. Frankenstein—*Mrs. Shelley*; and Ghost-Seer. Vol. I.—*Schiller.*
10. Edgar Huntly—*Brockden Brown*; and Conclusion of Ghost-Seer.
11. Hungarian Brothers—*Miss A. M. Porter.*
12. Canterbury Tales. Vol. I.—*The Misses Lee.*
13. Canterbury Tales. Vol. II.—*The Misses Lee.*
14. The Pioneers—*Cooper.*
15. Self Control—*Mrs. Brunton.*
16. Discipline—*Mrs. Brunton.*
17. The Prairie—*Cooper.*
18. The Pastor's Fireside. Vol. I.—*Miss Jane Porter.*
19. The Pastor's Fireside. Vol. II.—*Miss Jane Porter.*
20. Lionel Lincoln—*Cooper.*
21. Lawrie Todd—*Galt.*
22. Fleetwood—*Godwin.*
23. Sense and Sensibility—*Miss Austen.*
24. Corinne—*Madame de Staël.*
25. Emma—*Miss Austen.*
26. Simple Story, and Nature and Art—*Mrs. Inchbald.*
27. Mansfield Park—*Miss Austen.*
28. Northanger Abbey, and Persuasion—*Miss Austen.*
29. The Smuggler—*Banim.*
30. Pride and Prejudice—*Miss Austen.*
31. Stories of Waterloo—*Maxwell.*
32. The Hunchback of Notre Dame—*Victor Hugo.*
33. The Borderers—*Cooper.*
34. Eugene Aram—*Bulwer.* Price 5s.
35. Maxwell—*Theodore Hook.*
36. Water Witch—*Cooper.*
37. Mothers and Daughters—*Mrs. Gore.*
38. The Bravo—*Cooper.*
39. The Heiress of Bruges—*Grattan.*
40. Red Rover—*Cooper.*
41. Vathek—*Beckford*; Castle of Otranto—*Horace Walpole*; and Bravo of Venice—*M. G. Lewis.*
42. The Country Curate—*Gleig.*
43. The Betrothed—*Manzoni.*
44. Hajji Baba—*Morier.*
45. Hajji Baba in England—*Morier.*
46. The Parson's Daughter—*Theodore Hook.*
47. Paul Clifford—*Bulwer.* Price 5s.
48. The Younger Son—*Capt. Trelawney.*
49. The Alhambra—*Washington Irving*; The Last of the Abencerrages—*Château briand*; and the Involuntary Prophet—*Horace Smith.*
50. The Headsman—*Cooper.*
51. Anastasius. Vol. I.—*Hope.*

52. Anastasius. Vol. II.—*Hope*.  
 53. Darnley—*James*.  
 54. Zohrab—*Morier*.  
 55. Heidentauer—*Cooper*.  
 56. De L'Orme—*James*.  
 57. Headlong Hall—Nightmare Abbey  
 —Maid Marian, and Crotchet  
 Castle—*Peacock*.  
 58. Trevelyan—*The Author of "A Marriage in High Life."*  
 59. Philip Augustus—*James*.  
 60. Rookwood—*Ainsworth*.  
 61. Henry Masterton—*James*.  
 62. Peter Simple—*Marryat*.  
 63. Jacob Faithful—*Marryat*.  
 64. Japhet in Search of a Father—  
*Marryat*.  
 65. King's Own—*Marryat*.  
 66. Mr. Midshipman Easy—*Marryat*.  
 67. Newton Forster—*Marryat*.  
 68. The Pacha of Many Tales—  
*Marryat*.  
 69. Rattlin the Reefer—*Marryat*.  
 70. Captain Blake; or, My Life—  
*Maxwell*.  
 71. Helen—*Miss Edgeworth*.  
 72. The Last Days of Pompeii—  
*Bulwer*. Price 5s.  
 73. The Bivouac—*Maxwell*.  
 74. Precaution—*Cooper*.  
 75. Jack Brag—*Theodore Hook*.  
 76. Rory O'More—*Lover*.  
 77. Ben Brace—*Capt. Chamier*.  
 78. The Vicar of Wrexhill—*Mrs.*  
*Trollope*.  
 79. The Buccaneer—*Mrs. S. C. Hall*.  
 80. Tylney Hall—*Thomas Hood*.  
 81. The Widow Barnaby—*Mrs.*  
*Trollope*.  
 82. The Soldier of Lyons—*Mrs. Gore*.  
 83. Marriage—*The Author of "The In-*  
*heritance" and "Destiny."*  
 84. Inheritance.  
 85. Destiny.  
 86. Gilbert Gurney—*Theodore Hook*.  
 87. The Widow and the Marquis—  
*Theodore Hook*.  
 88. All in the Wrong; or, Births  
 Deaths, and Marriages—*Theodore*  
*Hook*.  
 89. Homeward Bound—*Cooper*.  
 90. The Pathfinder—*Cooper*.  
 91. The Deeralayer—*Cooper*.  
 92. Jacqueline of Holland—*Grattan*.  
 93. The Man-at-Arms—*James*.  
 94. Two Old Men's Tales.  
 95. The Two Admirals—*Cooper*.  
 96. Richard Savage—*Whitehead*.  
 97. Cecil—*Mrs. Gore*.  
 98. The Prairie Bird—*The Hon. C. A.*  
*Murray*.  
 99. Jack o' Lantern—*Cooper*.  
 100. Ayesha—*Morier*.  
 101. Marchioness of Brinvilliers—*Albert*  
*Smith*.  
 102. Belford Regis—*Miss Mitford*.  
 103. My Cousin Nicholas—*Ingoldby*.  
 104. The Poacher—*Marryat*.  
 105. The Outlaw—*Mrs. S. C. Hall*.  
 106. The Phantom Ship—*Marryat*.  
 107. The Dog-Fiend—*Marryat*.  
 108. Adventures of Mr. Ledbury—  
*Albert Smith*.  
 109. Agnes de Mansfeldt—*Grattan*.  
 110. The Improvisators—*Andersen*.  
 111. Romance and Reality—*Miss L. E.*  
*London*.  
 112. Catherine de Medicis—*Miss L. S.*  
*Costello*.  
 113. Percival Keene—*Marryat*.  
 114. Recollections of a Chaperon—*Lady*  
*Dacre*.  
 115. Experiences of a Gaol Chaplain.  
 116. Legends of the Rhine—*Grattan*.  
 117. Tales of the Peerage and Pea-  
 santry—*Lady Dacre*.  
 118. Sir Ralph Esher—*Leigh Hunt*.  
 119. The Hamiltons—*Mrs. Gore*.  
 120. Life of a Sailor—*Capt. Chamier*.  
 121. Hector O'Halloran—*Maxwell*.









