

A. J. Aitken

The pioneers of anglicised speech in Scotland; a second look (1997)¹

Edited by Caroline Macafee, 2015

Editor's note: this was the last piece of work that AJA published, and it bears the marks of haste. The data are detailed enough to support his impressions of the (sometimes varying or changing) habits of individual writers and of the linguistic items that are most often subject to anglicisation, but they are not always complete enough for quantitative analysis.

For the convenience of the reader in navigating the dense presentation of data, I have highlighted (in bold) the names of the various individuals whose writing is examined in sections 3 and 4. Since digital publication does not suffer the same constraints of space as hard copy, I have laid out the lists of examples more expansively, though it will sometimes be obvious that they started off as connected text in the original.

As AJA says in note [3], he uses the abbreviation conventions of *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (DOST) to refer to sources. These are not currently (2015) searchable online: when the reference is to editorial content or AJA quotes a text at length, I have expanded the references, placing the original abbreviated reference in square brackets.

How to cite this paper (adapt to the desired style): Aitken, A. J. (1997, 2015) 'The pioneers of anglicised speech in Scotland; a second look' in †A. J. Aitken, ed. Caroline Macafee, 'Collected Writings on the Scots Language' (2015), [online] Scots Language Centre
[http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/The_pioneers_of_anglicised_speech_in_Scotland_a_second_look_\(1997\)](http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/The_pioneers_of_anglicised_speech_in_Scotland_a_second_look_(1997)) (accessed DATE). Originally published *Scottish Language* 16, 1–36.

[1] 1 Preamble

This article looks again at some of the writers who form the subjects of the well-known article by M. A. Bald (1927), adding others not considered by her, and dealing much more in the linguistic specifics largely glossed over in her rather vague and general account. I have always regarded the word 'speech' in Miss Bald's title as a misnomer, since her discussion is mostly limited to the written practices of her subjects, except to a limited extent in her

¹ [1] Many of the texts cited as evidence in this paper are from the nineteenth-century editions of John Small, Sir William Fraser, David Laing and Joseph Bain, all of whom practise some normalisation of spelling, of <u, v, w>, of <3> and <y> and of <y> and <th>, and expand abbreviations without notice. Doubtless all occasionally err as copyists, though when I have been able to compare edited texts of the first three of these editors with originals or facsimiles I have found few substantive errors. Unfortunately I could not incur the time and expense needed to verify all of my sources. But I do not believe that the few erroneous examples which may lurk among my citations will more than marginally affect my conclusions.

Editor's note: originally published in *Scottish Language* 16, 1–36. Reproduced by kind permission of the Association for Scottish Literary Studies.

The text has been edited for uniformity of style with other Aitken papers and some bibliographical references have been expanded or added. The original page and note numbers are shown in square brackets.

discussion of Knox. I discuss how far and in what circumstances these written practices extend to spoken performance.

Something approaching Scottish English, by which I mean the Scots-accented variety of Standard English, more or less ‘pure’, or phonologically unmixed with Scots except at the level of accent, first emerged, I believe, in the speech of some Scots aristocrats near the end of the seventeenth century.² The prior stage in the anglicising of Scots saw the genesis of a prose variety which combined phonological elements of Scots and English in writing and probably also in speech. This mixed variety first appears in some of the correspondence and other personal writings of a minority of Scottish writers in the first half of the sixteenth century. As a label for this variety we might borrow Tom McArthur’s term for the continuum of Scots and English at the present day, ‘Scots English’ (1979: 59).

This paper will be concerned with the manifestations of this variety in Scottish writers of the sixteenth century, with special attention to John Knox, and also with how far the anglicisation at the phonological level of the written texts was replicated in the writers’ speech. I will be concerned almost solely with phonological anglicisms, not with those I deem merely orthographic.³ For reasons of time and space, Scotticisms of vocabulary, idiom and grammar, the frequency of incidence and particular selection of which may suggest how far the author was ‘thinking in Scots’ at that point, I will treat more cursorily than these features deserve. I will be concerned primarily with the internal phonological data, less with external evidence, though some of the latter will be mentioned.

At best the evidence tells us only about phonological phenomena at the selectional level, nothing at all about phonemic phenomena at the level of realisations: it specifies such forms as, say, /ani/ *any* and /sor/ *sore*, with no indication of the precise realisations of any of these phonemes.^[2] *A priori* it seems most likely that when Scots-English speakers of that time borrowed English forms, say /ani/ *any* or /sor/ *sore*, they realised them with the sounds of their Scots, as in say /kani/ *canny* and /stor/ *store*, but I am aware of no evidence either way concerning this.⁴

I will make much use of the terms *anglicised forms*, *anglicisms*, *anglicisation*. By the latter term I mean of course the replacement, often apparently piecemeal and fairly haphazard, of native Scots forms by cognate forms introduced into Scots writing and/or speech apparently from the Southern English dialect. I regard these terms as more precisely descriptive than the more non-committal alternatives *standardisation* etc. preferred by some. In reverse, I will also frequently refer to *Scotticisms*, to denote distinctively Scots forms and lexical items as against anglicisms and ‘common core’ forms; and the term *scotticised* describes a text predominantly English but including a sprinkling or more of phonological Scotticisms (and, usually, of Scots features at other levels, especially the orthographic).

As a convenient means of identifying particular Scots vowel phonemes, I will also make a little use of the numbers assigned to these in my reconstruction of the Vowel Systems of Scots (see Aitken, 1977, 2015; 1981, 2015; 1984, 2015).⁵

² Editor’s note: AJA gives an account of this process in ‘Scottish speech: a historical view with special reference to the Standard English of Scotland’ (1979).

³ [²] Thus I have mostly ignored features of orthography such as <ea> versus <e-e> or <ei> or <sh> versus <sch> or <wh> versus <quh>. I have not regarded as anglicisms possible ‘common core’ forms such as <punischit> versus <puniest> or <father> versus <fader> (for further examples of these, see McClure, 1986: 413), and the supposedly anglicised morphographic features <-ing> versus <-and> present participle, <-ed> versus <-it> past tense.

⁴ Editor’s note: if Scots speakers at this period pronounced *any* as /ani/, as AJA appears to assume, rather than /eni/, it would be a spelling pronunciation.

⁵ Editor’s note: also †Aitken (2002), Macafee and †Aitken (2002), Macafee and †Aitken (2003, 2015).

2 Anglicisation of Scots in mainstream prose

The anglicisation of Older Scots verse, in the shape of forms with Southern *o* in place of Scots *a* – *go* for *ga* and the like – is almost as old as extant Older Scots verse itself. Beginning in a very limited way in some poetry of the late fourteenth century (Aitken, 1983: 27; 2015), it is copiously manifested in spelling and confirmed by many occurrences in rhyme from the middle of the fifteenth century.

In prose there is a handful of words that look like the fifteenth-century verse anglicisms but which occur exceptionally early and some of them more frequently than the anglicisms described in the next paragraph; some of them also occur in verse texts otherwise free of anglicisation. These are:

lord (1379, 1393, 1397, etc.);

more (in rhyme in Barbour and *Legends of the Saints*, which are otherwise virtually free of anglicisms; in prose in 1513, 1521, etc.);

quhom (1449) (whom);

bote (1471, frequent thereafter, current earlier but unrecorded?) (boat);

and *pole* (1474) (a staff).

On the histories of *lord*, *more* and *pole*, see DOST. All five of these words have Vowel 4 (Early Scots /a:/) in my numbering system (see above); in all of them except the first it is adjacent to a labial: it therefore seems possible that all five are primarily of native Scots origin and not borrowings from Southern English as the later prose anglicisms are commonly taken to be. Perhaps the same is ^[3] true of two other words of similar chronologies:

no adj. (a 1424, 1487, etc.),

not adv. (1386, 1408, etc.).

I label all of these ‘quasi-anglicisms’. From early in the fifteenth century *lord* deviates in sense from its cognate *larde*; by the end of the fifteenth century *bote* appears to have overtaken *bate* in frequency; *pole* is the only Scots representative of its OE, ON *ā* etymon. But *more*, *quhom*, *no*, *not*, behave more like normal anglicised variants, as at first less common alternatives to their more regularly developed variants, *mare*, *quham(e)*, *na*, *nocht*; these I will treat below as if they were ‘normal’ anglicisms.

Prose anglicisms more generally occur from about the early sixteenth century. As with verse, much the most common, but not the only, type is that in which Vowel 4, spelled <aCe> etc. (by this time pronounced approximately /ɛ:/) was replaced by English *o* (pronounced /o:/). The first occurrences I have noted in mainstream prose, i.e. other than the exceptionally anglicised ‘Anglo-Scots’ prose discussed below, are:

on(e)ly (c. 1500) (Scots *an(e)ly*),

quwiche (1505), *quhich* (Scots *quhilk*),

go (1515, Gavin Douglas) (Scots *ga*),

so (1515, Gavin Douglas) (Scots *sa*),

hole (1515) (Scots *hale*) (whole),

also (1516) (Scots *alsa*),

none (1518) (Scots *nane*),

quho (1519) (Scots *quha*) (who),

boith, *both* (Bellenden’s *Boece* (M)),⁶

⁶ [3] Original sources are cited with the abbreviations of DOST.

quhois (1544) (Scots *quhais*) (whose),
othe (1547) (Scots *athe*) (oath).

Some of these – I guess the quasi-anglicisms *more*, *quhom*, *no*, *not*, and also *on(e)ly*, *so* and *both* – may be more common in the prose of the earlier decades of the sixteenth century than the others.

It is possible that, at least in the first instance, these forms were literary borrowings from contemporary or earlier native verse or from English writings in verse or prose, by the eye rather than the ear. One at least seems to have been this. The word *loin* (Scots *lunze*) was, it seems, first borrowed by David Lyndsay from one of the English Bibles, apparently in ignorance of how it was pronounced, for he rhymes *loins* with *bones* (see *Loyn(e)* in *DOST*). It is nevertheless also possible that some of these spelling anglicisms passed into Scots speech soon after appearing in writing. I will mention some such possibilities later.

As the dictionary record suggests, the token frequency of these items in the sixteenth century in both MS and printed prose, including the quasi-anglicisms *more*, *quhom*, *no*, *not*, is at first down to the 1550s, quite low, varying from virtual zero in some local texts such as *Peebles B. Rec.*, *Stirling B. Rec.*, and *Fife Sheriff Ct.*, and national records such as *Acts II.*, *Acta Conc. Public Aff.*, *Reg. Privy S.*, *Reg. Privy C.*, *Treas. Acc.*, to about one token in 600 to 1000 words of text in literary texts such as the prose of the *Asloan MS*, *Gau*, *Bell. Boece*, *Bell. Boece (M)*, *Boece, Compl.*, *Hamilton Cat.*; but *Lamb Ressonyn*^[4] (in the speeches of the Scottish, as well as the English, merchant) reached the higher rate of one anglicism in about 200 words. Some Catholic writings of the 1560s – *Winzet*, *Q. Kennedy* – also have quite low token counts of this group of words, but from about this time these and other anglicisms occur with increased frequency in some other literary writings in MS, including *G. Buchanan*, ‘The Pretended Conference’ (*Jack*, 1971: 63 f.), *Leslie J. Melvill* (of *Kilrenny*), and some texts of *Conf. Faith* (*Robinson*, 1983). Other types of text display different frequencies of anglicisation in respect of these items – burgh records much lower, some printed texts higher – though variably from text to text and/or printer to printer.

3 The evidence of private correspondence: pre-Reformation

What I have related so far is true also in general of the private writings, and in particular correspondence, of Scots of the sixteenth century. At this time the normal language of letters, holograph and scribal, from Scottish noblemen and others resident in Scotland to their compatriots is almost anglicism-free Scots, with low or nil token counts of the new anglicisms. This is true, for example, of almost the entire contents of *Corr. M. Lorraine*. Other examples, judging from the extracts given, include letters from **Huntly** (1559–60 *Cal. Sc. P. I.* No. 679), from the **Queen Regent** (1560 *ibid.* No. 787), from **Glencairn** (1560 *ibid.* No. 905). Some scribes, e.g. in the series of letters of **James VI** between 1590 and 1594 in *Maxwell Mem.* II. 4–7, and some of the lairds themselves, e.g. **David Carnegie of Kinnaird** (1588 *Hist. Carnegies* II. 59–60; *idem*, 1597 *ibid.* 60), **Logan of Restalrig** (1600 *Facs. Nat. MSS Scot.* III. lxxvi) write all but unmixed Scots to the end of the century.

The same is true of many letters, holograph and scribal, addressed from Scotland by Scottish correspondents to English addressees, e.g. the **Earl of Angus** to Henry VIII (1524 *Douglas Corr.* 91; and 1527 *ibid.* 118), **Regent Arran** to Edward VI (1550 *Hist. Carnegies* I. 28; and 1551 *ibid.* 30), the same, now **Châtellerault**, to Cecil (1559 *Cal. Sc. P. I.* No. 569), the **third Earl of Arran** to Sir Ralph Sadler (1559, *ibid.* No. 541, *idem*) and **Lord James Stewart** to Sadler and Croft (1559 *ibid.* No. 596(1)), and many other examples in the same source.

There also exists from early in the sixteenth century a substantial body of correspondence and private writing which is more pervasively anglicised than this, some of it predominantly Scots but more or less heavily anglicised, some in a mixed variety in which the Scots and the English elements are more evenly apportioned. Until the Reformation, the greater part, including the very earliest examples, of this body of writing was by Scots resident in England, but not all of it. More permanent ^[5] conditions were that most – but again not quite all – of this kind of writing had English addressees, and most of the writers were Scots who were or had been resident in England and were also sympathisers with English political aims; the latter persons we may dub Anglo-Scots.

I begin with documents by or associated with **Gavin Douglas**, ecclesiastic, poet and politician.⁷ The holograph letters of Douglas of 1515, printed in the ‘Introduction’ to Small’s edition of his poems (Small ed., 1874: I. xxxvii f. [Doug. (Sm.)]; also in Fraser ed., 1885: 68 f. [*Douglas Corr.*]), written from Scotland, contain the anglicisms already listed – *go, so, not, only* –, also, however, the novelties *Popis Halynes* and *amongis*, at much the same low token rate as other Scots prose of the time, of one item per 600 or more words of text: these letters were addressed to recipients in England, one a Scot (Adam Williamson), one (Lord Dacre) English. The same low incidence of anglicisms characterises several letters written by Douglas to Cardinal Wolsey on Christmas Eve 1521, and on 6 Jan. 1521–22, immediately after Douglas’s arrival in London near the end of his life, the latest of these letters however containing the form *know* as well as *knaw*, according to Small’s transcript. Also predominantly Scots is a scribal letter of 800 words to Wolsey of 31 Jan. 1521–22 (Small ed., 1874: I. ciii–cvi [Doug. (Sm.)]), with over 45 distinctive Scotticisms as types, over 70 as tokens, or one token to 12 words, including:

allane; avne, awne (own),
beseyk (beseech),
eftir,
gif (if),
knaw,
lang,
quhilk,
ony (any),
sall (shall),
sen (since),
wald (would),
na and *sa*;
 and *aluterly, Januar, quhill* (until);
 and *ane* as indefinite article.

The same document, however, also contains the following anglicisms, at a rate of one token to 30 words:

hole (whole),
most,
none,
wofull,
good(e) 6X,
goodness,
not 6X,
 and *no, so* 10X.

⁷ [4] Listed and their authenticity discussed in Bawcutt (1996: 52–5); see also Beal (1980: 3).

The following document, of about the same date, place of composition not stated, which, despite Small's statement that it is "undoubtedly in [Douglas's] handwriting" (1874: I. cvi [Doug. (Sm.)]), seems also to be scribal rather than penned by Douglas (Bawcutt, 1996: 53; Beal, 1980: 3), has a still greater variety of anglicisms at the higher density of one token to 22 words of a 2500-word text.

(1) ?1521 ?Gavin Douglas: Certain charges against the Duke of Albany, in Small ed. (1874: I. cvi–cxiii [Doug. (Sm.)]).

(cx–cxi) Howbeyt God and all the realme of Scotland knowis the Kingis Grace is richt evill furneist in clothing and all vther necessaris, on sik one sort ... his hienes has diuers tymes within thir two yheris bywent lakkit honest hole hoysing and dowbillatis, till that his sister the Countes of Mortoun persaving sik disordour, furneist his grace honorabillie of sik nedful thingis; and also quhen the Qweenis Grace his moder, and sum tyme ^[6] this ilk Duke of Albany, sent cloith of siluer or gold to mak govnes to his hienes his officiaris wald not furneis lynyng nor pay for the fassoun thereof.

This passage contains five anglicisms, in this case only *o* for *a* anglicisms:

one,
two,
hole,
also,
cloith,
not.

The document of which this is a sample contains these further anglicisms:

bene (are v.),
the English verb inflection in *scheweth*,⁸
boith,
gone,
moir,
m(o)ist,
no,
none,
nothing,
old,
one,
thois,
tokynnys,
two,
wrong,
the holy bloode,
holy churche,
the Popis Holynes,
goode,
moche, *much*,

⁸ [5] This inflection, which appears in many of the anglicised texts cited below, also occurs in *The Spektakle of Luf* in the Asloan MS: *comparith* (Myll *Spect.* 275/4, 6), *apperith* (ibid. 278/4), along with a few other anglicisms: *none*, *quhom*, *so*, *also*. Otherwise, to the best of my knowledge, it is absent from mainstream Scots prose before the 1560s.

as well as some of the anglicisms already encountered.

In all other respects, this document is, like the letter of 31 Jan., above, fully Scots. If not by Douglas himself, it was apparently written by a Scot. Whether its anglicisation, and that of the 31 Jan. letter to Wolsey, was a mere veneer – a mechanical substitution of occasional English forms for corresponding Scots ones, as happened in Scots verse at this time – rather than a reflection of some anglicisation of speech, is not clear. The form *one* in the ‘Charges against Albany’ as used in:

that in the hole montis to one richt grete sovme;
one Robert Bertoun;
one verre pyrett and sey revere;
on sik one sort;
sik one prince, etc.

looks like a mechanical substitution for the Scots *ane*, the indefinite article. But apart from this, there remains the possibility that the anglicisms of the letter of January 31 and of the Albany document do reflect acquired spoken habits of these writers – amanuensis, or amanuenses, of Douglas? – who in at least one case were writing from London, though, as Bald noted (1927: 179), Douglas did not himself adopt “an unhomely foreign [i.e. anglicised] diction”.

According to Bald (1927), there was at least one Anglo-Scots angliciser before this, Adam Williamson: see the Appendix to this paper.

Some early letters, perhaps holograph, with English addressees, of **Sir George Douglas**, nephew of Gavin, brother of the Earl of Angus, are in full Scots: George Douglas to the Duke of Norfolk, ? holograph, from Bonkle (1524 *Douglas Corr.* 89–90), George Douglas to Sir Christopher Dacre, ? holograph, from Coldstream (1525 *Douglas Corr.* 98–9). But, during and after his long sojourn in England between 1528 and 1542, Douglas introduced into the idiosyncratically spelled Scots of some holograph or apparently holograph letters, all with English addressees (1533 *Douglas Corr.* 141, and six letters of 1545, *ibid.* 153–64), numerous anglicisms, at the rate of four or more tokens per 100 words. These include:

bothe,
go,
hole (whole),
home,
homely,
long,
longit (belonged),
moir,
most,
no,
qu(h)o,
quhome,
shouit (shown),
so,
sore (sorry),
tho (those),
two,
rodīs (ships’ roadsteads) ^[7] (Scots *radis*)
strongholdis;
quhiche,

not,
frome,
if,
wold (would),
miche (much),
siche (such).

Scotticisms are, however, more numerous as types and more frequent as tokens, including:

awne,
efter,
furtht,
hawpen,
knaue (know), *knawis,*
lang,
mony,
sa,
sal,
thir,
vald;
fayftelie,
nayntlie
gar,
tille,
ane,

as in the following:

(2) c. 1544–45 George Douglas to Sir Ralph Eure, place of writing not given (Fraser ed., 1885: 153–6 [*Douglas Corr.*]).

(155) For 3e heif beine to crowelle als veille apou 3our freindis as ennemis, in sa fare that the hole pepille belevis that and 3e be maisters ther is no thing bot detht to thaim alle, man, veymen, and chaylde. Therfor ther moste be comfort agane to bring ther hartis towart 3ow, in howpe off gentile handeling tille tho that ville assent to 3our openions, and to gar yaim onderstand yat it is ane common veille, and no particular mater of 3ours. Veisdome, mixte with forse, ville helpe miche in gret affaires.

The informant to the English, **James Henrison**, who *floruit* 1547–49, when, apparently, he lived in the North of England, pens “letters to Somerset and Cecil in a dialect fundamentally Scots but mixed with English forms” (Bald, 1927: 180). Of the calendared versions of the four letters of Henrison in *Cal. Sc. P. I.* only one offers enough continuous text to verify this statement (whereas Bald had examined the originals). This, however, to Sir John Thynne and Cecil, place of writing not given (1548 *Cal. Sc. P. I.* 140–1, No. 285), bears out Bald’s claim, with one anglicism to 18 words of text, including:

go,
moist (most),
one,
so,
two;
yf;
schall, schuld,

wold;
whiche.

Writing from Newcastle in England to Sir John Luttrell, the English commander in East Scotland, **Thomas Stewart** has a rather lower incidence of anglicisms than the foregoing, but nevertheless one noticeably higher than the general norm, with:

mor,
most,
one,
schow 2X (show),
showd (showed),
one indef. art.

in a letter of 320 words (1548 *Corr. M. Lorraine* 225–6).

Five and a half years after he settled in England and married Henry VIII's niece, Margaret Douglas, daughter of Angus and Margaret Tudor, who from the age of fifteen was resident at or about Henry's court, **Matthew, Fourth Earl of Lennox**, wrote out an account of the interview between his father-in-law the Earl of Angus and a Scots servant of his own, reporting a speech by Angus:

^[8] (3) 1549–50 (Fraser ed., 1885: 172–3 [*Douglas Corr.*]):

What care I all the rest of the worlde yf thei be in honour? Thow may tell him there was bands betuyx ys affore this, but now there is greater bandis of flesh and bloode; and where he haitht always put a dowbt in George my brother, schew him noder he nor Drumlangrig shall go ony waye or doo ony thing but as I will. And thus, I pray the, mark well my words, and bring me ansuer agane, and he shall know more at out meting.

Unlike the documents so far treated the anglicisms of this document slightly outnumber the Scotticisms as types and as tokens, including, in the 580 words of the complete text, these anglicisms:

bones,
boitht,
go,
no 3X,
moore, more,
ould(e) 2X,
towlde,
bloode,
good,
trust,
well 2X,
not,
yf 4X,
which 3X,
shall 3X, *shalbe;*
wolde (would) X3,
haitht (hath) 6X, one token in 15 words,
their (their), *there* (there),
where;
also the verb form in *sayetht*.

On the other hand, anglicisms not employed are *any*, *many*, *know*; only:

ony 4X,
mony,
knew 2X

along with other Scotticisms, including:

dawing (dawn),
deid (dead),
eneucht (enough),
furtht,
gif (if),
glaid,
whow (how),
and *broukis* (possesses),
or (before),
ware (spend),
and note the syntax of *was* and *is* in the quoted passage.

Other extant documents by **Lennox** are a letter written ten months after he arrived in England, to Robert Lord Maxwell, from Carlisle (1544–45 *Bk. Carlaverock* I. 26–8), and one written from Edinburgh to his wife in London (1570 *Lennox Mun.* 447–8). The first of these purports to be a ‘copy’, yet its language is sufficiently similar to that of the other two, both apparently holograph, to suggest that, if so, it is a rather faithful copy. Certainly it displays more inconsistencies between Scotticisms and anglicisms than the others, employing both:

knew and *know*,
mair and *moir*,
ony and *eny* (any),
and *wald* and *wold*,

and it has *sic* 2x, but not *such*. To *boitht* in the 1549–50 document, that of 1570 opposes *baith*. Otherwise all three show overlapping lists of anglicisms, which include, in addition to those of 1549–50, in 1544–45:

huole (whole),
onlie,
those, *thoise*,

and in 1570:

holy,
long,
such(e),
so,
two,
whole.

Another holograph letter of this period which, in contrast with the foregoing, is in all but perfect Scots, was written by **Robert, Lord Maxwell** from prison in England to Mr William Paget, Secretary of State (1544 *Bk. Carlaverock* I. 29). I mention it here because its few anglicisms include the interesting spellings:

<hanoy> (any), as well as the ^[9] Scots <hony> 3X (any),
and <noy> (no),

along with, in 500 words:

know,
mor,
not 3X,
so.

In all, or all but one, of the anglicised documents considered so far, all except those associated with Gavin Douglas, either certainly or apparently holograph, and all in a mixed Scots-English style, residence by the writer in England at or prior to the time of writing is a common attribute. This doubtless facilitated and may well have served to induce the adoption of a partly anglicised style. Most, though not quite all, of these documents were addressed to English recipients.

In addition to the known Anglo-Scots who penned the writings just discussed, there were other people given to similar anglicisation, who, as scribes, were in the service of, or on call by, some Scots lairds of the time. It is not evident how far, if at all, the same condition (of residence in England or other contact with English people) applied to them. Such are the writers of the following scribal letters addressed to Englishmen: the **Earl of Angus** to Henry VIII, from Holyrood House (1527 *Douglas Corr.* 117), with:

moist (most) 3X, most,
two,
holy,

in 360 words; the report of the **Earl of Cassillis** concerning Angus and George Douglas, (1545 *Douglas Corr.* 159–60), with:

boiht,
good,
no,
one 2X,
schwld 2X,

in 220 words of text; **Lord James Stewart** to Cecil, from Holyrood House (1561–62 *Cal. Sc. P. I.* No. 1057), with:

boyth,
bringeyth,
doyth,
so,
whome,

in sixty words of extract. Exceptionally heavily anglicised is the letter from the **Earl of Angus** and **George Douglas** to Lord Lisle, from Edinburgh (1542 *Douglas Corr.* 146–9), containing, in 1000 words of text, 24 anglicisms as types, 50 as tokens, not counting 18 occurrences of *one* as the indefinite article:

abroide,
after, aftre,
boith,
from 2X,
go 3X,
hoill (whole),
home,
knowe, knowis,

moist (most) 4X,
alsmoche (as much), *mouche* (much),
no 2X,
none,
not 2X,
shall 6X, *shalbe*,
shulde 4X,
so 5X,
sore,
suche 2X,
two,
whiche,
who 2X,
whom,
wold (would).

Even so, Scotticisms, including:

ane,
efter,
ferde (fourth),
gud(e),
langit (belonged),
mare,
maist,
mony 2X,
ony 2X,
sa (so),
thir (these),
thridlie,
wald (would) 5X>.

over 40 types, over 55 tokens, outnumber the anglicisms. An equal or greater level of anglicisation is achieved by the unknown writer of the following letter from **two Lothian lairds** to Sir John Luttrell, from Musselburgh, in which note:

who,
hatht,
show,
souche,
theisis,
whiche,
yf,
wold.

(4) 1547–48 in Cameron ed. (1927: 211) [*Corr. M. Lorraine*]

Thair is ane freind of ouris callit Robert Hammiltoun, who hatht saiff condweit of my lord protectouris grace to rapair in to England, as he him selff did show yow, who hes appoyntit ane toun callit Carrail, the men thairof, to be his furnysaris of souche fyschis as he thynkis nedfull to cary in theisis pertis; ^[10] men, duellaris in the said toun, as the names of ar writin within this letter, have your letteris of safe

conddueitt, which yf we thocht prejudusiall to the kyngis effaris, we wold in wyse desyre.

But in this case the suspicion arises that this may be an English scribal copy of a Scots original.

Other Scots scribes penned similarly anglicised texts, likewise addressed to Englishmen, from England: **Thomas Stewart** to Luttrell from Newcastle (?1548 *Corr. M. Lorraine* 270), with the anglicisms:

from(e) 2X,
not 2X,
so 3X,
sory,
whome,

and the Scotticisms:

gevin,
monyfald,
sall (= shall),
schewit (= showed),
wirshipfull, *virschypfull*,

in 100 words of extract; **Lord James Stewart** to Cecil, from Berwick (1559–60 *Cal. Sc. P. I.* No. 666), with *boytht*; the same, now **Earl of Moray**, to an English lord, from Westminster (1565 *Facs. Nat. MSS Scot.* III. lvi), with:

not 3X,
so,
moir,

in 220 words; and the **eighth Earl of Angus** to Walsingham, from Carlisle, with:

from 2X,
both 2X,
moir,
so,
two,

in 300 words (1581 *Douglas Corr.* 177). The Scots orthography of these documents makes it all but certain that their penmen were indeed Scots.

Most of the anglicised correspondence from Scots that has come to my hand from before the 1570s is directed to English addressees. The few exceptions to this are the letters of the Earl of Lennox, and the following letters in Scots orthography, holograph and scribal, from Scots to Scots, which include a sprinkling or more of anglicisms: **Regent Arran** to the Earl of Angus, from Linlithgow (1542–43 *Douglas Corr.* 152–3), with:

not,
woolde,
quhois,

in 200 words of text; the **third Earl of Arran** to Maitland of Lethington, from Dysart, holograph (1559–60 *Cal. Sc. P. I.* No. 613), with:

also,
both,
no,

only,
so,
two,

in the 145 words of the extracts given; the **Earl of Morton** to the then Earl of Angus (1577 *Douglas Corr.* 175) with *after* and *quhom* in some 300 words of text; and, much more heavily anglicised, **Mary Queen of Scots** to Sir John Carnegy, from Chatsworth, scribal (1570 *Hist. Carnegies* I. 54), in which the anglicisms, at the rate of one token to 14 words of a 360-word letter, are:

fourthe,
from,
good 6X,
lounge (long),
no,
not,
cannot,
only,
so,
allso 2X,
whensoever,
thes (these),
two,
whom,
and the form *becomithe*.

Without much further study it is not possible to confirm or refute the impression that writings of this sort from Scot to Scot occur later and less frequently than those with English addressees.

None of the documents we have considered so far in this section, heavily anglicised as some of them are, is without some infusion of Scotticisms at several linguistic levels. There are also, however, some letters from Scots, surviving from this period, written both from Scotland^[11] and England, addressed (those that I have encountered) to English recipients, that are in near perfect or only very slightly scotticised English. Sometimes, apparently, an English scribe was employed, as perhaps in the letters, from Berwick, of **George Douglas** to Henry VIII (1533 *Douglas Corr.* 140–1), and (? the same scribe) of **Angus** to the Lord Privy Seal of England (1536 *ibid.* 144–5). (Another letter of Angus from Berwick to George Douglas, earlier in the same year, perhaps holograph (1536 *Douglas Corr.* 143–4), is in unmixed Scots.) Perhaps also it was an English scribe who wrote out the two letters from **Robert Lord Maxwell** from prison in England to the English Privy Council (1544 *Bk. Carloverock* I. 31–2, 32–3). (Compare Maxwell's own slightly earlier letter to Paget in all but full Scots: see above.) Concerning some of these documents it is unclear whether they were originated in English or are subsequent copies by English scribes of lost originals partly or wholly Scots; there are doubtless many documents of the latter sort in the English state papers (e.g. **Châtellerault**⁹ to Norfolk (1559–60 *Cal. Sc. P. I.* No. 690), “copy in Randolph's hand”). Some of these dubieties exist in the editions from which I have been quoting, e.g. the **Earl of Angus** to Henry VIII, from Dalkeith (1544 *Douglas Corr.* 153); Angus and others to Hertford, from Melrose (1545 *ibid.* 160–1) (whereas a letter from Irvine a month later, the same to the same (1545, *ibid.* 161–2), is in only slightly anglicised Scots); **James VI** to Walsingham, from Edinburgh (1583 *Colville Lett.* 35–6). However, according to the editor,

⁹ Editor's note: later title of Regent Arran (see above).

Bain, it was a Scots scribe who penned the letter in slightly scotticised English from **Lord James Stewart**¹⁰ to Elizabeth from Edinburgh (1560–61 *Cal. Sc. P. I.* No. 990). Naturally Scots brought up in England, such as the child **Darnley** and his brother **Charles Earl of Lennox**, write in English: Darnley to Mary Queen of England (1554 *Facs. Nat. MSS Scot.* III xxxvi) (but Darnley, it has been suggested, may merely have copied words supplied by another as a display of penmanship), Charles Earl of Lennox to the Counsell of Scotland, from Gray's Inn (1572 *ibid.* lxiii).

4 The evidence of private correspondence: Post-Reformation, Knox and others

Until he returned to Scotland in 1559 **John Knox** spent most of the ten previous years in England or ministering to English congregations on the Continent. His published writings of this period, and also the *Sermon on Isaiah 26* (1565) (Knox VI. 221 f.) are in English except for the spellings of words in *-tein* such as *atein*, *pertein*, etc., and very rare instances of such Scotticisms as:

accompets,
ane (one),
auctoritie,
expone,
saul,
sclander,
wirk.

The contributions by Knox to the ^[12] two disputations printed by Robert Lekpreuik in 1563 and 1572 respectively (Knox VI. 169 f. and 479 f.) are also in English, but much more heavily infused with Scotticisms, though still much less Scots in language than the contributions of his Catholic opponents.

Knox's only surviving holograph MSS are these: most of the first part of the *Exposition of the Sixth Psalm* of 1553 (Knox III. 121 f.), holograph according to David Laing, and a body of letters and other missives from 1559 onwards. The holograph portion of the *Exposition* appears to be part of a copy made specially for Mrs Bowes, Knox's English mother-in-law. It is in all but simple English, though with a noticeably larger proportion of Scotticisms than the prints, other than those by Lekpreuik mentioned above, viz. in some 3500 words:

yncalle 2X,
ingyne,
sprete 2X,
apperteyneth,
conteyned,
opteyned,
whan,
wraith (wrath *noun*) 2X,
to all whom effeires,
and some spellings in <ai>.

Among the otherwise standard literary English spellings, there is one instance of <eny> (any).

¹⁰ Editor's note: 'Lord James' in original.

All of the surviving holograph letters,¹¹ including some signed by others but penned by Knox, down to 1564 (Knox VI. 15–132, 528–42) have English addressees (Cecil, Elizabeth, Croft, Raylton, Percy, Dudley). The earliest of these, written to Sir William Cecil, secretary of state to Queen Elizabeth, from Dieppe in 1559 (Knox VI. 15–21: II) – the end of Knox’s phase of living among the English – is, except for a few Scots digraph spellings:

<ei> in *appeire, feir, theis, yeir*
 <ai> in *pairtes*,
 and the form *meintein* (maintain),

all but entirely in English. The subsequent ones resemble the following in their language: predominantly English at all levels, but well laced with Scots.

(5) 151 LVIII: John Knox to Queen Elizabeth in Laing ed. (1846–64: VI. 126–7 and facsimile) [Knox]:

It war but foolishnes to me to prescribe vnto [La. (= Laing) unto] *your maiestie* [La. Majestie] what is to be down [La. doune] in any thing but especiallie in such thingis as men suppos do tuoch [La. tuech] my self. But of on [La. one] thing I think my self assured and *therfor* [MS. *yer-*] [La. thairfor] I dar not conceall it. To witt that neyther doht *our souerane* [La. Soverane] so greatly fear her owen estate

¹¹ [6] I have taken the following to be holographs of Knox:

(1) Those in Knox’s hand of which Laing provides a facsimile, viz. XIII, LVIII, XCII (see Laing ed., 1846-1864: VI. 43, 126, 574 [Knox]).

(2) Those specifically stated by Laing to be Knox’s originals, viz. II, XIV, XV (see Laing ed., 1846-1864: VI. 353 [Knox]), XII (see Laing ed., 1846-1864: VI. 43 note 2 [Knox]), XVIII (see Laing ed., 1846-1864: VI. 59 [Knox]). The *Cal. Sc. P.* version of XV (I., No. 496) is apparently a copy of this by Alexander Whytlaw.

(3) In addition to XII, XIII, XIV and LVIII (see above), Bain *et al.* eds (1898–1969 [*Cal. Sc. P.*]) state that the following are holographs of Knox: VII, IX, XIX, XXIV, XXVII, XL, XLIC, XLVI, XLVIII, LXXI, LXXII, LXXVIII, LXXXVIII.

(4) Three other letters of Knox, XXX, XXXV, XXXVIII, share with most of the others above a quirk of Knox’s spelling practice, viz. his frequent, though far from invariable, habit of writing <ht> for word-final <th>, and, in the word <yneucht> (e.g. Laing ed., 1846-1864: VI. 98, 528 [Knox]) for word-final <ch>. This is by no means unique to Knox – it is practised by other sixteenth-century writers, including George Douglas, and, apparently, Alexander Whytlaw – but it seems relatively uncommon. I have treated these letters also as his holograph.

(5) Relying only on Laing’s personal indications, I have accepted the following also as holographs of Knox: LXXXVI, CI, CII and CIII.

Laing specifically excludes from holograph status a number of letters, viz. those in the collection addressed to Mrs Anna Lock, which Laing derives from Calderwood, and others cited from Calderwood and from Bann. *Memor.*

R. D. S. Jack (1981), followed by R. J. Lyall (1988: 178), are mistaken in claiming that Knox’s autographs were more Scots in their language than most of Laing’s texts reveal. They base this assertion mainly on the spellings and forms of the MS collection called by Laing McCrie’s MS (of 1603), now in Edinburgh University Library. This MS is demonstrably scotticised from Knox’s originals, as indeed Miss Bald had already pointed out (1927: 184, n. 6). This can be shown, for example, by comparing the language of the holograph letters of Knox with that of McCrie’s MS (Laing’s source for the letters in Knox III. and IV.) or by comparing the holograph portion of *An Exposition of the Sixth Psalm* with the preceding section from McCrie’s MS. Professor Jack’s comparison (1981: 241) of some minor features of the language of the *First Blast* (1558), in English like nearly all of Knox’s prints, and those of a copy of a letter in McCrie’s MS, is therefore not to the point. On McCrie’s MS see further Ridley (1968: 538).

Doubtless a new edition of Knox’s works to modern standards of textual criticism to replace that of Laing is a very great desideratum.

by reasson of that book, neyther yit doht she si vnfeanedlie [La. un-] fauour the tranquillitie of *your maiesties reing* and realme that she wold tack so great and earnest panes, onles that her crafty counsall in so doing shot att a father marck. Tuo *yearis* [La. yeares] ag[o] [La. ago] I wrote vnto [La. unto] your *maiestie* my full declaration tuoching [La. tueching] that work[;] experience ^[13] since hath schawen that I am not desirus of *innouations* [La. innovations], so that Christ Jesus be not in his *membris* [La. membres] openlie troden vnder [La. under] the feitt of the vngodlie [La. ungodlie] ... beseching the *eternall* so to assist *your* highnes in all effares, that in his sight ye may be found acceptable.

Here the orthography is predominantly English, including:

<sh> not <sch>,
<wh> not <quh>,
<gh> not <ch>,
<ght> not <cht>,
<y> not <3>,
<ea> as a frequent option for Vowels 2 and 3,
<oo> in *foolishness*, *book*,

and inflections are spelled as in English:

<-es>,
<-ed> not <-it>,
and present participle <-ing> not <-and>.

In this document the majority of the distinctive word-forms too are English:

any,
such,
on (one),
not 3X,
neyther 2X,
doht (doth) 2X,
so 6X,
owen,
she 2X,
wold,
tuo,
wrote,
since,
hath,
ago,

fifteen types, 25 tokens, one word in seven, the highest density of anglicisms of form we have so far encountered. But there are also orthographic Scotticisms, in the <ei> of *reing* and *feitt*; other texts have also:

<ai>, e.g. in *saim* (Knox VI. 32), *persuaid* (ibid. 36), *bondaige* (ibid. 45), etc.;

<sch> in *schawin*, <ht> for <th> and <ch>, the latter, e.g. in *yneuht* (enough) (Knox VI. 98, etc.: see note [6]);

<w> for <v> in e.g. *dewill* [La. *devill*] (ibid. 43);

and there are Scottish MS abbreviations, such as:

<yerfor> (see above),
 <mt^tty> [La. *myghtty*] (ibid. 127),
 <ry^t> [La. *rycht*] (ibid. 44),

alongside *right*, *myghty*, *hight* (high) (ibid. 43, 44). The <-is> in Laing's transcription of *thingis* above, and in other texts in e.g. *otheris*, *dangeris*, etc., doubtless most often, as here, represents the MS looped word-final symbol (for <-is>, <-es>, <-us> etc.), which was a shared feature of Scots and English handwriting at the time.¹² And there are seven Scots word-forms:

war (were),
tuoch 2X,
dar,
yit,
reing (reign),
tack,
schawen.

The orthographic and morphological features noted above are virtually invariable in all but two of Knox's holograph and presumed holograph letters, letters XCII and CI (the latter are reserved for separate discussion below). A similar mingling of Scots and English forms in roughly the proportions of the sample characterises most of these letters down to 1564; in a minority of them, however, the rate of Scotticisms falls below the average, but without ever disappearing altogether (examples of the less Scots texts are XII, to Cecil; XV, to Elizabeth; XXXV, to Croft; all of 1559; and XLVIII, to Raylton, of 1560). Of the later batch of letters considered by me, from 1569 to the death of Knox in 1572 (Knox VI. 565–619), three have English addressees (LXXXVI, to a friend in England; LXXXVIII, a brief letter to Cecil; CIII, to Christopher Goodman), three are addressed to Scots. One of the ^[14] latter, CII, to Sir John Wischart of Pittarrow (1572 Knox VI. 616–8), and the letter to Cecil display roughly the 'normal' proportions of English to Scots forms, while the other two English-addressed letters belong to the group with a low density of Scotticisms.¹³

These documents include virtually all of the anglicisms I have so far presented from the earlier writings discussed in this paper, and a few that I have not noted in earlier record (the bracketed numbers are pages of Knox VI.); those previously unnoted are:

ago (126),
mo (more in number, Scots *ma*) (86, 89, 568),
moorne (mourn) (20),
 the plural *yeis* (17), *eis* (45), *eyes* (49), in place of *ene*,
 and the 'hyper-anglicism' *throward* (105) (see below).

Other anglicisms, mostly already on record in previous Anglo-Scots writings or in prose generally, are (only less common items or those noted only in the late texts will be provided with page-numbers):

¹² [7] R. D. S. Jack (1981) is therefore mistaken (see previous note) in using this as a criterion of orthographic Scottishness.

¹³ [8] Another document of this period the language of which closely resembles that of the holograph documents with the 'normal' proportion of Scotticisms is XCVI (1571 Knox VI. 602–4), to the Brethren of the Church of Edinburgh, cited by Laing ed. (1846–64) apparently from a contemporary print of Robert Lekpreuik: among the Scotticisms of this text are:

sall (shall) (in the motto at the head), *deith*, *feght*, *laughfullie*, *prevene*, *sclandered*, *wraith* (wrath).

I have not however included this work in my lists of anglicisms and Scotticisms.

after;
also;
*among*s (131);
any, *anie*;
beholde (20);
blowe (131);
bold, *boldlie*;
both;
cold (531);
either, *eyther*;
from;
hath;
high;
holden (528, 617);
hole, *holl*, *whole* (whole);
holsome (131);
yf, *if* (if);
lowe (low) (69);
many;
mor(e);
most;
much, *moche* (much);
no;
not;
nothing (616);
old (106);
on(e);
oonlie, *oneli*e (only);
ought (ought, should) (132);
promot (69);
shall; *shalbe* (shall be);
s(c)he;
secretary, *-ie*;
should;
so;
whatsoever (528);
ouerthrow (528);
token, *-en*;
two(o), *tuo*;
weeke;
w(h)ich;
who;
whom;
whose;
wold(e), *woolde* (would) (80);
world (619).

Throughout these letters also the 3rd person present of verbs regularly ends in <-eth, -eht, -th, -ht> and sometimes (see below) in <-est>, in the singular, and, according to Scots syntax, when there is no adjacent personal pronoun, occasionally also in the plural (see below); exceptions to this are:

LXXVIII (1564 Knox VI. 541), to Randolph, which has *Thus with ws ravis Maddy every day and it likes the ladeis nothing*;

the letter to Wischart (CII), which has <-eth> 4x in the singular, but *stands* after a plural noun subject (see below);

and the two letters in Scots (on which see below), XCII, where the simple present indicative does not occur, and CI, which uses the Scots form <-is, -es>.

In one text, not, however, one of those that I have accepted as holograph (1559 Knox VI. 92–4, XLII), to Sir James Croft, *you* occurs several times as well as the regular *ye* as the subject pronoun of address, as it does also in the anglicised writings of some of Knox's contemporaries.

In the same documents, Scotticisms are as numerous as types, though less frequent as tokens:

asily (easily) (69);
awght (ought) (32);
cam (came);
compon (compose) (68);
dar (dare) (126);
entress (44), *enteress* (45) (entry);
establissing (45);
ferd (fourth) (31);
freind, freindshipe;
foundation (41);
furht, furth(e);
geve (give);
glaid (101);
hinging;
hundreht (hundred) (68);
kirk and *kirklands* (both CII: to ^[15] Wischart, 617);
laubour (69);
laughfull, lauchtfull (44), *laughfullie* (lawful, -fully);
manassing (68);
mes (the religious service, the mass);
murn (mourn);
necessare (69);
nixt (68);
opponne (132);
obteyne (80);
prencess (43);
prent, prented;
prev(e)y (21, 541);
proponed (49, 63, 68);
sanct (saint);
schawen;
schooles (shovels) (541);
sempill (45);
soldartis (68);
spreit;
tack, tak (take) and *tackest* and *tacken*;

thare (there);
thrist (thirst);
throughtlie (thoroughly) (57);
together, alltoidther (131);
tuoch (touch), *tuoching, tuiching* (touching, concerning);
vesy (visit) (542);
vesit (31);
weght (568);
wemen (45);
wissed (wished);
yneucht (enough) (87, 98, etc.);
faschious (vexatious) (530),
lippen (trust) (69),
myndeht (intends) (126),
pans (think) (541),
skaile (scatter) (90)
solan geese (gannets) (542),
untymouslie (untimely) (47);
albeit I have bein fremmedly (in unfriendly fashion) *handilled* (568);
I have laid my compt (I have settled my accounts) (528);

and occasional Scotticisms of grammar, such as:

the inflected adjective *otheris* (45);
till (to) (68, 107);

and the inflected 3rd plural present, where there is no adjacent personal pronoun, in *as our ennemies supposes* (XXX: to Croft, 74), *both the parteis stands as it were fighting against God himself* (CII: to Wischart, 617); and, with <-eth>, *unto the other men that cumeht for my wief* (XXX: to Croft, 74), and *as other things occurrih* (XXXV: to Croft, 81).

For some words Knox uses both the English and the Scots forms. In some cases the English form is favoured, the Scots alternative making only a single or rare appearance, thus:

<i>befor(e)</i>	<i>or</i> (528);
<i>knowledg</i> (531), <i>know, knoweht,</i>	<i>knowledge</i> (99);
<i>knowing, knowen</i>	
<i>long, longest</i> (529)	<i>lang</i> (99);
<i>must</i>	<i>man</i> (530), (but <i>most(e)</i> is common in the same use);
<i>ones, once</i> (617)	<i>anes</i> (528)> (if Laing's reading is correct; <i>Cal. Sc. P. II.</i> No. 34 has <i>ones</i> here);
<i>owen</i> (63), <i>owne</i> (617)	<i>awen</i> (528);
<i>theis, these</i> (64, 106, 568)	<i>thir</i> (617);
<i>thrust</i> (trust) (45, 529)	<i>traist</i> (47);
<i>unfained, unfainedlie, unfanedlie</i>	<i>unfeened</i> (40);
<i>w(h)ich(e)</i> (sometimes, ?usually <w ^{ch} >)	<i>quhilk</i> (45) (?MS <qlk> or <q ^{lk} >).

In other instances it is the Scots form which appears to come more readily to his pen:

<i>mack</i> (make)	<i>maykeht</i> (41), <i>makith</i> (82);
<i>ring, reing</i> (reign)	<i>raign</i> (49);

<i>sence</i> (31)	<i>since</i> (132);
<i>thame</i>	<i>themselves</i> (102);
<i>thare</i> (their)	<i>there</i> (69, 107);
<i>together, alltogidther</i> (131)	<i>together</i> (132);
<i>wyrk, wirking</i>	<i>work</i> (19);
<i>wirshipfull</i>	<i>worshipfull</i> (47, 132);
<i>wraite</i>	<i>wrote</i> (126);
<i>yit(t)</i>	<i>yet</i> (528)

And:

lick varies with *liek, like*;
luf (93) with *love* (98);
nather with *neyther* (36, 57), *neather* (57);
ellis whare (529) with *where* (618);
war with *were*.

Only three of the surviving holograph or probably holograph letters of Knox printed in Knox VI (Laing ed., 1846–64) have Scots addressees, and all ^[16] three belong to the last two years of his life. That to Sir John Wischart of Pittarrow (CII, 1572 Knox VI. 616–8) is predominantly in English and has been treated above with the letters in similar language to English recipients. Like them its English is sparsely sprinkled with orthographic and formal Scotticisms, the latter being single occurrences, in the 500 words of the complete text, of:

furth,
kirk, kirklands,
nather (neither),
tak (take),
thir (these),
yitt,

and it has the grammatical Scotticism mentioned above.

By contrast, the two remaining letters are, uniquely for surviving holograph documents of Knox, largely in Scots, though in each case with a sprinkling of anglicisms of orthography and form; indeed, the anglicisms, though outnumbered by Scotticisms, are nearly as frequent as those in some of the earlier Anglo-Scots documents (of George Douglas and others discussed above).

The letter to Sir William Douglas of Lochleven (XCII, 1570 Knox VI. 574), definitely holograph:

sometimes spells Vowels 2 and 3 with <ea>;
 mostly spells /hw/ as <wh>;
 and the past ending is <-ed> in its four occurrences;
 in 220 words it has single instances of *after*, *shall*, *whose*, *worshepfull* and several of *not*.

Otherwise it is in Scots, including:

alltgidder,
 <quhilk>,
sick (such) 2X,
tack (take), *tacken*,
thare (their) 2X, *tharby* (thereby),

tua (two),
wyrshipfull,
also *lard* (laird),
and *meitt* (meet),
<*nycht*> as well as *ryght*,
and <I have tacken my good *nycht* of it>.

The letter to Sir James Douglas of Drumlanrig (CI, 1572 Knox VI. 615–6), holograph according to Laing's guidelines, but not verified, is still more predominantly Scots. Its spellings include the English:

<ea>,
<wh> 3X,
<-ed> 4X,

alongside the Scots:

<ai>,
<ei>,
<oi> in *befoir*,
<cht> 5X (but perhaps representing MS abbreviations);
behovit, *defendit*, *wickit*;
admoniseth (for *admonisit*),
and both *dead* and *deid*.

The numerous anglicisms of form:

both;
long;
ones (once);
onlie, *-ly*;
so;
therof;
they;
which;
who;
whome;
worschipfull;
wronge;

14 tokens in 300 words, or one in 21, are nevertheless greatly outnumbered both as types and as tokens by the Scotticisms:

anes (once),
awin (own) 2X,
blissed,
efter,
gif (if),
knaw,
laiked,
lat (let),
most (must),
murne (mourn),
ony (any),
pure (poor),

remeid,
sail (shall) 4X,
sua (so),
thea (those),
thair (their),
thame (them),
thir (these),
waike (weak),
wald (would);

25 tokens in 300 words, one in twelve. In contrast with Knox's other surviving holograph letters, the 3rd singular present of verbs ends, *more scottice*, in <-is, -es> in *craves*, *seikis*, *restis* (p. 616).

All but one (viz. *wronge*) of the English forms of these two documents are shared with the (mostly earlier, mostly English addressed) letters predominantly in English considered above. Twelve of the thirty Scots forms, conversely, are rare or unrecorded in the other ^[17] holograph letters:

(XCII) *sick* (such), *tua*, *quhilk*;

(CI) *anes*, *awin*, *efter*, *gif*, *knaw*, *lat*, *ony*, *sall*, *sua*, *wald* and *thir*, which is also in the letter to Wischart.

In a few cases there is variation between English and Scots within the two documents:

after (XCII) and *efter* (CI);
ones (CI) and *anes* (CI);
shall (XCII) and *sall* (CI);
so and *sua* (CI);
which (CI) and *quhilk* (XCII).

The 250-word correction in Knox's own hand inserted at fol. 354 of the Laing MS of his *History*, thus after 1567 (Knox II. 392–3; see Dickinson ed., 1949: II. 86 and note 3), contains a similar proportion of Scotticisms, 12 types, 13 tokens, to that of the letter to Douglas of Lochleven (XCII: see above), including:

baith,
kendled,
sticked (stabbed),

none of which I have noted in the other holograph writings, also:

laird
and the spellings <deid> (deed) and <thocht>;

but there is a much higher density than in XCII of the usual anglicisms: 16 types, 18 tokens, including:

both,
from,
howsoever,
sche,
their,
they,
whereof.

Let us try to construct a linguistic biography out of all this. So we might follow Miss Bald (1927) and guess that Knox spoke the English or near-English of the 1559 Dieppe letter to his English congregations and friends when in England or the Continent. When he preached in Ayr, during a temporary visit to Scotland in 1555, in the middle of the England and Continental period, and it was mooted that he was an Englishman (1558 Knox IV. 439), this may have been why: he was still in his English-speaking phase. (Alternatively this conjecture may have been on the basis of his Bible-reading and preaching language which might well have been more anglicised than his regular speech.) However, one spelling in the 1559 Dieppe letter is <hedds> (heads), which looks as if an English, not one of the Scots, pronunciations underlay it. But if he did speak English during his time of exile, the occasional Scotticisms of the printed texts of this period (see above) suggest that it was an English not wholly unmixed with traces of his native tongue.

In the letters written from Scotland there are clear indications of an underlying Scots or at least partly Scots pronunciation. As we have seen, there is a long list of Scots forms which Knox consistently or all but consistently favours over their English alternatives, and nearly all by 1564:

furth,
hinging,
laughfull,
mack,
murn,
schawen,
tack,
thare (their, there),
thrist (thirst),
whare (where),
wrait(e) (wrote),
yneucht (enough)
and others.

In a number of letters of 1559 Knox uses <-est> as a third person singular present verb ending (VII: 1559 VI. 32, XII: 42, XIV: 46, XV: 48, XXVII: 68, XXX: 74, XLVI: 102, 2X) in place of his usual correct <-eth>; at *ibid.* 42 he has *dost* for *doth*; he also occasionally has <-eth> as a plural according to ^[18] Scots syntax (see above). These errors would be easy to a Scot whose normal speech had only the morpheme /-(I)S/ for all of these. The form <throward> (XLVIII, 1560 *ibid.* 105) is apparently a ‘hyper-anglicism’ for underlying Scots *thrawart*, with English <o> erroneously substituted for Scots <a> (compare English *froward*). These and the lexical Scotticisms, in letters addressed to English recipients at the same period, suggest a speaker of Scots who heavily anglicised his writing but not to the same extent his speech. As for Ninian Winzet’s well-known gibe about Knox’s forgetting “our auld plane Scottis” for “Southron” (Hewison, ed., 1888–90: I. 138 [Winzet]), written in October 1563, after Winzet had left Scotland in 1562, if this refers to Knox’s speech (of the period soon after his return from exile), it is most likely that Winzet was writing from hearsay: we do not know that he ever actually met Knox. Or Winzet may merely have had Knox’s published writings in mind, to which of course the gibe fairly applies.

Granting the manifest presence of Scots throughout Knox’s holograph writings, and, doubtless, speech, and his evident failure to convert from the Scots to the English syntax of the present tense verb, it nevertheless does not follow that English elements were absent from his speech. The contrary is more likely. His written language, whether predominantly anglicised, as in most of the surviving holograph letters, or predominantly Scots, as in the

two letters to the Douglas lairds (XCII and CI), is inconsistent in both these respects, and even in the latter two the English content is considerably higher than the contemporary norm for MS texts. This is of course in writing. As for Knox's speech, is it likely that this ever achieved a consistency (to Scots or English) which his written language never did? Or did he speak as well as write a somewhat inconsistently mixed Scots English, perhaps tending to select from the English or Scots options according to the social setting or the interlocutors, in much the same way and for similar sociolinguistic reasons as many Scots speakers have done from the seventeenth century onwards? This would make him, perhaps with some or all of the other Anglo-Scots already mentioned, one of the earliest speakers of 'Scots English'. This seems possible.

A prominent Scot of Knox's generation was **William Maitland of Lethington**, 'Secretary Maitland' (?1528–73). Maitland made several lengthy diplomatic visits to the English court between 1558 and 1568, and was an associate of the English Secretary Cecil. According to Miss Bald (1927: 185), Maitland's early letters to Cecil "evinced an imperfectly realised desire to write in English". The brief snatches of original text quoted in the calendared entries for these letters given in *Cal. Sc. P.* (Dec. 1559, *Cal. Sc. P.* I. 279 (no. 603), etc.: for a small selection of other references see Bald, 1927: 185) indeed show that they^[19] contain phonological and lexical Scotticisms (Bald had herself checked the original MSS of those documents she cites – by no means the total in existence); similarly the letter of 20 Aug. 1560 (Knox VI. 114–6) (not considered by Bald), has 15 formal Scotticisms in 500 words of (predominantly) English, viz.:

aneuch 2X,
auld,
begouth,
maist,
mony,
quhilk 2X,
sould 2X,
tak,
wes (was);
ane indef. art.
and the verb *man* (must).

The language of several letters to Cecil of July, August and early September, 1560 (*Cal. Sc. P.* I. 451 (No. 871), 460 (No. 880), 474 (No. 894), 477 (No. 901)) is similar.

"By Sept. 1560 he had practically attained his goal," claimed Miss Bald, referring to Sept. 13, 1560 (*Cal. Sc. P.* I. 479–80 (No. 903)); and indeed the extract of 80 words from this document given in *Cal. Sc. P.* is in unmixed English, including *yow* (you) as both subject and object, incidentally. This appears to be anticipated by the letter to Cecil of Aug. 18, 1560 (*Cal. Sc. P.* I. 464 (No. 885)), also very heavily though not totally anglicised; it also contains *ane* as indefinite article, and *aune* (own). Miss Bald finds in the letter of Feb. 4, 1563–64 (*Cal. Sc. P.* II. 39 (No. 51)) "a temporary retrogression"; this letter appears to be in very heavily anglicised Scots (with one phonological anglicism per ten words of text). The extracts given from the later letters to Cecil considered by Miss Bald, in *Cal. Sc. P.* from 1561 onwards, are in all but perfect English, with few and very infrequent Scotticisms.

In sharp contrast are two letters to Scots noblemen (the Laird of Coldingham and the Marquis of Huntly), both from Blair Atholl in a single week of July, 1570 (*Cal. Sc. P.* III. 265–6 (No. 362), 278–80 (No. 376)), which Miss Bald, though not the editor of *Cal. Sc. P.* III., believed to be holograph. These are in almost unmixed Scots, except for a few instances of *not*, one of *onely* and one of *from*. If these letters are indeed of Maitland's own

penning, it would seem that, even more than Knox, Maitland was an accomplished bilingual, suiting the language of his letters to their intended recipients, “from motives of tact”, Bald suggests, and managing almost perfect English and almost perfect Scots, such as Knox rarely achieved.

The earlier career of **Mr John Gray**, Clerk to the General Assembly, 1560–74, appears to have paralleled that of Knox, with episodes in St Andrews Castle in 1547, in the French galleys with Knox, and a visit to Geneva in 1558 (Shaw, 1964: 144–7). We may conjecture that he had English contacts similar to those of Knox. His linguistic practice seems also to have resembled that of Knox. The letter penned by Gray, printed at Knox VI. 534–6, LXXIV, and, in calendar (*Cal. Sc. P. I.* 40–1 (No. 54)), described there as Gray’s holograph, from three Edinburgh ministers, including Knox, to the English archbishops, is in English with very ^[20] few Scotticisms. The accompanying General Assembly Act (Knox VI. 537–8, LXXV) is also essentially in English but with more Scotticisms. Gray’s *The Kirkis Testimoniall* (1565 *Misc. Wodrow Soc. I.* 287–8) is also Knox-like in style; it includes an erroneous use of *hath* as a plural (287). Gray is also believed to have been the copyist of a large part of the Laing MS of Knox’s *History* (see e.g. Robinson, 1983: 65). Another associate of Knox whose linguistic as well as his personal history may turn out, following investigation, to parallel those of Knox and Gray, is **Alexander Whytlaw**, but the extracts from letters by him in *Cal. Sc. P. I.* are insufficient to confirm this, and his copy of a letter by Knox (1559 *ibid.* 228–30 (No. 496), compare Knox V. 47–51, XV) is no doubt influenced by the spellings of Knox’s original.

Two other Anglo-Scots who were contemporaries and associates of Knox and Maitland were **Henry Balnaves of Harthill** (born c. 1502) and **William Kirkcaldy of Grange**. To English addressees Balnaves wrote a Scots English in which the anglicisms outnumber the Scotticisms, not much less anglicised than Knox (see, e.g. 1547 Knox III. 419–20; 1559 *ibid.* 420–2, 423–6). All of Kirkcaldy’s letters that I have inspected have English addressees, and all anglicise to some slight to moderate degree (*viz.* 1559 Knox VI. 33–4, *Cal. Sc. P. I.* 217–8 (No. 474), 219–20 (No. 480), 226 (No. 492), 233–4 (No. 505); 1564 *ibid.* II. 60–1 (No. 72(1)), 75 (No. 93), etc.). Like other anglicisers of his time Kirkcaldy occasionally uses *you* as a subject form: *I dout not but you have hard thairof* (1564 *Cal. Sc. P. II.* 60 (No. 72(1))), to Randolph).

A one-time servant or dependent of the fourth earl of Lennox, who was for many years from the 1540s on an agent the English government in Scottish affairs, the Scot **Thomas Bishop**, penned in 1561–62 a letter to Cecil, in which the English element is predominant, though not total as in the following sample:

(6) Thomas Bishop to Cecil, place of origin not given, 1561–62 in Bain *et al.*, eds. (1898–1969: I. 600–2 (No. 1076)) [*Cal. Sc. P.*]

Wheare my lady and he [sc. Lennox] to the ewill brute of the cuntraye haitht defaced castellis and manouris, and sould awaye the lede, tymbre, byrk [?brick], and stones, and as I think never in there dayes spent one hundretht markes in beilding, I have spent for planting me and my poore case eight hundretht markes and above ... Noo mervelle seing ... the deatht of the two dukis my frendes, my displeasoures sustened for my dewitie by my lady Levenax above a thowsande poundes throught hir, and other wayes to long to resyete.

[21] Other anglicisms of this document include:

*blowen,
boetht,
knowetht,
ould (thould erle of Glencarne).*

An Anglo-Scot of the next generation who anglicised heavily in his English-addressed letters, less so in those to Scots, was **John Colville** (b. 1542) (Colville *Lett.*, passim).

Doubtless there were in the period examined above, other anglicisers remaining to be discovered by a more exhaustive survey, and some, such as Balnaves and Kirkcaldy, who deserve much fuller investigation than I have been able to carry out.

5 The case of Margaret Tudor

A converse case to that of the writers of anglicised Scots whom we have been considering was that of Margaret Tudor, widow of James IV and sister of Henry VIII. Having resided in Scotland since her fourteenth year in 1503, with only one absence of two years in England (1515–17), Margaret had scotticised not only her writing but also her speech, as appears from several holograph¹⁴ letters of 1523 (*St. P. Henry VIII* IV. 16 f., 126 f.):

(7) 1523 Margaret Tudor to the Earl of Surrey, no place given, in *St. P. Henry VIII* IV. 19.

I inswr you that I can cawse the Kyng to com forth and charge hys Lordys to com to hym ondar payn of tresson, bot than I am not swr vay vol take part vyth hym and that I thynke dangeros. Therfor I can dw ne thyng vhol I get ansvar from you.

Margaret Tudor to the Duke of Norfolk, from Edinburgh, *ibid.* 126–7:

Alsua I sent the sayd Patryk to you, my Lord, touschyng the mony that the Kyngs Grace my brothar ordard to the Kyng my son for tway hwndreth men to be abowht hyz parson, trastyng that he suld sped of the sam; vylke mony he hath not gatyn. Vharefor I desyr ... to know parfytylly gyff thyz mony salbe fwrnyssyd or not. ... And for my part I gange ne vay bot uttarly for the wel and swrty of the Kyng my son; and otharz gayngyz for favor of fryndyz and for thayr aune profyt mare than for the Kyng my son.

The irregularity or ‘incorrectness’ of some of these spellings as Scots suggests that Margaret was writing at least partly ‘by ear’, rendering internalised pronunciations, and that she indeed spoke the Scots of these letters, though probably with an English accent. This last may be^[22] indicated, *inter alia*, by the form <vay> (who): with <ay> as a regular Scots spelling of Vowel 4, approximately /ɛ:/ then, and <v>, as often in Older Scots spelling, for /w/ – perhaps she was one of those Southern English speakers who merged former /hw/ and /w/, realising both as [w] and so substituted this for Scots /hw/.¹⁵ I leave it to the reader to spot the many other Scotticisms and sparse anglicisms in these passages. Whether and how far she reverted to English in English company is for speculation only.¹⁶

¹⁴ [9] According to the volume editor (Brewer ed., 1875).

¹⁵ [10] The reverse spelling <vhald> (would) (1523 *State P. Henry VIII* IV. 58) confirms this.

¹⁶ [11] A study of Margaret’s entire holograph correspondence, which I have not attempted, would doubtless reveal more of her linguistic biography. For example, some later letters suggest that she had then reverted to a much more nearly ‘pure’ English style: e.g. 1537 *State P. Henry VIII* V, 89 f.; 1541 *ibid.*, 188.

6 Some conditions and motives

The anglicisations we have witnessed in the previous sections of this paper were, as I have formerly suggested (Aitken, 1979: 89; 1985: x; 2015), facilitated or enabled by the pervasive linguistic identities and similarities between the two languages involved, outnumbering and outweighing their distinguishing characteristics: “because of this, elements originally English could be infiltrated into Scots writings and, later, speech, without appearing too incongruous” (1979: 89). Supporting or justifying the trend towards the assimilation of Scots to English was the widely, if not universally, held view that the Scots and the English were joint participants of “oure Inglisch” (Dunbar *The Golden Targe* l. 259, in Small ed., 1893: II [Dunb. *G. Targe*]), were “of ane langage” (*The Complaynt of Scotlande* c. xiii, in Murray ed., 1872 [Compl.]), possessed “ydentie of langage” (1604 *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*: VII. 16–17 [Reg. Privy C.]); and see Donaldson (1961: 287–8, 290–2), McClure (1981: 65–8), Robinson (1983: 59–61).¹⁷

In prose writing generally the beginning of anglicisation, however initiated (very possibly by imitation of writings in English), seems to antedate, albeit ever so slightly (see above), the earliest anglicised writings of those I have been calling Anglo-Scots. The latter, however, had the additional stimulus to this practice over their home-based compatriots of constantly hearing English spoken around them by native speakers, which may explain why, once they had, and to an enhanced degree, adopted the fashion, they were from then on visibly in its van. In their case, then, the phenomenon we have been studying was led by speech as well as by writing, by pronunciation as well as by spelling.

A minority of the heavily anglicised documents which I have cited in the foregoing discussion were addressed to Scots by exiles in England (Lennox, the scribe of Mary’s letter of 1570). In these, we presume, their writers were merely persisting in the style which had become habitual to them when in England, however inappropriate in letters to Scots. Other letters I have commented on from Scots resident in Scotland to their compatriots also in Scotland are much less heavily anglicised.

^[23] The majority of the heavily anglicised letters of the middle decades of the sixteenth century that I have encountered, all of them by Anglo-Scots, have English addressees, mostly dignitaries. Perhaps in these cases one of the Scottish writers’ intentions was to compliment or do courtesy to the intended recipient or, as Bald puts it of Maitland, “from motives of tact”; or the practice may reflect deference as well as mere courtesy to the English person addressed – an early manifestation of the ‘Scottish cringe’ (on which see further Donaldson, 1961: 307). Bald suggests that William Maitland’s anglicising arose out of wished emulation of “the courtliness and grace of the Southern tradition” (Bald, 1927: 184), and “because he realised that the Southern language was a better medium for expressing his thoughts with grace and verve” (ibid.: 186). There are indeed indications that some at least of the Scots of this period were inclined to regard their native speech as “braid & plane” (Douglas ‘Prologue’ I to the *Æneid*, l.109, in Coldwell ed., 1951–57 [Doug. I. *Prol.*]), as “our ald plane Scottis” (Hewison ed., 1888–90: I. 138 [Winzet]), beside “sudron”, as rough and harsh beside the more polished English (Aitken, 1979: 89–91; 1985: x; 2015; Donaldson, 1961: 289–93; McClure, 1981, somewhat dissents). While Scottish writers showed courtesy or deference to English addressees by anglicising their Scots or simply writing in English, I know of only one case (that of Margaret Tudor: see above) who paid the same compliment in reverse – another indicator of the relative

¹⁷ Editor’s note: AJA also made the point in ‘Variation and variety in written Middle Scots’ (1971: 184; 2015) that the adoption of anglicised spellings could hardly have occurred without the Middle Scots spelling system’s “habitual tolerance of spelling variation”.

statuses of the two languages at that time; evidently English, both as the language of the dominant nation and for other historical reasons (Aitken, 1979; 1985, 2015; Donaldson, 1961), enjoyed greater respect than did Scots.

7 Anglicised speech? Anglo-Scots and others

Of course anglicisation practised only in writings directed to English persons, out of sight of Scottish readers, could scarcely affect Scots writing or speech more generally. Anglicised writings addressed to Scots, such as the few I have been able to identify, could at least potentially influence their Scottish recipients: thus Lennox to Maxwell, Knox to Wischart and to the Douglas lairds. But a greater and more general impetus towards progressive anglicisation of Scots, spoken and written, could have been exerted by the Anglo-Scots if, having internalised some or all of their anglicisms, they continued to use these after their return to Scotland, in their speech as in their writing. And of course many other Scots, some known, many unknown, including many of much humbler rank than the letter-writers we have been examining, visited England at this period, among them the poet Dunbar (Donaldson, 1961: passim, but especially 303–7, 310–2). They too may ^[24] well have carried back anglicisms in their speech from their English visits.

All this is of course speculative. A little less so is the following. Many of the Anglo-Scots we have been discussing have some spellings of anglicised forms that were somewhat irregular in English of the time as well as in Scots – such as:

- <miche>, <siche> (George Douglas);
- <eny>, <ould>, <towlde> and the spelling-pronunciation <huole> (Lennox);
- <hanoy> (any) (Maxwell);
- <eny>, <hedds> (heads), <wiche> (Knox);
- <ould>, <sould> (Bischoep).

The same writers and others also apply Scots orthographic practices to the rendering of English forms:

- <abroide> (scribe);
- <boith>, <boiht>, <boiht>, <boyth>, <boytht> (both) (Lennox, various scribes);
- <boeht> (Bischoep);
- <cloith> (scribe);
- <hoill> (scribe);
- <moir> (more) (George Douglas, Lennox, scribes);
- <moist> (most) (Henrison, scribes);
- <thois(e)> (Lennox, scribe);
- <theis(e)> (Knox, scribe);
- <doyth> (scribe);
- <haith(t)> (Lennox);
- <hatht> (scribes);
- <deatht> (Bischoep);
- <bringeyth> (scribe);
- <becomithe> (scribe);
- <qu(h)o>, <quhois>, <quhome> (George Douglas, scribe);
- <quiche> (George Douglas);
- <schow> (show), <schowd> (showed) (Thomas Stewart);
- <schall>, <schuld> (Henrison);
- <schwld> (scribe).

These suggest that these writers at least had internalised not so much the English spellings as the English pronunciations of these words, and are rendering them ‘phonetically’. Whether they actually so pronounced them ‘out loud’ is again speculation, but certainly possible. Again, the **third Earl of Arran**, rather less of an Anglo-Scot than the writers just cited, in his holograph letter to Maitland mentioned earlier, in, essentially, Scots, has the sentence *thair both a afek* (according to 1559–60 *Cal. Sc. P. I. No. 613*) (they’re both (of) one effect): the ‘phonetic’ spelling of <thair> and <afek> encourages one to grant ‘phonetic’ verisimilitude to that of <both> also.

If the speech of returning expatriate Scots was one source of anglicisation of Scots speech and writing in the early and middle decades of the sixteenth century, it was surely not the only one. Another, maybe, was the speech of the many English persons resident in Scotland, envoys, traders (Donaldson, 1961: 307–10, especially 309), even some of the occupying troops; the speech of Darnley too was doubtless of a piece with that of these English visitors. The reliance of Scottish readers on books in English and the eagerness of those of Protestant leanings to obtain ecclesiastical texts in English (see e.g. Donaldson, 1961: 286) no doubt also had its influence on those readers’ linguistic tendencies.

We can only speculate at the speech-variety or varieties that late sixteenth-century Scottish ministers, church readers, schoolmasters and simple worshippers used when reading aloud from English service books, psalters and Bibles. Some late sixteenth century texts by Scottish ^[25] Protestants, printed by Lekpreuk, quote the Bible in simple English, (Dickson and Edmond, 1890: 230 (1566), 262 (1574), 265 (1581, William Fowler)). Conversely, the *Gude and Godlie Ballatis* (*G. Ball.*) (1567) quotes the Bible (in this particular case Tindale’s English New Testament) in scotticised orthography (Tulloch, 1989: 15), as does James VI in the holograph text of *Basil. Doron* (1598) and James Melvill of Kilrenny in his MS autobiography (1600). This perhaps lends qualified support to Mairi Robinson’s suggestion that “the Tindale [scil., New Testament in English] was being pronounced in Scotland as Scots, not English” (Robinson, 1983: 62) and “what was written as English could be and was pronounced as Scots and therefore was regarded as being Scots, although it could at the same time quite happily be accepted as English” (ibid.: 59). It is certainly conceivable that the English of these biblical texts was a special register, with little direct influence on everyday speech, like the English accents we Scots hear today on the media. Yet it is also impossible to believe that this regular contact of virtually the entire literate population of Scotland with the English of revered texts (in print) on the most solemn occasions would be without effect on the speech of some of them, in the first instance in extempore prayers and sermons (as indeed the language of surviving sermons and other religious texts might be held to bear witness), then perhaps more generally.

One well-known testimony to the use of anglicised speech by some Scots of the mid or late sixteenth century is John Hamilton’s often cited story (1581, in Law ed., 1901: 105/6 [*Cath. Tr.*]) that James V “hering ane of his subiectis knap suddrone, declarit him trateur”. If this is more than a later invention, it is unlikely that it refers to the particular persons we have already named as anglicisers; for so far as I can tell James would not have had the opportunity during his lifetime of personally hearing any of them in the course of their respective anglicised periods. Nevertheless, for John Hamilton’s own time, the earlier part of the reign of James VI, the existence of the expression ‘knap suddrone’ is itself evidence that that phenomenon – in speech as well in writing, judging from Hamilton’s choice of the word *hering* – had, at least by 1581, become a matter of public comment and disapproval. Taking all of the foregoing considerations together, it does seem that anglicisation of Scots speech was to some extent under way, with the Anglo-Scots setting the pace, from early in the sixteenth century.

If we had a number of fairly complete concordances to reliable late sixteenth century prose texts, preferably holograph, we could tell which anglicised types were consistently used by particular writers and which merely existed as alternatives to their Scots cognates. The task of assembling these concordances (with the help, no doubt, of the Helsinki ^[26] Corpus of Older Scots: see Meurman-Solin, 1993) and of analysing the word-form preferences that they display I must for this time leave to another occasion or hand. However, we already have Kuipers' Index to Quintin Kennedy's tracts, copied in 1561, in Kuipers ed. (1961). This shows that the copyists consistently preferred *onely* to the native *anely* or *anerly*. This confirms the dictionary record (DOST, s.vv.) that *onely* had indeed superseded its former native rivals before the middle of the sixteenth century. So that is one anglicism which may have passed into Scots speech. Other anglicisms in the Kennedy tracts, namely *among*, *more*, *most*, *quho*, appear only as alternatives to their native cognates. From the lists presented earlier in this paper and the practice of Mary and James VI mentioned below it emerges that in the later sixteenth century other frequently used anglicisms included:

any,
many,
from,
if,
so,
which,
who,
whose,
shall,
should,
wold,
old,
bold,
hole (whole),
holy,
most,
two,
ones (once),
long,
wrong,
good,

in addition to the quasi-anglicisms *more*, *no*, *not*, *quhome*. But, even if, as seems likely, most or all of these passed into spoken use as invariables for some speakers, as alternatives to their Scots cognates for other speakers, they need not have constituted more than a leavening of what remained predominantly Scots speech.

8 "Kepand na sudron bot our awyn langage": Mary, James VI and others

However much the returned Anglo-Scots, let us say Lennox, Knox and Maitland, may have been given to peppering their Scots speech with anglicisms, and that a vogue had now been established for the optional use of a limited repertory of anglicisms by a wider group of somewhat less anglophile persons, this need not mean that the main body of sixteenth

century Scottish speakers spoke anything other than a language very predominantly Scots, as the text-books have always told us. Nor is there any visible reason to suppose that Hamilton's unnamed 'knappers of suddrone', whoever they were, constituted anything but a disapproved anomaly among Scottish speakers.

This is what appears in the specimens of spoken dialogue which turn up in the sixteenth century Scottish law-court records of state or church or in prose narrative. These snatches of dialogue are either in the literary Scots of the surrounding narrative or, as in the following, in colloquial Scots with few or no anglicisms:¹⁸

(8) 1600 Narrative by Mr Robert Bruce, in *The Bannatyne Miscellany* (1827–55: I. 173 [*Misc. Bann. C.*]).

Indeed, quoth the King, I waitt nocht quhidder he fauldit it vp or nott. ... I sie, Mr. Robert. that ye wald mak me ane murderar.^[27] It is kend werray weill that I wes neuer bloode thristie. And iff I wald haue tane thair lyffes, I had causse anew; I misterit nocht to haue hazard my selff sa.

In this example we see the King varying between *nocht* and the quasi-anglicism *nott* and using *iff* as against *gif*; otherwise he speaks unmixed Scots.

The impression conveyed by Bruce's version of James's dialogue, that James normally spoke Scots lightly laced with anglicisms, is borne out by some surviving holograph letters of James addressed to Scots recipients. A letter by the child **James VI**, eight years old (1573 *Lennox Mun.* 354), has one anglicism only, *from*, in 60 words of text. Three undated letters of the 1590s (*Facs. Nat. MSS Scot.* III., lxxiv, lxxviii, and lxxix), and also 1596 (*ibid.* lxxiii), between them present 13 anglicisms in 550 words, viz.:

abroade,
amongst,
any,
from,
manie,
not 5X,
onlie,
quhom,
trust.

A much more heavily anglicised letter (1599 in Fraser ed., 1863: II. 8–9 [*Maxwell Mem.*]), containing 48 anglicisms to 23 Scotticisms in 380 words, was written by James to his agent at the English court, James Sempill of Beltrees. A sample is this:

(9) I also uonder muche that the Quene shoulde not haue been ashamed to tell so foolishe a tale anent James Ogis knichting, for he was knichtid many monethis before his killing of the Englishemen, in token quhair of he both dynd the same daye of his knichting uith olde Bowis her ambassadoure then, and at his othe geuing, exceptid his alledgeance to the Quene his souueraine.¹⁹

¹⁸ [12] The edition of this document tells us nothing of its MS source, but its language leaves me in no doubt of its genuineness. Two other revealing specimens in colloquial Scots occur at 1560 *St A. Kirk S.* 106–7 and 1567 *Crim. Trials* I. *494–5. There are many others that deserve to be collected and studied for the light they throw on Scots speech at this period.

Editor's note: for further examples, see the Addendum to 'Variation and variety in written Middle Scots' in the present edition (1971, 2015).

¹⁹ Editor's note: James VI's spelling was distinctive in its "invariable preference of *u* to either *v* or *w*" (Aitken, 1971: 184; 2015).

But the letter which accompanied this in the same package (ibid. 9–10), is much more lightly anglicised, with seven anglicisms, viz.:

not,
onlie,
secretarie 2X,
since 2X,
urote,

to 14 Scotticisms, including;

awin 2X,
fourt,
hame,
knaw,
sall,

in 160 words. In the first letter James refutes some rumours discreditable to him which were current at the English court, and may have anticipated that Sempill would show the letter to influential English courtiers. The instructions given to Sempill in the second letter were hardly suitable to be made public. It seems that James, like Knox and Maitland, was, when the need arose, capable of performing, in writing at least, along a range of more or less anglicised styles. A third letter to Sempill written a few weeks later (1599–1600 ibid. 10) has an anglicism count of 19, including:

shall 8X,
if 2X,
any 2X,
hath,
not,
nothing,
olde,
quho,
quhom
of,
these,

to 14 Scotticisms, in 190 words, intermediate in style between the two previous letters.

^[28] Craigie in his edition of James VI *Basilicon Doron* (1944–50: II. 115–31, especially 123–6) notes a dozen or so formal anglicisms all but one of which occur only as alternatives to their Scots cognates, e.g.:

wrong,
go,
olde,
any,
many,

alongside *urang*, etc.,

but only *boldlie*;
and *uolde* is apparently more frequent than *ualde* (would).

But Craigie's lists are patently incomplete, and a full study of this text is beyond the scope of this paper.

The foregoing leaves little doubt that James VI's habitual speech, while he remained in Scotland, was a more or less, but often less, anglicised Scots.

It appears that his mother too had spoken a Scots of a similar character. The several eccentricities of the orthography, partly French-influenced, of the holograph letter in Scots of **Mary Queen of Scots**, to Lord St Colme, from Bolton, England (1568 *Facsimiles of the National Manuscripts of Scotland*: III. lvii [*Facs. Nat. MSS Scot.*]), strongly indicate that she was writing 'phonetically' and that her spoken Scots resembled that of the letter. This begins:

(10) Gud frind y meruel ze [Mary writes <z> for <3>] vreit ne meer to auld frinds
for the wl nocht forguet zou is for neues y dar nocht vreit les y henn a sipher
Therfor send mi en.

It concludes:

efter zour nixst aduertissement y schal vreit furarder zour auld frind and so schal
bi to the end from boton thes xxiii off Juli.

The letter's anglicisms are:

from,
schal,
so 2X,

in 150 words. Otherwise Mary writes, and doubtless spoke, Scots.

If we may take the speech of these two monarchs as typical it looks as though Scots, with a sprinkling of formal anglicisms, was the normal upper-class speech of later sixteenth century Scotland. The later history of Scots suggests, however, that lower-class speech of this time was virtually anglicism-free, as it remained for some time thereafter.

The foregoing may suggest only slight modifications of the text-book statements that while Scots was becoming increasingly, and variably according to the author and the genre, anglicised in writing through the latter part of the sixteenth century, the *speech* of nearly all Scots continued fully Scots into the seventeenth century. These modifications are that some anglicised forms had certainly invaded the speech of many educated speakers well before the end of the century (*onely* and the rest: see above), so that their speech was a little distance short of *fully* Scots, and that there was also, from early in that century, a small group of repatriated 'Anglo-Scots', some of considerable influence – ^[29] George Douglas, Lennox, Knox, Maitland and the others – who wrote and probably spoke varieties containing a still heavier lacing of anglicised word-forms, albeit doubtless individually varying, and fluctuating according to circumstances and interlocutor.

9 Anglicised speech in the seventeenth century

There are grounds for believing that, after the Union of the Crowns, anglicised forms of the types we have noted were occurring still more generally in the speech of many of the Scots gentry. One evidence of this is the new rhyming practice of the Castalian and 'Scoto-Britane'²⁰ poets of the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These poets now

²⁰ [13] A term applied to himself in 1604 and several times thereafter by Alexander Craig of Rose-Craig, who followed James VI to England in 1603; cf. the titles of Craig's *The Poeticall Essayes of Alexander Craige Scotobritane Seene and Allowed* (1604) and subsequent works; similarly applied to himself by Sir David Murray of Gorthy, gentleman of the bed-chamber to Prince Henry, in *The Tragical Death of Sophonisba, Written by David Murray, Scoto-Brittain* (1611). Later Sir Robert Ayton (d. 1638) was referred to by John Aubrey as "Scoto-Brittanus": see Gullans ed. (1963: 88).

operate, alongside more or less frequent rhymes in Scots, the whole range of rhymes possible in contemporary English; this is in addition to the very limited range of anglicised rhymes available to the Middle Scots poets of the sixteenth century (Aitken, 1983: 26–9; 2015). In the sixteenth century, mingling of Scots and English forms in MS prose, with more than a meagre infusion of anglicism, was practised by specific writers only, in particular and chiefly the Anglo-Scots in their correspondence. In the seventeenth century, mingled Scots and English in similar texts was now universal, with the proportion of Scotticisms to anglicisms diminishing, albeit variably from writer to writer, through the century, reaching vanishing point in the correspondence of some of the upper gentry towards the end of the century. Writers of MS prose, especially letters and other private writings (mostly, what survives, of the gentry), continued to produce occasional ‘phonetic’ spellings indicating English pronunciations, such as:

- <towe> (two) (1610 *Hist. Abbat. Kinloss* xi),
- <too> (two) (1615 *Melrose P.* 211; 1664 *Old Ross-shire* I. 204),
- <tu> (two) (1657 *Elgin Rec.* I. 302),
- <howe> (who) (1654 *Fam. Innes* 74),
- <hou> (who) (c. 1680 *Wemyss Mem.* III. 141),
- <no> (know) (1666 *Lauder Jrnl.* 54),
- <old> (old) (1666 *Wemyss Mem.* III. 126).

(‘Phonetic spellings’ indicating Scots pronunciations also continue to occur, as in the sixteenth century also: see Aitken, 1971: 193 f.; 2015.) There is also some external evidence indicating wholly or partly anglicised speech had now become a fashionable desideratum for the best Scottish speakers.²¹

It is conceivable that some of the new speakers of anglicised Scots, perhaps especially some of the ‘Scoto-Britanes’, did so with fairly minimal infusion of residual Scots features, at least when addressing English interlocutors. Most of the evidence just advanced, however, suggests rather that few if any anglicised speakers of this time attained to anything like ‘pure’ English, even when resident in England, until quite late in the century, but rather mingled Scots and Southern English^[30] features, much as do most working-class Scottish speakers today in their more familiar speech-styles. The ultimate near elimination of Scots forms from the correspondence of the upper gentry late in the century suggests a corresponding diminution in the Scottishness of their speech (but this seems not to have been the case with most of the middle and, especially, the lower middle and the working classes).

Presentation in detail of the abundant evidence for all this must await separate publication.

²¹ [14] See Aitken (1979: 89–92).

Editor’s note: in the present edition, see ‘Scots and English in Scotland’ (1984, 2015: n. 10).

[32] **Appendix: Note on Adam Williamson**

According to Miss Bald (1927), Douglas was not quite the first Scot visiting England to anglicise his writing and perhaps speech. The pioneer, Miss Bald believed, was Adam Williamson, a Scottish priest – born within the diocese of Glasgow – who in the latter part of 1514 was sent to the court of King Henry VIII as an envoy of Queen Margaret Tudor and Gavin Douglas. Just after Christmas of that year he repaired to the household of Thomas Lord Dacre, Lieutenant of the Western Marches of England, in the latter's castle at Kirkoswald, Cumberland, and was still there at the end of January 1514–15 (see various documents in Brewer, 1864). In 1517 he received English denizenship.

We have copies of three letters sent in January 1515 by Williamson, two to Gavin Douglas, one to Queen Margaret Tudor (Doug. (Sm.) I. xx–xxvii; Brewer, 1864: 1515, p. 17 (No. 27), p. 18 (No. 65), p. 18 (No. 66);^[33] and see also p.17 (No. 63)) totalling 2500 words of text. In a prescript and a postscript to the first of these Williamson indicates that he copied that document himself. Miss Bald has assumed that all three copies were by Williamson and it is upon them that she bases her assertions about his anglicised language.

Now it is quite true that the orthography of these documents displays traces of an (ultimate) Scottish origin: initial <v> exchanges with <w>, e.g.:

vell,
voo (woe),
vold (would),
vrythen,
vas,
ewyn;

there are quite a few instances of (in the edited texts) <-t^ht> for <-th> (the point holds even if the MS had superscript <^h> for <t^ht>), e.g.:

boytht (both),
deth (death),
feytht (faith),
monetht,
moutht,
persewitht;

and of <-cht> in:

nechtbour (Doug. (Sm.) I. xxi);
mycht (might) (ibid. xxvi);
and <youcht> (though) (ibid.), spelled <thoucht> by Small but <youcht>, taken erroneously for 'youth', by Brewer;

and the initial <y> in such a word is more likely to be Scots than English at that time. Past forms of verbs in <-yt, -it> could be either Scots or Northern English:

presentytt,
obeyyt,
raseyvyt,
mellit,

but also *sollicited*.

Conversely, these documents lack other orthographic Scotticisms which were normal at that time (and which obtain in nearly all the writers commented on in this paper, before John Knox), having:

<wh-> or <w->, not <quh->, in *who, whom, what, wher, wiche, wils* (whiles);

and <sh->, not <sch->, in *shall, shuld*.

Another oddity (from a Scots point of view) is the spelling of Vowel 5 /o:/ as <oo> in *moost* (most), *foo* (foe), *soo, voo* (woe), a practice rare or absent in Scots but common at that time in Northern England: see e.g. letters of Lord Dacre (e.g. Doug. (Sm.) I. xxx, xlv f., lii, xcvi) and of Sir William Bulmer of Norham (e.g. *St. P. Henry VIII* IV. 73 f.). The geminate vowel in *yee, bee, doo* is likewise a non-Scots feature. Spellings of Vowel 8, ESc /ai/, as <ey, ei> in *feytht, raseyvyt, feyne, suffrein* occur in Northern English but not at all in Scottish writings: e.g. Lord Dacre (in Doug. (Sm.) I. xxx, xlix), and Thomas Strangways of Berwick (in 1529 *St. P. Henry VIII* IV. No. 209). The form *suffrane, suffrein* (sovereign) (Doug. (Sm.) I. xxii) is uncommon in Scots but common in Northern English. The curious spelling <defeytht> for 'defeat' may be due to a confusion with the Scots scribal superscript <^> by a non-Scots writer.

The density of anglicisms of form, about two tokens to 15 words, and the proportion of anglicisms to Scotticisms, the latter under one token to 80 words, greatly exceed those of any Scots writer before John Knox. Specific anglicisms include most of those found in Douglas, and a long list in addition:

beyn (for 'are');
the inflection in *persewitht* (xxi), *entendytht* (xxvi);
she;
on in place of Scots *ane* in *with* ^[34] *on mass of lettris*;
bothe, boytht;
foo;
holy;
husbond;
Ynglond;
moost;
soo;
soyr;
voo;
who;
whome;
blood;
good;
iff, yff;
wiche;
what;
wher;
after, thereafter;
agens;
any, eny, enythyng;
shall;
shuld;
vold;
mych (much).

The list of formal Scotticisms as types (but of course many of these may equally be Northern English) is much smaller:

awn (own),
efter,
gyff (if),
Ynglis,
knaw (know),
man (must),
ower (over, excessively),
preveyn (prevent),
rubry (robbery),
sack (sake),
sclayff (slave),
Scottis,
sen (since),
than (then),
tuyk,
vold (would),
vrat (wrote).

I conclude that none of these documents is in the hand of Williamson. He himself may well have, as he said, made his own copies of the first or of all three of the letters but what we have is not Williamson's copies, but copies, apparently at a second remove, by a Northern English scribe, most likely a secretary of Lord Dacre. This Northern English scribe did, however, retain some of the spellings of the texts by Williamson from which he made his copies and, probably, some of Williamson's Scotticisms of form. Thus these documents are not evidence for anglicising by Williamson.

A specimen of these texts may nevertheless be of interest.

1515 Adam Williamson to Gavin Douglas, in Small ed. (1874: I. xxiv) [Doug. (Sm.)]:

I know vell that the Quene has no sure frenddys in Scotland but only my Lord off Angus and hys familier seruants: as for the other Lorddis that takys hyr part now ther is no trust in them, bot to day a frend to morn a foo: gyff the Quene be in danger and haff the veyker part they wyll leyff hyr, and than is to layte to repent. My lord, I beseyk you traist not to myche in your awn wytt, take the sure vay and leyff the vnsure. Yff the Quene, hyr chyldryn, and husbond com in Ynglond all the lorddis off Scotland wilbe feyne to resort to hyr and obey hyr, or ellys thei man cheysse som other land to dwell in. The Kynggis entent is only, I knaw vell, that his sister and hyr husbond shalbe obeyyt in Scotland on to the tyme that his nevoys come to age, accordyng to ther faderis testament and will.

A fourth letter to Douglas from Williamson (Doug. (Sm.) I. lviii–lix) is all but entirely in Scots except for *anything*, *onlie*. The original of this was one of several letters forwarded by Lord Dacre to Douglas but arrested in transit and handed over to the Scottish Regent, the Duke of Albany; the existing version (1515 *Acta Conc.* MS XXVII. 32b) is in the hand of a Scottish scribe who also copied on the same sheet another of the arrested letters, to Douglas from his agent in Rome, Turnbull; the same hand or one like it appears elsewhere in the Register, ^[35] thus it too seems to be a copy, and not evidence for Williamson's own practice.

References

- Aitken, A. J. (1971, 2015) 'Variation and variety in written Middle Scots' in A. J. Aitken, Angus McIntosh and Hermann Pálsson, eds., *Edinburgh Studies in English and Scots* (London: Longman), 177–209. Reproduced in †Aitken ed. Macafee (2015), [online] [http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/Variation_and_variety_in_written_Middle_Scots_\(1971\)](http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/Variation_and_variety_in_written_Middle_Scots_(1971)) (accessed 27 April 2015).
- Aitken, A. J. (1977, 2015) 'How to pronounce Older Scots' in A. J. Aitken, Matthew McDiarmid and Derick Thomson, eds., *Bards and Makars. Scottish Language and Literature, Medieval and Renaissance* (University of Glasgow Press), 1–21. Reproduced in †Aitken ed. Macafee (2015), [online] [http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/How_to_pronounce_Older_Scots_\(1972\)_and_\(posthumously_wi_Caroline_Macafee\)_The_phonology_of_Older_Scots_\(2003\)](http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/How_to_pronounce_Older_Scots_(1972)_and_(posthumously_wi_Caroline_Macafee)_The_phonology_of_Older_Scots_(2003)) (accessed 27 April 2015).
- Aitken, A. J. (1979) 'Scottish speech: a historical view with special reference to the Standard English of Scotland' in Aitken and McArthur, eds., 85–118
- Aitken, A. J. (1981, 2015) 'The Scottish Vowel-length Rule' in Michael Benskin and M. L. Samuels, eds., *So meny people longages and tonges: Philological Essays in Scots and Mediaeval English presented to Angus McIntosh* (Edinburgh: Middle English Dialect Project), 131–157. Reproduced in †Aitken ed. Macafee (2015), [online] [http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/The_Scottish_Vowel_length_Rule_\(1981\)](http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/The_Scottish_Vowel_length_Rule_(1981)) (accessed 27 April 2015).
- Aitken, A. J. (1983, 2015) 'The language of Older Scots poetry' in McClure, ed., 18–49. Reproduced in †Aitken ed. Macafee (2015), [online] [http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/The_language_of_Older_Scots_poetry_\(1983\)](http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/The_language_of_Older_Scots_poetry_(1983)) (accessed 27 April 2015).
- Aitken, A. J. (1984, 2015) 'Scottish accents and dialects' in Peter Trudgill, ed., *Language in the British Isles* (Cambridge University Press), 94–114. Reproduced in †Aitken ed. Macafee (2015), [online] [http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/Scottish_accents_and_dialects_\(1984\)](http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/Scottish_accents_and_dialects_(1984)) (accessed 27 April 2015).
- Aitken, A. J. (1985, 2015) 'A history of Scots' in *The Concise Scots Dictionary*, ed.-in-chief Mairi Robinson (Aberdeen University Press), ix–xvi. Reproduced in †Aitken ed. Macafee (2015), [online] [http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/A_history_of_Scots_\(1985\)](http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/A_history_of_Scots_(1985)) (accessed 27 April 2015).
- †Aitken, A. J., ed. Caroline Macafee (2002) *The Older Scots Vowels: A History of the Stressed Vowels of Older Scots from the Beginnings to the Eighteenth Century* (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society)
- †Aitken, A. J., ed. Caroline Macafee (2015) 'Collected Writings on the Scots Language', [online] Scots Language Centre <http://www.scotslanguage.com/aitken-papers> (accessed 27 April 2015)
- Aitken, A. J. and Tom McArthur, eds. (1979) *Languages of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Chambers)
- Bain, J., W. K. Boyd, H. W. Meikle, A. I. Cameron, M. S. Guiseppe and J. D. Mackie, eds. (1898–1969) *Calendar of the State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots, 1547–1603*, 13 vols. (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House; vol. IX published in Glasgow)
- Bald, M. A. (1927) 'The pioneers of anglicised speech in Scotland', *Scottish Historical Review* 24, 179–193

- The Bannatyne Miscellany* (1827–1855) eds. Sir Walter Scott, D. Laing and T. Thomson, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club)
- Bawcutt, Priscilla (1996) ‘The correspondence of Gavin Douglas’ in Janet H. Williams, ed. *Stewart Style 1513–1542: Essays on the Court of James V* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press), 52–61
- Beal, Peter (1980) *Index of English Literary Manuscripts I. ii. 1459–1625* (London: Mansell)
- Brewer, J. S., ed. (1864) *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, vol. II (London: HMSO)
- Brewer, J. S., ed. (1875) *Letters and Papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII Part IV Correspondence relating to Scotland and the Borders* (London: HMSO)
- Cameron, Annie, ed. (1927) *The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society)
- Coldwell, D. F. C., ed. (1951–1957) *Virgil’s Aeneid translated by Gavin Douglas*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society)
- Craigie, James, ed. (1944–1950) *The Basilicon Doron of King James VI*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society)
- Dickinson, William, ed. (1949) *John Knox’s History of the Reformation in Scotland* (London: Thomas Nelson)
- Dickson, R. and J. P. Edmond (1890) *Annals of Scottish Printing* (Cambridge: Macmillan & Bowes)
- A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (DOST) (1937–2002) eds. William Craigie *et al.*, 12 vols. (Oxford University Press). [Online] ‘Dictionary of the Scots Language’ <http://www.dsl.ac.uk/> (accessed 7 February 2014).
- Donaldson, Gordon (1961) ‘Foundations of Anglo-Scottish Union’ in S. T. Bindoff, ed., *Elizabethan Government and Society: Essays Presented to Sir John Neale* (London: Athlone Press), 282–314
- Facsimiles of the National Manuscripts of Scotland* (1867–1871) ed. Cosmo Innes, selected under the direction of Sir William Gibson Craig and photozincographed by Sir Henry James, 3 vols. (Southampton: Ordinance Survey)
- Fraser, William, ed. (1863) *Memoirs of the Maxwells of Pollok*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: privately printed)
- Fraser, William, ed. (1885) *The Douglas Book*, vol. IV *Correspondence* (Edinburgh University Press)
- Gullans, Charles, ed. (1963) *The English and Latin Poems of Sir Robert Ayton* (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society)
- Hewison, James King, ed. (1888–1890) *Certane Tractates ... by Ninian Winzet*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society)
- Jack, R. D. S. (1971) *Scottish Prose 1550–1700* (London: Calder and Boyars)
- Jack, R. D. S. (1981) ‘The prose of John Knox: a re-assessment’, *Prose Studies* 4, 239–251
- Kuipers, Cornelis, ed. (1964) *Quintin Kennedy: Two Eucharistic Tracts* (University of Nijmegen)
- Laing, David, ed. (1846–1864) *The Works of John Knox*, 6 vols. (vols. I–II Edinburgh: Wodrow Society; vols. III–VI Edinburgh: Thomas George Stevenson)
- Law, Thomas Graves, ed. (1901) *Catholic Tractates of the Sixteenth Century, 1573–1600* (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society)
- Lyall, R. J. (1988) ‘Vernacular prose before the Reformation’ in R. D. S. Jack, ed., *The History of Scottish Literature*, vol. I *Origins to 1660* (Aberdeen University Press), 163–181
- Macafee, Caroline and †A. J. Aitken (2002) ‘A History of Scots to 1700’ in the Preface to *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, vol. XII, xxix-clvii. Online see ‘About Scots’.

- Macafee, Caroline and †A. J. Aitken (2003, 2015) ‘The phonology of Older Scots’ in John Corbett *et al.*, eds., *The Edinburgh Companion to Scots* (Edinburgh University Press), 138–69. Reproduced in †Aitken ed. Macafee (2015), [online] [\(http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/How_to_pronounce_Older_Scots_\(1972\)_and_\(posthumously_wi_Caroline_Macafee\)_The_phonology_of_Older_Scots_\(2003\)\)](http://medio.scotslanguage.com/library/document/aitken/How_to_pronounce_Older_Scots_(1972)_and_(posthumously_wi_Caroline_Macafee)_The_phonology_of_Older_Scots_(2003)) (accessed 27 April 2015).
- McArthur, Tom (1979) ‘The status of English in and furth of Scotland’ in Aitken and McArthur, eds., 50–67
- McClure, J. Derrick (1981, 1995) ‘Scottis, Inglis, Suddroun: language labels and language attitudes’ in J. Derrick McClure *Scots and its Literature* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 44–56. Originally published in Roderick Lyall and Felicity Riddy, eds., *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Scottish Language and Literature (Medieval and Renaissance) University of Stirling 2–7 July 1981* (University of Stirling and University of Glasgow), 52–69.
- McClure, J. Derrick (1986) ‘A comparison of the Bannatyne MS and the Quarto texts of Lyndsay’s *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*’ in Dietrich Strauss and Horst Drescher, eds., *Scottish Language and Literature, Medieval and Renaissance: Fourth International Conference, 1984, Proceedings* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang), 409–422
- McClure, J. Derrick, ed. (1983) *Scotland and the Lowland Tongue. Studies in the Language and Literature of Lowland Scotland in honour of David D. Murison* (Aberdeen University Press)
- Meurman-Solin, Anneli (1993) *Variation and Change in Early Scots Prose. Studies based on the Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 65)
- Murray, James, ed. (1872) *The Complaynt of Scotlande* (London: Early English Text Society) *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland (1545–1691)* (1877–1970) eds. J. H. Burton, D. Masson, P. H. Brown and H. Paton (Edinburgh: General Register House)
- Ridley, Jasper (1968) *John Knox* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Robinson, Mairi (1983) ‘Language choice in the Reformation: The Scots Confession of 1560’ in McClure, ed., 59–78
- Shaw, Duncan (1964) *The General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland 1560–1600* (Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society)
- Small, John, ed. (1874) *The Poetical Works of Gavin Douglas* (Edinburgh: Paterson)
- Small, John, ed. (1893) *The Poems of William Dunbar*, 5 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society)
- Tulloch, Graham (1989) *A History of the Scots Bible with Selected Texts* (Aberdeen University Press)