Studies in Scottish Literature

Volume 10 | Issue 1 Article 4

7-1-1972

Encore: Lindsay's Thrie Estaitis, Date and New Evidence

Joanne Spencer Kantrowitz
Kent State University

JOANNE SPENCER KANTROWITZ

Encore: Lindsay's *Thrie Estaitis*, Date and New Evidence

The question of dating is particularly important for Sir David Lindsay's *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*. Since it is a political play which implicitly assumes a knowledge of Scottish politics and the ideas used to order and discuss the political life of the nation, one must have a clear idea of the time and place within which the text exists before an accurate interpretation can be established. Because Scottish politics took a decisive turn after 1542 with the death of James V and the growing intensity of religious conflict, the two dates associated with the *Thrie Estaitis* — 1540 and 1552 — intimately affect potential interpretations of the play's meaning and effect. The soundest evidence supports a first performance in Cupar, Fifeshire, on Whitsun Tuesday, June 7, 1552. Yet that evidence, accumulated slowly, has recently been challenged once again with a reading of the play in terms of politics before 1540.[1] Since this is the case, a review of the scholarship on the dating question is more than ritualistic: it is essential if any subsequent interpretation according to historical materials is to be sound.

The *Thrie Estaitis* survives in two forms, a quarto published in 1602 by Robert Charteris, an Edinburgh printer, and a manuscript copy made by George Bannatyne in 1568. Shorter by nearly 1600 lines,[2] the latter is a series of extracts from the play, and, as such, can provide only an important ancillary to the quarto. It does, however, provide the Banns for the play and fifty-two lines which do not appear in the quarto. The two texts differ in spelling and diction, but these differences have not yet been subjected to linguistic analysis. In general, the Bannatyne seems to preserve more of the Scots dialect while the quarto seems relatively more "Southern" in its English. Aside from these linguistic differences, the texts — where they are parallel — do not diverge to

1. See John MacQueen, "Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis," *Studies in Scottish Literature*, III (1966), 129-143, and the rebuttal by Anna Jean Mill, "The Original Version of Lindsay's *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*", *SSL*, VI (1968), 67-75. Also, Vernon Harward, "*Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* Again" *SSL*, VII (1970), 139-146.

2. James Kinsley, "Note on the Text," in his edition of the *Thrie Estaitis* (London: Cassell, 1954), p. 36.

any greater extent than that usually found in normal textual problems where the author has had no immediate part in the transmission of his work.[3] The extant texts, then, appear to derive ultimately from one hypothetical authorial manuscript; certainly their differences do not suggest widely variant forms like those, for example, in the three distinct versions of *Piers Plowman.*

If this were the only material available, the chronological problem would be relatively simple, but a further complication exists in the form of a report written to Thomas Cromwell on January 21, 1539/40 by Sir William Eure, an English representative in Scotland.[4] The report includes notes on an interlude presented at the royal court in Linlithgow on Twelfth Night, 1540. Despite the differences between the report and the texts we possess, this interlude has been associated with Lindsay's play since Eure's letter was first noted in the late eighteenth century. Because the *Thrie Estaitis* is the only Scottish morality play whose text has survived, we have no way of knowing if other plays might fit Eure's description more closely. In any case, the correspondence is close enough that the court interlude can be viewed as a variant on the more complex play we do possess.

Yet, for all the similarity, considerable difference exists, too. Anna Jean Mill summarizes these differences succinctly, and her account is well worth quoting:

> The summary of the Linlithgow plot as given in the "Nootes" [Eure's report] seems to differ considerably in detail from the plot of the 1602 quarto. In the "Nootes" we have the messenger Solace; in the quarto, Diligence. In the "Nootes" we have the courtiers Placebo, Pikthanke, and Flaterye; in the quarto, Placebo, Wantonness, and Solace. These may be merely verbal changes, and similarly Good Counsall of the quarto is probably Experience of the "Nootes" under another name. But the speechs of the Poor Man of the "Nootes" have evidently undergone considerable revision; and the character seems to have been extended and duplicated in Pauper and John the Commonweal of the quarto. In the "Nootes" there is no mention of the three Vices, of the Interludes of the Sowtar and Taylor or of the Poorman and the Pardoner, or of the Sermon of Folly. It seems quite clear too that the unmarried King's seduction by Sensualitie, the main theme of Part I in the quarto, did not form part of the Linlith-

3. Cf. the variants listed in Vol. IV, 132-135 of the standard edition of Lindsay's works, edited by Douglas Hamer for the Scottish Text Society (4 vols., Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1931-1936), and in Kinsley's edition, pp. 35-37, 199-201. Since Lindsay died in 1555, both versions were done after his death.

4. B.M. MSS. Reg. 7. c. xvi. ff. 137-139, printed in Hamer, II, 2-6 with commentary in IV, 125-126.

> gow plot. "Nexte come in a King," say the "Nootes," who passed to his throne, having noe speche to th'ende of the Playe (and thene to raitefie and approve as in playne Parliament all things doon by the reste of the players which represented the three estes [estates]." If, then, the "Nootes" are a faithful summary of the Linlithgow representation, there was considerable variance *in detail* between that and other representations.[5]

The date of 1540 conflicts with other external evidence, too. In four notes, Bannatyne described the play as performed in Edinburgh, during the 1550's, an ascription which agrees with comments by Henrie Charteris in his preface to his 1568 edition of Lindsay's works (exclusive of the *Thrie Estaitis*).[6] This production appears to have been performed on Sunday, August 12, 1554, before the Queen-Regent, Mary of Lorraine. Yet, in the Banns which appear in Bannatyne's manuscript, the heading reads: "Proclamatioun maid in cowpar of ffyffe" and the announcement itself specifies Whitsun Tuesday, June 7, on the castle hill at Cupar at 7 a.m. as the time and place for the coming performance. While the year is not specified, the range is narrowed by a reference to the battle of Pinkie Cleuch which occurred on September 10, 1547.[7]

In its simplest form then, the dating argument involves three places and three dates: 1540 in Linlithgow, on the basis of Eure's letter; 1554 in Edinburgh, on the testimony of Bannatyne and Charteris; and 1552 in Cupar, on the basis of the information provided by the Banns.[8]

The scholarly discussion of the play's date begins in 1806 with George Chalmers' edition of Lindsay's *Works* where, for the first time since 1602, the complete quarto text was used.[9] The quarto was again edited by Fitzedward Hall for the Early English Text Society in 1869 (Orig. Ser. No. 37). David Laing was responsible for two editions. The first, a popular edition, appeared in 1871 while the second was issued posthumously, with additional work by John Small, in 1879, in a limited

5. "Representations of Lyndsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'," *PMLA*, XLVII (1932), 644.

6. See Hamer, IV, 139-143, and A. J. Mill's *Medieval Plays in Scotland* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1927), 181-182.

7. Hamer, II, 10, 20; lines 125 & 139.

8. The argument for the latter two dates are specifically set forth by Mill in "Representations," although Laing also lists them (without evidence) in his 1871 edition of Lindsay's Works, p. xxxiv, as "subsequent performances" of the play.

9. The Bannatyne text was earlier printed by Pinkerton in 1788. Sibbald printed excerpts from the quarto (rearranged into five "acts") in two issues in 1802. The entire Bannatyne Manuscript was printed by he Hunterian Club in 4 vo!s., 1873-1900, and, in the standard edition, by the STS, in 1928-1933. See Hamer, IV, 130-131.

edition of 485 copies.[10] The latter is more fully annotated but, according to Hamer, "the text pages themselves seem to have been printed some years before the appearance of the edition of 1871" (p. 111).

Although the "Fifth Report of the Committee" includes a description of the play as "a most curious sketch of the time, A.D. 1535-9 (p. 12), the EETS edition includes no further discussion of the date. For all practical purposes, then, the authorities during the nineteenth century were Chalmers and Laing who disagreed in detail if not in substance. While both Chalmers and Laing accept the 1540 document as evidence for the date of the play, they treat its significance differently. Identifying King Humanitie as James V, Chalmers argues that the play must have been written before James' marriage in 1537, since Lindsay's king is unmarried. He denies the relevance of the evidence in the Banns and argues for a date of 1535.[11] Laing says that Eure's description does not "materially differ from the play in its printed form." He denies Chalmers' identification of Rex Humanitas with James V, and cites Diligence's opening speech (with italics added) as evidence that no such specific identification is included: "*For we shall speik in general* For pastime and for play." Accepting the evidence of the Banns, Laing sees the 1552 and 1554 performances as occasions when "there may have been numerous changes and alterations which we have no means of ascertaining, by the omission or introduction of short Interludes. But it is obvious, considering the protracted time for the performance, that such Interludes of a coarse and indelicate character were meant for the amusement of the lower classes, during the intervals when the chief auditory had retired for refreshments."[12]

Both editors agree that Eure's report described the *Thrie Estaitis,* although Chalmers saw that performance as subsequent to an earlier form of the play, represented by the 1602 Q, while Laing views the extant text as possibly a later variant on its original state. Chalmers' argument rests on an assumption that the play literally represents Scottish politics while Laing sees it as a general depiction, not geared to specific personalities of the time. Both editors view the play as a collection of "inter-

10. Hamer, IV, 106-111.

11. See Mill, "Representations," 641-645, for a detailed exposition and rebuttal of Chalmers' views. Besides the announcement of time and place, the Banns include a short dramatic sketch; the characters and action are not related to the play itself.

12. 1871 edition, Vol. I, pp. xxxiii-xxxv. Laing recognized that the 1602 Q does not break the play into interludes or parts of any kind, yet in printing the text he separates the parts which he thinks "interrupt the progress of the play." See II. 347-348 & 351.

ludes" — an implicit assumption of fragmentation and lack of real connection between the parts — despite the fact that the sixteenth-century use of the term *interlude* is currently considered vague indeed. Such a view lends itself easily to an assumption that the play is a series of accretions, or added parts, rather than the embodiment of a single concept, executed as one whole. Such a view also lends itself easily to a theory of subsequent revisions or expansions of a limited original, and is encouraged by the division of the *Thrie Estaitis* into two parts with the second introducing many new characters.[13]

In 1932, the dating problem was subjected to the analysis of modern scholarship. In her "Representations of Lyndsay's *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*",[14] Anna Jean Mill examined the arguments and added extensive materials from her research in Scottish records. For its acumen and careful use of evidence, her work stands as the definitive argument on the dating problem. She carefully demolishes Chalmers' position, points out allusions to events from 1545-1550, and carefully decides that the extant version must be dated 1552: "In the absence of further evidence, therefore, 1552 should be regarded as the date of the first and only performance of the *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* at Cupar." (p. 645). On the subject of earlier performances, she is cautious: "There is nowhere any direct reference to Lyndsay, but the general correspondence of the 'Nootes' [Eure's report in 1540] with the plot of Charteris's quarto text, together with Lyndsay's close court connection, has preserved his authorship from challenge." (p. 636).[15] With Miss Mill's article, then, it was established that 1552 is the date represented by the extant text.

This seems clear and simple enough, once one has examined the arguments, and, one would think, the issue should have been settled there, barring some further discovery of contradictory evidence. Yet, in 1936, the fourth volume of Hamer's edition of Lindsay appeared, and

13. In my view, the *Thrie Estaitis* is an artistic whole centered around the theme of reason and sensuality. Part I demonstrates the process of decadence in the state; Part II elucidates the methods needed for reform. See J. S. Kantrowitz, "Sir David Lindsav's Moral Play" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, English Dept., Chicago, 1967).

14. *PMLA,* XLVII (1932), 636-651.

15. John Row (born 1568) in a history written c. 1625, refers to a fourth performance given at Perth before James V. Miss Mill finds little evidence for this, and cites Laing's observation that "Row may have substituted the name of St. Johnston (Perth) for that of Linlithgow (the site of the 1540 performance)." She further adds that "Laing's suspicions, one is forced to admit, may be justified." See pp. 645-647. Hamer connects Row's statements with a traditional connection between James V and Lindsay. See IV, 156 & 157.

the waters were muddied once more. Given two texts and Eure's "Nootes," Hamer postulated three versions of the play, and so labelled his texts in volume II, which appeared in 1931, the year before Miss Mill's article. Thus, the reported 1540 performance became "Version I" of the *Thrie Estaitis,* the Bannatyne Manuscript is labelled "Version II," and "Version III" is represented by the 1602 Quarto (II, 1, 8, 9). While this 1931 arrangement looks like the simple human tendency to invent three categories for three pieces of evidence, Hamer, in Volume IV (1936), discusses Versions II and III together and states that "Despite a trace of revision undertaken for the Edinburgh performance (note to lines 3609-80), I think that most of the gaps in the *Bann. MS.* are due, not to additions made for the 1554 performance, but to deliberate omissions by Bannatyne." (IV, 134). Such a minor trace of revision would seem to contradict the hypothesis of "Versions II and III," but the terms are maintained in a confusing discussion of the date which adds little to Miss Mill's clearer exposition and research.[16] In 1940, Raymond A. Houk[17] disposed of the "trace of revision" theory by subjecting lines 3609-80 of the two texts to a comparison which found that the differences could be explained by Bannatyne's methods of omission.

Thus, by 1940, scholarly opinion had accumulated to support a date of 1552 for the extant texts and an unchallenged date of 1540 for an earlier version which does not exist in any text. Yet this apparent clarity continues to appear in confused forms whenever the *Thrie Estaitis* is discussed in histories, and one can find the play read as a reflection of events in 1540, in 1552, or in 1554, depending on the focus of the writer.[18] It seems that most writers rely on Hamer's discussion, and that his three versions continue, despite their hypothetical nature. Chalmers' identification of Rex Humanitas with James V has persisted, too, despite Laing's counterargument and despite the absence of any new evidence to prove such an exclusive identification.

The latest variation on Chalmers' view appears in John MacQueen's account where the author asserts that "the present form of the play belongs in its essentials to the thirties, even the twenties, rather than

16. Still, Hamer had many more problems to solve than this one; with its wealth of materials, the four-volume edition is immensely valuable.

17. "Versions of Lindsay's *Satire of the Three Estates,*" *PMLA,* LV(1940), 396-405.

18. For example, compare the dates used by different authors in *Essays on the Scottish Reformation,* ed. David McRoberts (Glasgow: Burns, 1962), pp. 75, 173, 470. These examples can be multiplied many times over in both literary and historical books.

the fifties of the sixteenth century."[19] MacQueen explains the 1552 date as a revival, and, for 1540, observes that "If [Eure's] summary is to be trusted, the text used at the performance was only generally similar to the one which has survived." (p. 135). It is, perhaps, unnecessary to argue against MacQueen's view in detail, for his remarks on the dating question are only one part of an essay which also discusses the questions of text, staging, and satiric effect. One should observe, however, that his argument is essentially more sophisticated than Chalmers', for MacQueen bases his identification of the king in the play and the king of Scotland on the texts from earlier poems, the *Dreme* (1528) and the *Complaynt* (1529-1530). There, Lindsay did indeed discuss James V. He also extracted passages from the poems for use in the play.[20] Yet MacQueen dismisses Lindsay's comparable use of materials from the *Monarche* (written before 1553)[21] in a footnote (n. 16, p. 141), seems unaware of Houk's correction of Hamer's theory of variant versions of the texts, ignores the evidence of the Banns, and neglects to account for the two specific references to the date at the end of the play.

These references occur in a passage within Folie's mock sermon which ends the play. According to Miss Mill, the first seems to allude to "the events of the years 1545 to 1550, the period of the Hertford invasions of Scotland . . . [and] the repeated dispatch of French ships to the aid of the Scots:"[22]

> Quhat cummer haue ȝe had in Scotland
> Be our auld enemies of Ingland?
> Had nocht bene the support of France,
> We had bene brocht to great mischance.
> (ll. 4564-4567)

Hamer agrees with the Mill interpretation of this passage and describes it as "the sole internal reference to contemporary events which can be dated, apart from the references to Pinkie Cleuch, 10th September 1547, in the Cupar Banns." (IV, 238, ll. 4564-4567 n.) But he rejects her reading of the succeeding lines (ll. 4568-4579) as a reference to events in "the last stage of the Smalkaldic war, which ended in August, 1552, with the peace of Passau." (Mill, p. 641). In discussing this second passage which, like the first, has a parallel in the *Monarche,* Hamer

19. "Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis," p. 136.
20. These passages are discussed in Chapter II of my dissertation.
21. See Hamer's discussion of the date of the *Monarche,* III, 237-238.
22. "Representations," p. 640.

rejects such an interpretation. For him, Lindsay is simply expressing a general disapproval of "the frequency of the wars" which involved the papacy and the European powers.[23]

To this evidence, however, we may now add a third contemporary allusion which appears in both the Bannatyne MS and in the 1602 Q. The parallel between lines 4601-4608 of the *Thrie Estaitis* and John Foxe's account of the Pater Noster controversy in *Acts and Monuments* provides new evidence for dating the play not earlier than late 1549. Considered with other probable interpretations, the reference supports Anna Jean Mill's conclusion that the extant text was written shortly before its 1552 performance at Cupar. Although the parallel with Foxe was noted by two nineteenth-century church historians, their brief comments have escaped the attention of Lindsay scholars. Yet Lindsay's reference to the Pater Noster is important because it adds another element in the text proper (exclusive of the Banns) which can be dated with some precision.

The pertinent lines occur in the play's last speech. Having given his mock prophecy at the end of a long attack on church and state, Folie turns his satire back on a specific clerical quarrel:

So be this prophecy planely it appeiris
that mortall weir salbe amang the freiris
That thay sall not weill knaw in to thair cloisteris
to Quhome that thay sall say thair pater nosteris
Wald thay fall to and fecht with speir & scheild
the Divill mak cair quhilk of thame tynt the feild
(11. 335-340, Bann. MS.)[24]

Sa be this Prophesie plainlie appeirs,
That mortall weirs salbe amang freirs:
Thay sall nocht knaw weill in thair closters,
To quhom thay sall say thair Pater nosters.
Wald thay fall to, and fecht with speir and sheild,
The feind mak cuir quhilk of them win the feild.
(11. 4601-4608, 1602 Q.)

23. See Vol. IV, 238, 11. 4568-4589 note, and also 222, 11. 3562-3563 note. Here, Diligence remarks that "Thay se the Paip with awfull ordinance / Makis weir against the michtie King of France." This occurs just after the examination of the clergy in Part II. The lines are paralleled in the *Monarche* which was published in late 1552 or early 1553 (Hamer III, 237-238).

24. *The Bannatyne Manuscript*, ed. W. Tod Ritchie, Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh, 1928), III, 163. One should read the Bann. MS. text in its original order, since Hamer rearranged some passages to parallel the Q text.

The reference is to an event in Scotland first described by Foxe in the 1570 edition of *Acts and Monuments*.[25] It seems that an Englishman named Richard Marshall had preached a sermon at St. Andrews asserting that the Pater Noster should be addressed only to God. Having been taught that they might also address the prayer to saints, the people responded to the new idea with confusion, and, Foxe continues, on all Saints' Day, 1551, a certain Friar Toittis attempted to argue in a public sermon that the Pater Noster might also be said to the saints. But the friar's attempt to fit his argument to the text for the day (Matthew 5) became so obviously strained that the sermon intensified public ridicule and clerical quarrel. Eventually, the matter was settled in a provincial council of the church, but while the controversy raged, pasquils mysteriously appeared on the walls of St. Andrews Abbey Church. Foxe prints one such lampoon in English which contains the same rhymes that Lindsay employed in ll. 4601-4604:

> Doctors of Theologie, of foure score of yeares,
> And Old iolye Lupoys the balde gray Friers,
> They would be called *Rabbi* and *Magister noster,*
> And wot not to whom they say their Pater noster.

If Foxe's account is correct, the performance at Cupar on June 7 ended with a biting effect. Six months before, in January, the Provincial Council of the Scottish Catholic Church had met in Edinburgh and had finally authorized the production of the catechism which would end the dispute. In June, that book was not yet printed; when it finally did appear the author simply said that the Pater Noster was to be said to God and kept silent on the subject of the saints.[26] In June, the audience was probably still savoring the comic discomfort of the conservative clergy at a religious quarrel which ended in a small victory for the left wing of Christendom: the prayer was to be presented in the vernacular, and the *Our Father* was restored to its rightful recipient, God alone. If we accept Foxe's dates, Lindsay must have been working on the play and have finished it sometime between November 1, 1551, when the

25. All quotations are from the Folger copy of *Acts and Monuments,* 1570 edition, pp. 1450-1452. For convenience, one must resort to the inadequate editions published by Seeley of London from 1853-1877, based on S. R. Cattley's edition, revised by Josiah Pratt. There, the Pater Noster account is in Vol. V,[2] pp. 641-644.

W. Murison discusses the reference briefly in another context in his biography, *Sir David Lyndsay* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1938), pp. 117-119.

26. See *Hamilton's Catechism,* ed. Thomas Graves Law (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884), p. 292. The colophon of the catechism is dated August 29, 1552.

controversy erupted publicly, and early June, 1552, when the play had its first performance.

As it sometimes does, however, modern scholarship complicated this simple chronology, and raised a small controversy of its own. During the nineteenth century, dominant scholarly opinion characterized John Foxe as a fanatic Protestant given to gross exaggeration and, as such, an untrustworthy historian.[27] Since Foxe's account of the Pater Noster controversy is the only one known, opinion generally held that such a ridiculous event could not possibly have occurred and that Foxe printed the story as a mere polemic against the Papists. As a result, Joseph Robertson avoided the sensible conclusion when, in 1866, he pointed out Lindsay's reference to the Pater Noster incident. In a note to his edition of the *Statua Ecclesiae Scoticanae,* Robertson followed the historian Grubbe's opinion that the incident, as reported by Foxe, could not have happened, and then decided that Lindsay's supporting testimonial possibly referred to "some such question [as] may have been mooted in some convent of the Mendicant Orders."[28] While not directly contradicting his colleagues nor mentioning their names, Alexander F. Mitchell answered each of Grubbe's and Robertson's objections in his introduction to the 1882 edition of *Hamilton's Catechism and the Two Penny Faith.*[29] Since it is now ninety years later, one may argue frankly that Foxe's account glosses Lindsay's lines and that Lindsay's lines confirm Foxe's narrative.

Clearly, Robertson's suggestion of a minor dispute within "some cloister" has no evidence behind it at all and would never exist if *Acts and Monuments* had not suffered a nineteenth-century decline. Since then, Foxe's reputation has been vindicated by J. F. Mozley who convincingly demonstrates that the historian was a careful reporter, within the limits of human error.[30] Of course, one cannot unquestioningly accept Foxe's every detail. But, once we take his account seriously, the problem then becomes one of checking Foxe's facts, and it is here that complexities arise. Following his custom with the Scots material, Foxe labels the Pater Noster story *ex testemonio e Scotia allato.* The

27. J. F. Mozley, *John Foxe and His Book* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1940), pp. 175-203, especially pp. 181-185.

28. *Ecclesiae Scoticanae Statua Tam Provincialia Quam Synodalia Quae Supersunt MCCXXV — MDLIX,* II (Edinburgh: Constable, 1866), 295, note to p. 121, no. 226. See also I, cxcvii. David Patrick's translation (with new notes) is entitled *Statutes of the Scottish Church, 1225-1559,* Scottish History Society, LIV (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1907).

29. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1882), pp. xxiii-xxiv.

30. Mozley, pp. 118-241.

report was first published in 1570 when *Acts and Monuments* was greatly expanded over its first English edition (1563) by the addition of new research and new material with which enthusiastic readers had showered Foxe.[31] It is possible, then, that Foxe's Scots source for the Pater Noster story sent him a manuscript account, and the original may exist still.[32] Since we do not know Foxe's source precisely, however, we cannot estimate the informant's accuracy nor the time at which he recalled the events. He might have assembled the information for Foxe sometime between 1563 and 1570, or the account may have been produced in the 1550's and later sent to Foxe as an interesting recollection. Without this hypothetical manuscript — or perhaps even with it — we cannot know the informant's qualifications.

Without its source, Foxe's published text provides our only clues. His report does not lack corroborating evidence. As Mitchell observed, an incomplete canon remains in the Provincial Council's decrees of November 27, 1549.[33] The entire passage reads: "Circa Orationem Dominicam *Pater Noster,* etc. Concilium decrevit ex moventibus hoc vulgare quod sequitur his inserendum," and, after a lacuna, the next passage commands that "In omnium concionum publicarum exordiis servetur vetus et receptus invocandi modus per Orationem Dominicam, cum Salutatione Angelica ad Virginem Deiparam, pro gratis impetranda.[34] In other words, a decree concerning the Lord's Prayer was apparently considered and judgment deferred, while the following section provides for public prayer according to the ancient and received form. The next conciliar decrees, issued on January 26, 1551/52, endorsed and described a prospective catechism in the vernacular: "quem Catechismum, id est, communem et facilem rudimentorum fidei institutionem et doctrinam vocari vult . . . continentem veram sinceramque, juxta Catholicae ecclesiae sensum ac intellectum Decalogi, seu decem manda-

31. Mozley, p. 141. The Scottish accounts appear on pp. 1107-1117 and pp. 1442-1453 of the 1570 edition. Foxe's labels vary, suggesting several different sources.

32. I have had a search made of Lansdowne 389 and 819, which seemed the most likely places for such a document. Unfortunately, the search was unsuccessful.

33. *Hamilton's Catechism,* p. xxxiii.

34. Robertson, II, 121. Patrick's translation, pp. 127-128: "Concerning the Lord's prayer, 'Our Father' etc. The council enacted, for reasons appealing to it, that this [statement] in the vulgar tongue which follows should be here inserted." After the lacuna, the next article is: "Of the 'Our Father' and 'Hail Mary' before sermons. At the beginning of all public sermons the ancient and received form of invocation by saying the Lord's Prayer and the Angelical Salutation to the Virgin Mother of God to obtain grace shall be observed."

torum Dei interpretationem, articulorum fidei, septemque sacramentorum simplicem, puram et Christianam doctrinam, nec non Orationis Dominicae et Salutationis Angelicae integram et salutarem expositionem."[35] From the lacuna in the decrees of 1549 and the order for the catechism in 1552, it appears certain that some discussion of the Pater Noster began on or before November 27, 1549, and was resolved on January 26, 1551/52. That much is clear.

But could the preliminary events described by Foxe have occurred before November 26, 1549 and added fuel to the controversy which occurred in the council, or might the public manifestations have happened in the intervening two years when the issue may have grown to such proportions that the church hastened to compromise in 1552? Foxe mentions three names in his account; they are "Richard Mershall Doctour of Divinitie and Priour of the Blacke Friers at the new Castle in England,"[36] a Friar Toittis, and a Friar Scott. Two of the names appear in the list of participants in the Council of 1549. "Frater Joannes Scott" is listed under the heading "Ordines Minorum de Observantia," and under "Doctores in Theologia, Licentiati et Baccalaurei," the name of "Frater Richardus Marchell, Anglus, Divinarum Litterarum professor," appears. In addition, a "Frater Andreas Cottis" is described as the guardian of the Friars Minors Observants at St. Andrews.[37] The similarity between the name Cottis and Toittis added to the fact that the former was at St. Andrews leads one to suspect that it was Andrew Cottis who preached the exaggerated sermon on All Saints' Day and that the name Toittis in the 1570 edition of *Acts and Monuments* is probably an editorial error that has continued to the present. Thus far, Foxe's facts are accurate. There was some sort of disagreement about the Pater Noster in Scotland during the period 1549-1552, and the three men

35. Robertson, II, 136. Patrick's translation, p. 144: "which . . . Catechism, that is to say, a plain and easy statement and explanation of the rudimen s of the faith . . . having for its contents a true and faithful interpretation of the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments of God, according to the sense and meaning of the Catholic Church, a plain, orthodox, and Christian instruction on the articles of the Creed and the seven sacraments, as also a complete and edifying explanation of the Lord's Prayer and Angelical Salutation." The text continues with a rebuke of ignorant clergyman.

36. John Durkan has traced the career of Richard Marshall, originally a Dominican of Newcastle ,in his essay "The Cultural Background in Sixteenth-Century Scotland," *Essays on the Scottish Reformation,* ed. David McRoberts (Glasgow: Burns, 1962), pp. 274-231, and especially pp. 326-329. The English exile appears in Scotland in 1539, and apparently joined the faculty of St. Andrews in 1547. I am grateful to Mr. Durkan for correspondence on his research.

37. Robertson, II, 83, 84.

Foxe mentions were indeed present at the council in 1549. Lindsay's lines, echoing the rhyme Foxe quotes, must refer to the local controversy which either promoted, or was incited by, a similar disagreement at the conciliar session of 1549. From Foxe's account, the incident seems to have occurred in November 1551, just before the final decision was made in the following January.

Lindsay's reference to the Pater Noster dispute provides external evidence which limits the date for *Ane Satyre* and reduces the time span suggested by the only other references which have been identified heretofore. These are the mention of Pincky Cleuch, 1547, in the Banns, and the apparent reference to the French army's presence in Scotland during 1548-1550 (ll. 4564-4567). Taking the latter, with the Pater Noster reference, it then seems consistent to read ll. 4568-4579 ("Now I heir tell the Empreour,/Schaippis for till be ane Conquerour . . .") as a description of the continental war of 1551-1552. This is the interpretation proposed by Anna Jean Mill, and despite Hamer's rejection of it, the contemporary character of the other events, taken with the Pater Noster reference, makes such an interpretation probable. The final citation, "Sanct Peter, Sanct Paull nor Sanct Androw,/Raisit never sic ane Oist I trow" (ll. 4580-4581), may be read as a reference to the year-long siege of St. Andrews during 1546 and 1547. Considering these events together, we see that Folie ends his sermon by attacking the specific manifestations of national folly which occurred between 1546 and 1552: the English invasion of Scotland (1547); the war involving the Pope, Charles V, and Henry II of France (1551-52); the internal Scottish assault on St. Andrews (1546-47); and, finally, the current Fifeshire folly: the Pater Noster quarrel (1549-1552). On the basis of the Pater Noster reference, the limits for the extant version of the *Thrie Estaitis* are 1549-1552. Accepting the reference to the war on the continent further limits the span to 1551-52.

If these dates are accurate, then what are we to think about Eure's account in 1540?

It is difficult to argue about the nature of a text which does not exist and especially so when we are working with a play which we cannot surround with the texts of contemporary dramatic productions that we know, from records, did indeed occur.[38] Certainly, Eure's notes represent a piece of evidence, but their relevance seems largely a function of one's view of the text we do possess. Laing emphasizes the similarities between the report and the text; Chalmers and McQueen emphasize the differences. Yet both Chalmers and Laing see the play

38. See A. J. Mill's *Medieval Plays in Scotland.*

as a collection of interludes, i.e., related fragments, a view which permits one to argue that a 1540 version subsequent to that produced in the 1530's must have been an extract (Chalmers) or that a 1540 production provided the basis for a later revision (Laing, Hamer). Yet the fact remains that we have only one text which, if the 1540 notes did not exist, would provide sound evidence for dating it 1551-52. Moreover, if one views the drama as an artistic whole, then the theory of accretion of parts becomes irrelevent. From my own work, I believe that the apparent shifts in the play's action are the result of a dramaturgy which proceeds by a demonstration of theme, and not by the later method which centers on a protagonist's action.

If the play is unified in its form, then we must take another view of Eure's notes, a view which is at least plausible from the practice of modern writers. While it is true that Eure's account, in general, sounds like Lindsay's play, the differences in the characters' names and in the scope of the action suggests a very different play indeed. While there is no evidence that he did, Lindsay *may* have written such an entertainment for the court at Linlithgow in 1540. If other contemporary Scottish plays connected with the court survived, we could evaluate the possibility that the 1540 performance was indeed produced by Lindsay and not by any of the other writers who were also part of that Scottish literary world. Unfortunately, we simply do not know.

Even assuming that Eure is indeed reporting Lindsay's work, we should use the term "Version I" cautiously. James Joyce, after all, wrote an earlier version of *Portrait of the Artist,* just as Proust wrote an earlier version of *Remembrance of Things Past.* Yet, valuable as they are for studying the growth of the final masterwork, we do not confuse *Stephen Hero* or *Jean Santeuil* with the later work when undertaking a critical study of the texts for which their writers are valued and remembered.

Taken in this light, it is illogical to discuss a text we do have on the basis of a hypothetical text which might or might not have been close enough to the *Thrie Estaitis* to be labeled Version I. We have only one text of *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis,* and it exists in two forms: one, Anglicized and complete; the other, Scots and incomplete. Considering the Pater Noster reference alone, we should date the play, conservatively, 1549-1552. Within its context, ll. 4568-4579 seem more likely to refer to the European war 1551-1552. If we accept the latter interpretation and Foxe's date of 1551, *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* must have been written sometime between the end of 1551 and its performance on June 7, 1552. A counter-argument could hold that these contemporary references were added only for the Cupar performance, but this would seem to push the accretion theory beyond the available evidence. The materials for the 1552 date are specific while the evidence of Eure's report is only, at the very most, possible evidence for a not-impossible earlier draft. In any case, we simply cannot tell, for we have only one text.

The choice between 1540 and 1552 for the date of Lindsay's play is not simply a matter of arguing for a historical record of approximate accuracy. The decision determines both how far we extend the historical limits of the time to which the play refers, and, given those limits, how we may apply the materials of history in an attempt to describe the meaning of the dramatic action. No one has directly challenged the 1540 date, but it remains an impediment to interpretation. As Anna Jean Mill observed in 1932, "There is nowhere any direct reference to Lyndsay, but the general correspondence of the 'Nootes' [Eure's report in 1540] with the plot of Charteris's quarto text 1602, together with Lyndsay's close court connection, has preserved his authorship from challenge."[39] Any attempts to interpret the play in light of its relevance to Scottish affairs must accept that challenge. If other versions indeed existed, we do not have them. If the *Thrie Estaitis* should be interpreted solely in terms of events before 1540, we must have factual evidence as solid as that for the later date. Such evidence, so far, has not emerged. Since this is the case, it would seem only sensible to take, as a basis for interpretation, the first performance for which the text itself provides unmistakable evidence: June 7, 1552.

Kent State University

39. "Representations," p. 636.