

www.e-rara.ch

Memoirs of John Napier of Merchiston

Napier, John

London, MDCCCXXXIV. [1834]

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich

Shelf Mark: Rar 29243

Persistent Link: <https://doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-69825>

Appendix.

www.e-rara.ch

Die Plattform e-rara.ch macht die in Schweizer Bibliotheken vorhandenen Drucke online verfügbar. Das Spektrum reicht von Büchern über Karten bis zu illustrierten Materialien – von den Anfängen des Buchdrucks bis ins 20. Jahrhundert.

e-rara.ch provides online access to rare books available in Swiss libraries. The holdings extend from books and maps to illustrated material – from the beginnings of printing to the 20th century.

e-rara.ch met en ligne des reproductions numériques d'imprimés conservés dans les bibliothèques de Suisse. L'éventail va des livres aux documents iconographiques en passant par les cartes – des débuts de l'imprimerie jusqu'au 20e siècle.

e-rara.ch mette a disposizione in rete le edizioni antiche conservate nelle biblioteche svizzere. La collezione comprende libri, carte geografiche e materiale illustrato che risalgono agli inizi della tipografia fino ad arrivare al XX secolo.

Nutzungsbedingungen Dieses Digitalisat kann kostenfrei heruntergeladen werden. Die Lizenzierungsart und die Nutzungsbedingungen sind individuell zu jedem Dokument in den Titelinformationen angegeben. Für weitere Informationen siehe auch [Link]

Terms of Use This digital copy can be downloaded free of charge. The type of licensing and the terms of use are indicated in the title information for each document individually. For further information please refer to the terms of use on [Link]

Conditions d'utilisation Ce document numérique peut être téléchargé gratuitement. Son statut juridique et ses conditions d'utilisation sont précisés dans sa notice détaillée. Pour de plus amples informations, voir [Link]

Condizioni di utilizzo Questo documento può essere scaricato gratuitamente. Il tipo di licenza e le condizioni di utilizzo sono indicate nella notizia bibliografica del singolo documento. Per ulteriori informazioni vedi anche [Link]

APPENDIX.

NOTES AND REFERENCES.

NOTE A.

THAT the earliest ancestor of the philosopher's, in lineal male ascent, who can be distinctly traced, was the first Napier of *Merchiston*, is proved by an entry in the great Chamberlain Rolls of Scotland, preserved in the Register-House, from which it appears that "Alexander Napare" acquired the lands of Nether-Merchiston by wadset from James I. sometime before the year 1438. The genealogical document transmitted by the first Lord Napier to Sir William Segar is printed in *Hutchins' Dorsetshire*, ii. 48, where the genealogical history of the distinguished English cadets of Merchiston, Napiers of Luton-hoo and Napiers of Morecritchill are given. This author says, "the Napiers of Scotland are also extinct, though the barony of Merchiston still exists in another family, their descendants." This is very inaccurate. The Lord Napier of Merchiston is the lineal descendant of the philosopher, and represents him in his right to the dormant Earldom of Levenax, although he is not lineal heir-male of Napier. But the philosopher is represented in the direct male line by Sir William Milliken Napier of Napier and Milliken, Bart. who has many sons. William Napier, Esq. of Blackstone, of whose hospitable house we wish the same could be said, is also a lineal male descendant of the philosopher's. Besides, are the Generals, and Colonels, and Majors, and Captains Napier, distinguished in the service of their country, and who have scattered "Neper's bones" by sea and land in the shape of their own limbs, to be forgotten as scions of Merchiston? This note was intended to record the Scottish Napiers; but the clan and their gallant deeds are so numerous that I must sum them up in one word, *Carlos da Ponza, Count Cape St Vincent*, who, alas! has no son. For English and Irish Napiers, cadets of Merchiston, see *Collins' Peerage, passim*.

NOTE B.

I found many interesting genealogical facts, particularly in the records of wills, and the ancient protocols of Edinburgh, regarding the families of Bellenden and Bothwell, for which, however, I must refer the curious reader to those sources.

NOTE C.

Of many particulars regarding the state of the College of St Salvator, when the philosopher was there, (kindly communicated to me by Dr Lee,) I have only space to insert the names of those under whose immediate tuition he must have been. John Rutherford, Principal. William Ramsay, second principal master. David Guild, third principal master. James Martyn, John Ker, Thomas Brown, John Arthur, Regents.

NOTE D.

The philosopher's reply to the queries of Sir John Skene are, like every thing he composed, characterized by consummate skill and the most unpretending simplicity. The reader will find them in Skene's treatise *De Verborum Significatione, voce Perticata*.

NOTE E.

The peerage writers have generally recorded that the second wife of the philosopher's father was Elizabeth Mowbray, daughter of ——— Mowbray of Barnbougall. Mr Wood supposed this lady to have been the daughter of Robert Mowbray; but dates and facts have led me to the conclusion that she was the daughter of John Mowbray, Robert's son. Sir Archibald Napier was married to this lady about the year 1571, at which period the laird of Barnbougall was John. In the register of obligations, preserved in the Register House, there is a marriage-contract, dated at Barnbougall, 6th August 1572, "betwixt honarabill persones, Johne Moubray of Barnebougall and Agnes Moubray, his dochter, and Maister Robert Creychton of Eliok," &c. John Mowbray had a daughter Elizabeth, who is named in a deed, dated 2d February 1585-6, dividing a provision of 1500 merks among his family. Of this sum, 1460 merks are allotted to John Mowbray's daughter *Marion*, and only 20 to *Elizabeth*, her sister; probably because she was sufficiently provided for by marriage to Sir Archibald Napier. *Agnes* was dead at this time, as appears by a previous deed, dated 14th September 1575. The other sisters were with Queen Mary. The children of John Mowbray were, through their mother, cousins to Sir Archibald Napier. Barbara and Gilles Mowbray were the companions of Queen Mary in her captivity. In "la mort de la Royne d'Escosse," which records the severity of the English government towards the domestics of Mary after her execution, this sentence occurs; "le Baron de *Barnestrudgal*, gentilhomme Escossois, qui avoit deux de ses filles en prison, vint à Londres, ou ayant commandement du Roy d'Escosse de parler pour les serviteurs de sa mere, poursuyuit leur deliverance." Mary's funeral took place immediately afterwards, and "Madamoyselle Barbe Maubray" and "Gilles Maubray" are recorded among "les femmes de la Royne d'Escosse," who walked in the pageantry. Barbara Mowbray's tomb at Antwerp records her fidelity to Queen Mary, and the fact that she was the daughter of *John Mowbray, a Scottish baron*. There can be no doubt that *Barnestrudgal* is a corruption of *Barnbougall*; and that Barbara and Gilles were the two daughters whose release from prison the venerable father-in-law of Sir Archibald Napier travelled to procure. For a particular and most interest-

ing account of Barbara's tomb at Antwerp, and the story of *Queen Mary's head*, see *Antiquarian Repertory*, Vol. iii. p. 388. The ill-fated Francis Mowbray was the brother of these young ladies. Barnbougall is now the property of the Earl of Rosbery, but the fine old name is changed to one of no meaning. Bar-na-buoi-gall signifies the point of land of the victory of strangers.

ORIGINAL CHARTERS, &c.

No. I.

[*Extract from the Philde Charter, with fac-simile of the autograph of James II.*]

“JACOBUS,” &c. “dedisse, concessisse et hac presenti carta nostra confirmasse dilecto nostro Alexandro Napare nostrorum computorum rotulatore pro continuo et fideli servitio quondam carissime matri nostre Regine impenso, et recompensatione lesionis sui corporis ac gravaminum et dampnorum sibi illatorum tempore proditorie captionis et incarcerationis dicte carissime matris nostre per Alexandrum de Leuingston militem et Jacobum de Leuingston filium suum ac suos complices nequiter perpetrare. Et pro dicti etiam Alexandri Napare fideli servitio nobis impenso et impendendo totas et integras terras nostras de Philde cum pertinentiis jacentes in domino nostro de Methuen infra vicecomitatum de Perth; que terre de Philde ad manus nostras devenerunt ratione forisfacture Alexandri de Leuingston filii dicti Alexandri de Leuingston militis,” &c.—“Apud Edynburgh septimo die mensis Marcii Anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo quadragesimo nono, et Regni nostri decimo quarto.”

A fac-simile of a handwritten signature in cursive script, which reads "James II". The signature is written in dark ink on a light-colored background.

No. II.

[*Grant from Henry VI. of England to John Napier of Rusky.*]

HENRICUS Dei gratia Rex Anglie et Francie et Dominus Hibernie, omnibus ad quos presentes littere peruenerint salutem Sciatis quod nos bona et gratuita obsequia que dilectus noster Johannes Naper de regno Scotie armigero nobis impendit et in futurum impendere desiderat considerantes de nostra gratia speciali concessimus ei quinquaginta marcas tenendas et percipiendas annuatim pro termino vite sue ad receptum scaccarii nostri per manus Thesaurarii et Camerarii nostrorum ibidem tempore existente ad terminos scilicet michalis et pasche per equales porciones. In cujus rei testimonium has litteras nostras fieri fecimus patentes, teste me ipso apud Edinburgh vicessimo octavo die Augusti, anno regni nostri tricesimo nono. [1461.]

[*No seal or signature.*]

No. III.

Instructionis to be gevin to Schir Alexander Napare of Merchanstoune, Knicht, on the behalve of the King, to be shawin to the Duc of Burgunze, his derrest coussing and confederat.

In the first, to schew to the said Lorde Duc how that the King understands, nocht alanerly be the relations of the said Schir Alexander Napare, the tyme that he cam last fra his said coussing, the gret kindnes and towart dispositione that he has to the King and his realm, but also be the hertly and tendre ressaiving of his last ambaxate send unto him, and of the gude deliverance of thame, of the quhilk he sal thank his said coussing, praying him of gudely continuance.

ITEM, to schew to the saide Lorde Duc of [sic] the behalve of the King, that his entent of the sending of his last ambaxat was for to approve and renew the ald confederations and appointmentis made of befor betwix baith thare predecessours, and to conclude upon a certane article of new, tusching the sending of certane men of war upon the expenss of the party requerand, as is mar at lenth contenit in the endenture made betwix baith the commissioners thareuppoun, and evar to haue hade the said confederations of mar strenth and effect than thai war of befor than of less, nochtwithstanding the Kingis ambassiat, quether reklessly or of necligence he wait nocht, excedit the bounds of thare instructionis, and consentit to ane inconvenient, and concludit tharuppoun; that is to say, that his said coussing the Duc exceptit in his band the King of England, and becaus the King has nane uthir Prince that makis war upon him, he couth nocht fynde the way to appruve nor conferme the said appointmentis; and tharefor, for his part, he has left owt the exceptioun of the King of Denmark, his gude-fader, likeas he has schewin now of late mar at lenth to the ambaxators of the said Lorde Ducis: For the quhilk causs, and to the effect and entent that the King desirs the tendernes and favours of his said coussing, and to pless him sa far as he gudely may with his honour, baith becaus of nere-nes of blude and the repar of his liegs and merchands in his lordschippis and tounys in thai partis, he has send to him his treue and famuliar knicht, Schir Alexander Napare, with his letter under his Great Sele, in effect comprehendand baith the auld confederatioun and new in all points and articlis, the exceptioun of the said King of England alenarly left out for the party of the said Lorde Duc, and for the party of the King, the excepting of his gude-fader of Denmark richt swa left owt. Requerand his said coussing the Duc, that gif the forme of the said new confederatioun sent to him be acceptable, that he will ressaive it, and deliver siclike under his Gret Sele to the said Schir Alexander.

ITEM, to schaw to the said Lorde Duc, and remember how that now of late his ambaxat has bene at the King, desiring ane new abstinence of war and trewis betwix him and the King of England for twa zeris, under certane forme and effect, likeas was con-

tenit in thare instructonis ; and, nochtwithstanding that trewis was taken for lang termes and mony zeris of befor betwix baith the said princes, and that the Kingis lieges, baith be sey and be land, has sustenit gret skaith and dampnage unredressit, and letters of promitt of King Edward and uthers under him bundyn tharfor ; nevertheless, becaus it was understanden be the king that the said abstinence and trewis was desirit be the said Lorde Duc, his cousing, for the gude ese and support of him, yet tharefor the King, his cousing, consentit and aggreit thareto at the emplesance of him, the quhilk he wald nocht have done be na manner of way at the instance of the King of Ingland, considering that he and his people remanys plantwiss on him, and Inglismen unredressit.

ITEM, to schaw to the said Lorde Duc, that sen at the emplesance of him his cousing, the King of Scotland has consentit and taken sic trewis with King Edward for the termes desere be him, that tharefor he write his autentik letters with personis of fame and auctorite to the said King Edward, to mak him redress incontinent the bargh broken at Balmburgh, and the laif of the attemptats that ware adiugit to be redressit the last diet haldin at the Newcastle, and sensyne, for thair part, like as the King here is reddy to mak redress for his part ; and that he certify King Edward in his said letters, that without redres be made the peple of his realme that ar herijt, hurt, and grevit, cannocht kepe pece in case trewis be never sa sikker bundyn.

Item, to schaw to the Duke that the King traists it is nocht owt of his mynde how that the merchandis of his realme has license of his fader and of himself to cheiss thare stapill within his Lordschippes in ony toune under him ; that tharefor he wald remane in the samyn will to his merchandis, and that thai may have his license and gude will in any toune of his cuntre to chese thar staple, sen thai ar in sumpart grevit in thar privileges in the toune of Bruges, and nocht sa wele tretit be thame as frends suld be, na as thai ar tretit in Scotland quhen thai cum.

ITEM, into the matter of Gelrill, the said Schir Alexander Naper sal schaw, in oure Sourane Lordi's name, to his cousing the Duc of Burgunze, how his grant-schir the Duc of Gelrill, quham God assoilze, wrate til him of late how that his son had cruelly put handis til his person, and takin him and put him in preson, and demainit him, as is wele knawin; for the quhilk his said son, nor nane that mycht cum of him, mycht never apon law succede til his heritage; for the quhilk, sen our Sourane Lord was his eldest dochter son, he exhortit and requirit him that he wald cum in the cuntrie, or send ane of his brethir, and he suld, with the aviss of nobles and baronis of his land, put him in the full possessioun of his said Duchery, sen he knew him nerrest and maist lachfull heretar til him.

And now sen the said Duc is decessit, oure Sourane Lord, quhilk be the informatione of his foresaid grant-schir traistand to have full richt to the succession of the same, will nocht labour na put his hand to the said matter withoute counsale and aviss of his said cousing, the Duc of Burgunze, traisting verraly to have throu him supportatione, aide, and supplie in the said matter, and in the recovering of his richt, as he that is als ner of blude til him as ony uther that pretendis to have interest thairto, and sal be mair thankfull till him, baith in the demeinning of that matter and in al utheris, than ony utheris. Apon the quhilk matter, the said Schir Alexander sal require the said-foure Duc of Burgunze that he will in haisty wiss send his entent therapon til oure Sourane Lord, and lat him wyt baith his counsale, directione, and aviss in the said matter, and quhat that he sal traist and lippen therto, sen he has the personage in hand that pretendis to have richt or interest therto.

[The royal signature (James III.) is repeated in the original, because the last item is on a separate sheet.]

No. IV.

[The Philosopher's Theory of Equations literally translated from the unpublished Latin Manuscript.]

CHAP. 9.—OF EQUATIONS AND THEIR EXPONENTS.

1. EQUATION is the collation of the uncertain values of *positives* [the unknown quantities] with others of equal value, from which the value of the position is demanded. Thus, if for the number or quantity sought any one should place 1 R ignorant of its value, and then, from the hypothesis of the question, should find 3 R equal to 21, thus comparing three things with their equals 21, that collation of equality is termed *æquatio*; and from it is inferred, that the value of one thing, or one position, is 7.

2. Betwixt the parts of an equation that are equal to each other a double line is interposed, which is the sign of equation, (*signum æquationis*;) thus $3 R = 7$, which is pronounced, one thing equal to seven.

3. Of equations, some are only of one position, others of more; thus, as an instance of one position, $1 a Q + 3 a = 10$; of more positions, $2 Q - 1 a = 6$.

4. Again, of equations, some are *rude*, and may be reduced to lesser terms, more perspicuous and succinct; others are called most perfect, which are as perspicuous and succinct as possible. Thus, $3 R = 21$ is a rude equation, because it may be reduced into the most perfect form, namely, $1 R = 7$. So $5 a Q = 20$ is a rude equation, because it can be reduced into a more perfect one, namely, $1 a Q = 4$; but $1 a Q = 4$ is also a rude equation, because it may be reduced to one even of the most perfect form, namely, $1 a = 2$; an art of which I shall treat hereafter. So $12 Q + 3 a = 6$ is a rude equation, because it can be reduced into the more perfect one, $4 Q + 1 a = 2$.

5. Again, of equations, some are simple, some quadrate, some cubic, and some higher. Those are called simple which consist of no more than two orders. Thus, $3 R = 27$, or $1 R = 9$; so $5 b Q = 20$, are called simple equations.

6. Of simple equations, some are real, which are things equal to number; others are radical, which are the equation of quadrates, cubics, or any of the higher orders, to number. Thus, $3 R = 21$, or $1 R = 7$; also $1 a = 3$; so $2 R = \sqrt{Q} 3 - 1$ are real equations; but $2 Q = 8$, also $3 C = 24$; also $1 a Ss = \sqrt{C} 9$, &c. are radical equations.

7. That is a quadratic equation which consists of three proportional orders, thus, $2 Q + 3 R = 4$, or $3 R = 2 Q - 4$; also $1 a Q C - 10 = 3 a Q$; also $12 - \sqrt{Q} 1 R = 1 R$.

8. That is a cubic equation which consists of four proportional orders, thus $1 C - 9 Q = 24 - 26 R$; also $1 C + o Q - 2 R = 4$; this also, $1 a Q C - 2 a Q = 4$, is a cubic equation, because, (according to our *fourth proposition*, c. 6,) collected in this manner, $1 a Q C + o a Q Q - 2 a Q = 4$, it consists of four orders.

9. A quadrati-quadratical equation consists of five, a supersolid of six, a quadrati-cubical of seven proportional orders, and so on of all the higher orders *in infinitum*; thus $2 Q Q - 28 C + 142 Q = 308 R - 240$, is a quadrati-quadratical equation; $1 b Q Ss -$

$4b QQQ + 1b QC - 3b QQ - 1b Q = 12$ is a supersolid equation; $1a QC - 3a Ss + 2a QQ - 6a C + 1a Q = 1a + 6$, is a quadrati-cubical equation.

10. An illusive equation (*illusiva*) is that which asserts an impossibility; and if any one demands an impossibility in an illusive equation, his answer falls; thus $1R = 3R$ is an illusive equation, seeing it is impossible that any thing can be equal to the triple of itself; also $1Q = 4R - 5$ is an illusive equation, seeing that no quadrate can equal four things, or its roots, *minus* five; as will be made manifest hereafter.

11. Exposition (*expositio*) is the reduction of a rude equation to the most perfect and real equation, and that part of the real equation which is equal to one thing is called the exponent (*exponens*), and solves the question; thus, when this rude equation $3R = 21$, is reduced to this most perfect $1R = 7$, the exponent of either equation will be 7, because that is equal to one thing, namely, to $1R$. Again, this rude equation $5Q = 20$ is reduced to this more perfect one $1Q = 4$; then to this most perfect and real equation $1R = 2$; now the work of reduction is called exposition, and 2 the exponent, because it is equal to one thing. I shall afterwards teach how the exponent solves the question.

12. Every equation, except an illusive one, has at least one exponent, valid or invalid. I shall teach this hereafter; at present it is sufficient to have premised so much.

13. Valid exponents are those which placed by themselves are noted with this sign +, and are always greater than nothing; but invalid exponents are those which placed by themselves are noted with this sign —, and these are less than nothing, (*minora sunt nihilo*); thus, in this equation $1R = 7$, seven is a valid exponent, because (*as by C. 6, Prop. 1, Lib. 1,*) it is understood to be noted with the copula +; but in this real equation $1R = -7$, by parity of reasoning the exponent is termed invalid, because it is noted with the copula —, thus —7, and is less than nothing.

14. Of exponents, some are capable of being expressed entirely by a single number, others again entirely by a single quantity; some can only be expressed in a single number, some only in a single quantity; some partly one way and partly the other, some in neither way. *These, with their examples, shall be amply discussed in their order in chapters 11, 12, and 13.*

15. Every portion of an equation, subject to one leading sign, is called a term (*minima*), whatever number of signs and terms there may be; the leading and predominant sign is called the *ductrix*, and the rest are called *intermediæ*; thus in this equation $1C - 3 + \sqrt{Q} 2 + \frac{3R - 4}{1Q + 1} - \sqrt{Q} . 6 + \sqrt{Q} 1R = 0$, in which $1C$ is called a term, and + its ductrix; so 3 is called a term, and — its ductrix; so $\sqrt{Q} 2$ is a term, and + its ductrix; so $\frac{3R - 4}{1Q + 1}$ is a term, and + its ductrix, *because its power extends throughout the whole fraction*; but the other signs of this fraction are called intermediates; so $\sqrt{Q} . 6 + \sqrt{Q} 1R$ is called a term, and the sign — its ductrix, *because its power extends throughout the aggregate value of the whole universal root*; the remaining sign + is called intermediate.

CHAP. 10.—OF THE GENERAL PREPARATION OF EQUATIONS.

1. *Preparation* is the reduction of rude equations to more perfect ones, which are afterwards reduced to the most perfect real equations by exposition; thus $5aQ = 20$ is first prepared, and becomes $1aQ = 4$, then it is expounded $1a = 2$; the modes of preparation shall now be laid down; the modes of reducing shall afterwards appear.

2. Rude equations are prepared and made conspicuous in five ways; by *transposition*, *abbreviation*, *division*, *multiplication*, and *extraction*. Of these modes the rules and examples follow.

3. If you transfer a term from one part of an equation to the opposite, and prefix the opposite sign as ductrix, the parts are equal, and this is called transposition: as thus in this equation $4R - 6 = 5R - 20$, if -20 be transposed from the posterior to the prior part of the equation, and the sign changed in this form, $4R - 6 + 20 = 5R$; again, transpose $4R$, and you have $-4R$, in this form $-6 + 20 = 5R - 4R$; so of this equation $1Q - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3Q - 2 = 3a$, transpose $-\sqrt{Q} \cdot 3Q - 2$, it becomes $+\sqrt{Q} \cdot 3Q - 2$ in this form, $1Q = 3a + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3Q - 2$; and again, transpose $3a$, that gives $-3a$ in this form, $+Q - 3a = \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3Q - 2$, and the opposite parts are equal as before.

4. If (as premised) you transpose all the terms of one side of an equation to the opposite side, the whole compound will be made equal to nothing, and this is called an equation to nothing; and, by the 4th prop. 2 c. of this book, ought to be abbreviated: thus, in the above example $4R - 6 = 5R - 20$, transpose $5R - 20$, and you have $-5R + 20$ in this form, $4R - 6 - 5R + 20 = 0$, which abbreviated, becomes $-1R + 14 = 0$, and is an equation to nothing; so, in the equation $1Q - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3Q - 2 = 3a$, transpose the left side to the right, and you have $0 = -1Q + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3Q - 2 + 3a$, which is also an equation to nothing.

5. If the highest unknown quantity have the sign $-$ in front, convert all the ductrices of all the terms, and a more perspicuous equation will be produced; thus, to take the above example, if $-1R + 14 = 0$, consequently $+1R - 14 = 0$; so $-1Q + 3a + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3Q - 2 = 0$ becomes $1Q - 3a - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3Q - 2 = 0$; so $-1R - 1 + \frac{32}{1a+1} = 0$ becomes $1R + 1 - \frac{32}{1a+1} = 0$.

6. If you divide all the unknown quantities of the highest order by unity signed with the positive and radical signs of the same order, and then divide the whole equation by the quotient, a perspicuous equation will arise, having the highest order signed with unity. Thus, in the equation $2C - 8Q + 6R = 0$, divide the unknown quantity of the highest order, namely, $2C$ by $1C$, the quotient is 2; then divide the whole equation by 2, and it becomes $1C - 4Q + 3R = 0$; so, in this equation $3R - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2Q - 6 = 0$, the unknown quantities of the highest orders are $3R - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2Q$, which, by 5th prop. c. 4 of this book, are of the same order of power, and their order is of things; divide, then, $3R - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2Q$ by $1R$, or (which is the same thing) by $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 1Q$ and the quotient is $3 - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2$; by this quotient, according to 2 prop. c. 11, lib. 1, divide the whole equation and you have $1R - \frac{18}{3} - \frac{\sqrt{Q} \cdot 72}{7} = 0$, which, although it be a fraction, is more

perspicuous than before, in so far as the sign Q is removed; so, to give a third example, $1 R a + 1 a + 1 R - 31 = 0$, from which, if you wish to expunge and delete the mixed sign, namely, $1 R a$, divide $1 R a + 1 a$, by $1 a$, or $1 R a + 1 R$, by $1 R$, (whichever you wish to receive in the place of the highest order;) for example's sake, let $1 R$ be taken; divide, then, $1 R a + 1 R$ per $1 R$, the quotient will be $1 a + 1$, by which divide the whole equation $1 R a + 1 R + 1 a - 31 = 0$, and the equation becomes $1 R + 1 - \frac{32}{1 a + 1} = 0$, which, though a fraction, is more perspicuous than before, in so far as that the mixed sign, which previously was obscure, is removed.

7. If the lowest order of an equation be an unknown quantity, then divide the whole equation by unity signed with the sign of the lowest order, and there arises a perspicuous equation, having an absolute number in the place of the lowest order; thus, divide $1 C - 4 Q + 3 R = 0$, by unity of the lowest order, namely, by $1 R$, and it becomes $1 Q - 4 R + 3 = 0$; so $3 Q - \sqrt{Q} 2 R = 0$ divide by $\sqrt{Q} 1 R$, and this equation is obtained, $\sqrt{Q} 9 C - \sqrt{Q} 2 = 0$, of which the last series is always number.

8. If any particles of an equation be true fractions, multiply the whole equation by their denominators, and there will be produced an integral equation more perspicuous; thus, in this equation $\frac{6 R - 8 Q}{1 C + 3 R} + 2 = 0$, there is a true fraction, though abbreviable; multiply then the whole equation by the denominator $1 C + 3 R$ and you have $2 C + 12 R - 8 Q = 0$; so, multiply this equation $1 Q + \frac{2 R}{3} - \frac{88}{75} = 0$ by 3 , and you have, in the first place, $3 Q + 2 R - \frac{264}{75} = 0$; multiply this again by 75 , and you have $225 Q + 150 R - 264 = 0$, which are integral equations freed of fractions.

9. If there be in an equation a single root universal, separate it from the rest of the equation, (*3d prop.*) then multiply each side of the equation together as often as the sign universal denotes, and there will be produced a more perspicuous equation, for it will have no universal signs; thus $2 Q + 3 R - \sqrt{Q} . 12 C + 4 Q Q + 18 = 0$, first, by transposition, becomes $2 Q + 3 R = \sqrt{Q} . 12 C + 4 Q Q + 18$; then let the sides be squared, because the sign universal is \sqrt{Q} . and they become $4 Q Q + 12 C + 9 Q = 12 C + 4 Q Q + 18$; and, consequently, being transposed and abbreviated, become $1 Q = 2$: To give another example; $\sqrt{C} . 2 R - 6 = 3 R$ the sides being cubically multiplied, become $2 R - 6 = 27 C$; otherwise, $2 R - 27 C - 6 = 0$.

10. If an equation consist of two roots universal similarly radicated, without any other terms, let them be separated by transposition, and multiplied together as often as the sign universal denotes; and a perspicuous equation will be produced, free of roots universal: thus let $\sqrt{Q} . 2 R + 5 - \sqrt{Q} . 3 R - 4 = 0$ be separated, and they become $\sqrt{Q} . 2 R + 5 = \sqrt{Q} . 3 R - 4$, which quadratically multiplied become $2 R + 5 = 3 R - 4$, and, by transposition and abbreviation, $1 R - 9 = 0$.

11. If an equation consist only of two roots universal, dissimilarly radicated, let the universals be separated, and let each side be multiplied together, according to the quality of each sign of the dissimilar universals, and a perspicuous equation, free of universals,

will come out; thus, let $\sqrt{Ss} \cdot 3Q + 6 - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2R - 3 = 0$ be first separated by transposition in this manner, $\sqrt{Ss} \cdot 3Q + 6 = \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2R - 3$; then let the sides be *quadrati-supersolide* multiplied together, and they become $32Ss - 240QQ + 720C - 1080Q + 810R - 243 = 9QQ + 36Q + 36$, which transposed and abbreviated become $32Ss - 249QQ + 720C - 1116Q + 810R - 279 = 0$.

12. If there be two roots universal squared with other simple quantities or uninomes in an equation, separate both the universals with their signs from the rest, and multiply quadratically the two sides together, and an equation comes out, consisting of only one root universal, which also may be removed by *prop. 9 of this chapter*: thus, if this equation $\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 48\frac{1}{4} + 1R - 1Q + \frac{1}{2}R - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 79 - \frac{3}{4}Q = 0$, be transposed in this manner, $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 79 - \frac{3}{4}Q - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 48\frac{1}{4} + 1R - 1Q = \frac{1}{2}R + \frac{1}{2}$, then each side being squared become $127\frac{1}{4} + 1R - 1\frac{3}{4}Q - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 15247 + 316R - 460\frac{3}{4}Q - \sqrt{C} + 3QQ = \frac{1}{4}Q + \frac{1}{2}R + \frac{1}{4}$; transpose and abbreviate this, and it becomes $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 15247 + 316R - 460\frac{3}{4}Q - 3C + 3QQ = 127 + \frac{1}{2}R - 2Q$, which finally, by *prop. 9*, become $1QQ + 1C - 47Q - 189R + 882 = 0$.

13. If an equation consist of three roots universal squared, without any other terms, let the two quadrates be separated from the rest by transposition, and the sides be squared, and an equation will be produced of only one universal, to be deleted by *prop. 9*: thus, let the equation $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 3R + 2 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2R - 1 - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 4R - 2 = 0$, be separated in this manner, $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 3R - 2 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2R + 1 = \sqrt{Q} \cdot 4R + 2$; let the sides be squared, and they become $5R - 1 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 6Q - 1R - 2 = 4R + 2$; then, by abbreviation, they become $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 6Q - 1R - 2 = 3 - 1R$; afterwards, by *prop. 9*, they become, $6Q - 1R - 2 = 1Q - 6R + 9$; and finally, $5Q + 5R - 11 = 0$, otherwise $1Q + 1R - 2\frac{1}{2} = 0$.

14. If an equation consist of three universals squared, with one uninome or simple quantity; let two universals be transposed from the rest, and the sides squared, and an equation is produced of two roots universal to be removed by *prop. 12*: thus, let the equation $\sqrt{Q} \cdot \sqrt{C} \cdot 2R + 3 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3R - 2 - 2R - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2Q + 1 = 0$, be transposed in this manner, $\sqrt{Q} \cdot \sqrt{C} \cdot 2R + 3 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3R - 2 = 2R + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2Q + 1$; let the sides be quadratically multiplied together, and they become $\sqrt{Q} \cdot \sqrt{C} \cdot 3456QQ - \sqrt{C} \cdot 1024R + 36R - 24 + \sqrt{C} \cdot 2R + 3R + 1 = 6Q + 1 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 32QQ + 8R$, consisting of two universals squared, to be deleted by *prop. 12*.

15. If an equation consist of four universals squared, without other terms, let two from two be separated by transposition, and the sides squared, which will produce an equation of only two universals to be deleted by *prop. 12*: thus, let the equation be transposed in this manner, $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 5Q - 2R - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 10 - 1R = \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2R + 6 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 1Q + 4$; the sides being squared, give $5Q - 3R + 10 - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 208Q - 20C - 80R = 1Q + 2R + 10 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 8C + 24Q + 32R + 96$; which consist only of two universals, to be deleted by *prop. 12*.

16. If a single *universallissima* on one side be equalled to a *universallissima* alone, whether

on the other side there be a universal alone, or a universal and uninome together, or uninomes or simple quantities only, multiply the sides together to the qualities of the universal signs, and the *universallissima* sign will be removed, the other universals being removed by the preceding rules: thus, in this equation $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 10 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 5R - 2 = \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3R + 1$, *universallissima* is equalled to *universallissima*; let the sides be squared, and they become $10 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 5R - 2 = 3 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3R + 1$, or $7 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 5R - 2 = \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3R + 1$; of which you may delete the universals by *prop.* 12. Another example is as follows: Of the equation $\sqrt{Q} \text{ Ss. } 3 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2R - 1 = \sqrt{C} \text{ Ss. } 5 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 3R - 4$ let the sides be multiplied together *quadrati-cubice-supersolidè*, and they become $18R + 18 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 8C - 12Q + 6R - 1 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 1458R - 729 = 21 + 3R + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 300R - 400$, or $15R - 3 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 8C - 12Q + 6R - 1 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 1458R - 729 = \sqrt{Q} \cdot 300R - 400$, of which the universals cannot be deleted. A third example is as follows. Of the equation $\sqrt{C} \cdot 3 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2R - 1 = \sqrt{C} \cdot 20 - 4R$ multiply the sides together cubically, and they become $3 + \sqrt{Q} \cdot 2R - 1 = 20 - 4R$, or $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 2R - 1 = 17 - 4R$, of which you will delete the universal by *prop.* 9.

17. By the same propositions which have been laid down for deleting universals, so may simple irrationals, betwixt rationals, be transposed, multiplied, and then deleted; thus, let the equation $12 - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 1R = 1R$ be separated in this manner $12 - 1R = \sqrt{Q} \cdot 1R$; then the sides quadratically multiplied together become $1Q - 24R + 144 = 1R$, or $1Q - 25R + 144 = 0$, which are entirely rational. Therefore, what has been said of universals in propositions 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, must be understood to apply to simple radical quantities.

18. If not prepared as above, there is another mode of preparing these equations; for the multiplication of simple irrationals for the most part exhibits more roots than required; thus, to take the foregoing example, $12 - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 1R = 1R$, multiplied as above, returns the equation $1Q - 25R + 144 = 0$, which has two valid [positive] roots, namely, 16 and 9, when truly the principal equation itself $12 - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 1R = 1R$ has only one root, namely, 9, as afterwards will appear; therefore, that principal equation, unless prepared according to *prop.* 17, may be better and more simply prepared by *prop.* 20 hereafter, as will there be shown.

19. If, from an equation to 0 there be extracted any true root, (that is, leaving no remainder,) that root will be a more succinct equation to 0; thus, from the equation $1C - 6Q + 12R - 8 = 0$ extract the true cube root, namely, $1R - 2 = 0$, which will be an abbreviated and succinct equation; so from the equation $1R - \sqrt{Q} \cdot 36R + 9 = 0$ extract the square root, which will be true (*by Cap.* 8,) namely, $\sqrt{Q} \cdot 1R - 3 = 0$, being a more succinct equation.

“ Ther is no more of his algebra orderlie sett down.”—(*Note by Robert Napier to Henry Briggs.*)

No. V.

[KEPLER'S LETTER.]

Illustri et Generoso D. D. Joanni Nepero, Baroni Merchistonij, Scoto. S. P. D.

Cœpi superioribus annis in vestibulis Ephemeridum Lectores de Tabularum Rudolphinarum statu certiores reddere, causasque explicare morarum quas illi crebris et literis et publicis scriptis increpabant: Hac vice, Te, Illustris Baro, compello, seorsim quidem à cæteris, quia sic postulat res ipsa, et liber tuus, cui titulus, Mirificus Logarithmorum Canon: publicè tamen, quia quæ tecum confero, illa ad omnium lectorum notitiam pertinent.

Quòd igitur moris meis rursus unus accessit annus, præter generales illas quæ hactenus me impediunt, singulares etiam in hunc annum causæ concurrerunt: quarum aliquas fama publica loquitur, Bella et cometas, aliquas prædixi aut tetigi in vestibulis Ephemeridum in annos 1617 et 1619, quæ anno 1618 prodierunt; scilicet editionem librorum V. Harmonices Mundi: quæ sola editio (ut non adnumerem præcedentem illorum elucubrationem) me per annum solidum tenuit occupatum; absoluta tamen est, favente supremo Mundi totius Harmosta, necquicquàm fremente et infrendente et horridè admodum interstrepente Bellonâ cum Bombardis Tubis et Taratantaris suis: ut nisi nos etiamnum vel hæc Diva obsederit domi forisvè, vel Mercurialium tergiversationes destituerint, (ut accidit in altera parte Epitomes seu doctrinâ Theoricâ, in quâ Typi non ultra primam paginam progressi conquieverunt hactenus:) exemplaria tam Harmonicorum, quàm descriptionis Cometarum (quæ jam in tertiam mensem hæret Augustæ) his Autumnalibus nundinis Francofurto habere possint ij, quibus cordi est, Opera manuum Dei, mentis lumine collustrata, penitus intueri.

Princeps verò causa, quæ progressibus meis in condendis Tabulis hoc anno intercurrit, est, nova planè sed felix calamitas Tabularum partis à me jam dudum perfectæ liber scilicet ille tuus, Illustris Baro; quem Edimburgi in Scotia impressum ante annos V., primùm vidi Pragæ ante biennium; perlegere tamen non potui: donec superiori anno, nactus libellum Benjaminis Ursini, mei dudum domestici, nunc Astronomi Marchici (quo ille rei summam ex tuo libro transcriptam verbis brevissimis comprehendit) quid rei esset cognoscerem. Vix autem uno tentato exemplo, deprehendi magna gratulatione, generale factum abs te exercitium illud numerorum, cujus ego particulam exiguam jam à multis annis in usu habebam, Tabularumq. partem facere proposueram; præcipuè in negotio Parallaxium et scrupulorum durationis et moræ in eclipsibus, cujus methodi exemplum hæc ipsa Ephemeris exhibet. Sciebam equidem, illi meæ methodo locum non esse, nisi ubi arcus à rectis nihil sensibile differrent: at illud ignorabam, ex secantium excessibus fieri posse Logarithmos, qui methodum hanc universalem faciant, per omnem arcuum longitudinem. Satagebat igitur animus ante omnia videre, num etiam exquisiti essent in Ursini libello Logarithmi. Usus igitur opera Jani Gringalleti Sabaudi, domestici mei, jussi millesimam sinus totius aufèrre; à residuo rursus millesimam, idque plus quàm bis millies; donec de sinu toto restaret pars decima circiter; sinûs, verò, qui ami-

sisset millesimam totius, Logarithmum curiosissimè constitui, orsus ab unitate divisionis illius quâ Pitiscus utitur numerosissimâ, quippe duodecim ordinum: hunc sic constitutum Logarithmum adnumeravi residuis omnium subtractionum ex æquo. Itaque deprehensum est, ad rei summam nihil illis deesse Logarithmis; errores verò incidisse pauculos, vel typi, vel in distributione illa minuta Logarithmorum maximorum circa principium quadrantis. Hæc te obiter scire volui, ut quibus tu methodis incesseris, quas non dubito et plurimas et ingeniosissimas tibi in promptu esse, eas publici juris fieri, mihi saltem (puto et cæteris) scires fore gratissimum; eoque percepto, tua promissa folio 57, in debitum cecidisse intelligeres.

Nunc ad tabulas propiùs. Vix tandem enim hoc ipso Julio mense Lincium allato exemplari libri tui, ut ad fol. 28 legendo perveni: considerare cœpi occasione tui consilii; num fortasse sufficiant solæ epochæ, et deductiones motuum mediorum, et magnitudines Eccentricitatum semidiametrorumque et tui Logarithmi; æquationum verò tabulæ penitus possint omitti, quippe quæ meris additionibus vel subtractionibus facillime perficiantur? Atqui res habet paulò aliter. Primum, non omnis molestia cum multiplicatione et divisione sinuum sublata est: restat etiamnum attentio et cautelæ variæ, circa usum additionum et divisionum, quæ succedunt sublatis; ubi non tantum hebetiores, sed enim ingeniosissimos interdum contingit hallucinari: quibus utrisque tam ad sublevandam memoriam, quàm ad redimendum tempus, succurrendum est per tabulas æquationum, quæ summam ejus, quod Logarithmorum tractationibus elicitur, proximis numeris debitam, statim ad primum intuitum exhibeant. Sanè quo consilio Logarithmos ipsos in libello communicamus, cùm possent illi computari ab uno quolibet modum edocto, idque longè faciliùs quàm sinus, eodem consilio et tabulas condimus æquationum. Deinde cùm duæ sint classes, prior eccentrici æquationum, posterior Orbis magni (seu Ptolemæo, Epicycli:) neutrobique neque eccentricitates, neque semidiametri, quod tu præsupponis, constantem tuentur magnitudinem; frustrà hic respectamus antiquam formam; Braheanæ nos observationes aliud docuerunt. Vera quidem itineris planetarii eccentricitas constans est; at æquantis (veteribus dicti) eccentricitas, si quis hac potius, quam meâ formâ computandi, velit uti, variabilis erit perpetuò: aut non exacta nec naturæ vestigiis insistens prodibit altera pars equationis. Rursum semper quidem est eadem maxima orbitæ planetariæ diameter: at non omnes diametri per omnem ambitum sunt æquales, quippe orbitæ planetarum sunt ellipticæ. Quod verò attinet classem æquationum alteram ibi neque orbis magni neque Epicycli Ptolemaici semidiametri constans usurpari potest; h. e. ut ad formam loquar astronomiæ reformatæ, variabilis est distantia Solis à Terrâ, variabilis et distantia planetæ à Sole: nec potest pro sole punctum aliquod soli vicinum eligi, quod semper distet a terra æqualiter; nisi motum ejus circa terram inæquabilem velimus admittere, majore incommodo. Itaque in triangulo inter terram solem et planetam latera duo data, sunt utraque variabilia. Quâ de causâ ratio talis mihi fuit ineunda hactenus, ut duæ essent pro uno quolibet planeta tabulæ, altera indicis (intellige indicem proportionis, datorum laterum summæ ad differentiam) altera anguli (Elongationis a Sole) cum indice et anomaliâ commutationis excerpenti.

Hæc illa pars est tabularum, ad tuos Logarithmos reformanda. Nam si meos exhibeam indices, non poterunt ii servire volenti computare per ipsa triangula, nisi is multiplicaverit indicem in tangentem dimidiæ anomalæ commutationis. At si pro indicibus ponam Logarithmos, ii tantummodò adduntur ad ejusdem dimidiæ anomalæ medium Logarithmicum. Indices igitur convertendi sunt in Logarithmos; ut quod singuli sæpissimè facere deberent, detrahere scilicet Logarithmum summæ laterum a Logarithmo differentiæ: id a me uno semel fiat. Anguli vero tabula de nova est condenda, et accommodandæ areæ seu elongationes a Sole, ad æquales saltus Logarithmorum; quæ prius respondebant æqualibus saltibus indicum. Quo ratione et responsus utrinque æquabilior, et tota Tabula Anguli brevior multo fieri poterit: manebitque forma cruciformis ingressus, et correctio per partem proportionalem, usitata hactenus, pro iis, qui ea volent esse contenti. At cum omnis cruciformis excerptio, ob multiplicationem logisticam duplicem, sit tædiosa et cerebrosa: logista illam effugere poterit per tractionem Logarithmorum expeditissimam, quippe accuratis Logarithmis opus erit minimè: nihiloque minus tabula anguli, summam quæsitæ proximam ob oculos statuens, logistam in usu Logarithmorum non patietur aberrare. Multò verò maximâ solitudine circa latitudines me liberant tui Logarithmi: absque his enim si fuisset, duorum alterum necessarium fuisset, aut ut Logistam ad parallacticam meam remitterem, insertam meæ astronomiæ parti optiçæ, imperato duplici quadrato ingressu, verius duplici cruce, nec id satis accurato successu: aut certè, ut duas insuper pro quolibet Planeta conderem tabulas latitudinis æquè prolixas prioribus: unam indicis latitudinariæ, alteram latitudinis ipsius. Opus ipsum longissimi temporis et fastidiosi laboris, usus ejus intricatus fuisset. AT NUNC MELIUS EST. Facile per data, duos excerpemus Logarithmos, eorumque differentiam addemus medio Logarithmico inclinationis locorum eccentrici, quod exhibebitur ex tabulâ cujusque planetæ; summa confecta, ut medium Logarithmicum, ex Canone exhibebit latitudinem: scrupulosis Logarithmis opus erit rarissimè. Et ne quis dubitet, hoc equidem artificio Ephemeris ista confecta est; eoque tibi, Illustris Baro, jure inscribitur. Ita Logarithmi tui necessario pars fient tabularum Rodolphi; prius tamen in officina mea recusati: eritque cur sibi gratulentur astronomici de moris meis. Tu si quid commodius habes, ejus me quæso participem primo quoque tempore facito; quod item et Astronomiæ Professores, ut dudum privatis literis aliquos, sic nunc publicè universos, rogatos volo. Vale Illustris Baro; et hanc compellationem, ab inferioris conditionis homine, ex usu communium studiorum æstima. Lentiis ad Istrum. V. Cal. Sextiles Anno MDCXIX.

Illustris generositatis tuæ observantissimus,

JOANNES KEPLERUS.

No. VI.

Reply to some Erroneous Historical Passages relating to Levenax and Menteith.

THE most remarkable fact in the history of our Philosopher's lineage is one little known, but possessing no slight degree of historical interest. He was, through a female, *de jure*, an Earl of that ancient race of LEVENAX, from which his family, as stated in the Memoirs, claimed a lineal male cadency. By a royal deed, dated at Edinburgh 26th March 1455, and still preserved among the Merchiston papers, James II of Scotland bestowed upon John, the son and heir of his master of household, Sir Alexander Napier, the *maritagium* of Elizabeth Menteith. That is to say, the King gifted him with the casualty of her marriage, due, by the feudal customs, to the sovereign superior in consequence of the succession of the daughters of Sir Murdoch Menteith to the family estates. The gift was, in fact, part of the settlements of a marriage which took place not long afterwards. The young lady was one of two very interesting and high-born wards whose persons and estates had come, by feudal incident at that time in full force, under the guardianship of King James, about the middle of the fifteenth century. Elizabeth and Agnes were the sole surviving children, and consequently co-heiresses, of Sir Murdoch Menteith of Rusky, son of Sir Robert Menteith, and Lady Margaret, second daughter of Duncan eighth Earl of Levenax. Sir Murdoch was heir-male of those Earls of Menteith whose honours, which flowed in a female line of succession, set so deeply in blood upon the same scaffold where the venerable Earl Duncan died. Thus these young ladies came to inherit between them one-half of the whole comitatus of Levenax, besides goodly baronies in "the varied realms of fair Menteith."

Our best historians have sadly confused the history of the Levenax. Not to mention others of less note, Dr Robertson tells us that Earl Duncan beheaded by James I. was *forfeited*, and his *possessions added to the crown*. Mr Tytler, whose excellent history is still in the course of publication, has adopted the error of Dr Robertson. "These executions," says he, "were followed by the *forfeiture to the crown*, of the immense estates belonging to the family of Albany and to the *Earl of Lennox*; a seasonable supply of revenue," &c. (iii. 227.) No authority is quoted by these historians in support of their assertion, and it is curious to observe the careless manner in which both of them again introduce an Earl of Lennox upon the restless stage of Scotland's miserable commotions, without any explanation of the revival of the honours, and at periods too, when, in point of fact, no one had resumed them. But how came the Levenax to pass by inheritance, and be taken by services and retours to this very Earl Duncan, if his estates were forfeited to the crown? This important question our historians have never considered. The truth is, Earl Duncan suffered no attainder in title or estates. There is no proof that he did,—there is *unquestionable* proof that he did not. Of this our limits only admit of a summary notice.

1. Earl Duncan's eldest daughter and heiress, Isabella, was married to Murdoch, eldest

son of Robert Duke of Albany, Regent of Scotland. * By the marriage settlements the comitatus of the Levenax was vested in this lady, in the event of her father leaving no legitimate son, and failing her it vested in her two sisters, as heirs-general of Earl Duncan. Isabella, now Duchess of Albany, was bereft of her father, her husband, and her family, by the executions above-mentioned. In virtue, however, of the family settlements, that lady kept possession of the *whole estates of the Levenax*,—exercised without challenge the rights of feudal chief,—resided on the Island of Inehmurrin in Lochlomond, being the principal messuage,—granted many charters of lands belonging to the comitatus,—and in those charters used the style “ Isabel Duchess of Albany and *Countess of the Levenax*,” and all this for about thirty years, the period she survived her father.

2. This state of possession was not only not disturbed by the sovereign but expressly acknowledged by him. In the great chamberlain rolls preserved in the Register-House, and bearing date from 16th July 1455, to 7th October 1456,—being the royal accounts in which the King’s interests are particularly attended to,—there is an entry which unequivocally declares the King’s interest in the lands of the Levenax to be simply that of Overlord,—which expressly recognizes the countess under that title, calling her *antiqua comitissa de Lenax*; acknowledges the *casualty of relief* to have been paid, and the issuing of a precept of seisin to the heir; and complains of *continued non-entry* at the same time that she is enjoying the fruits.

3. This was not a mere personal indulgence to the Duchess. Her liferent rights having fallen by her death, the comitatus came, not to the crown, but to the representatives of her two sisters; which representatives made up their titles, and took as *heirs-general* of Earl Duncan, who, as those titles expressly bear, died at *the faith and peace of the King*; an expression which, under the circumstances, can only mean that that nobleman did not perish for treason, and was not forfeited. The original titles of these representatives are still extant, and were confirmed by successive sovereigns from generation to generation. In virtue of these titles it was that the romantic country, with which our historians have enriched the crowns of the early Jameses, continued to descend through the heirs-general of Earl Duncan. These were the representatives of his remaining daughters, Margaret and Elizabeth, co-heiresses after the failure of the rights of Duchess Isabella. Margaret, the elder, was represented by the family of *Rusky*; Elizabeth, the youngest, by the family of *Dernely*. Elizabeth *Menteith*, the eldest co-heiress of *Rusky*, transmitted her lands in the

* Every historian, from Fordun to Mr Tytler, without any exception that I am aware of, has recorded that the Regent, Robert Duke of Albany, died 3d September 1419. I find, however, in the Register of the Great Seal in the Register-House, a charter of confirmation by James I. dated at Edinburgh, August 29, 1430, of a charter “ *avunculi sui Roberti Ducis Albanie*,” which charter of Duke Robert is dated “ *apud Falkland, August 4, 1420, an. gub. 15.*” This clears up a difficulty started by Pinkerton, that in the records the year 1423 is called *an. gub. 3. of Duke Murdoch*. Pinkerton explains this by the inference that, although Duke Robert died in 1419, his son Murdoch was not recognized as Regent until 1420.

Levenax, and her right to the earldom, to the Inventor of Logarithms, her lineal male representative. Agnes, her younger sister, transmitted her share to Haldane of Gleneagles; and the lands came to the Earl of Camperdown as heir of entail of Gleneagles. Dernely, who eventually usurped the Earldom of Levenax from the elder branch, Rusky, but still through the semblance of *a service to Earl Duncan*, transmitted that usurped title to James VI.

These proofs rest upon original records extant; and more could be added. But in one word, we put it to historians, how came the Inventor of Logarithms to speak of "my landis in the Lennox," if, as they have recorded, those very lands were *added to the crown* when Earl Duncan died?

Another error has found its way into history in reference to this Earldom, and that is, that Earl Duncan left a *legitimate* son, his heir, who is now represented! This is recorded by Mr Chalmers in that excellent work *the Caledonia*, but most incautiously from an *ex parte* compilation, of a modern date, by an antiquarian lawyer who wrote on behalf of Miss Lennox of Woodhead. The family of Woodhead (now represented by Mr Kincaid of Kincaid) unquestionably descends from *Donald of Ballcorrach*, a son of Earl Duncan. But it is just as unquestionable that he was an *illegitimate* son.

1. According to the proofs already alluded to, Earl Duncan's honours and estates passed to his *daughter*, and in virtue of an investiture wherein she was *expressly postponed* to any legitimate son of her father. Yet the *Donald* in question was then alive, and held lands in the Earldom as the *vassal of his sister, whom he acknowledges for his superior*.

2. The comitatus was afterwards divided between the other daughters of Earl Duncan, as *his co-heiresses*, without challenge from *Donald*, or his lineal male representative, who continued to hold subordinate rights in the Levenax.

3. There is an original charter under the great seal, dated 25th August 1423, and preserved in the Register-House, where Duchess Isabella is styled "*HEREDEM Comitatus de Lenax*." Of this date the *Donald* in question was holding lands in the Levenax from his father Earl Duncan.

4. There is an original charter (preserved in the Brisbane charter chest) by Earl Duncan, dated 12th August 1423, and relating to lands adjoining *Donald's* estate, which is witnessed by "*Malcolmo Thoma, et Donaldlo filius nostris naturalibus*." *

5. There is extant an ancient charter seal of this *Donald's*, which carries the arms of Levenax. But not the *pure* arms, nor yet with the *label* of an heir, but with a star on the centre of the cross. Enough has been said to meet the ridiculous pretension of Woodhead. More might be said; but, in one word, how came the Inventor of Logarithms to possess so much of the Levenax, if Earl Duncan left a *son and heir*, who is still represented?

The claim of Lord Napier to the honours of Levenax has been presented to his Majesty. A case for his Lordship will be published, containing a complete history of the

* Discovered by Mr Riddell. See that gentleman's notes to his Reply to Dr Hamilton of Bardowie.

partition of the comitatus, with the proofs of Dernely's usurpation, and of the seniority of Elizabeth Menteith of Rusky, (through whom Napier claims the Earldom,) to her sister Agnes, the ancestress of Gleneagles.*

Next to his rights in "the Levenax," our philosopher's patrimonial connection with "the Menteith" possesses historical interest. The name of Napier-Rusky is still familiar to those who inhabit the beautiful vale of the Teith. The family of Rusky, the honours of whose eldest co-heiress descended to Napier, flowed from "Sir John de Meneith," second son of Walter Earl of Menteith, who was third son of Walter, High Steward of Scotland. This lineal ancestor of our philosopher has been most groundlessly maligned; and to remove an idle calumny from the honourable house of Menteith, is to clear history of a blot and a fable. Who, in his reminiscences of nursery lore, is unmindful of the *Wallace wight*, and his false friend the *traitor Menteith*? To the nursery should that fable be confined.

Some vague and scanty expressions of certain old chronicles, furnishing no details, and beyond the reach of cross-examination, had, in the progress of centuries and through the mists of the cloister, become magnified into popular obloquy against Sir John Menteith. The tragic fate of Wallace, moreover, created a predisposition to sacrifice great names to the *manes* of the patriot; and at length our philosopher's ancestor, (called *for the occasion* the bosom friend of Wallace,) obtained infamous celebrity. LORD HAILES, to whom the annals of his country are so deeply indebted,—who may be said to have destroyed a school of chroniclers with us, who, affecting an air of research, were apt to put forth the most unwarrantable assumptions,—Lord Hailes, whose fastidious accuracy, and philosophical impartiality, created a new era in the historical department of Scottish letters,—paused at this popular condemnation of a baron, who ranked so high among the noble and virtuous of his country, and, struck with the illustration afforded of the peculiar vice he laboured to eradicate, recorded his doubts and his dissent. None could more critically appreciate those meagre remnants of ancient chronicles, which have been said to couple the name of Menteith with the most dishonourable odium of the fate of Wallace; but he tested their truth, or *their meaning*, by the authentic facts of the distinguished career of Menteith, and satisfied himself that the slight expressions of chroniclers on the subject must be more rationally explained, than by making that individual baron the scape-goat for the nearly universal inconstancy, and disaffection, by which the nobles of Scotland sacrificed her single patriot. Above all, Lord Hailes scorned the fables of a mendicant minstrel of the fifteenth century, yeleft *Blind Harry*, who took the ill-fated Wallace for the hero of his muse. Our great annalist, whose acumen was unrivalled in that walk of letters, at once perceived that to the inventive genius of that rude poet might be traced all the *faitour colouring*

* For the most accurate antiquities of the Levenax, see *Cartularium de Levenax*, edited, with a historical preface, for the Maitland Club, by Mr Dennistoun of Dennistoun, 1833.

cast upon Menteith, which time has served to deepen; and the few remarks he could afford, upon so minute a point in his Annals, are chiefly confined to an *exposé* of the fact that no contemporary authority exists for the prevalent allegation, so essential to the calumny, that Menteith was the *personal friend* of Wallace, and then *basely betrayed him*. "Sir John Menteith," says Lord Hailes, "was of high birth, a son of Walter Stewart Earl of Menteith. At this time the important fortress of Dumbarton was committed to his charge by Edward. That he had ever any intercourse of *friendship or familiarity* with Wallace, I am yet to learn. So, indeed, is said by Blind Harry, whom every historian copies, yet whom no historian but Sir Robert Sibbald will venture to *quote*. It is most improbable that Wallace should have put himself in the power of a man whom he knew to be in an office of distinguished trust under Edward; but it is probable that Wallace may have been committed to the castle of Dumbarton, where Menteith commanded. The rest of the story may have arisen from common fame, credulity, the spirit of obloquy, and the love of the marvellous."—*Annals*, Vol. i. p. 281.

Blind Harry, whose surname has escaped all human record, found an able and enthusiastic editor in Dr Jamieson; no match, however, for Lord Hailes, in the walk of antiquities, to which both were attached. With the natural leaning of an editor, Dr Jamieson, though he candidly admits the fabulous tendency of the minstrel in general, is anxious to redeem the main incident of the poem, and to place it among the stores of authentic history. This he attempts, not by fortifying the fact with proofs, but by challenging the critique of Lord Hailes, in a vein of flimsy and fallacious controversy that is not difficult to answer.—(See *Notes to Dr Jamieson's Wallace and Bruce*.)

Mr Tytler, in his History of Scotland, instead of expanding Lord Hailes's remarks, has treated his readers with an elaborate *rifaciménto* of Dr Jamieson's controversial note, to which he has added nothing of any consequence, except a most unmeasured increase of the disrespectful tone assumed towards Lord Hailes by the editor of Blind Harry.* Our limits are too confined for long quotations and a minute critical exposition. At present no more can be done than to offer what may suffice to justify our remarks.

The case against Menteith is, that he was the *especial friend* of Wallace, and then *basely and meanly betrayed him*,—or there is no case at all. Every reader of Scotch history knows this. Nearly all the nobles of Scotland (including Bruce and Randolph, who were among the noblest,) were, during the feverish state of subjugation under which Scotland suffered, alternately false to their country, and faithless to their conqueror. If

* Mr Tytler's note is prefixed to Volume 1st of his History of Scotland, and commences, "I have elsewhere observed that Lord Hailes is fond of displaying his ingenuity in whitewashing dubious characters; and that, with an *appearance* of hypercritical accuracy in his remarks upon other historians, he is often *glaringly inaccurate* himself." The charge of *whitewashing* is bold from a Tytler. Our historian really adds nothing to the critique of Dr Jamieson. He only quotes in addition two old English chronicles, the *Scala Chronicle*, which actually says nothing to the point at all; and *Langtoft*, which, so far as it is *intelligible*, refers the friendship and treachery, not to Menteith, but to one Jack Short, a retainer of Wallace's.

Sir John Menteith had acted the same part, (which he did not,) still there would be no ground for making him the political traitor *par excellence*. Accordingly, that is not the charge against him. He is charged with peculiar perfidy towards Wallace. He is made the *Judas* of profane history. This is the charge upon which alone Mr Tytler can say, that "it was natural that the voice of popular tradition should continue from century to century to execrate the memory of such a man." This is the charge which Lord Hailes said was not proved, and without proof of which the calumny is baseless. True, certain old chronicles couple, in a few words, the name of Sir John Menteith with the capture of the patriot. But Scotland was then completely under the yoke of Edward, and Menteith was at the head of the executive in the district where Wallace was captured; and held, for England, the castle of Dumbarton, to which Wallace was at first conveyed. This fact is sufficient to account for the names of Menteith and Wallace being so coupled, and for the poetical fiction of Blind Harry. Dr Jamieson admits it to be so, when he says, "But at this time, we are told, (by Lord Hailes,) the important fortress of Dumbarton was committed to his (Menteith's) charge by Edward; here it would seem the learned writer fights the poor minstrel with his own weapons; for I find *no evidence* of this fact in the *Fœdera*, Hemingford, or the *decem Scriptores*; and Lord Hailes refers to *no authority*, so that there is reason to suspect, to use his own language, that he here 'copies' what is said by Blind Harry, whom no historian but Sir Robert Sibbald will venture to quote; if Harry's narrative be received as authority, it is but justice to receive his testimony as he gave it." The affectation of considering Lord Hailes as having borrowed this important fact from Blind Harry, the very authority he was crushing, can never rank higher than a sneer. We are content to *select* this passage as the test of the critique of Harry's editor. Had the Doctor read the Annals he must have found that Lord Hailes relies upon official records for the fact. He quotes *Ryley, Placita Parliamentaria*, repeatedly, both in reference to the circumstances attending the capture of the patriot, and also the settlement of Scotland at that period. He gives, *in his notes*, extracts from that record, and shows not only that King Edward then appointed Menteith sheriff of that county, but that he had *continued* him in the command of Dumbarton Castle, which Menteith had previously held for England! Which, then, is right? Dr Jamieson with his sneer, or Lord Hailes with Ryley? Let us attend for a moment to *facts and dates*. In the year 1303, Comyn and others assembled a large force before Stirling for the purpose of protecting that fortress from reduction by Edward I. The aged but invincible monarch, who was there in person, dispersed them without difficulty, and Comyn and his followers formally submitted to the conqueror, 9th February 1303-4. At this time, Menteith was still an adherent of Edward's, and not with Comyn. After this victory, Edward assembled a parliament at *St Andrews*, from whence he issued a summons to the garrison of Stirling, which refused to surrender, and that memorable siege commenced on the 23d April 1304. The castle surrendered on the 20th of July following. It was in 1305 that Wallace was captured, and he was executed in London upon the 23d August of that year. Now I find among the transcripts of ancient deeds in the

Advocates' Library, the grant from Edward I. to Sir John Menteith of the sheriffdom and castle of Dumbarton; and it calls upon all the subjects of the conqueror to be vigilant in aiding, and faithful in obedience to, Menteith in his important jurisdiction. It is dated 20th March at St Andrews. No year is mentioned, but unquestionably it is March 1303-4, when Edward was at St Andrews before the siege of Stirling, which occurred in the following month.* This deed appears to have escaped Lord Hailes, but it proves that he was not deceived in his reliance upon Ryley. There, in the meantime, we leave Blind Harry's editor.

Now we venture to say that Mr Tytler would have been better and more safely occupied in redeeming Lord Hailes from such an attack, than in repeating Dr Jamieson. Has our excellent historian himself always carefully read the annals he impugns? We fear he has not, if we may judge from the fact that he has quoted them hastily and inaccurately. There is a spurious chronicle, of which no one can give a distinct account, called *Relationes Arnaldi Blair*, in which it is said that, upon a certain occasion in the year 1298, Menteith, Wallace, and some others, went together in arms upon a warlike expedition. The passage asserts nothing about friendship between Menteith and Wallace, beyond the bare allegation that they were in arms together. Lord Hailes, in his Annals, takes this authority and *destroys it*. He convicts it of anachronism, inconsistency, and improbability; and very properly rejects it as worthless. Now, both Dr Jamieson and Mr Tytler quote this passage against Lord Hailes, meagre and inconsequential though it be, as if it had entirely escaped the observation of the annalist; while the fact is, that he examined the authority *critically*, and his antagonists have not. Again, the object in quoting this authority against Lord Hailes is to establish the fact of *friendship* at one time existing between Menteith and Wallace. This it by no means does, even could it be relied upon. If any thing, it proves a solitary instance of military intercourse or cooperation, but nothing more; and the whole calumny against Menteith depends upon the allegation of a base breach of *private friendship*. Here, again, we are constrained to say, that Mr Tytler has *not read* the Annals. He exclaims, "Hailes has also remarked, that he has yet to learn that Menteith *had ever any intercourse* or friendship and familiarity with Wallace; yet that Menteith *acted in concert* with Wallace is proved by the following passage from Bower, preserved in *Relationes Arnaldi Blair*." Now what Lord Hailes says is something quite different, though a very little word makes that difference. He says, that he has "yet to learn that Menteith had ever any intercourse *or friendship or familiarity*," &c. A proof of their having upon one occasion acted in concert would not prove the friendship alleged, but would certainly contradict an assertion of "*no intercourse or friendship and familiarity*;" such proof, however, manifestly would not meet the allegation of "*no intercourse of friendship or familiarity*." Now, *friendly and familiar*

* Wodrow's MSS. Jac. Vol. i. 14, No. 9, referring to the original in the Tower. "*Edwardus*," &c. "*universis et singulis tenentibus cæterisque fidelibus nostris de castro de villa et de vicecomitatu de Dumbretan*," &c. "*custodiam castri villæ et vicecomitatus prædictorum cum omnibus pertinentiis suis dilecto et fideli nostro Johanni de Meneteth nos commississe noveritis*," &c. "*Dat apud villam Sancti Andree xx Martii*."

intercourse is just what Lord Hailes denies. This he elsewhere shows pointedly by putting the word *friend* in Italics,—an ocular emphasis which I do not find preserved in Mr Tytler's quotation of that passage.

But our historian, with regret we say it, has, in respect of Sir John Menteith, forsaken his true mistress, the Genius of History, to follow that *false Duessa*, partial controversy. He has omitted to record the *historical facts* of Menteith's career. He has recorded that "Sir John de Menteith, a Scottish baron who had *served along with and under Wallace* against the English, *deserted his country*, swore homage to Edward; and employed a servant of Wallace to betray his master into his hands; that he *seized him in bed*," &c. and from these violent assumptions our historian deduces his moral remark, that "it was natural that the voice of popular tradition should continue from century to century to *execrate the memory of such a man*." But to no redeeming point in the long career of Menteith,—to no circumstance, however authentic and within the pale of legitimate history, which might contradict this mixture of fable and calumny, does he even slightly allude. Let us turn again to facts and dates.

Mr Tytler, in his own history, particularly records the battle of Dunbar gained by the Earl of Surrey in the year 1296; and also the fact that the principal Scottish nobility, there taken prisoners, "were immediately sent in chains to England, where they were for the present confined to close confinement in different Welsh and English castles; after some time the king compelled them to attend him in his wars in France, but even this partial liberty was not allowed them till their sons were delivered into his hands as hostages." But our historian, while he particularizes other nobles, does not record that *Sir John Menteith* was one of these prisoners; and that, so far from there being the slightest evidence that he was among the first to bend to the conqueror, his name does not occur in that degrading document the *Ragman Roll*. There can be no question that this is the true history of Menteith's involuntary allegiance to Edward I. In the *Rotuli Scotiae* will be found, under date 30th July 1297, the mandate of the English monarch, that the "*magnates*" of Scotland, taken at Dunbar, should be liberated, and have their lands again, as they were *about to perform military service in France and elsewhere*. It will be remembered that this was the expedition in reference to which Edward said to Humphrey Bohun, the haughtiest earl in England, "Sir Earl, by God, you shall either go or hang." *Sir John Menteith* is one of the Scotch nobles particularly mentioned as being released upon the condition of foreign service. Nor is this all. The *Fædera* afford the very terms of the oath which Menteith was *compelled to take*. Upon the 9th day of August 1297, Comyn was, by the king's command, released *from prison*, and made to swear with his *hand on the holy Scripture*, that he would accompany Edward to France against his enemies, and serve him faithfully according to the terms of a formal written obligation containing the highest penalties; and, moreover, that before the expedition set sail, he, Comyn, should find sufficient security. Immediately follows, in this public record, that an oath to the same effect, and precisely in the same terms, was extorted from *Sir John Menteith*,—"Eodem

modo, juravit et literam dedit, et manucaptionem dare promisit, Johannem de Meneteth, frater comitis de Meneteth." Not one word of this is recorded in Mr Tytler's history, although among his charges against Menteith is, that " he *deserted* his country, swore homage to Edward," &c. That monarch returned from the foreign campaign, in which Menteith accompanied him, upon the 14th March 1297-8. During his short absence, Wallace had reached, through a brilliant career of arms, the governorship of Scotland. Edward, upon the 22d July 1298, a few months after his return, met the patriot at Falkirk, where the humbler star of Wallace paled before that of Plantagenet. While most of the Scottish nobles were continually changing sides, I have not been able to discover a vestige of evidence or probability that the services of Menteith were for a moment restored to Scotland, until after the death of Edward I. His oath,—his bond,—his hostages,—the heavy penalties stipulated, are his excuse. Had Bruce so good a one for his fickle conduct? Menteith may even have conceived an affection for his conqueror while serving with him abroad; and, foreseeing no brighter prospect for his unhappy country, have hailed Edward, with abated reluctance, as her king. When and where was his private friendship with Wallace contracted? The patriot only emerged from comparative obscurity after Menteith was a prisoner of war in England! When and where did he serve " with and under Wallace against the English?" The time and occasion alleged by Mr Tytler, following the spurious *Relationes*, is a miserable expedition of fire-raising, a case of creeping arson, said to have occurred in the neighbourhood of Ayr, upon the 28th August 1298. Now it is *incredible* that Menteith could have been engaged in any such expedition a few months after his return from abroad with the king of England, if, indeed, he did immediately return with the conqueror. There is no authority for the fact, except the *Relationes*; and Lord Hailes (though his adversary does not notice it) destroyed that authority, and showed that another is also named by that unknown writer, as a companion of Wallace upon this occasion, who was killed at the previous battle of Falkirk. Aware of this difficulty, and anxious to prove one instance of companionship betwixt Wallace and Menteith, Dr Jamieson endeavours to make out the date in the *Relationes* an error, and to transfer the incident to the time of the treaty of Irvine in 1297. Be it so. Had Blind Harry's editor taken the *Rotuli Scotiae* along with him, he would have found that of that other date Menteith was a *prisoner of war in England!* Thus the assertion, that Menteith *deserted* his country, and *served under Wallace*, is absolutely inconsistent with the public records, which our historians overlook, while clinging to a legendary fable in the vain hope of discomfiting the father of accurate Scottish history.

But, says Mr Tytler, the memory of Menteith has been naturally execrated from generation to generation! And why does our historian not record the facts (worth a million of his legends) that prove how trusted, honoured, and beloved Menteith was in his own generation *after the death of Wallace?* Again let us turn to facts and dates. By the deed already quoted, of date 20th March 1303-4, it is proved that Sir John Menteith was in the highest favour with Edward I. and was trusted with the most important jurisdiction in

Scotland. This destroys all probability that Menteith, between this period and his return from the foreign campaign, had any dealings with Wallace, far less served with him against *the English*. The patriot was captured within Menteith's jurisdiction, or placed under his charge before being sent to England, where he was executed 1305. Edward I. died 7th July 1307. Edward II. went to the continent about the close of that year, and to a state paper, by which he provides for the quiet of Scotland during his absence, appears the name of Menteith. This indicates that he had not swerved from his oath to Edward I. before that monarch's death. But it is proved by the *Fædera*, that, in August 1309, Menteith was the leading commissioner for Scotland to conclude a truce with England. He was joined with *Sir Nigel Campbell*. Mr Tytler does not record this negotiation.* But it is most material. It proves that Menteith had taken the earliest opportunity to return to his country after the death of Edward I. released him from his bond; and that he stood in the highest esteem with *both countries*. Had his conduct towards his country, or towards Wallace, deserved execration, Menteith would not have been associated with the King's brother-in-law upon this most important mission. In 1615 Menteith was the companion in arms of Randolph, the King's nephew, in the expedition to Ireland. In 1616, Menteith accompanied the same nobleman on a mission to *England*. Menteith and Randolph were bosom friends, companions in arms, and in diplomacy; and here is Mr Tytler's own translation of Barbour's character of Randolph; "loving honour and loyalty, and *hating falsehood above all things*, ever fond of having the bravest knights about him whom he dearly loved." This companionship of Menteith and Randolph is not to be found in Mr Tytler's history, but is proved by the public records. Menteith is one of the barons who, in the year 1320, signed the memorable manifesto of Scottish independence. Our historian records this spirited appeal with the highest commendation, but does not record that one of the names attached to it is "*Johannis de Menteth custos comitatus de Menteth*." Menteith was one of the commissioners and conservators of the truce with England at the famous treaty of Berwick in the year 1328. Mr Tytler has not recorded this fact, or indeed any fact in favour of Menteith, who died not long after the above date, without a stain upon his shield. Under the circumstances, his allegiance to Edward I. was no stain at all.

Ancient chronicles, meagre and equivocal in their expressions, some of them English, some of them anonymous, or of doubtful authorship, some of them unintelligible, none

* This was the negotiation with Richard de Burgo Earl of Ulster, 2d and 21st August 1309.—*Fædera*. It was *before* this, (but after Des Roches's treaty,) namely, 30th July 1309, that Edward, alleging the truce to be broken by the Scots, declared war. It was *after* the negotiation of Menteith and Campbell with De Burgo, that the king of France sent Count de Evreux to Edward, namely, 29th November 1309. Now Mr Tytler omits entirely De Burgo's negotiation—speaks of Count De Evreux's mission as that which immediately followed Des Roches's, and then refers to Edward's declaration of 30th July 1309 as *subsequent* to Evreux's mission which occurred in *November following*. Lord Hailes, on the other hand, is *minutely accurate* with regard to all these transactions. Correct Tytler, Vol. i. pp. 277, 278, by Hailes, second Vol. pp. 28, 29; and by the *Fædera*.

of them susceptible of being thoroughly sifted upon the point, and the most explicit of them written long after the event, are referred to triumphantly by Dr Jamieson and Mr Tytler, to the exclusion of *legitimate history*. I must here content myself with a single instance of Mr Tytler's aptitude to grasp too hastily at these shreds and patches of dim and legendary records. *Wyntoun*, one of the best of the old chroniclers, but not born for more than half a century after Wallace's death, simply records that Menteith "tuk in Glasgow Willame Walays." This proves nothing. But our historian, in quoting it, also quotes the *rubric* of the chapter which says that Menteith "*dissavit* gud Willame Walays." Now *Wyntoun's* enthusiastic editor, Mr James M'Pherson, who brought that chronicle into repute, scouts the fable of Menteith's treachery, and adds, "Wyntoun only says that he 'tuk Walays:.'" the word "*dissavit*" being the *addition of the rubricator*, and probably from the report then circulating." Mr Tytler does not meet this. As for the evidence said to be afforded by the *Scotichronicon*, 1. It is not contemporary. 2. The scanty expressions attributed to Fordun on the subject cannot with certainty be separated from his continuators and interpolators. 3. If used by Fordun, they show that that prolix chronicler was acquainted with *no details* of Menteith's perfidy, or he would have noted them. 3. Bower, Fordun's alleged continuator and interpolator, is still farther removed from the event. He, too, has given *no details* of the perfidy, and obviously had none to give. 4. The violent tirade against Menteith, contained in the *Relationes*, and by some attributed to Bower, destroys itself; and Mr Tytler has wisely excluded from the pages of his history all the monkish trash, attributed to Bower on the subject of Menteith, to which in his controversial note he makes a vague and general reference. But we take fearlessly, what the antagonists of Lord Hailes have rejected, the *Fœdera* and the *Rotuli Scotiæ*, against the whole field of subsequent chroniclers and popular calumny. The moral principles which influenced one individual towards another, five hundred years ago, the degree of private personal friendship existing between them, and the minute circumstances of action composing the merits of such a case, are just those questions of all others in which even a contemporary chronicler, expressing popular, perhaps his own individual opinion, cannot be relied upon. It is a fatal mistake in a historian to suppose that because an authority is old it must be trust-worthy. Mr Tytler parades his legendary lore as if he had found *charter and seisin* against the Menteith. He arranges his authorities with the air of marshalling veteran, irresistible troops. But, at the best, they are like Falstaffe's tattered recruits,— "ragged old-faced ancients,—nay, and the villains march wide betwixt the legs as if they had gyves on,—there's but a shirt and a half in all their company."

THE END.



