The one may be questioned as well as the other. Some anti-confessor or anti-martyr to the same fort of prejudice, may determine the question as affirmatively on the one fide, as they have done it on the other. And how shall we, who are not for being confessors or martyrs to either, be able to determine betwixt them? One answer will be effectual to both. We have fome remains, as Dr. Robertson himself allows, of the French copy that was exhibited by Murray. We have also fome remains, as every one must allow, of the Scotch copy exhibited by him. "In the Scot-"tish translation of the Detection," fays the Doctor, "two or three fentences of the original "French were prefixed to each letter, which " breaking off with an &c. the Scottish trans-" lation of the whole followed."* And I have already given some passages out of the original Scotch, which the commissioners at York have afforded me. But are these passages, and these fentences, greatly different from those in the prefent copies? No! Are they different in any one important word? No! They are nearly to a word the fame in Scotch. They are actually the fame to a word in French. This Dr. Robertson himfelf admits. And where therefore, in the name of common-fense, can a possibility of doubt be lodged? No where within the regions of commonfense. But in that refinement of understanding, which is only the refult of difingenuousness, and which is a kind of intellectual juggle that an uncandid mind exercises upon itself, there will still be scope for evasion. These passages, so exactly the fame in the Doctor's pretended original and the present copy of the French, may have been, he will be bold to suppose, and actually were, he will be more bold to affert, taken from that original into the present copy; and so came to be exactly the same in both. "The French editor," the Doctor tells us, " laid hold of these sentences, " and tacked his own translation to them." And the extracts from the Scotch may be also afferted by an antagonist of equal bravery, if such a one can be met with, to have been equally borrowed by the present copy from the letters of the commissioners at York, and for that reason to be so entirely conformable in both. When the human mind once puts itself under the dominion of chicane, it is constantly punished by its own folly. Its vigour is debilitated by its fraudulence. The flrength of the lion finks into the wily weakness of the fox. And, in the just retributions of providence, the dishonesty is repaid by ridiculouineis.

This will appear still more strongly, if we consider the conduct of these brother-champions for credulity in another view. They are eminent patterns of that very credulity, which they want to ensorce upon us.

They are themselves the Great Sublime they draw.

They want to fix our faith upon an imaginary copy of the French letters, which once

* Diff. 34.

(they say) existed upon earth, but is now in nubibus; or rather is mounted to the moon,

As all things loft on earth are treasured there.

There it is secure from all the calamities of life. No critick eye can follow it thither, and expose its pretentions to originality. It there may rest with all its infirmities about it, safe from the GOODALLS of every age,

Safe where no criticks damn, no fierds moleft; embalmed in dews of æther, and configned to a peaceful immortality.

Manibus date lilia plenis, Purpurcos ípargam flores, animamque nepotis His faltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani Munere.

And every one must applaud the wisdom of thefe gentlemen, in the fudden translation of the original to fuch a flate of repose, just at a time when the voice of war was beginning to diffurb it in its old possessions, and to threaten even its very existence. But alas! all human wisdom is greatly tempered with folly. In this act of prudent attention to one point of the charge against Mary, they forget another. In their zeal to lodge the French original in fome unknown fphere, they deprive themselves of any original at all. The present Scotch is merely a version. The present French is also a version. And the present Latin is equally one with both. The Scotch is also afferted by Messieurs Robertson and Hume, to be very faulty. The Latin is allowed by them to be

still more fo. And the great faultiness of the French, is their principal argument for its spurioufnefs. All may be exceedingly vitiated. Each certainly differs from the other. This argues all to have been strangely corrupted, as we have no original for the trial of any. The French particularly, we know to talk egregious nonfense at times. It changes Mary's letter of adultery into her BIBLE, that edition of it anticipated (I suppose), in which the commandment ran, "thou " shalt commit adultery." It confounds her letter again with her first day's journey; and so makes her to promife, with a happy Hibernism, to finish this her first day's journey the NEXT DAY. It even mistakes irkit for nakit, strips the delicate Queen in the month of January and at the hour of midnight, and keeps her in this fituation " toute nuë," without even the cover of a smock upon her, writing a long letter to her lover. How can we rely, then, upon the testimony of fuch a blundering witness as this? And, what is more, as the Scotch can depose to what it knows at fecond hand only, so the Latin and the French can attest only at third and at fourth hand. The original French, now ev coyiois, all bleffings be upon it there! transmitted its intelligence to the Scotch; the Scotch imparted it to the Latin; and the Latin communicated it to the baftard French. This is furely that very

Which touch'd the ruff, which touch'd Queen Befs's china

To fuch hearfay, fuch vitiated, and fuch conri 2 tradictory tradictory evidences are we now reduced, by difpatching the original away from earth. With fuch a preposterous policy, have these two advocates for the letters been labouring to defend their genuineness, that they have almost annihilated their credibility. And the friends of innocence may well be allowed, to point the finger of triumphant scorn at the fight, and to cry out with the tone of triumphant language upon it,

—'Tis the sport to see the engineer Hoist with his own petar.

Nor can I refrain from adding one observation more in the same strain, in order to chastise properly this uncandid spirit of argumentation, in Dr. Robertson particularly. He objects to Mr. Goodall the circuitous route, which his remarks upon the three translations shewed to have been taken, in the French being translated from the Latin and the Scotch fuccessively. Mr. Goodall, he fays, " accounts for THIS STRANGE SUCCESes sion of TRANSLATIONS, by supposing that " when the forgery was projected, no person could " be found capable of writing originally in the " French language, letters which would pass for "the Queen's; for that reason they were first " composed in Scottish; but unluckily the French " interpreter, it would feem, did not understand "that language; and therefore Buchanan trans-" lated them into Latin, and from his Latin they "were rendered into French. Goodall, i. 79, "80." I have affigned a reason for there being both a Scotch and a French copy of the letters, that

that is very different from this, and more biftorical. "It is fcarce necessary to observe, that " no proof whatever is produced of any of these " fuppolitions." The Doctor here fpeaks at the best, with an unguarded amplitude of expression; as the main suppositions are all proved demonstratively, that the letters were first composed in Scotch, that they were thence translated into Latin, and that from the Latin they were again translated into French. "The manners of the "Scots in that age, when almost every man of " rank spent a part of his youth in France, and "the intercourse between the two nations was " great, render it altogether improbable" [as if the FACT was not plain], " that so many com-" plicated operations should be necessary, in order " to procure a few letters to be written in the " French language." * Yet how does Dr. Robertfon mend the matter? Instead of " this " ftrange fuccession of translations," he has reduced us, no doubt, to one fingle translation; or perhaps has overleaped them all, and carried us to the original at once. And " fo many com-" plicated operations" will thus be discharged for ever, by that fimplifying principle of underflanding, which is the peculiar happiness of genius. Yet, when we come to examine, we find ourselves disappointed. The "many compli-" cated operations" are still left at work. The "frange fuccession of translations" is still continued on the file. And all these objections to

Mr. Goodall's fystem, stand in equal force against bis own.

But is this possible to be true, with a writer of Dr. Robertson's reputation? It is not only possible. It is actually true. And even upon the Doctor's own hypothesis, the present French was translated from the present Latin, and the present Latin was translated from the present Scotch. "This French translator," fays Dr. Robertson afterwards, "does not pretend to pubso lish the original French letters, as written by " the Queen herfelf; he expressly declares that " he translated them from the Latin. Goodall, i. " 103. Had our author attended to all these " circumftances," this and others, " he might " have faved himfelf the labour of fo many crier ticisms, to prove that the present French copy of the letters is a translation from the Latin. "The French editor himfelf acknowledges it, " and fo far as I know no perfon ever denied it."* We are therefore left by the Doctor upon the old ground of "improbability," on which he pretended to take us up. But, what is much more, we are actually left upon it, with an additional load of "improbability" on our shoulders. The very chain of abfurdity, of which the Doctor complains, is lengthened by him almost while he is complaining, and actually receives an addition of one link more from his bands. Before, the Scotch was the original, and the Latin and French were progressively translations from it. Now, the Scotch is equally a translation with the Latin and French, and all mediately or immediately from

a new original of the Doctor's own fabrication in French. We have thus one step more added to the slight before; and by the very artist who laughed at the number before, and who pretended to make the approach with sewer. Such was the promise, and such is the performance, in this curious specimen of literary quackery!

But this is not all. The reason affigned, why the French copy of the letters could not be thus a translation from the Scotch through the Latin, the reflection of the reflection of a rainbow; is this. At that time, fays the Doctor, "almost " every man of rank spent a part of his youth in " France," and "the intercourse between the two " nations was great." " These," the Doctor adds, " render it altogether improbable, that fo " many complicated operations should be neces-" fary, in order to procure a few letters to be " written in the French language." Yet, at that very time, these very operations were used, by the Doctor's own account, to procure a few letters to be translated into the French language. And, what is the crowning part of the contradiction, these very operations were used to procure a French translation, when there was a French original existing at the very time, and when this original had been written without fuch a complexity of operations.

But I will push the good Doctor no farther. Theology and history owe too much to him, to let him be pressed too sharply, even when he is most wanton in his attacks, and most weak in his weapons. And I go on to observe, that the facts,

114

which I have previously stated, preclude all this frantic hypothesis of an original, which was just feen, and then ascended to the clouds,

Ostendunt terris hunc tantum fata, neque ultra Esse sinunt;

and which was feen only by Dr. Robertson in its flight upwards,

As Rome's great founder to the Heavens withdrew, To Proculus alone confess'd in view.

The letters were originally Scotch for fixteen months together, from June 1567, when they were pretended to be found, to October 1568, when they were produced to the commissioners at York. They were then, and not till then, translated into French. In French they appeared at Westminster, on the 8th of December following. And, as the translation had been awkwardly made, they betrayed their Scotch extraction so plainly under all their French disguise; that, after Mr. Goodall had pointed it out, his boldest adversaries could not deny it, and were driven by it into a most extravagant supposition, a kind of subtle ether, or nature's abhorrence of a vacuum, or some such speculation of dreaming reason.

The original fabricator of the letters, has been always conjectured hitherto to be the celebrated Buchanan; a man with a head qualified for any department in literature, but with a heart ready for any practice of villainy; and actually one of the affiftants to the rebel commissioners, in the

conferences

conferences at York and Westminster.* have shewn them to have been pretty certainly fabricated by Lethington, who is witneffed expressly by two cotemporary authors, to have forged the handwriting of Mary frequently; † who feemed to love wickedness, for the infidiousness which it enabled him to exercise; who practised all the frauds of villainy, merely to shew the dexterity of his genius in managing them; and who had fuch an habitual propenfity to intrigues, that he plotted against Mary, that he plotted against Murray, that he plotted against all who had any connection with him. And the version of the Scotch letters into French, should naturally have been the task of Buchanans; of Lethington again; to transcribe them. Buchanan had spent many years in France, 1 and was peculiarly adapted for the work from his knowledge of both languages. Yet it is plain, that he was not employed in it. The translation was plainly committed to a perfon, who was totally incompetent to the making of it. This man was compelled to translate the Scotch, by the interposition of a Latin copy. Buchanan, with the indolence of a studious man, with the pride of a scholar, or rather with the infolence of a half-commissioner, devolved the me-

^{*} Goodall, ii. 109, 140, and 307.

[†] Crawford, 114; and Camden's Annals, translation, 116, and original, 143-144.

[‡] See his life written by himself, and prefixed to Ruddiman's edition of his works.

[§] He actually represents himself to have been a commissioner, when he was only an affistant to the commissioners, and when even Lethington was no more. Hist, xix. 372.

chanical employ upon another. He did so afterwards, when he published his own Detectio Mariæ in French. That be published this edition of his Detection in French, and confequently published the French copy of the letters which was inferted in it: is plain from positive evidence at the time. Blackwood, "who next to Lefley was the best informed of all Mary's advocates in that age," as Dr. Robertson himself allows; * and who was so, principally, because he was entrusted with all the papers of Mary's embaffadour in France; † fpeaks in these terms of "Buchanan, homme ingrat, " et desloyal :-- IL a depuis adjousté a cette decla-" mation," the Detection, " un petit libelle du " pretendu mariage du Duc de Norfolk, et de "la facon de son proces, et le tout envoyé" into France.-But he had previously looked out for a Frenchman, to make the translation. This we equally know from a cotemporary writer. " Ice celuy," fays the author of Innocence de Marie, printed in 1572, concerning the Detection, remierement composé (comme il semble) par "George Bucchanan, Escossoys, et depuis traduit " en langue Francoise par un Huguenot." 1 It was published in Latin at London, as I have formerly shewn, about the end of October 1571. And it was republished at London in French, on the 13th of February 1572. But he did fo in

^{*} Diff. 30, and Jebb, ii. 256.

⁺ Jebb, ii. Preface, and Keith, App. 146.

[‡] Jebb, i. 425.

[§] Goodall, i. 38, and Tytler, 72-73.

a point, that comes still nearer to our present one. He had most probably drawn up the sonnets in French, himself. Yet he lest the translation of them into Scotch to another. He lest it to some poor wretch, who seems to have understood neither Scotch nor French, and who has actually made his translation a chaos of both and of neither. So consistently careless does Buchanan appear, in both these operations! And so little stress of seriousness did he and his affociates lay, upon the sonnets and letters at the time; though succeeding generations have taken them up with respect, and have treated them with reverence!

Yet who was the person engaged by Buchanan, in translating the Scotch letters into French for the conference at Westminster? The very same, I suppose, who was employed by him in translating his Detection afterwards. This is highly probable in itself. But, when we consider another circumstance, it becomes more than probable. The very man, who translated the Detection into French, published the letters translated with it; and not merely the three, that were in the original Detection, but all. To the original three of his author, he added the other five. Only, from fome accident, a great part of the French eighth is loft. And this translation of his is the very fame with that, to which the Scotch original, after the conference at Westminster, was obliged to rank as a translation; is the very same that we have at prefent; and is the only French copy, known or likely to have existed at all.

What then was the name of this author? Let the anonymous cotemporary, whom I cited before, tell us. He was "un Huguenot, Poitevin ce (advocat de vocation) CAMUZ, foy difant gen-" tilhomme, et un de plus remarquez seditieux " de France." * And as we may conclude from a blunder in Blackwood, who makes the version to have been formed and printed at ROCHELLE in France, + though it was demonstrably printed in London; he was one of the advocates and protestants of Rochelle, that celebrated capital of protestantism to the year 1628. To this man, pretty certainly, did Buchanan confign the tafk, of making Mary's letters unlearn their native Scotch, and speak in the language of France at last. Camuz was a refugee for his religion. He had nobly renounced his country, refigned his profession, and devoted himself to poverty and exile. The author of Innocence de Marie therefore, with the low turn of men that fix felicity in wealth, hints at his poverty in questioning his gentility. But he was also one of those champions for religion, who brought one of the worst principles of popery into the bosom of protestantism; who were just as ready to facrifice all the laws of morality for the one, as the papifts were for the other; and who stained the bright annals of the reformation, with rebellion and facrilege, with perjury and forgery, with ufurpation, devastation, and murders. And his engaging in this pious fraud of forgery against Mary,

^{*} Jebb, i. 425.

Latin

shews his exile not to have civilized the religious barbarity of his principles, not to have tamed him into a peaceable citizen, and not to have humanized him into an honest man. He was still a knave. But then he was a knave for protestantism still. And, as such, he was a sit inftrument to be employed, in this dark work of affaffination upon the good name of Mary. He was perhaps recommended by Cecil himself, for the employ. Since we have feen the change of the very language carried on by fuch a grofs collusion with Elizabeth and Elizabeth's ministers; we can have no doubt, but she, or Cecil, or both, were privy to all the management of the change. And the man must certainly have been employed by Cecil afterwards, in publishing the. French copy of the letters from his office.

But, after all, Camuz had one great deficiency of knowledge for the work. He was ignorant of the Scottish language; that language, in which the letters had been hitherto written; that language, from which he was now to translate them into French. This indeed was a deficiency of a capital nature. How shall it be supplied? In the fame way, that fome of his countrymen fince are faid to have supplied their ignorance of Homer's Greek, by translating from a Latin copy. His education for his professional employ, had given him a fufficient acquaintance, with the one universal language of European literature. And a Latin copy must be substituted to him, in the room of the Scotch. This was done accordingly. Buchanan had probably turned the letters into

Latin already, with a view to that publication of them in his Latin Detection, which he made . about three years afterward. In this work he should naturally have inferted them all, though he inferted only three. And he actually prefented the work to Elizabeth and to her commiffioners in form, at the Westminster conference.* This Latin copy he communicated to Camuz. The unprincipled refugee went to work upon this fecondary original. He translated as the Latin read. And, as the Latin had read falfely in various places, it drew Camuz and his French copy into various falsehoods. Some of these Buchanan saw and corrected, before he published his Detection and three letters in Latin. Some other person faw and corrected others. And this has produced a flight train of variations, betwixt the Latin and the French of those authors.

Thus translated, the French letters appeared at Westminster as the true originals. Drest up in the second-hand livery of Camuz, they strutted with all the dignity of their masters, assumed the honour of their names, and mocked at all subordination to them. And succeeding times were so little acquainted with the discriminating marks, between the port of a lord and the step of his valet; that they received the one for the other, took the valet into the drawing-room, and lest the lord in the servant's hall.

But, when Camuz came afterwards to publish the French edition of the Detection, he acknow-

^{*} Camden's Annals, translation, 117, and original, 1446

⁺ See next volume for them.

ledged the imposition which had been put upon the commissioners at Westminster, with all that ferenity of impudence, with which Murray had changed the Scotch of the letters into French before. " Au reste," he said to the reader, "les " epiftres mifes fur la fin," which were all the letters except the eighth, " avoient esté escrites er par la Royne, partie en Francois partie en "Escossois, et depuis traduictes entierement en "Latin: mais n'ayant cognoissance de la langue " Escossoise, j'ay mieux aimé exprimer tout ce " que j'ay trouvé en Latin, que me monstrant " trop scrupuleux au changement d'une syllabe, " te frustrer de l' esclaircissement que tu y auras, " pour cognoistre a qui la faute de l'execrable " meurtre, et autres enormitez y contenues, " doivent estre imputées."* In this account of his work, Camuz appears as unprincipled as Buchanan himfelf, and worthy to rank as a translator to fuch an author. He had turned the Scotch letters into French. He knew, therefore, the imputed manufacture of Mary to be bis own fabrication. Yet he supports the forgery. He acknowledges, he had translated the letters into French himself. Yet he supports the forgery still. So thoroughly were all the workings of grace, all the fuggestions of natural conscience, and even all the motions of modefty, overborne in his foul by a villainy, that usurped the title of religion!

He fays, however, that he translated the letters into French, not from the Scotch immediately,

^{*} Goodall, i. 103.

because he was ignorant of the Scottish language, but mediately through the Latin. He thus tells all, that Mr. Goodall discovered near two hundred years afterward. But he told it, because he thought it would be discovered. He had begun to be aware, that he had been led into fome mistakes by the Latin. He therefore tells us of his original. And he intimates his fuspicion expressly, that the Latin had not been " too scru-" pulous in the change of a fyllable." But, if he had "no knowledge of the Scottish language," and was therefore forced to take "what he found " in Latin;" then the letters were originally written in Scotch. This is plain. It is plain from his own account. And the letters appear from his own confession, from the tenour and from the terms of it, to have been all in Scotch, when he began to translate them. He therefore provided himself with a Latin version of them. This was not confined, as has been hitherto understood, to the three which Buchanan published in Latin. If it had been, Camuz could never have translated the other five. It comprised all the eight. Hence all the eight appeared in French at Westminster. Hence also all the eight were published by Camuz in French afterwards, except only one which had been accidentally loft. And Camuz expressly tells us, that he had a Latin copy of all the eight before him at the time, and that he translated all the eight from it into French. The letters, he fays, were "traduictes ENTIERE-" MENT en Latin;" and I, he adds concerning himfelf,

himself, have expressed in French " Tout ce que " j'ay PROUVE EN LATIN."

But Camuz also fays, that the letters which he published were " escrites par la Royne, partie en "Francois, partie en Escossois; et depuis tra-" duictes entierement en Latin." This Dr. Robertfon interprets into an affirmation, " that " Mary had written these letters, partly in French, " partly in Scottish."* The Doctor also endeavours to account for it by a supposition of his own, which is even more extravagant than the imputed affertion of his author. He supposes him to have taken his idea, of the letters being written partly in Scotch and partly in French, from the incident of the Scotch letters carrying a few words of the French at the head of each. How fuch an incident, even under any misconceptions of ignorance, could have given rife to fuch a supposition; it is difficult to fay. But the difficulty is doubled, when we reflect on what the Doctor himself allows, that "this method of " printing translations was not uncommon in that " age." + And the difficulty is mounted up into an impossibility, when we additionally reflect, that these very Scotch letters expressly declared themselves to be a translation from the French. In conformity to the last exhibition of the letters in French, the published Scotch hypocritically professed itself to be merely a version from the French, and to be made word for word from it. 1 But the real fact is this, undifguifed by hypothe-

* Diff. 31.

+ Ibid. 32.

Detection, 129.

tical reasonings, and unobscured by pretended illuminations. Camuz speaks of the eight letters, not as written partly in French, and partly in Scotch, a mode of compoling them, which is as ridiculous as it is false; but as composed some in French and fome in Scotch, and all translated into Latin. He speaks not with a strict accuracy or a full confiftency. But he plainly alludes to a fact. He alludes to the appearances of five letters in Scotch at York, of five in French at Westminster, of ten in Scotch, and of eight in French, there. He was confounded by the complexity of these backward and forward movements, this "cycle " in epicycle, orb in orb." He probably knew them imperfectly. He certainly comprehended them indiffinctly. He therefore speaks confusedly of them, as if some of bis own eight had been written by Mary herself in Scotch, and some in French. And he therefore runs himself into a contradiction, as if one or more of the letters had been originally composed in French; when he acknowledges they were all in Scotch, when he acknowledges they were all translated out of Scotch into Latin, and when he acknowledges that be bimfelf translated them into French from the one, because he was unacquainted with the other. His information struggling in his mind with his knowledge, the notices derived from others with the certainties acquired by his own experience; he related both just as they stood before him, and found himself unable to reconcile them. But we can do what he could not. We first take what he must certainly know, his own condust; his translating

translating the letters into French, his finding them only in Scotch, his being ignorant of this language, his procuring a Latin version, and his turning the Latin into French. These facts being certain, we can afcertain the others by them. As he found the letters only in Scotch, and as he translated them mediately from Scotch into French; there could not possibly be a French copy antecedent to the Scotch, there could only be a Scotch one. We also know the fact to be fo, independently of his testimony. His testimony and the fact now unite together. And Camuz appears from both, clear in what lay within the compass of his own knowledge; confused only in what he had gained from information, confused by his misapprehension of some facts related to him, fo making them run counter a little to his own experience, and writing equally with a bewraying explicitness concerning all.

I have thus stated to my reader the whole history of this French translation, as far as we can trace it by its own records. It is, we see, in a very near correspondency with the facts before. Had it not been, it must have been overborne by them. But, as it is, it serves to confirm them. And it unites with them to shew, that the Scotch was the original to Murray's French, that the Scotch was the original to Camuz's, and that the French of both was as much the same as the Scotch of both. By the final resolution for a French copy of the letters, Murray ventured upon an enormous audacity of impudence, that endangered his whole system. By

the confignment of the translation to Camuz, he risked a disclosure of his knavery from the new confederate. By the badness of Camuz's translation, he actually betrayed the knavery to the penetrating eyes of a critick, in Mr. Goodall; and so gave occasion to the first detection of the letters, that had been hitherto made through a course of nearly two hundred years. And, by the journals of the commissioners, he also furnished me with a proof of the whole forgery, that lay much more obvious to the common eye, that however had lain even more unnoticed than the other, and that greatly heightens the evidence against the authenticity of the letters.*

§ viii. BUT

* In this French edition of the Detection, printed in February 1572, and about three or four months after the Latin and the English editions; and particularly in that additional supplement to it, which was not in the Latin edition, but was first published in the English, and was thence taken into the French; were many errours concerning names and words, that were evidently derived from the English. "Blak Maister Johne Spens," a person so called from his dark complexion, is made into two men, "Blac, Mai-tre," and " Jean Spens" (Detection, iii. and Jebb, i. 330). The translator thus misinterpreted the word "Maister," into a regular firname. He had even given the mifinterpretation before. He had then given it with an interpolation of his own, in order to lend a colouring of fense to his erroneous construction. "Andro Maister of Arrole" he tuined into " André Maister, Sieur d'Errole" (104 and 327). "Eleok" was changed, in both the French and the English, into "Chok" (97 and 324); "Kinros" into "Kinrof" in the English, and "Rinrof" in the French (104 and 327); "Hereis" into "Hereif," English, and "Heierif," French; " Lochinwar" into "Lothinwar," English, and "Bothin-

§ VIII.

BUT there is one point more which I wish to explain, before I close the chapter and the kk3 argument

" war," French; and "Barnebowgal" into "Berne Buxal" and "Vernée Bruxal" (112 and 331). " Johne Hammil-"toun, commendater of Arbroith," was by a flight elifion reduced into a "commander" in English, and appears as 45 Jean Hambleton commandeur de Arbroycht" in French " (112 and 331). "At quhilk tyme" was, by as flight a substitution, made " all quhilk tyme" in English, and " de "tout temps" in French; was taken in both, from the head of a fentence; and was placed by both, in the middle of one (105 and 327). " The langer dirt is hiddin, it is the " ftranger," was by a cafual misprint of the English turned, in the leading word, into "deirt;" was interpreted to mean dearth; and was rendered in French thus, "d'autant plus " qu'on cache la faim, d' autant plus elle s'augmente" (160 and 351). "Hindmest he confessit" became "Hinmest" in English, then rose astonishingly into a person, and appeared " Hinest confessa" in French (160 and 351). " Nouther," which had been invariably printed " neither" before, being accidentally left in its native form at one place, was supposed to be "no uther," and to have lost its accompanying word "time;" and was therefore translated, with a wild perverfion of the fenfe, "fusient forclos cy apres a produire," &c. (113 and 331). And, to close this long bead-roll of blunders, that technical idiom of the Scotch law, "art and part," was three times metamorphofed in English into " acte & "part," and in French into "acte" only for the two first times, the words " & part" being rejected, as impossible to be moulded to any meaning with the other; and into "en "tout et en partie" afterwards, the latter half being now retained, and the former moulded into a conformity with it (103 and 326, 105 and 327, and 113 and 331) and that technical term of law, "dittay," was turned into "adjourne-" ment" and " ajournement" at first, then into "fignifiées," argument together. I have now traced the French copy, from its origin to its publication. I wish

as applied to "lettres," then into "proces," and finally into "accusation" (103 and 326, 103 and 327, 113 and

331, and 113 and 331 again).

Mr. Goodall was the first who observed these, and a thoufand errours befides, which had paffed unnoticed in the hiftory of the letters, for one hundred and eighty years before (i. 197-113). But he drew a conclusion from these, which was very natural indeed, and yet was not just. The same blunders existing nearly in the same form within the English and the French editions of the Detection, he prefumed them to have been derived into the French, immediately from the English. And he inferred the French translator to have actually known the English language, though he expressly declares himfelf to have been ignorant of it.

But this reasoning is not accurate. It is founded upon a false affumption. It consequently partakes of the salfenood of that. The blunders may have been transmitted, mediately, from the English to the French. They may have been transmitted, through the interpolition of the Latin. A Latin translation was actually interposed, in three of the letters. This was even executed by the hand of a Buchanan. Yet it is replete with mistakes. And it has transplanted them all into the French. This therefore stands as a strong argument of analogy, that the fame medium was equally used in the additional supplement. A meaner hand than Buchanan's was engaged, in translating this. The translator was probably an Englishman, and therefore not fo well acquainted as Buchanan necessarily was, with those peculiarities of words and idioms, which diffinguish the language of Northern Britain from that of the Southern. He therefore mifunderstood them. He was not converfant too with those titular and personal appellations, which diferiminate the lords and knights of Scotland from those of England. He therefore mispelled them. The French historians often do fo, to the prefent day; and disfigure the names of foreigners in fuch a wonderful manner, that the foreigners can hardly know themselves again, under also to trace the Scotch. This alone is requisite to wind up the whole of my reasoning here, completely.

under the strange disguise. Then the imperfections of a prefs, in that age negligent and inaccurate beyond any example of modern times, created fome mistakes, which a translator was obliged to copy, because he was unable to correct; and multiplied others, by giving scope to conjectural readings, whenever ignorance found itself perplexed. All would be taken into the Latin translation, and all would be preserved in the French. Some would even be added, and fome would even be improved, by both. This we know to have been actually the case in the letters. And as the French translator expressly declares himself to have been ignorant of the Scottish (or English) language, and to have therefore translated the letters from the Latin; and as this ignorance must have extended to the additional supplement, equally with the letters themselves, we have a decisive evidence, that he translated the letters and the supplement, equally, from a Latin copy; and that all the deformities of the English, which are reflected in the French, are reflected through the mirrour of the Latin.

One of the very deformities above, coincides with all this, and confirms it all. We have feen the Scotch "dirtay" translated "adjournement" and "ajournement," then "fignifiées," then "proces," and finally "accufation." Nor did the French translator, as Mr. Goodall thinks (i. 113), fee "at last" the true meaning of the word, because it was coupled with "inditement," and fo give us "accufation" as an equivalent to it. He found it thus coupled " at last" in 114, and translated it "accufation" in 332. But he had previously found it uncoupled in 113, and yet had translated it "accu-" fation" in 331. He had even found it coupled before in 67, but had actually rendered it "adjournement" in 323. And, what is still more, he had even found the words "ze "ar indytit" in 103, and had rendered them "[vous] etes-" adjourné" in 326. He plainly therefore derived not his information of the meaning from any accompanying explanations in the English copy. He had no accompanying explanations

pletely. I shall therefore go back to some circumstances in its history, which I have not dwelt upon sufficiently before. And the demonstrated fact of its originality, will lead us to some useful conclusions at the end of all.

When the fecond fet of letters was fabricated, for the view of the parliament in December 1567,

explanations at all, in the copy from which he translated. "Dittay or inditement" in 114, and also in 97, were rendered by one word in his copy, and were therefore answered by one word in his version, both in 332 and in 323. "Indited" was also replied to by a word of the same family with "dit-"tay," and was therefore echoed back in "adjournée," as "dittay" was in "adjournement." The French translator knew nothing, either of the variation or of the explication in the English copy. There was neither explication nor variation in his copy. And he drew his final intelligence from another fource. He drew it all from a copy in Latin. In the Latin alone could be the word, that would answer all his various explications. The word "dittay," and the words "dittay or inditement," would very naturally be translated "dictum" in the Latin. "Ze ar indytit" would as naturally, and more elegantly, be translated, " vobis "dies dicitur." And all would be translated into "ad-" journement" and "adjourné," in French. Nor is this merely an airy furmife. We see it reduced to act. In the first letter, the words "he was chargeit to ane day of law," which in the Latin are "ut caufam diceret accerfitum," are in French "il estoit adjourne" (Sect. iv). This corresponds pretty closely with "adjourne" for "indited" and with " adjournement" for "dittay." But, in the second letter, " ane day of law" is "dies dietus" in Latin, and "jour " affigné" in French (Sect. iv). This is equivalent to "fig-" nisiées" for " dittay" above. And " dictum" became ultimately " proces" and " accufation," from the light gradually breaking out of the context.

they were the same, as I have shewn before, with the ten letters of the journal, and with the letters of December the 7th, 1568. But my reader will be amazed to see me add at present, that they were also the same with the famous eight themfelves. Yet so it is in fact. They were substantially, they were verbally, the same. I was long before I could perceive it. But the evidence at last proved too strong to be resisted. And what has convinced me, I must naturally presume,

will equally convince my reader.

The account of the ten letters, is thus given us by the commissioners at Westminster. "This dave," fays their journal on the 8th of December, " the " Erle of Murray, according to the appointment " yesterday," though no mention is made of the appointment in the journal of the day preceding, " came to the Quene's Majestie's commissioners, " faying, that as they had yesternight produced " and shewed fundry writings, tending to prove " the hatred which the Quene of Scotts bare " toward her husband to the tyme of his murder: " wherin alfo, they faid, might appear speciall " arguments of her inordinate love towards the " Erle Bothwell: fo," &c. * This is the description of the ten. Let us now turn to the account of that part of the eight, which was produced this day. "So," fays Murray in the journal concerning himfelf and his affociates, " for the " further satisfaction both of the Queen's Ma-" jestie and theyr lordships, they were ready to

^{*} Appendix, No. viii.

" produce and thew a great number of other let-" ters wrytten by the faid Quene; wherin, as " they faid, might appear very evidently her inor-" dinate love towards the faid Erle Bothwell, with 46 fundry other arguments of her guiltynes of the " murder of her husband." These two pictures are fovery like to each other, that, in this view of them, we hardly know which is our own. But we foon fee it. " And fo therupon," adds the journal, "they produced feven feveral wrytings in French, " in the lyke Romain hand as others her letters, which were shewed yesternight, and avowed " by them to be wrytten by the faid Quene; which feven wrytings, being copied, were read " in French, and a due collation made therof" &c. Here we fee diffinctly, which were the present letters, and which were not. But, in the descriptions before, we could hardly do it.

Let us now, therefore, attend to another circumfrance in them. The letters of the rebel journal confilt of some from Glasgow before the murder, and some from Stirling after it. So did also the letters of the Scotch council and Scotch parliament. They were, says the book of the one and the act of the other, "divers hir previe lettres writtin and subscrivit with her awen hand," or writtin halelie with hir awin hand," and sent by hir to James Erll Boithwell, cheiffe executor of the said horrible murdor, as well before the committing theirof, as THERAFTER."* And

^{*} Appendix, No. i, and ii.

the prefent letters are also the same, four before the murder, and four after it.

We can come, however, to much closer proofs of fameness. These are not in their general nature. These are not in their general dates. These are in their particular dates. These are in the very circumstances of their narrations. These are in the very terms of their language. I have previously noticed this with another view, when I did not observe the full extent of the notice. And I must beg leave to go over it again, in order to enlarge and point it properly for my present argument. " Jan. 27th," fays the journal, "the Quene (conforme to HIR COMMISSION, " as she wryttis) broucht the King from Glas-" cow."* The paffage alluded to is fill in one of the letters, and runs thus: "According to MY " COMMISSIOUN I bring the man with me, &c."+ It was originally in one of the ten, as the journal witnesses. It is now in one of the eight, as the fact shews. And the eight and the ten appear in this instance at least, relating the same intentions in the fame language. This would be fufficient of itself, I believe, for the inference, which I mean to draw from the whole. I shall add others, however. " Jan. 23d," fays the journal, "the Quene came to Glascow, and on " the rode met HIR Thomas Crawford from the " Erle of Lennux, and Sir James Hamilton, with " the reft, MENTIONIT IN HIR LETTER." All these circumstances were as much in the first

^{*} Appendiz, No. x. + L. ii. S. ii. ‡ Appendix, No. x.

of the ten letters then, as they are in the first of the eight at present. But the journal goes on. " Jan. 24," it adds, "the Quene REMAYNIT " AT GLASCOW, lyck as she did the 25th and the " 26th, and hayd THE CONFERENCE WITH THE " KING whereof she WRYTTIS." In the ten the Queen continued at Glasgow, just as long as she does in the eight: she being there, by the journal made for the ten, the 24th, 25th, and 26th of January: and she being also there, by the fecond of the eight, on Saturday, which was the 25th of January in that year; t being there, by the first, upon the day before and evening preceding, or Friday the 24th and Thursday the 23d; and, by the fecond again, intending to leave it upon Monday the 27th. But, as the journal proceeds, "in this tyme," the 24th-26th, she "wrayt "hir BYLLE and uther letteris to Bothwell." She therefore appears from the journal, to have written fuch of her ten letters as were fent from Glasgow, on the 24th, 25th, and 26th of January. And she appears from the eight themselves, to have written also such of them as were equally fent from Glafgow, on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, the 24th-26th of that month. All this ferves strongly to prove the fameness of the letters. But the journal adds to the force of all, by referring to the fame word as her own appellation for the first of the ten, which is equally her own appellation for the first of the eight at present, BYLLE. And the Glafgow letters appear plainly to have

^{*} Appendix, No. x. Appendix, No. x.

[†] Goodall, i. 120, and ! Appendix, No. x.

been the same, in both these sets of epiftles. Nor are the Stirling letters different. If one half is the same, the other, we may be sure, is the same alfo. But the journal equally shews it. " April " 21st, viz. Mounday," it fays, " the Quene raid to Stirling, AS IT WES DEVYSIT, and from " thence wreyt THE LETTERIS CONCERNING "THE PURPOSE DEVYSIT OF HIR RAVISHING; " quhair Huntly CAM TO HIR, and BEGAN TO " REPENT HIM."* The Stirling part of the ten fpoke equally, as the Stirling part of the eight fpeaks now, of the journey to Stirling being previously agreed upon betwixt Mary and Bothwell, of the defign for feizing her being fettled betwixt them, of Huntly's coming to her there, and of his beginning to repent of the part which he had undertaken for the enterprize. And they are obviously, therefore, the same.

So fully do the eight and the ten, the letters of the Scotch council and parliament, the letters of the rebel journal, the letters of the 7th of December at Westminster, and the present letters, all assimilate together. They are equally from Stirling and from Glasgow. They are equally of the same general and particular dates, from both. They are of the same nature and substance. They relate the same facts. They speak of the same agreements. And they even use the same words. Yet there was a difference between them. I have marked it before. I now proceed to account for it. It was totally foreign

^{*} Appendix, No. x.

to all these proofs of sameness. It no ways asfects them. And it consisted in two letters more, which are not in the present set, but were in the former; and in some corrections, that were made in the letters of both.

The ten are strikingly distinguished from the eight, by the letter from Linlithgow and the letter from Kirk-a-field. Of that the journal fays: " Jan. 29th, she [the Queen] remayned all day " in Linlythquow with the King, and WRAYTT " FROM THENCE TO BOTHWELL." Here then is a letter, one of the feries of letters in the journal, which does not appear among the prefent. But there is also another. " Feb. 7th," fays the journal, " she ludged and lay all nycht " agane in the foresaid chalmer [the chamber "under the King's], and FROM THENCE wrayt "THAT SAME NYCHT the LETTER CONCERNING "THE PURPOSE OF THE ABBOT OF HALYRUID-" HOUSE. 8. She confronted the Kyng and my "Lord of Halyruid-house, conform to HIR " LETTER WRYTTIN THE NYCHT BEFOIR." + Here is also another letter of the journal-series, which is equally non-apparent among the prefent. Both unite, in discriminating the present series from that of the journal. Both unite, in shewing the journal to have been constructed for the ten. But then it was equally constructed for the eight too. These were eight of the very ten. And, there two being deducted from the ten, their number was directly reduced to eight.

^{*} Appendix, No. x.

In consequence of these two letters it is, that the ten are characterized by the rebels themfelves to the commissioners at Westminster, as " tending to prove the HATRED which the Quene of Scots bare toward her husband TO THE "TYME OF HIS MURDER, wherin also they faid " might appear speciall arguments of her inor-"dinate love towards the Erle Bothwell." And by the fubstraction of these it is, that the eight are equally characterized by them at the fame time, as shewing "very evidently her inordinate " love towards the faid Erle Bothwell, with fundry " other arguments of her guiltyness of the mur-" der of her husband." By the deduction of these two murderous letters from the rest, the Queen's hatred for Darnly, which before stood prominent on the face of the whole, was taken away in the magnitude of it, and the adultery came stalking forward in its room.

The other note of difference between the two fets of letters, was this. Some corrections had been made in the letters of the journal. And fome variations had been produced by them, betwixt the journal, the letters, and the truth.

Thus, when the journal refers to one of the letters, and cites some of the very words of it, for Mary's conducting the King from Glasgow to Kalendar, to Linlithgow, and to Kirk-a-field; the letter itself exhibits the words, but carries the King by a very different route. I have shewn this circumstantially, before. Yet it is requifite to bring the two passages together again, that the correction made in the letter fince the formation formation of the journal, may appear the more flriking in itself, and may be properly accounted for now.

JOURNAL.

"Jan. 27th, the Quene
"(conforme to hir commif"fion, as she wryttis) broucht
"the King from Glascow
"to the Kalendar towards
"Edynbrough. Jan. 28th,
"the Quene broucht the
"King to Linlythquow—.
"29th. She remayned all
"day in Linlythquow with
"the King—. 30th. The
"Quene broucht the King
"to Edynbrough, and patt
"him in his ludging quhair
"he endit."

2d LETTER.

"Howbeit I have na far"ther newis from zow, ac"cording to my commif"fioun, I bring the man with
"me to Craigmillar upon
"Monounday, quhair he
"will be all Wednifday; and
"I will gang to Edinburgh,"
&c.

Here the difference is very great. But it could not have been so, originally. The letter originally must have been, just as the journal quotes it. It must, equally with that, have conveyed the King from Glasgow to the Kalendar on Monday January the 27th, have lodged him at Linlithgow on Tuesday and Wednesday the 28th and 29th, and have carried him to Kirk-a-field on the 30th. But it now conducts him and her to Craigmillar on Monday, keeps them at Craigmillar all Tuesday and Wednesday, and sends her to Edinborough with him on Thursday. This alteration is a very remarkable one. And it must stand for ever, an evident proof of the whole forgery.

But it is the more remarkable, as we see the rebels,

rebels, in the pretended depolitions of Paris, recurring to the route of the journal again. " Com-" me elle," fays the filly forger of this filly confession concerning the Queen, " retournoit de " Glascow vers Lisleburg [Edinborough]*, avec " le Roy a KALLANDER," &c. " Apres le Royne "et le Roy," he adds afterwards, "estans a "LYTHGOW," &c. And, as he subjoins, "le "Roy-ils conduirent jusques a son logis a " KIRK-A-FIELD." + All this marks the uncertainty and dubiousness of the rebels, concerning the route that they should take for the King and Queen, in very vivid colours. This uncertainty occasioned the correction of the letters, and the departure from the journal. This dubiousness again occasioned the depositions, to revolt from the letters, and defert to the journal. And we have thus three authentick documents, all equally furnished by the rebels, all equally stamped with the impress of their authority, and all in a state of hostility against them; their grand and capital document of all, opposing and being opposed by their formal journal upon one fide, and being contradicted by, and contradictory to, their folemn depositions on the other.

Nor can the variation of the letter from the depositions and the journal, be accounted for by any supposition, that the course by Craigmillar was intended by the Queen, but that the route

^{*} Edinborough was called Listeburg by the French, I fuppose, from its peninsulated site on a large rock, and having a long neck of land at sirst, leading them up to it.

⁺ Goodall, ii. 78, 79.

by Kalendar was purfued by her. Thomas Nelfon indeed, one of the two witnesses whom the rebels produced at Westminster, to facts that proved nothing at all concerning the perpetrators of the murder, fays, he " remembris it was de-" wyfed in Glafgow, that the King fuld haif lyne " first at Craigmillar; bot, becaus he had na will 56 theirof, the purpois was altered, and concluse floun takin, that he fuld ly befyde the Kirk-of-" field." The rebels thus exhibited a testimony with the letters and the journal, that directly confronted them to their face. The letters did not originally choose the route by Craigmillar, and afterwards prefer the course by Kalendar. No! They originally took the road by Kalendar. They thus harmonized with the journal. And the reference of the journal to them, proves irrefragably that they did. But the route for Craigmillar was afterwards fubflituted, in the place of this. It was a new line of motion, that was posteriourly given to the letters. It was hastily taken up, and hastily abandoned again, by the rebels. It was adopted in preference to the line, already in the letters and journal. It was adopted in the letters, but forgotten to be adopted in the journal too. And it was afterwards abandoned in the depositions again, for the original and primary line still subfifting in the journal.

This extraordinary inflance of oscillation in the conduct of the rebels, is a full attellation of their roguery. Nor is it difficult to affign the reasons for their conduct. They were these: The real

^{*} Goodall, ii. 244.

route purfued by the King and Queen I believe, but I cannot prove, to have been by Craigmillar to Kirk-a-field. This therefore should naturally have been followed by the letters. But a new fuggestion of forgery prevented it. A resolution was taken, to write another letter for her from Linlithgow to Bothwell, in order to mark her concern decifively in the coming murder. This therefore compelled the forger to leave the line of truth and Craigmillar, and to move by the round of falsehood and Kalendar. And accordingly, as the journal still takes this round, and as the journal proves the letters to have equally taken it once; fo the journal goes on to give us an additional letter from Linlithgow. Such, I doubt not, was the reason for selecting the first route. In so acting, the rebels shewed all that bold confidence in the credulity of the world, which characterizes so many of their actions. But afterwards this reason was withdrawn, and then this temerity was recalled. When the resolution was taken to cut off the murderous evidence from the rest, the letter from Linlithgow was first suppressed. It was accordingly not shewn, either at York or at Westminster. letters therefore, which had been violently bent by the force of falsehood into the circuitous course by Linlithgow, now returned, as it were by the natural elasticity of truth, into the straight line of Craigmillar. And the letters were actually exhibited in this new state at York. But, when the confession of Paris came to be drawn up afterwards, a counter resolution was taken, for ad-1.12 ding

ding again what had been cut off before, and even for enlarging the murderous evidence. The rebels did thus go on,

Downwards to climb, and backwards to advance!

The depositions, accordingly, bring forward a monstrous addition of murderous evidence. And they particularly dwell upon the previously rejected letter from Linlithgow. So clearly have we found a reason, that runs like a thread through all the rebel curvatures of conduct, and becomes a kind of central pin to all their circumvolutions!

But we find the fame correcting hand equally at work upon another of the letters. The feventh calls the Earl of Huntly "brother-in-law THAT " was" to Bothwell, when he was as much his brother-in-law as ever. This is fuch a miftake, as no forger of the letters, writing them in a regular confecution, could possibly make. The two letters immediately before, which pretend to be written equally with the 7th and 8th on Monday and Tuesday, the 21st and 22d of April, calling Huntly expressly "the brother" and "the brother-in-law" of Bothwell; the 7th could only have fallen into the abfurdity of calling him the brother-in-law that was," from either being written or being corrected at a subsequent period. But it now appears not to have been written posteriourly to the rest. It was therefore corrected. And as it shews in general, what alterations the rebels were continually making in the letters; fo it shews in particular, one more of those alterations, which constitute the difference betwixt the ten and the eight.

In an unaltered flate were the ten, at the meeting of the Scotch parliament. They were thus produced before it. But in an altered one they came to the conference at York. Then fix of the ten were shewn to the commissioners. Three of these were from Glasgow, two from Stirling, and one from Kirk-a-field. So far did the rebels proceed in their original purpose, of exhibiting the murderous letters with the rest. They did fo, in direct opposition to their present plan. They therefore did not produce one of the letters. And, for reasons not known, they omitted to produce some of the others. The fourth from Glasgow, the one from Linlithgow, and two from Stirling, they withheld. And it was not before the conference at Westminster, that they resolved upon the retention of the two from Linlithgow and Kirk-a-field together. They thus exhibited only five, on the 8th of December at Westminster. But they had exhibited all the ten on the day before. "They had yesternight," fays the journal of the 8th, " produced and shewed sun-" DRY WRYTINGS, tending to prove the hatred," &c. These were written " in the lyke Romain " hand" with the letters of the 8th; are spoken of expressly, as "her letters which were shewed " yesternight;" and were equally " avowed by "them to be wrytten by the faid Quene." And thus they exhibited a fet of letters in Scotten on the 7th, re-exhibited some of them in FRENCH on the 8th, afferted the one fet to be totally different from the other, afferted both to be Mary's handwriting, and pretended to put the commiffioners 113

fioners upon proving it, by collating the one with the other memorially. "They produced feven feveral wrytings wrytten in French, in "the lyke Romain kand as others her letters, which were shewed yesternight, and avowed by them to be wrytten by the said Quene." This is such a capital stroke of assurance, as was worthy of Murray, worthy of Elizabeth, worthy of that complication of all villanies, the forgery of the letters against Mary. It can only be paralleled in all the braveries of human impudence, I believe, by the grand change in the language of the letters. And it forms a very important addition to what we have seen of that already.

Five only of the ten, however, were yet delivered. The letters from Linlithgow and Kirka-field, were resolved to be finally suppressed. And, as to the other three, they were delivered a few days afterward with the journal. This being the scale, by which all the ten were originally graduated, it was very properly prefented with the delivered eight of them. But Murray strangely forgot, when he determined to withhold the two others, that were equally graduated by it, and therefore equally mentioned in it, to strike out the mention of what he had withheld. The journal was thus left, referring to a couple of Mary's letters that do not appear at all. He forgot also to alter the journal in the route by Kalendar and Linlithgow, and make it conformable to the letters. The letters therefore carry the King one way, while the journal conveys him another. And the journal and the letters thus stand,

stand, bewraying the forgery of themselves and of each other, in the plainest manner.

But that amazing miracle of impudence, in shewing the same letters one day in Scotch and the next in French, and pretending them to be different in themselves, and both in Mary's handwriting, accounts very well by itself for the conduct of Murray, in not entrufting the commiffioners at Westminster with even copies of the ten, though he did with copies of the eight. Those were profesfedly adduced as proofs against Mary, equally with thefe. "As they had yesternight " produced and shewed fundry wrytings, tending " to prove the hatred," &c. fays Murray; " fo, " for the further satisfaction both of the Quene's " Majestie and theyr lordships, they were ready " to produce and flew a great number of other "letters," &c. Yet these alone staid with the commissioners, even in copies. Those were inflantly withdrawn, both in copies and in originals. And what feems plainly to intimate, that the commissioners were privy to the whole system of illufion, in fecretary Cecil at leaft, who altered and interlined the journal, as he pleafed, and must therefore be supposed to have directed the clerks too, as he thought proper; the journal of the day before takes no notice of those letters being either produced or withdrawn, But, had they not been withdrawn, in what a happy flate would the epistolary evidence against Mary have then stood. There would have been ten letters in Scotch, pretending to be her handwriting. There would have been eight of them also in FRENCH, equally pretending 114

pretending to be her writing too. They were both the same. Yet one afferted, she had written them in Scotch. The other affirmed, she had written them in French. Fach in effect called the other an impostor. Each proved the other to be so. And both must have fallen a facrifice to each other's pretensions.

But there are two important particulars still behind, which I meant to reach by this novel concatenation of circumstances. They relate to the three letters, that were presented to the commissioners at Westminster, posteriourly to the others. And they concern the publication of all the letters in Scotch, afterwards.

Those three appear, at present, to stand distinguished from all the rest of the eight, in the nature of their original language. Seeming not a part of the feries exhibited to the Scotch council and parliament, not a part of the feries shewn to the commissioners at York, not a part of the feries presented on the 8th of December at Westminster; they look, as if they had been posteriourly fabricated for the purpose. Framed therefore ofter the resolution was finally taken for a French copy, they would naturally be composed in French. And all that has been faid, concerning the Scotch being the original and the French a translation, would be totally inapplicable to them. They would be French in their original; and the Scotch, in which they have been published as well as in French, would be confidered as a translation from it. This indeed could not affect the force of the argument before, concerning the forgery. The variation in

the language, that mafter-stroke of daring ingenuity, would still demonstrate the spuriousness of the whole for ever. Yet the observable difference between these and the rest of the French letters at Westminster, must create a difficulty, that ought to be noticed by me in fairness, and should be removed by me (if I can remove it) in judiciousness. And I can do it. What I have already faid, does it effectually. When the rebels produced only fix of their ten letters at York, they did it on the fame principle, on which we have feen them fo frequently acting before. They were ever fluttering and unfteady, in their conduct, unfteady from the eternal inflability of guilt, and fluttering from the lively impotence of fear. They were fo at Westminster, as well as at York. They kept back at Westminster one of those very letters, which they had antecedently prefented at York. They kept back the murderous letter from Kirk-a-field. This had been exhibited at York, even when its companion from Linlithgow had been withheld. Both were now withheld by them, at Westminster. They also suppressed still three others of the letters, which they had originally fabricated. They repented of the fabrication. They confidered them as unferviceable. They condemned them to filence and obscurity in the coffer, for ever. They appeared with this refolution at York. They even perfifted in it on the 8th of December, at Westminster. But at last, and indeed within a few days afterward, even this refolution melted away, in the heat of an agitated conscience. They trod back their steps at Westminster. They trod back their steps at York.

They now confidered the three letters as important. They now thought their importance a full compensation for the contradictoriness in which they would involve them, and for the detection to which they would expose them. They therefore took them out of the coffer again. They had them translated, like the rest, into French. And they added copies of them to the rest. They added copies to the others in Cecil's possession, without even any previous exhibition of the originals to the commissioners; and therefore without any mention of either the originals or the copies, in the journal of the commission.

This finishes the curious and striking picture of guilt in the rebels. This also completes the number of their letters in French. But how came all these French letters to be published in Scotch afterwards? How came they particularly to be published in that very Scotch, in which five of them had been presented at York, and from which all of them had been translated into French, for the commissioners at Westminster? These commissioners had them in French, not in Scotch. The York commissioners indeed had them in Scotch. But then they had no copies, as the others had. They had only extracts. And copies cannot be published from extracts. How then came Cecil by the Scotch copy, which I have formerly flated him to have published; and a copy exactly the fame, as that which was exhibited at York? This is a confiderable difficulty. And, as I wish to clear the controversy

from every difficulty, I have noticed in order to remove it.

When the rebels presented their eight letters in French at Westminster, they equally presented what they called TRANSLATIONS with them. They produced in fact their Scotch originals with them. And they left these, equally with the pretended originals, in the possession of Cecil and the commissioners. This seems extraordinary. But it was necessary in itself, and it is evident in fact. The publication of the Scotch, as well as the French, points very strongly at such an incident. The natural ignorance of French among the statesimen of those days, made it absolutely requifite. And the journal of the commissioners proves the reality. When Murray determined finally upon a French copy; he must have seen the necessity for an accompanying translation. The French language was better understood in Scotland than in England, I believe, at this period. The intercourse between the countries was much greater. The amity between them was very much greater. Yet the privy counsellors of Scotland would have thought it strange, I believe, to have had French letters laid before them without a translation. The privy counsellors of England certainly would. "We find," fays a writer who had ranfacked many of the voluminous letters of Elizabeth's reign, " that the statesmen of "that country," England, " in those days," those of which I am now speaking, " were at a "lofs upon occasions, when they had use for " writing papers under hand in the French lan-" guage."

" guage." And as he fays afterwards with refpect to one of these very commissioners at Westminster, even to the principal of them, even to fecretary Cecil himfelf, "whereas the manage-" ment of that business," the translating these very letters into French, " hath been charged " upon fecretary Cecil; it is not thereby meant, " that he did the drudgery part of the work him-" felf: for there are some reasons to be collected " from papers yet extant, which will shew, that " he was not by himfelf altogether fufficient for " it." * For this reason, Murray was obliged to put in a pretended translation, with his pretended originals. He had one ready for his purpose in the real originals. This indeed would be Scotch. But then it was to be a translation produced by Scotchmen. It would therefore be as proper for a translation, when he had procured it to be copied by a common hand, as it had been for an original, when it was in a hand imitative of Mary's. And we actually fee the commissioners provided with a translation accordingly.

The five letters were presented in French, on the 8th of December. In the journal of that day, not a hint is given of a translation; any more than in the journal preceding, is a hint of the ten letters then produced in Scotch to the commisfioners. The latter fact indeed appears, from the journal of the day afterward, to have happened on the preceding. Just so it is with the translation. From the journal of the subsequent

^{*} Digges's Ambassador, 1461. Goodall, i. 113, 114.

day, we see the commissioners to have been furnished with a translation the day before. "The "Queen's Majestie's commissioners," favs the journal of December the 9th, " being occupied " in perufing and reading certain lettres and fon-" nets wrytten in French, BEING DULY TRANS-" LATED INTO ENGLISH, and other wrytings also," the two contracts, &c. " exhibited yesterday to "them by the Erle of Murray and his collegues," &c.* This appears to have been in the morning, as " the commissioners proceded untill " dinner-tyme in the hearing and perufing of the "forefaid wrytings," then went to dinner, returned, and met Mary's commissioners at one.+ In the morning after the exhibition of the letters and fonnets, the commissioners appear perusing them, and perusing them in the translation, as they testify themselves. And this translation appears also, from their own attestation, to have been equally with the letters, fonnets, and other writings, " exhibited yesterday to them by the " Erle of Murray and his collegues."

In this manner came the commissioners to be furnished with a pretended translation of the French letters into Scotch, and with a real translation of the French verses into Scotch prose. In this manner also, came Cecil to be in possession of both. The three posteriour letters would be presented, like the former five and the sonnets, with their Scotch versions attending upon them. And thus were two successive agents of Cecil's

[#] Appendix, No. viii.

⁺ Ibid. ibid.

enabled to publish the sonnets and the letters, in

Scotch and in French progressively.

The Scotch was published from the same office with the French. It therefore pretended to be, what Murray had prefented it for, a translation only from the French. It also carried for the fame reason, at the head of every letter, a few clauses of that very French copy, which was yet unpublished, and yet deposited in the office of Cecil. And the eighth letter in French having perished by some accident, posteriourly to the publication of the Scotch; Cecil's agent could not publish any more of it in French, than what had been thus preserved by the Scotch copy. From Cecil's office came both. But so little stress did Cecil or Elizabeth lay upon the copies, either in French or in Scotch, which Murray had left with the commissioners; that Cecil seems to have fent those very copies to the press. He and the must undoubtedly have valued neither, except only as implements of mischief, to be fet at work against Mary. By publishing them, they were fetting them at work in a most formidable manner. They were doing in effect against Mary, what Murray's affociates had done in fact against Darnly before, and what some papists attempted to do afterwards against the son of both. were digging a mine, in order to blow her and all her fortunes into the air at once. For fuch a purpose, they could not scruple to send Murray's copies, and their originals, to the press at once. From them was the Scotch printed, I apprehend; Murray's copy of the Scotch equally pretending with

with the published Scotch, to be a translation, and therefore, in all probability, carrying equally some clauses of the French, at the head of each of its letters. From them also, I believe, was the French copy printed, with the loss only of the eighth letter; which had perished in some fire, or other calamity at the prefs, and which, as it could be retrieved in a fmall part only from the Scotch copy published before, was therefore not published at all. In consequence of the whole, both the Scotch and the French copies, which were originally deposited with Cecil, and with Cecil remained for months afterwards, have disappeared from among his papers. Though a variety of writings, which were just as much detached and fingle papers, which were much less than these in bulk, and were greatly less in value, are still to be feen in his collection; yet thefe are gone. Those were never published. Those were never fent to the press. But these were. One of these actually perished, antecedently to the printing. All perished at it. And the Scotch and the French have equally shared in the incidental deftruction.*

^{*} Goodall, ii. 73, 74, 75, 76, and 76—84, for papers which were equally copies with these.

CONCLUSION

TO THE

FIRST VOLUME.

I HAVE thus gone over all the arguments in proof of the forgery, which I intended to lay before my reader in this volume. They are all facts. They are all very important facts, in the history of the letters, contracts, and fonnets. They carry their own power of conviction with them. They speak with energy to every mind. And they go with an irresistible decisiveness, I think, to the very heart and center of the cause.

I began with the conduct of Elizabeth and Murray, as acting in confederacy together. This was so well known in some of its parts, and stood forth to the eye so prominent in all, that it arrested my attention first, and was therefore the best calculated to fasten first on my reader's. In the detail of this conduct, regularly as I have authenticated it, not merely by reference to the proving passages, but by an actual production of the passages themselves; we have seen Murray vol. 1. Mm

and Elizabeth behaving in a most dishonourable manner. Elizabeth particularly appears in a light, that must shock her numerous admirers greatly. Yet fiat justitia, ruat calum. The low adulations of her own age, and the confenting flatteries of fucceeding times, have united to throw a blaze of glory around the head of this political faint; to which she has as little claim, as many of the religious faints in the calendar of Rome to theirs. I admire her abilities. But I despise her principles. I admire her fagacity of understanding, her comprehensiveness of policy, and her vigour of resolution. But I detest her habits of fwearing, her habits of hypocrify, her rancorous jealoufy, and her murderous malignity. Elizabeth indeed appears in her worst light, while she is seen in her transactions with Mary. On this worst part of her history, have I been obliged to dwell, Nor should I have done justice to an injured Queen, if I had not stated this part of the history, in its full glare of enormity, before the eye. The generality of mankind are undignified enough in their own spirit, to pay their respect to understanding at the expence of morality; to ennoble perfons, who are only great from their powers, their fituations, and their fuccess; and to fink from view the profligacy, with which those powers were exerted, these fituations were improved, and this fuccess was infured. But let not fuch, as afpire to lead the opinions of the publick, be content to practife the vice of the yulgar. The interests of VIRTUE should

should be the object of every writer. And one fingle grain of virtue, it should be for ever confidered, is worth more, in the estimate of reason and of God, than all the mass of intellect that is diffused through the universe.

But having with the just severity of truth, I trust, laid open the behaviour of Elizabeth and Murray during the conferences in England; I then proceeded to shew the grounds and causes of all this, in the wretched state of the forgeries themselves. I have shewn the letters peculiarly, that main substance of all the forgeries, to have been changed and altered in a most wonderful manner. Throgmorton, who had received an account of the first letters from the very formers of them, could not possibly have recognized them again in the last. Like the ship of Athens, or the flockings of Sir John Cutler, they had scarcely one particle of their original materials left behind. Yet, like those stockings and that ship, they pretended to be still the same. And, what was infinitely more, they pretended to be the un-darned, the un-repaired fame, from the very beginning.

The letters of Throgmorton's days I have shewn to have been merely ideal at the time, though they were realized afterwards. But a new fet was foon formed upon a new principle. Even this was superfeded afterwards. A new principle again took possession of the mind, And a new fet again appeared upon the stage. The murder was the object of the FIRST. The adultery had no share in it. The adultery and the murder

became joint objects of the SECOND. The murder was still principal, but the adultery shewed itself of nearly equal magnitude with it. And at last, in the THIRD, the adultery became principal, and the murder was only hinted at.

Both the fecond and the third I have also fhewn, to have undergone many alterations of another nature. They appeared subscribed by Mary, on the 4th of December 1567; they appeared Nor subscribed, on the 15th-29th of the fame month. They were superscribed to Bothwell originally; yet they appeared NOT fuperscribed afterwards. They were all DATED, both in time and place, BEFORE and DURING their appearance at York, but NOT after it. They were also TEN in number with the parliament of Scotland, six at York, Five at Westminster on the 8th of December, EIGHT afterwards, TEN on the 7th of December, and actually EIGHTEEN in the months of December and January 1589, and on the 22d of January 1571.*

Nor is this all. The evidence against Mary was merely the LETTERS, at first. For nearly fifteen months from the afferted seizure of Mary's casket, it had disclosed nothing but letters against her. But, being properly put to the torture, it gave up twelve sonners and two contracts of marriage, to impeach her reputation. And then these pretended to have been equally found with the letters, at first.

^{*} Appendix, No. iv. Morton's Receipt.

But what is most astonishing, amid all these fuccessive scenes of astonishment, is the change of the LANGUAGE in the letters. They appeared as Scotch before the council and the parliament of Scotland, in December 1567. Yet Murray afferted them to be in FRENCH; by a meffage to Elizabeth in June following. But they still appeared in Scorch to the commissioners at York, in the enfuing month of October. And, after all, they re-appeared in FRENCH to the very fame commissioners, only a few weeks afterward at Westminster. What is even more surprising, they appeared fome of them in French and fome in Scotch, the published eight in French, the published eight also in Scotch, and both pretending equally to be Mary's writing.

All these variations sufficiently vindicate the conduct of Elizabeth and of Murray, for the policy, though not for the problet, of it; in the tricks and stratagems, in the frauds and evasions, which we have seen this couple of political jugglers exhibiting before. They both knew of the forgery. They both knew of these striking signatures of it. They both knew, particularly, of the changes and re-changes in the language of the letters. And their knowledge will combine with their conduct, I fear, to speak in a bolder language against them both, than any which I

But, whatever is the fate of these, the innocence of Mary must now be admitted by all, I think. The witnesses against her have been tried,

have used.

tried, in the examination of the letters, sonnets, and contracts. One single variation in their testimony, must have been fatal to the whole. But I have found many.

Each of these, in my opinion, forms a strong and lively ray of light, to disclose the forgery to every eye. The last of them, I think, forms a ray exceedingly lively and strong. And all together they unite into such a powerful blaze, I apprehend, as lays open the whole forgery from end to end, as enables the most weak-eyed to see, and compels the most incredulous to believe.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

