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Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis Again

Miss Anna Mill has recently replied\(^1\) to Professor John MacQueen's article\(^2\) on Sir David Lindsay's *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*. MacQueen had argued for a relatively full version of the play composed and performed in the earlier fifteen-thirties. Miss Mill knowledgeably supported the traditional view that the earliest version was presented at Linlithgow in 1540 and that this "interlude" was later considerably expanded for performances at Cupar in 1552 and Edinburgh in 1554. Almost simultaneously with the appearance of her essay, in Britain A. A. M. Duncan, professor of Scottish history at the University of Glasgow, accepted MacQueen's proposal in a historical note for the very successful revival of the play in Glasgow.\(^3\) At the same time I had in draft an answer opposing MacQueen's theory.

These differences of opinion about the development of the play, as well as still another production of it, evince an interest in Lindsay which he and his work certainly deserve. I have eliminated from my reply those points which Miss Mill has already sufficiently made and offer the observations which follow. Combined with hers, they may argue more strongly still against the proposed "early" play. It seems proper to begin by quoting MacQueen's conclusions at some length:

[The points of argument] suggest that the 1552 performance was a revival of a play, which was then twenty years old. They also suggest that in 1540 only a truncated version of the original play was produced at Linlithgow. . . . the evidence suggests that the episode of Wantones and Sensualitie, that of False, Plaistrie and Dissrait and that of Dame Chasitie were in existence by the middle thirties at latest. It is less certain, but still very probable that John the Commoun-weill too had by this time made his appearance. I can offer no certain evidence on the Tailor and Souter, the Pauper-Pardoner episode, or the sermon of Foly, but

\(^1\) "The Original Version of Lindsay's *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*," *Studies in Scottish Literature*, VI (October, 1968), 67-75.


\(^3\) Six performances, 26 April through 2 May, sponsored by the Departments of Drama, Scottish History and Literature, and Arts Theatre Group. Professor Duncan probably did not see Miss Mill's essay before he composed his note.
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it does seem altogether probable that the play reached what is essentially its present form in the fifteen-thirties, and was altered in minor ways for the 1552 performance. If that is so, it is very likely that the first performance was in Cupar in the immediate neighborhood of Lindsay's home, the Mount, perhaps on some occasion when James V visited the town.\footnote{Pp. 141-142.}

Apparently his argument would be for composition and performance some time after December 1530, because this is the date of Lindsay's Testament of the Papyngo\footnote{The Works of Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, ed. Douglas Hamer, Scottish Text Society, 4 vols. (Edinburgh and London, 1931-1936), III, 65-67.} and MacQueen proposes that Lindsay adapted a portion of that poem for the Chastitie episode.\footnote{Pp. 140-141.} A terminal date would seem to be James V's first departure on 23 July, 1536, for his marriage in France.\footnote{Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, VI, lx.}

In arguing for the early version, MacQueen does not discuss external evidence, and admittedly the absence of specific mention of such a play in contemporary records is not proof against it, for the records are lamentably fragmentary.\footnote{Anna Mill, Mediasval Plays in Scotland (Edinburgh and London, 1927), pp. 96 ff.} Still, it needs to be acknowledged that there is no contemporary mention of the postulated play. Its performance would logically have been at Cupar (because of the great number of references to that burgh and its environs in the versions of 1552 and 1554), perhaps in the presence of James V. According to the Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, James was in Cupar on only one occasion in the earlier thirties when the season of the year was appropriate for the performance—July 1534—\footnote{VI, 223.} and at that time Lindsay, whose presence can reasonably be assumed for the production, had been in France since February.\footnote{\textit{See below.}} Miss Mill long ago disposed of George Chalmers' claim for a 1555 performance in Cupar.\footnote{"Representations of Lyndsay's Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis," PMLA, XLVII (1932), 641-645. In the same article she acknowledged the remote possibility of a performance in Perth some time in or before 1542, but her recent essay does not repeat the suggestion. Cf. Hamer, IV, 156-157.}

Still another factor weighs against the early, full version of Ane Satyre. By January 1529, Lindsay had assumed the duties of the chief
herald of Scotland, and he was employed on several successive diplomatic journeys to the continent: to Flanders (early June-October 1531); to France (late March-November 1532); to France (February-August 1534); to London and then France (early August 1535- ? ); to France ( ? November 1536-January 1537).\textsuperscript{13} Hamer very sensibly suggested that Lindsay's known production of only two shorter occasional poems between the end of 1530 and the middle of 1537 was due to his preoccupation with these missions.\textsuperscript{14} One notes too that the journeys just outlined restrict the times when Lindsay was in Scotland during late spring or summer, when performance of the play would have taken place.

To be fair to MacQueen, it is upon internal evidence of extant versions of the play and of Lindsay's early poems that he bases his argument. As I understand it, that argument rests upon two interrelated theses:

1. King Humaneitie in the 1552 and 1554 versions is to be identified with James V. The character of the King in the 1540 interlude has only a minor part. It is unlikely that Lindsay created the "full" portrayal of James some ten years after the monarch's death. Therefore the full characterization with most of its attendant episodes existed in a version of the earlier fifteen-thirties, was reduced for the shorter 1540 performance, and then resurrected, as it were, for 1552 and 1554.

2. This thesis is bolstered by the fact that Lindsay in the 1552 and 1554 versions has closely adapted or even borrowed verbatim from certain poems which he addressed to James from 1528 to 1530, viz., the Dreme, the Complaynt, and the Testament of the Patryno. In their original contexts these adapted passages refer to, among other things, the youth, inexperience, sexual indulgence, and future marriage of the king. Reappearing in reference to King Humanitie, they argue for the early full play in which King Humanitie represented James.

It is quite clear that the King in the 1540 interlude is to be identified with James, as the summary of Poor Man's speech attests.\textsuperscript{15} But I

\textsuperscript{13} Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, XVI, xlv-li; Hamer, IV, 288-290. Lindsay did not receive the formal title of Lyon King of Arms until somewhat later.

\textsuperscript{14} The evidence is reviewed in Hamer, IV, Appendix I, 254 ff., and Anna Mill, "The Insence of the Continental Drama on Lyndsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis.'" MLR, XXV (1930), 426-429. Since notices of the returns to Scotland of various other emissaries in 1535-1536 do not mention Lindsay, it is possible that he remained away from Scotland from August 1535 until February 1537. If he returned to Scotland during that time, as acting chief herald he probably accompanied James V to France in September 1536.

\textsuperscript{15} IV, xxi-xxii.

Hamer, II, 5.
argue, even more strongly perhaps than Miss Mill, that it is incorrect so
to identify King Humanitié of 1552 and 1554. When Lindsay expanded
the original interlude, King Humanitié became not James V, who had
been dead since 1542, but a traditional morality protagonist who repre-

One model of King Humanitié was clearly the English (and Scott-

tish?) morality character who succumbs to the blandishments of vice
characters and then undergoes repentance and redemption with the aid
of characters representing virtues and virtuous counsel. It should be
noted that in the extant English moralities the protagonist’s youthfulness
and his temptation and often surrender to sexual indulgence are com-
monplace. The characteristic of youthfulness is explicit or clearly implied
Infans, Magnificence, Youth, Nature of the Four Elements, Wit and
Science, and Lusty Juventus. Sexual temptation figures significantly
in the plays just cited and in Mankind.

Add to this that Lindsay found the traits of youthfulness and sexual
indulgence not only in James V but in his predecessors on the Scottish
throne. David II acceded at the age of five, James I at twelve, James II
at six, James III at eight, James IV at fifteen, and James V at less than
two. Robert I is credited with six illegitimate children, Robert II with
eight, Robert III with two, James II with one, James IV with five, and
James V with seven. Attributing an extensive knowledge of Scottish
royal history to Lindsay is quite reasonable since it is consonant with
his duties as herald-genealogist.

It might be objected that in 1552 the monarch of Scotland was
young Mary Stewart, with whose womanhood King Humanitié jars il-
logically. But Lindsay’s Monarchie, composed 1548-1553, makes it
clear that he disapproves of women as rulers, and that he hopes for
the reign of a king:

I trust to se gude reformatione
From tyme we gete ane faithfull prudent king
Quhilk knewis the treuth and his vocatione.

Though not claiming Lindsay’s indebtedness to any particular play, I have
limited citations to those moralities whose anterior dates for composition
precede 1548.

*H*and*book of Britis*h Chronology, ed. Sir F. Maurice Powicke and R. B.

Sir Archibald Dunbar, *Scottish Kings* (Edinburgh, 1899), pp. 142 ff.;

Hamer, III, 237-238.

Hamer, I, 295, II. 3247-3250.

*ibid.*, 276, II. 2605-2607.
I urge, then, that Lindsay found a congruence between the erring young King of Scots in past history and the traditional morality protagonist. King Humanitie is not to be identified specifically with James V, although the latter shared the youthfulness and indulgence of his predecessors and of the morality protagonist.

Alleging the general inferiority of the 1540 version to the later ones, MacQueen argues for the early, more dramatic play because he believes "sufficiently in Lindsay's ability as an entertainer and dramatist."22 One asks, however, which view of the versions of Ane Satyre better attests Lindsay's stature as dramatist. That Lindsay revived in 1552 and 1554 a reform drama whose protagonist was to be identified with a monarch who had been dead for a decade or more and who had failed to achieve any effective large-scale reformation in either state or church? Or that Lindsay around 1550 turned to the composition of a timely and greatly expanded drama in which a representative King of Scots is redeemed from youthful folly and leads his Parliament to direly needed reformation of both state and church? Surely, I think, the latter.

The topical parallels adduced by MacQueen seem rather vague or untenable. For instance, it is not at all necessary to see the allusions to King Humanitie's future marriage as referring to that of James V. They simply reflect the recurrent and inevitable concern for royal marriages which would be diplomatically advantageous and would produce heirs for the throne.

I quite disagree that Lady Sensualitie in an early version was "to some degree a satiric portrait of James V's divorced mistress, Margaret Erkine, Lady Lochleven."23 Whatever favor Lindsay enjoyed from James, he would not have dared in a public play to depict as a harlot24 the woman who bore one of James' illegitimate sons in 1531 and whom James seriously considered making his wife and queen as late as the summer of 1536.25 It might be noted in passing that George Buchanan incurred her enmity—perhaps by referring to her failure to marry the king—and she played an important part in forcing him to leave Scotland.26

22 P. 136. Miss Mill has her own shrewd answer to this point ("Original Version,"
pp. 68-69, 74).

23 MacQueen, p. 139.

24 Hamer, II, 175, II, 1707, 1720; IV, n. to ll. 271-294.


Miss Mill has given her own good reason for remaining unconvinced by the identification of Dissait with Archibald Douglas (Treasurer from October 1526 until July 1528) and Falset with Sir Thomas Erskine (Secretary from October 1526 until January 1543).\textsuperscript{27} Admittedly there were grounds for satirizing Douglas, and Lindsay probably did so in the Complaynt.\textsuperscript{28} Douglas and other members of his powerful family kept James virtually a prisoner from 1526 until 1528, conducted the government to their own advantage, and may have tried to stop Lindsay’s salary.\textsuperscript{29} But I submit that Lindsay could not reasonably have paired Erskine with Douglas in the two Vice roles. Erskine had been educated at Favia, was partly responsible for the founding of the College of Justice, and was for many years apparently a very capable servant of the Crown.\textsuperscript{30} The incident of the theft of King Humanitie’s box cannot be effectively argued as supporting an early version.

“The vivid irruption of John the Common-weiill in the Dreame, as in Ane Satyre, is a parallel which speaks for itself.”\textsuperscript{31} This alleges that Lindsay, after developing this highly effective character in a play of the fifteen-thirties, discarded him in favor of Poor Man in the 1540 interlude, and then revived John in 1552. It seems more reasonable to believe that in expanding for the 1552 play, Lindsay retained Poor Man from the interlude and fashioned the rich role for John, building from his appearance in the Dreame.

Other parallels cited by MacQueen in Ane Satyre—references to nuns, to Lindsay’s complaint about inadequate pay, to the College of Justice, to English translations of the New Testament—seem to me incapable of provable significance in argument for the early version.

Miss Mill concludes her excellent essay with the modest statement that she finds the postulated play “a little hard to accept.” On the basis of her observations and my own inspection of the evidence, I find the theory, though ingeniously presented, very difficult to entertain.

I question another suggestion in MacQueen’s article. Commenting on the Banns in the 1552 version, he observes:

\textsuperscript{27} MacQueen, p. 139; Mill, "Original Version," p. 71; Handbook of British Chronology, pp. 181, 187.

\textsuperscript{28} Hamer, I, 45, ii. 195-197.


\textsuperscript{30} Donaldson, Scotland, pp. 42, 46; R. K. Hannay, The College of Justice (Edinburgh, 1933), p. 49.

\textsuperscript{31} MacQueen, p. 137.
The fact too that [the Nuntius] is introducing a kind of trailer—a short farce intended to whet the appetite of the locals for the main attraction to be performed a day or two later—suggests a well established tradition; even perhaps that he belonged to a permanent travelling company of the kind which performed the N-town cycle of miracle plays in East Anglia. 82

With "well established tradition" one immediately agrees, recalling Miss Mill’s finding long ago that proclamations were part of the routine in Scotland. 83 But the permanent travelling company is very conjectural indeed. In her careful investigation of the records of early Scottish drama, Miss Mill found some evidence for travelling groups of minstrels (not necessarily actors), principally in edicts against unlicensed minstrels. 84 But she conceded that the statement that "professional stage-players or companies were in the regular pay of the Scottish court from an early date must be accepted with reserve." 85 If there is not conclusive evidence for such companies at court, it is hard to believe in permanent travelling companies of professional actors. 88

Further, argument by analogy with the N-town proclamation is weak. The increasingly cogent evidence for locating this cycle at Lincoln tends to undermine the formerly held belief in the performance of these plays by a professional travelling company. In his arguments for staging at Lincoln, Hardin Craig does not commit himself on the point. 87 More recently Kenneth Cameron and Stanley Kahl concede payment to some actors at Lincoln and the possibility that the cycle, or part of it, may have been presented in other places; but they deny that the use of professional actors was invariably at Lincoln in the late fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries. 88 The performances of these plays a Lincoln will probably be ultimately attributed to amateurs and to some paid, experi-

82 P. 130.
84 Mediaeval Plays, Chapter II and Appendix II.
86 That English companies visited Scotland in the late sixteenth century is, of course, a matter of recorded fact (Mill, Mediaeval Plays, pp. 299 ff.).
enced actors (not members of a permanent travelling company) under the auspices of the Lincoln guilds and clergy.

It may also be noted that the travelling companies in England in the earlier and mid-sixteenth century usually numbered four to six actors, whose practice of doubling in roles made possible their staging of plays.59 By David Bevington's count and my own, even allowing for all possible doubling, the 1552 and 1554 performances of Ane Satyre required casts of at least thirty.60 Obviously Scotland, poorer and less populous than England, could not support a travelling company of anything like that size.

MacQueen's later remark that the play "was obviously performed by a company of reasonably professional actors"61 is less suppositional than the earlier one, if he means that the cast included a nucleus of persons who had had experience in acting and who may well have been paid for their performance. Still, I think that the majority of the players were not professional actors in the modern sense. The use of a considerable number of amateurs (emphatically the case at the Cupar performance) would testify to the vitality and popularity of drama in mid-sixteenth-century Scotland and, incidentally, Lindsay's skill as producer-director.

The publication of two rejoinders to Professor MacQueen's essay should in no way reflect upon the learning and perspicuousness of several points that he sets forth in it: details of the staging of the 1552 performance; the excellent hypothesis that Bannatyne copied his portions of Ane Satyre in 1568 from prompt-copies of the Cupar play, and that Charteris printed his edition in 1602 from Lindsay's manuscript version of the Edinburgh play; the argument, which cannot be made too often, that the qualities of Lindsay's play indicate the caliber and popularity of early plays in Scotland, although only Ane Satyre and Philotus survive; and the well-grounded observation about the importance of satire in late fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Scottish literature as a whole.

Smith College

60 Ibid., pp. 70, 128.
61 P. 142.