The Apparelling of Truth

The Apparelling of Truth: Literature and Literary Culture in the Reign of James VI

A Festschrift for Roderick J. Lyall

Edited by

Kevin J. McGinley and Nicola Royan

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING

The Apparelling of Truth:
Literature and Literary Culture in the Reign of James VI
A Festschrift for Roderick J. Lyall,
Edited by Kevin J. McGinley and Nicola Royan

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1873-9, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1873-5

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The idea of this volume was warmly received in all quarters when first mooted around six years ago, a tribute to Rod's contribution to the field. The contributors are many and from various disciplines; there are also those who would have contributed, had professional commitments or personal circumstances not prevented them. These include Dr Jamie Reid Baxter, Dr Sarah Dunnigan, Professor Alasdair MacDonald, Professor Roger Mason and Professor Jenny Wormald. The editors would like to thank both the contributors and Cambridge Scholars Publishing for their patience in awaiting this collection; the University of Nottingham for financial support; and the Trustees of the National Library of Scotland for permission to reproduce the images on pp. 34 and 42.

INTRODUCTION

KEVIN J. MCGINLEY AND NICOLA ROYAN

Rod Lyall has been an ebullient force in Scottish literary studies for over thirty years. As a scholar he has driven forward research in a tremendous variety of areas. His work has charted new territories across a range of literary periods with approaches that have included editing, bibliographical and textual scholarship, historical studies, examinations of the relations between politics and aesthetics, the formation of Scottish traditions, and the international dimensions of Scottish literature. As a teacher his enthusiasm and his academic rigour have led many of his students to pursue new interests right across the discipline. As a proselytiser for the discipline, most particularly at the University of Glasgow and the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam, he has successfully raised its profile and attracted new scholars to the field. Each of the contributors to this volume has their personal image of Rod, and it is perhaps invidious of the editors to seize the privilege of recounting theirs. However, we are confident that our recollections of Rod will resonate. As professor of Scottish Literature at Glasgow, he was almost always on the run, except in seminars, where there was always time to pursue new readings; he was always a critical reader; he was always surrounded by books, so that his desk appeared like a castle battlement; and he was good company, whether in lecture or seminar. He also appeared to know everything about Scottish literature.

A volume that could reflect the wide scope of Rod Lyall's interests would be copious indeed. However, the selection of the literature of the reign of James VI and I as the topic of this volume in Rod's honour focuses on an area of study which he has returned to again and again, most notably in his 2005 book *Alexander Montgomerie: Poetry, Politics, and Cultural Change in Jacobean Scotland*. Rod's contribution to this area has changed the discipline radically, both through his own work and through that which he has inspired and guided others to undertake. In limiting the period, we have, conversely, been able to gather a collection whose range of perspectives reflects Rod's own polymathic approaches to the subject. The essays gathered here include linguistic study, textual scholarship and bibliographical studies, detailed historicist readings of Scottish texts, and

editing (an activity to which Rod has returned, under the auspices of the Scottish Text Society, a Society of which he is Honorary President). These analyses emphasise distinctively Scottish literary traditions, the study of the international dimensions of Scottish texts, including responses to English and French material, travel writing, highlighting of the early colonial American context, study of how stanza form is deployed within the tradition over time, analysis of how theological and philosophical concerns feed into literary structure, discussion of rhetorical voice in connection with gender, and examination of Latin writing in Scots, on any and all of which Rod would have something to say.

The diversity of approach conveys something of the breadth and vitality of Rod's own scholarship and his seemingly effortless combination of close textual analysis with a breadth of historical knowledge and awareness of national traditions and international contexts. Readings include the linguistic as well as the literary. Jeremy J. Smith provides a careful detailed analysis of the language of John Knox's letters (Lyall 1988, 177). As well as casting significant light on larger debates over the socio-linguistic relations of Scots and English in the sixteenth century, this essay addresses the common accusation, originating with Ninian Winzet, that Knox abandoned Scots for English. Smith disputes that, suggesting instead that Knox adapted his language to suit its audience. This careful attention to textual detail is continued in Priscilla Bawcutt's study of the text of John Rolland's *Court of Venus*, where in detailing and correcting the textual corruptions that have been introduced by careless editing, Bawcutt makes possible the fuller critical reassessment of what Rod Lyall has recently argued to be a text of considerable cultural significance (Lyall 2005b). Questions of dissemination occupy particularly three other essays. Janet Hadley Williams's examination of verse additions to a manuscript of Pitscottie's *Historie and Cronicles of Scotland*, in detailing a response to Lyndsay, a key summariser of Scottish history and a dominant voice of political morality in sixteenth century, illustrates how manuscript study can shed considerable light on the different uses of and responses to texts through different historical periods. John Corbett's consideration of Vautrollier, his presence in Scotland, and his contribution to Scottish culture, emphasises the importance of individual printers and their distinctive literary interests and social relations in shaping literary culture in particular historical moments, and demonstrates how an immigrant from France could be an important collaborator in the cultural project of James VI. Finally, Sally Mapstone's discussion of a newly found manuscript similarly broadens out into a consideration of the cultural concerns of one of the regions of Scotland often forgotten in a focus on the

court and its main burghs of residence, as well as demonstrating how the interaction between print and manuscript is not clear-cut and can be, as in this particular case, quite involved. All of these pieces speak to Rod's interest in the material object of the book (Lyall 1989a and 1989b), and also reflect the growing significance of book history in literary study.

Other essays in the volume introduce varied dimensions to the study of national literary culture. Four essays are substantially concerned with the poetry of John Stewart of Baldynneis; their very various readings demonstrate how broad the discipline has become, in contrast to the limited discussion available even ten years ago; note the discussion in "'A new maid channoun'? Redefining the Canonical in Older Scots Literature" (Lyall 1991b). Katherine McClune's comparative study of David Lyndsay, John Stewart, and Alexander Montgomerie, examines how issues of authorial authority and the role of the reader are addressed through the adaptation of the figure of Experience, to present different perspectives on authorial authority and the role of the reader, detailing a distinctively Scottish debate on these matters. R. D. S. Jack and Michael Spiller focus on the European influences. Jack concentrates on the theological and philosophical background of the works of Stewart and Montgomerie to explicate how moral and religious concerns are inscribed in the literary structure of their texts. Spiller discusses Stewart's literary debt to Continental models and poetic theories, based on a consideration of the poems of Stewart of Baldynneis as a poetic offering to James. Morna Fleming's piece is more inwardly focused, analysing Stewart's employment of female voices; she builds on detailed attention to the rhetorical postures and personae adopted in the texts to interrogate gender attitudes in the period. A fifth essay on the poetry of the Scottish court also discusses the representation of gender. Nicola Royan's study of Thomas Hudson's *Judith*, a translation of Du Bartas' *Judit*, neatly illustrates how the process of adapting foreign texts can highlight significant ideological characteristics of the target culture. For although *Judith* is a very different poem from Stewart's lyric impersonations, both attribute a notable amount of autonomy to their female figures. Hudson's heroine, however, transgresses only within prescribed boundaries, and is an exception rather than a model. Perhaps assured patronage made all the difference: Hudson reports that his translation was commissioned by the king, whereas Stewart's relationship with his monarch is hard to tease out.

James was of course a peculiarly literate sovereign. The title of this collection derives from his *Reulis and Cautelis*, where it comes as part of a definition of rhetoric: it nicely opens the possibility of both appropriate dress and also disguise. James was certainly acutely aware of the power of

reputation and its written presentation. Astrid Stilma's study of the depictions of James VI as a Protestant crusader illustrates clearly the correlation of literary representation and political interests. Her essay lucidly maps how these representations are adapted in writings by James himself and others in Scotland, England, and on the Continent, and how they shift to serve a variety of political ends. Often following paths set by Rod in earlier work, all of these essays together reflect the depth and complexity of the literary culture supported and sponsored by James's Scottish court.

Throughout these essays, we are reminded that Scottish texts of this period had significant polyglot and cross-cultural elements, drawing not simply from English or even Latin literature, but from French, Dutch, and Italian, and also giving material back to those languages. The openness of Scottish literary culture to outside influences has been a recurrent theme in Rod's own work (e.g. Lyall 1981; 1985; 1993; 2002b), and it is good to be able to build on this in presenting work that further explores this dimension. In particular, two essays stress the presence of Latin in the literary culture of Renaissance Scotland. Robert Cumming's erudite analysis of Ayton's Latin elegies highlights the importance of Latin as a literary language in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as well as providing an admirable demonstration of how the status of Latin may have been changing. Ian Cunningham's edition of Andrew Melville's *Scotiae Topographia* provides a much-needed new text of an important Scottish poem, widely disseminated throughout Europe, and stresses the participation of Scots writers in European Latin culture. Less evident here is the influence of Gaelic writing. Its absence necessarily renders the collected view of Scottish culture here partial, which militates against Rod's inclusive habits. Yet the bounds of this collection make it more or less justifiable, since James's tutor, George Buchanan resolutely turned his face from his native tongue and literature, and doubtless communicated this to his pupil, while James himself was equally resolute in his focus on the English succession.

As well as Cummings's piece on Ayton, four others are concerned with literature written after the Union. Theo van Heijnsbergen shows how William Lithgow's writings employ concepts of foreignness in an attempt to define "home" after James's departure from Scotland to London, and exposes the tensions which emerge between the rhetorical postures Lithgow adopts in his text and his aim of defining a stable identity. David Parkinson focuses on Scottish responses to Sidney's *Arcadia* and shows how William Alexander drew on it in considering the Union of Crowns, the death of Prince Henry, and the colonisation of the New World. Tricia

McElroy brings historical concerns to the forefront of her literary analysis of the *Memoirs of Sir James Melville of Halhill*. She embeds precise study of the generic and rhetorical forms of the text within a detailed consideration of its political concerns that shape the way Melville represents the past for the present. Derrick McClure takes the after-effects of the reign up to the nineteenth century, with his account of the history of the Heliconian stanza from its sixteenth-century origin until its disappearance. He combines an eye for the nuances of metre and stanza structure with a keen sense of the role of literary form in the shaping of literary tradition. This essay demonstrates perfectly the two key features consistent in the collection: attention to detail and an awareness of the wider tradition, both aspects of Rod's own work.

Since retiring from the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam, Rod has found a new career in his long-held love for cricket, as a web commentator on international tours. Nevertheless, he remains a highly significant figure in Older Scots studies, and is still writing, editing, and reviewing. The scope of literary interests and the range of approaches represented in the essays presented here provide ample evidence of the current vitality of the field and offer a fitting tribute to Rod Lyall, holding up a mirror to the fertility and productiveness of his own scholarship. In no small part a result of his indefatigable efforts, the study of Scottish literature before Burns is no longer confined to a few great names, but instead places those names in a rich cultural and material context. This volume is testimony to the profound respect and admiration for Rod among practitioners of Scottish literary studies and we can be sure that the future projects of those who continue to build on his work (Rod himself among them) will provide yet further evidence of the fecundity of his scholarship and profound literary insight.

ABBREVIATIONS

APS. *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*. Ed. T. Thomson and C. Innes. 12 vols. Edinburgh: Record Commission, 1814–75.

DNB. *The Dictionary of National Biography*. 63 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1885–1900.

DOST. *A Dictionary of the Older Scots Tongue from the Twelfth Century to the End of the Seventeenth*. Edinburgh: DOST, 1937–2002.

DSL. *Dictionary of the Scots Language*. URL: http://www.dsl.ac.uk/

EETS. Early English Text Society.

MED. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1952–2001. URL: http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/

NLS. National Library of Scotland.

OED. *Oxford English Dictionary*. http://dictionary.oed.com/

ODNB. *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. URL: http://www.oxforddnb.com/

RPS. *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*. Ed. K. M. Brown et al. 2007. URL: http://www.rps.ac.uk/

SLJ. *Scottish Literary Journal*.

SSL. *Studies in Scottish Literature*.

STC. *A Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640*. Ed. A. W. Pollard, G. R. Redgrave et al. 2nd edn. 3 vols. London: Bibliographical Society, 1976–91.

STS. Scottish Text Society.

LIST OF IMAGES

SCOTS AND ENGLISH IN THE LETTERS OF JOHN KNOX

JEREMY J. SMITH

"Ze… hes forzet our auld plane Scottis"

It is often said that the Protestant Reformation was a principal cause of the decline of written Scots (e.g. McClure 1988: 15). The legal requirement of 1579 which required every Scottish householder with 300 merks to possess a Bible and psalmbook *in vulgare langage* is seen as the prime culprit, for this *vulgare* Bible was the English version of the 1561 Geneva Bible. Thus English spellings, grammar and vocabulary have been seen as providing an authoritative model to replace distinctively Scots usages, and it is thus, it has been argued, not surprising that anglicisation impacted earliest on public works of religious controversy (see Devitt 1989).

From certain modern perspectives, this development represents a kind of betrayal, which killed off the elaboration of Scots in Scotland, as opposed to English, and meant that Scots never achieved the prestige in the written mode which some have felt to be its due. In marked contrast with the situation of English, a "standard" form of written Scots did not emerge until sporadic attempts by language planners in the twentieth century, such as those undertaken by the Scots Language Society (see Aitken 1981, 88). Uncertainty about the status of Scots—is it a language or a dialect?—remains a matter of considerable cultural and political controversy (see Aitken 1981, *passim*; McClure 1988).

Such accusations are not new. A famous sixteenth-century complaint is that made by the Catholic writer Ninian Winzet, who attacked the reformer John Knox (*ca*. 1514–72) as follows:

> Gif ze, throw curiositie of nouationis, hes forzet our auld plane Scottis quhilk zour mother lerit zou, in tymes cuming I sall wryte to zou my mind in Latin, for I am nocht acquyntit with zour Southeroun.
>
> (cited Corbett 1999, 59)

Winzet, a schoolmaster at Linlithgow who later became abbot of Regensburg, was making a polemical point at a time (1559–61) when Knox was more than usually enmired in controversy with Scottish Roman Catholics. Rather uncharacteristically, Knox did not respond to this attack in writing. It seems quite possible that the two never met in person, and that Winzet was writing from hearsay (Aitken 1997, 18).

As Jane Dawson (2004b) has pointed out, Winzet's statement has "perhaps been taken too seriously by subsequent generations". It is important to be aware that such contemporary accusations have little to do with any correlation of nationhood and linguistic identity, "the popular view that Knox and James VI sold their Middle Scots inheritance for English" (Jack 1997, 253); such notions are anachronistic. As Manfred Görlach has put it, "we must not forget that the concept of a unitary nation-state based on cultural and linguistic identity is a development mainly of the [eighteenth and nineteenth centuries]" (Görlach 2002, 2). Some have seen Winzet's views as deriving from his Catholic faith, just as, in the eighteenth century, the use of Scots by writers such as Ramsay and Ferguson may be associated with discreet sympathy for Jacobitism (see J. J. Smith 2007); Knox's use of English, on the other hand, has been taken as a marker of Protestantism.

This paper offers a reassessment of Knox's position in the light of current linguistic research, of newly-discovered information, and of our increased knowledge of how language related to national identity in the sixteenth century. The overall argument put forward is that Knox's use of Scots and English varied according to his relationship with his interlocutors. Insights from sociolinguistics and pragmatics are therefore crucial, and it is for that reason that, in what follows, linguistic detail and biographical information are brought into close articulation.

Knox's Holographs

That John Knox betrayed his own language has been questioned by Rod Lyall, who has suggested that "there is much of Knox's writing which is unambiguously in Scots.... In general, ... we should be wary about assuming that the extant texts of Knox's work are faithful to his own practice; in many cases, printers and scribes will have carried the process of anglicisation much further than he ever did" (1988, 177–78). Lyall contrasts a short passage from the printed version of *A Comfortable Epistell sente to the Afflicted Church of Chryst*, dated 31 May 1554 but printed about 1556, "with the very similar opening of another letter to a similar English congregation, dated three weeks previously and copied in

1603 into a manuscript of Knox's letters which is now Edinburgh University Library MS Laing III, 345" (1988, 177). Characteristically Scots forms such as *belovit*, *efter*, *sa*, *na*, *maist*, *sair* appear in the Laing MS, contrasting with English *beloved*, *after*, *so*, *no*, *most* and *sore* in the printed text. In both cases, however, it is hard to distinguish which is more authentically Knox's "own" usage; the Laing MS was copied by a scribe after Knox's death, apparently for the use of Knox's surviving family, while the printed text was overtly designed for a congregation of godly English exiles.

More recently, the late Jack Aitken carried out a re-examination (*inter alia*) of anglicisation in Knox's writings. Aitken's account, which focuses on spelling and certain grammatical features, is probably the most thorough and authoritative account yet published of Knox's linguistic practices in relation to contemporary usage, and he includes a discussion of how Knox may have mapped written language onto speech (Aitken 1997). Much analysis of Knox's language had been undertaken hitherto, as in Lyall's discussion, on copies of his writings, where scribal or compositorial intervention in the spelling of exemplars may be supposed to have taken place. Aitken's survey of Knox's writing, however, is based on those texts which are generally considered to be holograph, mostly letters and other missives; although he uses David Laing's nineteenth-century edition for his statistical analysis, he also claims that Laing was in general a faithful transcriber of the texts in front of him, and his findings can therefore be accepted as broadly correct (see Aitken 1997, 30). In what follows, the references to individual letters will use Laing's numbering system. Laing's edition of Knox's works was first published by the Bannatyne Club in 1864. Biographical information is derived from the references to these individuals in the online *ODNB*. As we will see, there is a close correlation between the linguistic form of Knox's letters and the communicative function these letters performed.

Almost all the holograph letters which Aitken identifies are to English people: to Queen Elizabeth I (Laing XIII, XV, LVIII); to Sir William Cecil, later Lord Burleigh, Elizabeth's great minister (II, VII, XII, XIV, XXVII, XLIV, LXXI, LXXXVIII); to Sir James Croft, Elizabeth's governor in Berwick, the border-town which was a focal point for military tension between England and Scotland (XVIII, XXIV, XXX, XXXV, XL, XLVI); to Sir Henry Percy, at the time an English commissioner but later to become eighth earl of Northumberland and a dabbler in conspiracy, and to suffer a mysterious death in the Tower of London (IX, XIX); to Gregory Raylton, servant to Sir Ralph Sadler, who was English ambassador to Scotland and continued to maintain, on Cecil's behalf, close relations with

Scottish Protestants (XXXVIII, XLVIII); to Lord Robert Dudley, later Earl of Leicester, Elizabeth's long-term favourite and a patron of the "godly" (LXXII); to Thomas Randolph, an English diplomat and general-purpose trouble-shooter on Elizabeth's behalf (LXXVIII); and to an anonymous "English friend" (LXXXVI).

Aitken identified a further holograph in Laing's collection, to Christopher Goodman (1521/2–1603) (CIII). Goodman was a prominent English evangelical who was a close associate of Knox, being a fellow-exile in Geneva and at various times a Protestant minister of religion in Ayr and St Andrews; later he became a minister in Chester, but continued to engage in religious controversy. He was for much of his career under the patronage of Lord Robert Dudley: a necessary protection, since Queen Elizabeth loathed him as an advocate of resistance to ungodly rulers and a questioner of the legitimacy of rule by women. Goodman's tract, *How Superior Powers Oght to be Obeyd of their Subjects* was published in 1558 alongside Knox's notorious *First Blast*. At the time he received letter CIII, Goodman was in Chester, and Knox's letter is one of encouragement to a "marked man" (Dawson 2004a). Goodman had moved to a comparatively remote part of England, away from the court, to avoid persecution from which not even Dudley could protect him.

Since Aitken's study, a new holograph letter to Goodman has been discovered, edited recently by Lionel Glassey (in Dawson and Glassey 2004). This letter dates from 1566, when Goodman had just been forced out of his position as minister at St Andrews, part of the backwash from the so-called "chaseabout raid" of 1565, a rising of reformers led by Regent Moray against Mary Queen of Scots, aimed at preventing her marriage to Lord Darnley. Knox describes how one Robert Hamilton is ministering "to your church of Sanctandroes on Goodman's behalf, with conditioun that, that place is youres whensoever it pleaseht God to restore you to thame, which thei mest earnestlie crave" (Dawson and Glassey 2004, 185). Copies of a further set of letters from Knox to Goodman have also been identified as a result of this discovery, but none is holograph; see Dawson and Glassey 2004, *passim*).

Only three of Knox's holograph letters are to Scots: to Sir William Douglas of Lochleven (XCII); to Sir James Douglas of Drumlanrig (CI); and to Sir John Wishart of Pittarrow (CII). Of these three, Wishart was a major landowner and sometime royal servant who took part in the chaseabout raid. He was closely connected with the English reformed tradition. Not only did his house contain a painting satirising the papal curia, but Thomas Randolph commended him as a man "mervileus wyse, discryte and godly, with owte spotte or wrynkle" (Adams 2004); the term

godly would have signalled to contemporaries an adherence to Protestant beliefs. He died in 1585.

The Douglas lairds were similarly prominent in sixteenth-century Scottish society. Sir William was half-brother to Regent Moray; a firm reformer, he was famously Mary's custodian at Lochleven castle. He ended his career as sixth earl of Morton, dying in 1606 (see further M. H. B. Sanderson 1987). Sir James Douglas of Drumlanrig, "Old Drumlanrig", played a significant part in the deposition of Queen Mary, who referred to him bitterly as one of the "bludy tyrantis without saullis or feir of God" (Ramage 1876, 42); he died in 1578.

The Language of the Knox Holographs

The form of language in the Knox holographs may be swiftly characterised. In open-class ("lexical") vocabulary, whether writing to English or Scottish addressees, Knox generally avoided words, or forms of words, restricted to Scots. There are exceptions though: *spreit* "spirit", a word he frequently employs for obvious reasons, represents a form which entered Scots independently from English, i.e. derived from French *esprit* rather than from Latin *spiritus*; Knox uses *spirit* as well, but rather less frequently. He is comfortable about using the form *Kirk* "church" to Queen Elizabeth (XV) as well as to Wishart of Pittarrow (CII). Other forms used by him include *propone(d)* "put forward for consideration", *publictlie* "publicly", *kirklands* "glebe, church-lands" and *inflambe* "inflame"; consultation of *DSL* and *OED* shows that these forms are restricted to Scottish texts and have an etymology distinct from their English equivalents. Some forms have no English cognate, e.g. *faschious* "annoying" (from Old French *fascheux*) in letter LXXII to Robert Dudley, which only occurs, according to *DSL* and *OED*, in Scottish texts. The word *fremmedly* "strangely" (LXXXVIII, to William Cecil) is not recorded as such in *DSL* and *OED*, and seems to be peculiar to Knox; the related adjective, *fremed*, appears in Middle English with the meaning "strange, foreign" according to *MED*, but does not seem to have survived into Early Modern English; the form *fremd* is recorded in *OED*, but is rare and restricted to Scottish and Northern dialectal usage. The form *fremmitly*, however, is recorded in *DSL*; it seems that Knox took a word which was by this time restricted to Scots and gave it an inflexion more prototypical of contemporary English. In general, though, Knox favoured a plain style in his handling of vocabulary which generally avoided display; he was not, though, a "purist" in the same way as his English evangelical near-contemporary Sir John Cheke, who, in his translation of the Bible,

notoriously used *hundreder* for "centurion" and *biwordes* for "parables" in order to avoid words derived from Latin or Greek (see J. J. Smith 2004).

In closed-class ("grammatical") words, Knox seems generally to have attempted to use forms familiar to his interlocutors when writing to English addressees, but to have allowed himself occasional Scotticisms. Thus *thies* for "these" (e.g. II, XXXV) appears beside sporadic Scots *thir* "these" (LXXXVI), *wer* "were" (XXXV, XXXVIII) beside more common Scots *war(e)* (XXXV, LXXI), *which*, *wich(e)* (II) "which" beside less common Scots *quhilk* (XIV), and *shall* (LXXI) and *shalbe* (XVIII) beside *sall* (LXXXVI). Letter XV, to Queen Elizabeth, for instance, may be taken as representative; this text has *spirit*, *which*, *these* but also *quhairof* and *sall* (both once). When writing to the Douglas lairds, the proportions of Scots forms to English forms are reversed, e.g. *sall* (CI) beside *shall* (XCII), *thir* (CI), *quhilk* (XCII), *thea* "those" (CI) etc. Forms such as *sall* also appear in the letter to Wishart of Pittarrow (CII), but in general the letter to Wishart, interestingly, follows the pattern of those written to English addressees, being written in English with occasional Scotticisms; by contrast, the letter to Sir James Douglas (CI), though dating from the same year (1572), is written in Scots with occasional English forms.

In grammar, Knox's usage varies. In his letters to English correspondents, Knox, as Aitken notes, attempts as a rule to use morphological features with which they would be familiar, of which the most noticeable is the third person present singular ending in *-eth*, often (though not always) rather idiosyncratically spelt *-eht* by Knox: e.g. "it pleaseht him to mack his woord to be effectuall" (LXXII), "If this phrenesie ... doeth not justifie" (LXXXVI). Interestingly, Aitken notes that Knox often, though not always, used the ending *-est*—a second person singular inflexion in southern English—on forms which should, given the syntactic context, be parsed as third person present singular. Knox also used *-eth*, by this time marking third person singular in southern English, in circumstances where a present plural would be appropriate. Examples include "The case of these gentlemen stondest thus" (XXVII), "my book tuichest not your Graces person in especiall" (XV), "which nature and law denieth to all weomen" (XV), "as other things occurrith" (XXXV). Such usages are hyperadaptations, "errors ... easy to a Scot whose normal speech has only the morpheme /-ɪs/ for all of these" (Aitken 1997, 18); Knox sporadically exemplifies this usage even in his correspondence with English addressees: e.g. "as our ennemis supposis" (XXX). In his letters to the two Douglas lairds, *-(i)s* is common—e.g. "to thame that dependis vpon Jesus Christ" (CI)—and this usage is also found in the letter to Wishart, e.g. "both the parteis stands as it were fighting against God

himself" (CII). However, in general, English inflexions are employed in the Wishart letter: e.g. "my dull heart feareth the worst, who long hath railed against our religion" (CII).

Sometimes the mask slips more thoroughly. In at least one of his letters to English correspondents, Knox uses the Northern Personal Pronoun Rule, characteristically found in Middle English and Older Scots and still retained in many varieties of Present-Day Scots. According to this rule, the *-s* inflexion characteristic of all persons of the present tense verb is dropped when immediately preceded by a personal pronoun, but is used when the verb is not so preceded: e.g. "for I prase my God I have laid my compt, and fyndes my hol debtis discharged" (LXXI).

Spellings prototypical of Scots appear in all the holograph letters, but in different proportions. According to Aitken, some texts are in English, "sparsely sprinkled with orthographic and formal scotticisms", while others are "largely in Scots, though in each case with a sprinkling of anglicisms of orthography and form" (1997, 16). Such variety can also be seen in the texts discussed by Lyall (1988); *oppressit*, with the Scots ending in *-it* appears in the "anglicised" printed text cited by Lyall (as well as in the Laing MS), and the form *knawith* in the Laing MS (cf. *knowith* in the printed text) represents a mixture of a Scots stem (*knaw-*) and an English inflexional ending (*-ith*).

The two texts containing the largest number of Scots forms are those to the Douglas lairds; thus *rycht*, *quhilk*, *tacken*, *gude*, *tua* (for example) all appear in letter XCII to Sir William, while *efter*, *knaw*, *nocht*, *sua*, *sall*, *anes* all appear in letter CI to Sir James. By contrast, considerably fewer Scots forms appear in letter CII to Wishart of Pittarrow, apart from *sall*. Yet even the letters to Douglas lairds contain forms more prototypical of English, e.g. *after*, *ryght* (XCII), *which*, *ones* (CI).

The letters to Goodman (CIII, Dawson and Glassey 2004) may be taken as representative of the usage adopted by Knox in his letters to English persons. The spellings of CII, a comparatively short letter, are almost entirely those to be found in contemporary English correspondence, except for one occurrence of *sall*: e.g. *whome*, *both*, *which*, *long*. Knox, in CII, does not use his idiosyncratic *-ht*, thus *hath*. The only marked Scots feature in letter CII other than *sall* is in vocabulary, with two occurrences of *publictlie*.

The newly-discovered letter to Goodman is much longer, and more informative. Both Scots and English forms appear in it. Scots forms recorded in the text are *ane* (twice), *awen* (twice), *war* "were" (twice), *tacken*, *mack* (twice). Initial *sch-* appears sporadically for *sh-*, e.g. *schortar* "shorter"; though such forms are still found in English usage they are

probably more prototypically Scots by the sixteenth century. Knox's somewhat idiosyncratic *-ht* for *-th* is also in evidence, e.g. *boht* "both", *pleaseht* "pleaseth", beside *hath*. Knox also uses the words *publictlie* and *spreit*; however, he refers to "The church of Edinburght", rather than use Scots *kirk*. An apparent oddity is *yockfallo* "fellow-worker, associate", but this word, as *yokefellow*, seems to have begun life as a term characteristic of godly discourse; it appears earliest, according to *OED*, in Tindale's translation of the Bible and Tomson's translation of Calvin's *Sermons*, subsequently spreading from there into more general currency (e.g. Shakespeare's *Henry V*, Act II, Sc. iii, l. 56). The word is not recorded, in any spelling, in *DSL*. Inflexions are generally in English form, though there is one occurrence of a present tense in *-es*, viz. "he knowes expedient for me". The bulk of the letter is made up of forms characteristic of English usage, e.g. *shall*, *old*, *which*, *know*, *should*, *more*, *such*, *ones* "once", *one*, *mo* "more", *shalbe* "shall be", *she*, *hath*, *goode*, *whome*, *more*, *who*, *from*.

Aitken mapped this inconsistency of written usage onto speech as follows:

> As for Knox's speech, is it likely that this ever achieved a consistency (to Scots or English) which his written language never did? Or did he speak as well as write a somewhat inconsistently mixed Scots English, perhaps tending to select from the English or Scots options according to the social setting or the interlocutors, in much the same way and for similar sociolinguistic reasons as many Scots speakers have done from the seventeenth century onwards? This would make him ... one of the earliest speakers of "Scots English". This seems possible.
>
> (1997, 18)

The evidence of Knox's letters seems to reveal that he varied his written usage, at least, depending on his addressee: i.e. he "code-switched" in the written mode in a way which is commonplace in modern speech but seems somewhat strange (to modern eyes) in the written mode. His ability to draw from a repertoire of forms in this way would have derived from his extremely varied life-experiences, including lengthy periods with the English reforming community in Geneva. The Douglas lairds, whose social standing was not markedly less than that of (say) Lord Robert Dudley or Sir James Croft, were evidently accustomed to reading Scots; Knox responded. On the other hand, his English recipients clearly expected to read texts in English, and again Knox was ready, selecting a larger proportion of English forms from his repertoire. (The case of Wishart is an interesting anomaly, and seems likely to derive from some

aspect, now unknown, of Wishart's own biography.) It could in sum be argued that the varying proportion of Scots to English forms in his letters derived not from any ideological stance on Knox's part but from pragmatic considerations based on the usages expected by the addressee.

Knox's Views on Scots

The newly-discovered letter, however, also contains an interesting reference to the Scots language, viz.

> Fayr heghtes (I wold not ye should forgett your Scotish toung) will not only mack fooles fain (ye know the proverbe) but also will cause thame yit ones againe putt soules and bodies boht in daunger.

Knox adds the words *ye know the proverbe* in the margin, "with an insertion mark after 'fain' to indicate the place where they are to be recorded" (Dawson and Glassey 2004, 185; n.14). Dawson and Glassey note (acknowledging M. L. Anderson 1957, 60) that the saying is a well-attested Scottish proverb, and they gloss it "literally, 'fair promises make fools fond'; or, more colloquially, 'fools will be won over by fair words'" (Dawson and Glassey 2004, 185, n.15).

For our purposes, the expression *I wold not ye should forget your Scotish toung* is of considerable interest, for at least two reasons. First, Knox is conscious that there is a difference between English and Scots. The passage therefore may be placed alongside other contemporary references to the difference between English and Scots, e.g. the famous reference by Don Pedro de Ayala, Spanish ambassador to James IV, who wrote to Ferdinand and Isabella in 1498 "that the language of the Scottish king was as different from English as Aragonese from Castilian" (Moessner 1997, 112). (That Ferdinand and Isabella were to unite Aragon and Castile in a single polity, with all the linguistic implications which followed and continue to resonate to the present day, offers an interesting parallel to the relationship between English and Scots; see e.g. Laitin 1989).

Secondly, Knox does not want Goodman to forget the *Scotish toung* with which he would have been familiar during his time as a minister in St Andrews and Ayr. The reference to the proverb is jocular, to a man who was one of Knox's closest friends, but it is for that reason all the more revealing; Scots, at least in speech, is something which Knox values as a repository of at least traditional wisdom, and he wishes Goodman to retain this knowledge. In this sense, Knox would seem not to be, as has been

claimed, "lacking any sense that the distinctiveness of Scots was to be particularly prized" (McClure 1988, 15).

Dawson and Glassey (2004, 170) refer to the newly-discovered letter as being written in "a very heavily Anglicised form of Scots, either from deference to his English recipient or from general principle". We have seen that "deference to … recipient" is an important factor in Knox's linguistic choices, but the question clearly remains, given the formulation offered by Dawson and Glassey, as to whether Knox was writing in English or Scots.

The Scots/English distinction is of course notoriously tricky to define. It is now an axiom of linguistic enquiry that categories of language may be thought of not as discrete entities but as gradient, a continuum. The question as to whether Knox wrote in Scots or English is thus an ill-formed question; the issue is one or "more-or-less-ness" rather than "either-or-ness". English and Scots, as they do today, overlapped very significantly, rather as present-day Dutch and German do, and it seems that Knox was aware of this overlap, using forms of English when writing to, say, Goodman and forms more prototypical of Scots usage when writing to the Douglas lairds.

But it seems clear from the analysis of his holographs that Knox chose to vary his usage not from some religious or reforming impulse but rather from a wish to accommodate his interlocutors. His behaviour is thus an instance of "accommodation", of a kind which is well-attested by modern sociolinguists (see Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985). For Knox, the Protestant message was much more important than the linguistic medium in which it was expressed, and he preferred to put that message across clearly, focusing on the needs of his addressees, rather than to use his written language as a means of expressing linguistic nationalism; but this did not mean that he lacked affection for his *Scotish toung*. In sum, the relative roles of Scots and English in Scotland in the sixteenth century should not be seen as a straightforward matter, whereby Scots = Catholic and English = Protestant. The situation was considerably more nuanced and Ninian Winzet's accusation cited at the beginning of this article needs, as Dawson has suggested (2004b), careful qualification. Knox was, from the evidence of his holograph letters, no linguistic traitor; rather, he was trying, politely and with due regard for communicative function, to accommodate his correspondents. For Knox, anglicisation was a social rather than a religious choice; the correlation between Protestantism and the English language probably came later, as the English Bible began to dominate Scottish culture later in the sixteenth century.

"MANKIT AND MUTILLAIT": THE TEXT OF JOHN ROLLAND'S *THE COURT OF VENUS*

PRISCILLA BAWCUTT

John Rolland is a neglected but far from negligible poet, who, like several other early Scottish poets, was a notary public. Although little definite is known of his life, he is recorded as practising in Melrose and Dalkeith, and legal documents bearing his name date from 1551 to 1580.[1] Rolland's most popular work was *The Seuin Seages* (composed *ca*. 1560); the earliest extant edition was printed by John Ross for Henry Charteris in 1578 (*STC*, 21254), and there were at least five subsequent editions or reprints between that date and 1635 (Barr 1967–70; Couper 2002). *The Court of Venus*, by contrast, survives in a single edition, also printed by John Ross (and probably for Henry Charteris), dated 1575 (*STC*, 21258). According to the title page, the work was "newlie compylit be Johne Rolland in Dalkeith", but, despite this statement, there is evidence that *The Court of Venus* was composed earlier than 1575 and pre-dated *The Seuin Seages*. In his "Prologue" to *The Seuin Seages*, Rolland implies that *The Court of Venus* was written during the lifetime of four poets: Sir David Lyndsay (*d*. 1555), Bishop Andrew Durie (*d*. 1558), John Bellenden (*d*. ?1548), and William Stewart (*d*. ?1548). If true, this would suggest that *The Court of Venus*—or a first version of it—was composed some time before 1548, and that Ross's "newlie compylit" perhaps derives from the title page of an earlier edition. But the passage in the "Prologue" sounds more like a jocular fiction about Rolland's literary allegiances than a statement of fact, and the precise date of *The Court of Venus* remains uncertain (Rolland 1932, 1–3).

One might well wonder what prompted the printing of Rolland's two poems in 1575 and 1578. Literary critics pay little attention to the early years of James VI's reign, and usually regard the 1570s as a decade dominated by the polemical verse of Robert Sempill. But during this period older Scottish literature experienced a remarkable revival, for which the chief credit lies with the energetic bookseller and printer Henry

Charteris. From 1568 onwards he commissioned from a number of different printers, and at his own "expensis", an impressive series of publications that included not only *The Seuin Seages* and probably *The Court of Venus* but several of what are now regarded as the classics of early Scottish poetry: Sir David Lyndsay's *Warkis* (1568), Robert Henryson's *Fables* (1570), Hary's *Wallace* (1570), Barbour's *Bruce* (1571), and Douglas's *The Palice of Honour* (1578).[2] Charteris was a learned, patriotic and highly articulate man, and in various prefaces and "Adhortatiounis" (most importantly, to Lyndsay's *Warkis*, the *Bruce*, and the edition of the *Wallace* printed in 1594) he stressed the literary and historical value of these works. Speaking of Lyndsay, for instance, he proclaimed his intention:

> that na thing of sa Nobill ane wryter suld perische, throw negligence or sleuthfulnes of this present age, bot suld be reseruit to ye fruite of all posteriteis following.
>
> (Hamer 1931–36, I:403)

Sir Walter Scott attributed to George Bannatyne the "plan of saving the literature of a whole nation" (Ritchie 1928–34, I:cxxix–cxxx). But it is arguable that this tribute might have been more fittingly paid to Henry Charteris. Charteris expressed a strong personal liking for several of these old poems—his favourite term of commendation was "plesand and delectabill". But he was also a shrewd and wealthy business man, and it seems most unlikely that he would have commissioned these works unless he saw a potential market for them.

The Court of Venus (Rolland 1884) is a long and learned work on the theme of love; divided into a "Prologue" and four books, it contains nearly four thousand lines. It is an ambitious poem that testifies to the strong and persistent Scottish interest in allegorical poetry throughout the sixteenth century. Indeed it stands almost at the midpoint of that tradition, looking back to Lyndsay's *Dreme*, Dunbar's *Goldyn Targe*, and Douglas's *Palice of Honour* (to which it is indebted, stylistically and structurally), but also forward to three significant poems composed later in James VI's reign—John Stewart of Baldynneis's *Ane Schersing out of Trew Felicitie* (*ca*. 1584), Alexander Montgomerie's *The Cherrie and the Slae* (first printed in 1597) and Elizabeth Melville's *Ane Godlie Dreame* (printed in 1603). Some motifs characteristic of the tradition that might be mentioned are the quest for intellectual enlightenment or true "felicitie", the anxious or bemused protagonist who requires assistance from a divine or supernatural guide, debates between personified abstractions, and lavish setpieces of description, such as the allegorical palace or castle. The