

1-1-1991

Anglo-Scottish Literary Relations: Problems and Possibilities

A. A. MacDonald

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl>

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

MacDonald, A. A. (1991) "Anglo-Scottish Literary Relations: Problems and Possibilities," *Studies in Scottish Literature*: Vol. 26: Iss. 1. Available at: <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol26/iss1/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Scottish Literature Collections at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Studies in Scottish Literature* by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact SCHOLARC@mailbox.sc.edu.

A. A. MacDonald

Anglo-Scottish Literary Relations: Problems and Possibilities

One of the best recent works of scholarship on Middle Scots literature is undoubtedly Gregory Kratzmann's *Anglo-Scottish Literary Relations 1430-1550*.¹ This book offers a thorough and well-argued survey of more than a century of literary production in the two adjacent medieval kingdoms, and it casts much light on many of the works held to be masterpieces of the canon. Among other excellent chapters, those in which a detailed comparison is drawn between Douglas's *Palice of Honour* and Chaucer's *House of Fame*, between the *Aeneid* translations of Douglas and Surrey, and between Skelton's *Magnyfycence* and Lindsay's *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*, are particularly helpful. Through its merits Kratzmann's book imposes itself as a starting point for further discussion; the following comments therefore begin by examining some of the central theses of this book, but they go on to propose a significant broadening of the focus of critical attention, and they also take into consideration some literary texts from well into the Elizabethan Age.

A study of literary relations, it could be argued, must be concerned not only with intertextuality in a narrow sense but also with reception history and—perhaps most importantly—with cultural context. In his final chapter, "The two traditions," Kratzmann says of the literary connections which he has examined:

¹Gregory Kratzmann, *Anglo-Scottish Literary Relations 1430-1550* (Cambridge, 1980).

These instances of borrowing across national cultural boundaries are so interesting because they are so rare: they defy the pattern of local cohesiveness which is such a striking feature of the development of both Scottish and English literature in the period.

However, he also reminds the reader that the absence of direct allusion need not imply lack of knowledge: "Similarly, the failure or early sixteenth-century poets to refer to Henryson, Dunbar or Douglas must not be taken as an indication that they were unaware of the northern tradition."² The critic may be disposed to accept the general validity of these statements, while simultaneously wishing to enter some qualifications. For example, he may wish to go beyond the limitations of the well-known or "canonical" figures, and so attempt a wider account, in which the minor or anonymous writers, who often provide at least as good a gauge of the true state of affairs as their more illustrious contemporaries, can come into their own: although the tip of the literary iceberg, so to speak, may sparkle in the sunshine of critical attention, that tip will probably be resting upon an obscure mass submerged underneath. Furthermore, literary relations affect not just individual works but also the whole minds of authors, as the latter respond in a myriad of complex and possibly contradictory ways to their own reading and to their whole social and cultural environment. Most insidious of all, an obsession with writers of the "canon" may lead to generalizations which, in combination, may not be altogether felicitous. For example, the reluctance of English and Scottish poets to draw upon each other's work is explained thus:

Given the sheer dullness of most English poetry of the period, it is not difficult to understand why the Scots tended to ignore it as they did. It is natural, though, to wonder why the wide-ranging excellence of Scots poetry seems to have stimulated no poets other than Skelton, Surrey and possibly Wyatt. There is no single satisfactory answer, but the very weight of Lydgate's example as a writer of uniformly sober didactic poems is part of the reason for the ossification of English poetry.³

The essence of such a passage may be reduced to the following propositions: 1) most late-medieval Scottish poetry is good; 2) most late-medieval English poetry is bad; 3) the prestige of Skelton, Surrey and Wyatt depends in part on their response to Middle Scots poetry; 4) the influence of Lydgate is to blame for the inferior state of late-medieval English poetry; and thus 5) the

²*Ibid.*, p. 228.

³*Ibid.*, p. 258. On another page, however, Kratzmann declares "the general superiority of English lyric poetry to Scots," and concedes that, if more than just the longer non-lyric form were to be considered, the results of the comparison of the two literatures might look rather different, pp. 229-30.

corollary of the last point, the absence of Lydgatian influence must be partly responsible for the excellence of Middle Scots poetry. Each of these propositions seems to me debatable, though it is impossible within the present compass to discuss them separately and in the required detail.

The fundamental point here is that the study of literary relations should involve not just the comparing and contrasting of great works, but should attempt to take into account the whole phenomenology and sociology of culture. In such a perspective, readers, for example, are potentially as significant as writers, for the latter in this perspective presuppose the former. The practice of anthologists, in their selection and arrangement of materials, can be a valuable indicator of cultural *prise de position*.⁴ The openness, in both Scotland and England, to common influences from without, ought not to be ignored in the pursuit of cross-Border connections.⁵ The ways in which literary works are reused may be just as fascinating as the ways in which these works are used for the first time. Allegations of literary influence need to be supported, wherever possible, with information as to authors, copyists and readers and the manuscripts and printed books which passed through their hands, so that the opportunities for, and mechanics of, literary borrowing may be better understood.⁶ Literary relationships need not only imply cultural contact and transfer, but may also embrace parallelism of topic and genre. Finally, one can never escape problems of national self-awareness, leading to the study of what might be called the "international theme." In the following paragraphs, I shall attempt to show that this list of possible problems can also be a list of problematic possibilities.

For illustration I turn first to the *Contemplacioun of Synnaris*, of the Observant Franciscan, William of Touris.⁷ Although this work has been almost

⁴On the Bannatyne MS, for example, see Joan Hughes and W. S. Ramson, *Poetry of the Stewart Court* (Canberra, London and Miami, 1982); Alasdair A. MacDonald, "The Bannatyne Manuscript—A Marian Anthology," *Innes Review*, 37 (1986), 36-47.

⁵A full account of Anglo-Scottish literary relations would, for example, have to include a comparison of the ways in which each country absorbed cultural influences from France, Italy and Burgundy—whether in Latin or in the vernaculars.

⁶See, for example, Priscilla Bawcutt's remarks on the unfounded assertions of literary influence made by several critics of Middle Scots poetry: "Source-hunting: Some Reulis and Cautelis," in *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Scottish Language and Literature (Medieval and Renaissance)*, ed. Roderick J. Lyall and Felicity Riddy (Stirling and Glasgow, 1981), pp. 85-105.

⁷The information in this paragraph is largely based upon my "Catholic Devotion into Protestant Lyric: the case of the *Contemplacioun of Synnaris*," *Innes Review*, 35 (1984), 58-83.

totally neglected by modern critics, it has many claims to attention. First, it was one of the most popular works of Middle Scots literature, surviving in no fewer than six texts from before 1600; of other comparable imaginative literature, only the poems of Henryson and of Lindsay, it would seem, enjoyed a dissemination as large as that of Touris's poem—which on that account alone might be thought to have a claim to admission to the canon. Second, the *Contemplacioun of Synnaris* appears to be the first piece of Middle Scots literature to have been printed. Third, the poem was perhaps the first work of Middle Scots literature to be translated into English. Fourth, it maintained its appeal steadily, over a period of eighty years. Fifth, it had an impact in both Scotland and England (the earliest surviving text, indeed, is the Westminster printing of 1499); in both countries the poem was subjected to later adaptation, converting it into a Protestant lyric for post-Marian Scotland and a work of domestic devotion for Elizabethan England.

Once can go still further, and advance suggestions as to why and how this Scottish poem was taken to England. It seems likely that it was composed for the Passiointide retreats of James IV at the Observant Friary at Stirling. At some early point the work came into the hands of Richard Fox, bishop of Durham (and later of Winchester), who visited the Scottish Court more than once in connection with the negotiations leading to the Treaty of Ayton (1497) and to the betrothal of James to Margaret Tudor. The Prologue to the English edition declares that it was printed by Wynkyn de Worde at the behest of Bishop Fox. Before the poem could be published in England, it had to be translated by someone familiar with the linguistic forms of both countries, and a candidate for this could be the "good Scottish frere Father Donald" mentioned in Sir Thomas More's *Dialogue concernyng heresydes*—though this cannot so far be proved.⁸ This would be Donald Gilbert, the "Scottish doctor," guardian of the Greenwich Observant House in 1494, and, according to the *Great Chronicle of London*, the associate of Fox in forcing the Franciscan Conventuals to reform their dress, after the model of the Observants.⁹ It would seem that the Greenwich house fulfilled for the English Court much the same role as the Stirling house for the Scottish. The importation of Observant Franciscanism was, in both Scotland and England, a manifestation of Burgundian influence, and from the start the order enjoyed the special favor of ladies in both Courts—in Scotland Mary of Gueldres, wife of James II, and in England Margaret of Burgundy, sister of

⁸Malcolm Sinclair, "Saint Thomas More's 'Good Scottish Frere,'" *Moreana*, 55 (1977), 53-4.

⁹A. G. Little, "Introduction of the Observant Friars into England A Bull of Alexander VI," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 27 (1941), 7.

Edward IV.¹⁰ The Greenwich and Stirling houses were intellectual centers of reformed religious life and focal points of lay spirituality, both were in close proximity to royal palaces, both received lavish royal donations, and both supplied confessors to the royal families.¹¹ It could well be the case that Observant Franciscanism provided not only the impetus for the composition of the *Contemplacioun of Synnaris* in the first place—in the sense of directing the penitent thoughts of James IV—but also a route for cultural transfer from North to South.

This is perhaps the place to mention some further connections between Scotland and London at this period. The poem, "London, thou art of tounis A per se," was for long reckoned as being by Dunbar. It is preserved in several places, including Balliol College MS 394, where it is described as "A litill balet made by london made at mr shaws table by a skote."¹² (This was Sir John Shaw, Lord Mayor, and the occasion would have been the Scottish embassy of 1501, under Archbishop Robert Blakadder of Glasgow.) Nor should one overlook the fact that another poem, also formerly attributed to Dunbar, "Ros Mary, most of vertewe virginale," found in the Asloan and Makculloch MSS, is also preserved in an English manuscript (BL Harley MS 1703) belonging to William Forrest, friend of Alexander Barclay and confessor of Mary Tudor.¹³ Father William was a relation of John Forrest, who joined the Observants in c. 1494, later became warden of the Greenwich friary, and was roasted alive in 1538.¹⁴ There is a limit, of course, to what can be done with evidence so fragmentary, albeit pregnant, but it does suggest something of the channels of reception of Scottish literature in England.

¹⁰William M. Bryce, *The Scottish Grey Friars*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh and London, 1909); A. G. Little, "Introduction of the Observant Friars into England," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 11 (1923), 5; Dom David Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1948-59), III, 10-13, 206-11.

¹¹BL Egerton MS 2341 contains instructions for stained glass windows in the Greyfriars Church at Greenwich. These were not only to commemorate saints, but also Henry VII, Queen Elizabeth, Margaret Countess of Richmond (Henry's mother), and Princess Margaret Tudor (the future wife of James IV).

¹²*The Poems of William Dunbar*, ed. W. Mackay Mackenzie (London, 1932; rev. 1960), pp. 177-8; J. W. Baxter, *William Dunbar: A Biographical Study* (Edinburgh and London, 1952), p. 88.

¹³*Poems of Dunbar*, ed. Mackenzie, pp. 175-7; Baxter, p. 227; Louise Imogen Guiney, *Recusant Poets* (London and New York, 1938), pp. 137-45.

¹⁴Little (1923), p. 12.

It is certainly interesting that it was during the reign of Mary Tudor that the *Pallice of Honour* and the *Eneados* of Gavin Douglas were printed at London (by William Copland, 1553). One might wonder whether the restoration of the old faith led to a renewed interest in medieval literature; at any rate, at least one copy of Thomas Davidson's early (c. 1530-40) print of the *Pallice of Honour*, together with a manuscript of the *Eneados*, must have been in circulation in London at that time, in order to be used as copytexts for those prints,¹⁵ and it seems natural to suppose that there was in England a market potential for works of Middle Scots literature.

This is borne out by further evidence from the book trade. Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* was printed by William Thynne in 1532, and was reissued in 1542, 1545/50, 1561, 1598, and 1602.¹⁶ The poem was published anonymously and in translation, and was included in editions of Chaucer, where it followed *Troilus and Criseyde*; nevertheless, as a result of this association, it was probably the Middle Scots work best known in England. It would seem that the Thynne family was particularly interested in Scottish literature: the nephew of the said William, Sir John Thynne, was in Edinburgh with the Earl of Hertford in 1544 and again, with the commander now promoted to Duke of Somerset, in 1547. From the earlier campaign he brought back a manuscript of John Bellenden's translation of the *History* of Hector Boece (now at Longleat), and Coldwell finds it likely that the manuscript of Douglas's *Eneados*, likewise at Longleat, may have been acquired during the later campaign.¹⁷ But to return to Henryson, later in the century (1577) the *Fabulous tales of Esope the Phrygian, Compiled most eloquently in Scottishe Metre by Master Robert Henryson, & now lately Englished* were printed at London by Richard Smith.¹⁸

The Scottish writer who enjoyed the biggest success in England, however, would seem to have been Sir David Lindsay: in 1538 John Byddell put out the *Papyngo*; John Day and William Seres published the *Tragedie of the Cardinal* in 1548; in 1563 an edition of the *Dialog betuix Experience and ane Courteour* was projected by Richard Serle—only to be printed, rather, three

¹⁵*The Shorter Poems of Gavin Douglas*, ed. Priscilla J. Bawcutt, STS, 4th Series, 3 (Edinburgh and London, 1967), xv-xviii.

¹⁶Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Works: 1532* (facsimile), ed. D. S. Brewer (London, 1969).

¹⁷John Bellenden, *The Chronicles of Scotland Compiled by Hector Boece*, ed. R. W. Chambers, Edith C. Batho and H. Winifred Husbands, STS, 3rd Series, 10, 15 (1938-41); Gavin Douglas, *Virgil's 'Aeneid' Translated into Scottish Verse*, ed. David F. C. Coldwell, STS, 3rd Series, 25, 27, 28, 30 (1957-64), I, 100.

¹⁸*The Poems of Robert Henryson*, ed. Denton Fox (Oxford, 1981), p. lv.

years later by Thomas Purfoote and William Pickering (1566); Purfoote put out reissues of the *Dialog* in 1575 and 1581. These editions all gave translated texts of the Scottish poet; in the early seventeenth century, however, the process of anglicization of Middle Scots had progressed so far for it to be possible to send Edinburgh prints directly down South, with only a cancel title-page to attract the English reader—as with the '1604' issue of the *Satyre* (really Robert Charteris's edition of 1602) and of the *Works*.¹⁹ From these details one may conclude that the impact of at least some Middle Scots poets in sixteenth-century England was not negligible.

As one might surmise, the flow of communication was not all in the one direction, though it did take different forms in the two countries. Whereas in England one finds in the main printed texts of Scottish literature, in Scotland one finds normally manuscript versions of English texts: exceptions to this rule are, of course, Chepman and Myllar's texts (1508) of the romance, *Sir Eglamour*, and of Lydgate's poems, the "Rhyme without accord" and the dream vision, *The Complaint of the Blak Knight*—the latter poem is also preserved in Bodley MS Arch. Selden B 24 and in the Asloan MS, and in these three places it goes by the name of "The Maying and Disport of Chaucer."²⁰ In this context one could also mention that the Selden MS contains a Northern dialect translation of *Troilus and Criseyde* and other Chaucerian pieces. For its part BL Harley MS 6149, probably compiled by the pursuivant Adam Loutfut, includes Scots translations of English chivalric prose texts (e.g. the *Boke of Saint Albans*, Caxton's *Book of the Ordre of Chyualry*).²¹ The lyric, *Moder of God and Virgyne undefould*, by Thomas Hoccleve, is found in the manuscript of John Ireland's *Meroure of Wyssdome* (albeit misattributed to Chaucer).²² John Lydgate's "Magnificat," from the *Life of Our Lady*, is in-

¹⁹*The Works of Sir David Lindsay of the Mount*, ed. Douglas Hamer, STS, 3rd Series, 1, 2, 6, 8 (1931-6), IV, 15-74.

²⁰*The Chepman and Myllar Prints*, ed. William Beattie, Edinburgh Bibliographical Society (Edinburgh, 1950), pp. 53-88, 49-51, 111-33.

²¹"The Deidis of Armorie: A Fifteenth Century Heraldic Manual and Bestiary," ed. L. A. J. R. Houwen, Ph.D. diss., 2 vols., Univ. of Sheffield, 1989, I, 44-7.

²²Johannes de Irlandia [John Ireland], *The Meroure of Wyssdome*, Vol. I, ed. Charles Macpherson, STS, 2nd Series, 19 (1926), 166-70. Subsequent books of *The Meroure* were published as follow: Vol. II (Books 3-5), ed. F. Quinn, STS, 4th Series, 2 (1965); Vol. III (Books 6-7), ed. Craig McDonald, STS, 4th Series, 19 (1990). Although attributed to Chaucer in the text of the STS volume, Macpherson ascribes the poem to Hoccleve in the notes, p. 199. See Hoccleve's *Works: The Minor Poems*, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 61 (1892), 52-6; Furnivall also issued in revised edition

incorporated in the Bannatyne MS, and the same collection contains other items from English sources. BL Arundel MS 285 includes Richard de Caistre's lyric on the Holy Name, together with *inter alia* a Complaint of Christ known from the "Towneley Plays" (a version of which is also found in the Makculloch MS). Four poems in the *Goostly Psalmes* [1535?] of Miles Coverdale, the Reformer and Bible translator, are also to be seen in the *Gude and Godlie Ballatis*. The latter work, moreover, contains a poem which is a drastic reworking of the final stanzas of the fifteenth-century English encyclopedic work, the *Court of Sapience*.²³ This list, incomplete as it is, demonstrates that English literature was being absorbed to an appreciable degree in late-medieval Scotland.²⁴ Furthermore, the absence of Scottish editions of English works suggests that Scottish readers experienced few or none of the difficulties of comprehension which appear to have beset their counterparts in England, for whom printed translations were necessary. Only in the late sixteenth century do we find that imported English printers, such as Thomas Vautrollier and Robert Waldegrave, reprint English books: for example, Thomas Becon's *The sickle mans salve* (1584), Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* (1599), and the translation of the *Spiritual and heavenly Exercises* of Luis de Granada (1600).²⁵ Again, the inventory of the stock of the Scottish bookseller Thomas Bassandyne reveals that in 1577, alongside masses of moral, theological, devotional and pedagogical material, there was a Scottish market for such English books as: Stowe's *Chronicle*; Heywood's *Works*; *Guy of Warwick*; *Piers Plowman*—known also to Gavin Douglas, and mentioned in the *Palice of Honour* (l. 1714); Joseph Hall's *Court of Virtue*; and *Hugo of Bordeaux*.²⁶ This should not surprise, since the *Complaynt of Scotland* of c. 1550 testifies to knowledge of the *Canterbury Tales*, *Ipomedon*, *Robin Hood and Little John*, *Mandeville's Travels*, *Bevis of*

by Jerome Mitchell and A. I. Doyle in 1970. For details of the religious lyrics mentioned in this paragraph see my "Religious Poetry in Middle Scots," in *The History of Scottish Literature . . . Origins to 1660*, ed. R. D. S. Jack (Aberdeen, 1988), pp. 91-104.

²³A. A. MacDonald, "The Court of Sapience and The Gude and Godlie Ballatis," *Neophilologus*, forthcoming. See also Sally Mapstone, "A Mirror for a Divine Prince: John Ireland and the Four Daughters of God," in *Bryght Lanternis: Essays on the Language and Literature of Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. J. Derrick McClure and Michael R. G. Spiller (Aberdeen, 1989), pp. 308-23.

²⁴On this see Kratzmann's first chapter, "Influence and perspectives," pp. 1-32.

²⁵Robert Dickson and John P. Edmond, *Annals of Scottish Printing* (Cambridge, 1890; rpt. Amsterdam, 1975), pp. 376-474.

²⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 292-304.

Southampton—to name but a few.²⁷ From all this evidence, it is clear that by the sixteenth century the two literatures evince a considerable level of interpenetration. This fact alone should act as a deterrent for any critic keen to maximize the differences between North and South, and might rather be expected to stimulate the search for still further links and parallels.

One such was proposed almost a century ago by William Courthope, writing of Sir David Lindsay: "I think it is also probable that his poems suggested the composition of *The Mirror for Magistrates*."²⁸ Courthope was thinking here of the *Dialog betuix Experience and ane Courteour* and also of the *Tragedie of the Cardinal*. The latter work was Lindsay's response to the murder of David Beaton in his castle of St. Andrews, in May 1546.²⁹ According to Hamer, the poem was first printed by John Scot at Dundee or St. Andrews in 1547, and from this lost original the London print of the following year is assumed to derive.³⁰ In the prologue (*ll.* 1-42) Lindsay tells how he sat in his oratory reading "mony tragedie and storie" (*l.* 4) by "Ihone Bochas," when David, "that cairfull Cardinall" (*l.* 38) appeared to him and besought him to set down the story of his life. The ensuing poem is cast in the form of a first-person narrative and consists of a review (*ll.* 43-252) of Beaton's career in all its flagitiousness, with as climax the half-hour in which the potentate was deposed from his seat (*ll.* 253-73); this is followed by the cardinal's advice to his fellow prelates (*ll.* 274-343) and to the princes (*ll.* 344-434). The genre of medieval tragedy was already familiar from Chaucer's *Monk's Tale*, and John Lydgate had translated Laurent de Premierfait's French version of Boccaccio's *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium* in his mammoth work, *The Fall of Princes*.³¹ What is new in Lindsay's poem is that the old genre is adopted for detailed, satirical comment on the contemporary political scene. As with many specimens of the type, the tragedy is not wholly self-consistent in tone: in the longest part of the poem the dead protagonist recounts his deeds with shameless braggadocio, only to switch later

²⁷*The Complaynt of Scotland*, ed. A. M. Stewart, STS, 4th Series, 11 (1979), 50-1.

²⁸W. J. Courthope, *A History of English Poetry*, 6 vols. (London, 1895-1910), II, 103.

²⁹On which event see Margaret H. B. Sanderson, *Cardinal of Scotland: David Beaton, c. 1494-1546* (Edinburgh, 1986), pp. 226-30.

³⁰*Works of Lindsay*, ed. Hamer, IV, 19-23.

³¹*The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson (Boston, 1987), pp. 240-52; *Lydgate's Fall of Princes*, ed. Henry Bergen, EETS, Extra Series, 121-4 (London, 1924-7).

to words of stern admonishment; but the overall result is nonetheless highly effective.

Before examining the *Mirror for Magistrates*, that famous collection of tragedies which supplied many plots to Elizabethan dramatists, I should like to mention briefly a work which in many ways resembles and anticipates it: namely, the *Metrical Visions* of George Cavendish, mostly written c. 1552-54.³² Like its longer congener, it consists of a series of tragedies, spoken in the first person; they are linked by the reflections of the author himself, who rounds everything off with a laudatory epitaph upon Mary Tudor. The first tragedy is that of Thomas Wolsey, of whom Cavendish also wrote a celebrated prose life.³³ Although Wolsey died before Beaton [November 29, 1530], both are presented as careful cardinals, and it is entirely possible that in his poem Cavendish was influenced by Lindsay's example. The editor of the *Metrical Visions*, furthermore, notes that Cavendish may have been on friendly terms with William Forrest:³⁴ not only were both men ardent admirers of Mary Tudor, but Forrest's *History of Grisild the Second*—in which Katharine of Aragon plays Griselde to Henry VIII's Walter—seems to bear some relationship to the *Life of Wolsey* (incidentally, in the *History of Grisild* Forrest specifically records the devotions of the Queen among none other than the Greenwich Observants.)³⁵

The *Mirror for Magistrates* was printed first in a suppressed edition of 1555, and was reissued in 1559, 1563, 1571, 1574, 1578, and 1587.³⁶ Four authors—William Baldwin, George Ferrers, Thomas Chaloner and Thomas Phaer—were responsible for the tragedies in the first edition, and other poets made contributions to the later versions: namely, Thomas Sackville, Thomas Churchyard, John Dolman, Francis Seager, "Master Cavyl," and Raphael Holinshed. The central figure in the prose passages which connect the

³²George Cavendish, *Metrical Visions*, ed. A. S. G. Edwards (Columbia, SC, 1980), pp. 8-9.

³³George Cavendish, *The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey*, ed. Richard S. Sylvester, EETS, Original Series, 243 (London, 1959).

³⁴Edwards, p. 12.

³⁵William Forrest, *The History of Grisild the Second*, ed. W. D. Macray, Roxburghe Club, 101 (London, 1875), p. 47.

³⁶*The Mirror for Magistrates*, ed. Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1938); *Parts added to "The Mirror for Magistrates,"* ed. Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1946); Lily B. Campbell, *Tudor Conceptions of History and Tragedy in "A Mirror for Magistrates"* (Berkeley, CA, 1936).

tragedies is William Baldwin, whose *Treatise of Moral Philosophy* was printed by John Wayland for Edward Whitechurch in 1547; this book was frequently reprinted, and supplied several poems to George Bannatyne's collection.³⁷ The Catholic Wayland was also the printer of an edition of Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, and the *Mirror for Magistrates* was explicitly conceived as a continuation of the work of the fifteenth-century poet. Here we have another sign of the persistence of a taste for medieval poetry in the reign of Mary Tudor. The later printings, however, which were published under Elizabeth, demonstrate that post-Lydgatian tragedy had an equal attraction for Protestants. In the edition of 1578, indeed, Thomas Churchyard contributed a tragedy of Wolsey, which contains sharp criticism of the Church, as one might expect:

O let mee curse, the popish Cardnall hat,
 Those myters big, beset with pearle and stones,
 And all the rest, of trash I know not what,
 The saints in shrine, theyr flesh and rotten bones,
 The maske of Monkes, deuised for the nones,
 And all the flocke, of Freers, what ere they are,
 That brought mee vp, and left mee there so bare,
 (ll. 337-43)³⁸

Neither Cavendish nor Churchyard is quite so pungent as Lindsay, but the poems of both may have owed much to the Scottish poet's example.

The *Mirror for Magistrates* has still other points of interest for Scottish readers. In the first edition occurs the tragedy of *King James the First*, or "King Iamy," who is said to have fallen from fortune as a result of his breaking oaths and bonds of friendship.³⁹ In the 1587 edition, inserted just before Churchyard's *Wolsey* (which is the final piece), one finds the two tragedies of *King James the Fourth* and of *The bataile of Brampton, or Floddon fielde*. These were taken from an old manuscript, said to have been "pende aboue fifty yeares agone [i.e. before 1537], or euen shortly after the death of the sayd King [1513]."⁴⁰ English interest in Flodden was not inconsiderable, and produced, among other works, the poems *Scottish Feilde* and

³⁷*The Bannatyne Manuscript* (facsimile), ed. Denton Fox and William A. Ringler (London, 1980), p. xli.

³⁸*Mirror for Magistrates*, ed. Campbell, pp. 495-511.

³⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 155-60.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 488.

Flodden Feilde.⁴¹ Despite the late date of the *Mirror for Magistrates*, the two Scottish tragedies in fact stem from not long after the battle itself, and both deserve to be considered in any investigation of the impact of James IV on literature.

To sum up so far: it is possible that Lindsay's *Tragedie of the Cardinal* may have inspired the *Mirror for Magistrates*, either as a direct influence, or via Cavendish's *Metrical Visions*, or via both routes. But in any event, Lindsay's *Tragedie* stands in clear affinity with the *De Casibus* tradition, best known in English literature through Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*. Scotland, most certainly, did not escape the Lydgatian influence; the study of literary relations, in this case, rather involves the study of what was done in the two countries with the same influence.⁴²

It does not often happen that the literatures of Scotland and England deal with precisely the same topic, but when they do they provide opportunities for another kind of literary relationship. The poems composed to commemorate the capture of Edinburgh Castle in May 1573 from the forces of Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange—the one by Sempill, the other by Churchyard—are such a pair.⁴³ Both give vivid accounts of the artillery used by either side, with Sempill exulting in the "Bumbard" and "Pot Gun" (ll. 100-101) and Churchyard in the devastation wrought by the cannon, "roeryng Meg" (l. 89); both play on the inviolateness of the "Maiden Castle" (Sempill l. 171; Churchyard, l. 70); both mention the trench dug to enclose the besieged and to permit the undermining of the walls (l. 90; l. 106).

⁴¹ *Scottish Feilde and Flodden Feilde; Two Flodden Poems*, ed. Ian F. Baird (New York and London, 1982).

⁴² It seems necessary to say this, to counter Kratzmann's systematic downplaying of Lydgatian influence on Middle Scots literature. For example, Dunbar is said (p. 148) to have been too lively to attempt the "soberly ambitious labour of a *Troy Book* or a *Fall of Princes*," and Lydgate's *Troy Book* is invoked (p. 169) as a contrast to Douglas's *Eneados*, in illustration of the different tastes in Scotland and England in 1513. However this may be, one should not forget that another Middle Scots poet (formerly taken to be John Barbour) composed at least parts of a *Troy Book*, in the Lydgatian manner: *Barbour's Legendensammlung nebst den Fragmenten seines Trojanerkrieges*, ed. C. Horstmann, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1881-2; rpt. 1967), II, 215-304. Kratzmann notes (p. 15) with surprise that stanzas from the *Fall of Princes* even appear in a Gaelic MS (The Book of the Dean of Lismore), but this is entirely symptomatic of the contemporary regard for Lydgate—in both countries.

⁴³ *Satirical Poems of the Time of the Reformation*, ed. James Cranstoun, STS, 20, 24, 28, 30 (1891-3), I, 262-74; II, 174-88. Churchyard's poem is reproduced in an Appendix, II, 271-83.

There are, of course, also differences: Sempill gives more information concerning the whole campaign and the parts played by the valorous besiegers, while Churchyard lets rhetoric compensate for detail:

Nowe cannons roerd and bullets bownst lyk bawls;
 Nowe throwe the throng the tronks of wieldfier flue;
 Nowe totring towrrs tyept down with rotten wawls;
 Nowe som pakt hens, that neuer said a due;

(ll. 113-6).

For Churchyard the victory is quite simply one of the English over the Scots; for Sempill, however, it is the victory of the combined forces of English and Scots in "ane godlie quarrel" (l. 176) over the Marian faction, led astray by Secretary Maitland that "cruikit Ethnik and ane crewall Tod" (l. 192). There is much of interest in these poems for the study of history and literature. The very existence of the Churchyard poem testifies to the real interest in Scottish affairs currently being taken in England, and Sempill's poem, with its fraternal regard for the Protestant, English soldiery, is a landmark in national attitudes moving away from—for example—the xenophobia of Blind Harry.

It will be evident that the subject of Anglo-Scottish literary relations cannot be adequately treated in the space available here. Yet I hope to have shown that it is a subject which is far from exhausted, and one which offers many possibilities. In order that the possibilities may be perceived and exploited, all that is required is a reconsideration of what has hitherto been understood by such a topic. Further research into patterns of cultural interpenetration should reveal the overall extent to which the early literatures of Scotland and England received influence from without and from each other. This context of connection, with its implications for cultural history as a whole, ought not to be underestimated when comparative value-judgments are passed on the merits of the literary masterpieces.

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen