The Languages of Scotland

Introduction

There were several languages in use in Scotland in the period 1400-1700. Of these the Scots tongue, closely related to but distinct from its southern neighbour, was the most widespread and influential spoken and written language throughout Scotland for most of the period. Scots had replaced Scottish Gaelic as the vernacular language in much of the south and east or the lowlands of Scotland by 1400. By the fifteenth century Scots was the language of burgh, court and parliament; yet, during the course of the seventeenth century, it slowly gave ground to English.

Gaelic, however, was widely spoken, perhaps by half the population of Scotland by the beginning of the period, ca1400, and possibly spoken as a first language by up to a third of all Scots by 1700. It remained as the predominant vernacular in the Hebrides and the Highlands as far south as Dumbartonshire, Stirlingshire and Perthshire and as far east as Aberdeenshire. South of ‘the Highland line,’ Gaelic was also spoken in Galloway and Carrick probably until the end of the seventeenth century.

Latin had been the language commonly used in church, for formal and legal documents, conveyancing, in parliament and in business prior to 1400. Latin, however, was retreating before Scots, an assertive and confident newcomer during the fifteenth century.¹ The Reformation of 1560 and the move from the Latin Mass to vernacular worship diminished the status of Latin to an extent. Nevertheless, Latin remained as one of the predominant languages of education in schools and universities, was widely known and used throughout the period and it retained its importance in legal usage. It was often the medium through which Scots scholars demonstrated their learning and it remained a means of intellectual discourse before and after the Reformation.²

The dominance of Scots, Gaelic and Latin had supplanted the wider linguistic plurality of earlier centuries. Pictish and Cumbric (‘P’ Celtic languages related to Old Welsh) had become extinct as spoken languages well before 1400 as, probably, had
Norse, formerly used in the far north and the Hebrides. Norse or Norn lingered longer, however, in Orkney and Shetland, which did not become part of the Scottish kingdom until 1469, although there too it was under great pressure from Scots during the course of the sixteenth century. These languages, though, left a rich crop of place names and other linguistic features inherited by their successor languages to a greater or lesser degree. ³

Some use of aristocratic French prevalent in earlier centuries, as represented for instance in the Anglo-French ‘Song of Roland,’ ca1200, had also dwindled by this period. Certainly, George Dunbar, the Earl of March, claimed in 1400 in a letter to Henry IV of England that, although he knew French, he was much more comfortable with ‘Englishe’. ⁴ Ability to read French may have remained among noble and mercantile communities, reinforced perhaps by royal marriages and alliances up to 1560. Southern English, however, became increasingly important after the Reformation, with a significant amount of southern English print materials in circulation alongside native products during the latter half of the sixteenth century. ⁵ The union of the crowns of 1603 reinforced this drift towards southern English at the expense of Scots (see below).

The different approaches taken to Gaelic and Scots in this chapter mirror the position they found themselves in and the concerns they faced during the period. Gaelic was still widely spoken in Scotland, but increasingly marginalised socially and politically and with an archaic, obsolescent literary culture divorced from the vernacular. One of the many challenges which faced Gaelic in this period was the struggle to achieve orthographic stability against a background of official indifference if not hostility. Scots on the other hand, the language of government and commerce in the kingdom at the start of the period, had a rich and well established literary tradition. It faced a very different set of challenges. Scots, perhaps, both benefitted from and had its distinctiveness eroded due to its similarity to the English language. While the closeness of the languages allowed, for example, English books to be circulated in Scotland where they could be understood, this had, in the longer term, a deleterious effect on the status of Scots, accelerated by the departure of the court in 1603 and James VI’s British agenda. Much of the discussion on Scots thus focuses on issues of syntax, register and on the differentiation of Scots from southern English before and after the Union of the Crowns in 1603.
The sociolinguistic situation
Although Gaelic had been the language of court and Kirk during the formation of the kingdom, 900-1100, and was used as far south as Galloway and Berwickshire, it fell out of fashion in the south and east of the country during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It lost ground at an elite level to Anglo-Norman, the language brought in or adopted by the ascendant aristocracy. Scots, known originally as ‘Inglis’, had been well established in the south and east of what became Scotland for centuries. During the period 1100-1400 ‘Inglis’ expanded, slowly displacing Gaelic as an everyday speech in the south and east ‘lowlands’ of Scotland by 1400.6 Gaelic while retreating in the south before Inglis, may, however, have been expanding northwards into Ross, Sutherland and Caithness and, perhaps, the Hebrides during the thirteenth century.7 By around 1400, however, Gaelic had retreated from the lowlands north and west up to the ‘Highland line’ and to Galloway and Carrick, where it remained the everyday speech of much of the population. Gaelic, formerly known as the Scots tongue, was at some time (possibly during the fifteenth century) rebranded as ‘Irish’ or ‘Erse’ by the speakers of what was now called ‘Scots’. This may have happened around the same time as speakers of ‘Inglis’ appropriated the label ‘Scots’ for their own language. Not only was Gaelic becoming marginalized in the southern and eastern parts of the kingdom, but its speakers, by the fifteenth century if not earlier, came to be labelled as ‘barbarous’ or ‘hieeland’ by lowlanders, who in turn came to be called ‘Gall / goill’ (which can be translated as ‘strangers’ if not ‘foreigners’) by speakers of Gaelic.8

While much of the detail of the process of language shift from Gaelic to Scots is unclear, it seems to have been tied to the domination of the new structures and institutions introduced in the early twelfth century by Anglo-Norman and Inglis speakers, such as ecclesiastical foundations and burghs. Gaelic also seems to have lost favour at court level at much the same time. An increasingly confident and assertive Scots language dominated commerce, Kirk and government orally and, increasingly during the fifteenth century, came to be the written language of business and everyday correspondence (to a greater degree than Latin) throughout the kingdom.9 The link between the establishment of burghs, the advancement of Scots, and the decline of Gaelic in and around these establishments, particularly in lowland Scotland, seems firm.10 Yet, while burghs were undeniably engines of linguistic change from Gaelic to Scots in the south and east, there are exceptions to such a broad generalization, particularly in the Highland area. Inverness, a burgh established in the twelfth century,
had by the start of the eighteenth century about 3000 parishioners who could not understand English, and another 800 who were bilingual. Only forty people resident in Inverness in 1704, according to Synod papers, could not understand Gaelic.11 Gaelic, having retreated to the Highland ‘line’ and to the Hebrides by 1400, remained unchallenged as the vernacular until the later eighteenth century. However, the position of Scots (and Latin) as the dominant languages of court, government, Kirk and commerce during the period 1400-1650 meant that Gaels had to – and did – widely engage with Scots writings.

While one of the tenets of the Reformation was access to the Scriptures through the vernacular, Scottish Gaelic Protestants had to wait until 1767 for a translation of the New Testament published in their own tongue.12 It followed on from the reluctant adoption of Gaelic instruction for children by the SSPCK (Scottish Society for the Propagation for Christian Knowledge) in the early eighteenth century. The clause in the Statutes of Iona (1609) stating that the children of wealthy Gaels should be educated in the lowlands, and a proclamation by the Privy Council (1616) that Gaelic should be ‘abolesheit’ are often taken as the start of an official assault on Gaelic. In reality, however, a laissez faire attitude was taken to the language by the Privy Council and the wealthier elements in the Highlands, other than to ensure that all lairds’ children could read and write Scots / English.13 Almost all the families of Highland chiefs, inasmuch as the evidence survives, seem, in any case, to have had an education in Scots (and Latin) prior to the end of the sixteenth century.

Educated speakers of Gaelic were thus, typically, from at least the mid sixteenth century onwards (if not much earlier), habitual writers of Scots and latterly English. The extant correspondence of the Campbell clan with their neighbours during the mid-sixteenth century – all in Scots – underlines this point.14 According to one writer, Sir Robert Gordon, the Tutor of Sutherland in 1620, the ability of a laird to be able to speak the ‘vulgar language’ of his tenants, Gaelic, was vital. However, despite this necessity, Gordon also wanted to ‘ruit out’ Gaelic on the Sutherland estates through education. Education and Scots / English-speaking were equated with progress, and Scottish Gaelic, labelled by Gordon as the language of the ‘poor ones’, was to be eradicated over time through the establishment of schools.15

The study of Latin and Greek texts dominated the syllabus of Edinburgh grammar school in 1614. The first-year students started with the study of Dunbar’s ‘Rudiments,’ progressing in the second year to Erasmus and Cicero, with scholars in
the third year tackling works such as Ovid’s Epistles, Virgil and Suetonius. Such an approach was probably mirrored in a network of schools from Stranraer to Shetland and to Stornoway in the west by the mid seventeenth century, where, according to the traveller Martin Martin (1695), Latin and English were taught. The same observer also cautioned against the needless education of girls which, he observed, could lead to ‘love intrigues’.

Yet, Margaret Sanderson’s study of handwriting in the Lowlands of Scotland shows wide rates of literacy in women from the early sixteenth century. The evidence of signatures in Sanderson’s study would suggest that a substantial proportion of women drawn from the noble, laird and burgess class were literate. Despite Martin’s comment, women of the wealthier families in the Gaidhealtachd did, like their Lowland counterparts, probably have an education, albeit probably in Scots / English. A substantial corpus of the work of at least three major female poets survives from seventeenth century Gaelic Scotland: Síleas na Ceapaich, Mairi nighean Alasdair Ruaidh and Maighread nighean Lachlainn. If they had an education, as presumably they did, it would almost certainly not have included formal Gaelic instruction. Indeed their songs circulated in oral tradition and the earliest manuscript witnesses of their work dates from two to three generations after their lifetimes (1740-1800).

**Gaelic as a literary language**

Although Scottish Gaelic was widely spoken, it was not widely used in writing, as its speakers almost always employed Scots and Latin for written purposes. Thus, vernacular Scottish Gaelic made its debut as a published language as late as 1751, with Alasdair mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s *Ais Eiridh na Sean-Chánoin Albannaich*, a collection of seditious and bawdy Jacobite poetry which broke out of the traditional straightjackets of panegyric and convention embracing themes such as love and nature. When speakers of Gaelic wished to write their own language prior to this they often used an orthography with which they were familiar: that of Scots and latterly English. This can be seen in the two most voluminous and important collections of Gaelic made in this period, the *Book of the Dean of Lismore, ca1512-42* and the *Fernaig Manuscript*, 1689 (see further below). Notably, of the sixty extant clan histories, the single biggest surviving cultural product bequeathed to us by the Gaelophone clans of Scotland in terms of written texts, fifty-eight were written in Scottish-flavoured English during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.
Even when these English language histories occasionally sought to illustrate an anecdote with Gaelic verse, they used English orthography to do so.\(^24\)

Prior to the Norman influx of the twelfth century, there are indications that a form of Middle Gaelic (\(ca900\)-1200) was used in the south and east of the country, but little evidence survives other than the twelfth-century Gaelic notes in the Book of Deer, from Aberdeenshire.\(^25\) After this the language used for written Gaelic was a form of the language based on a dialect of Irish, known variously as ‘classical Gaelic’ or ‘early modern Irish’, devised in Ireland around \(ca1200\) (as distinct from Scottish Gaelic as Barbour’s Scots is from modern English).\(^26\)

Classical Gaelic (or classical Irish) was used throughout Ireland and also in the written forms of Gaelic widely practised in the inner and southern Hebrides, Kintyre and Argyll \(ca1200\)-1650. These were the areas most closely in touch with Ireland politically and culturally, under the auspices of the Macdonald Lordship of the Isles, a powerful dynasty that flourished on the western seaboard of Scotland from the mid fourteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century. Classical Gaelic also seems to have been sponsored by and appreciated by the Campbells, who rose to prominence as Clan Donald power faded, expanding eastwards into Perthshire from their Argyll base from the late fifteenth century. The language used in the Book of the Dean of Lismore, written in the Campbell worlds of Argyll and Perthshire, contains material composed in several varieties of Gaelic together with material in Scots and Latin.\(^27\) However, there is little evidence that classical Gaelic was ever adopted elsewhere in Gaelic Scotland, such as Moray, Ross, Sutherland, Caithness, Angus, Aberdeenshire and Inverness-shire. The languages used in all areas of Gaelic Scotland for business were overwhelmingly Latin and, increasingly, Scots – even in the most undoubtedly ‘Gaelic’ of areas, the Lordship of the Isles.\(^28\)

Classical Gaelic has, despite its seemingly limited range within Scotland, bequeathed us not only the *Books of Clanranald*, \(ca1700\), written at the very end of the tradition, but also a number literary and non-literary texts mainly from the coast of Argyll and the Isles.\(^29\) Several families were associated with the production of classical Gaelic manuscripts over several generations such as the MacMhuirich dynasty of poets and genealogists associated with Macdonalds of Clanranald, and other families such as the Beaton family, associated with medicine.\(^30\) Most of these families using classical Gaelic had ties with Ireland (often as mercenaries during the sixteenth century) prior to the defeat of the Irish Gaels by English forces at Kinsale.
1601. One such clan chief, Ruairidh Mòr Macleòid of Dunvegan (d. 1626), had particularly strong ties with Ireland, having spent long periods of time there in the 1590s, and was a sponsor of classical Gaelic.31 Ruairidh’s successor as chief, however, Iain Mòr, does not seem to have continued to support classical Gaelic writings, perhaps due to the collapse of the Gaelic order in Ulster, although the Dunvegan household did continue to support a harpist and a vernacular Scottish Gaelic poet until the end of the century. John MacInnes has cautioned, however, against seeing the difference between the vernacular and classical traditions as a stark one and has suggested that there was interaction between both traditions in terms of imagery and rhetoric.32

1567 witnessed the publication of the first book in Gaelic, classical Gaelic rather than the vernacular. This was the translation by Bishop John Carswell of the Genevan prayer book, *Foirm Na N-Urrnuidheadh*.33 Its publication was sponsored by Archibald Campbell, the devoutly Protestant fifth Earl of Argyll, and Carswell and Campbell opted for classical Gaelic rather than the Scots orthographic models found elsewhere on the Argyll estates. Classical Gaelic was probably chosen because of its prestige among the influential Gaelic ‘learned classes’ in the Hebrides, but it may also have been done with one eye on Ireland, where the Earl was heavily involved politically and where the prayer book might also have an audience. While this work had a very limited reception outside Argyll and the Isles, it did establish a precedent for printing classical Gaelic on which the Argyll family built a little during the seventeenth century by sponsoring the translation and publication of catechisms and psalms. The episcopalian minister Robert Kirk translated and published a psalter in 1684 and transliterated Bishop Bedell’s classical Irish Bible (printed in a font mimicking Gaelic script) into the more familiar Roman font in 1690, but this Bible was not widely adopted. This was probably mainly due to the difficult nature of the ‘classicisms’ or ‘Irishisms’ in the language, although the tensions between the Episcopalian and Presbyterian factions within Protestantism may also have been a factor.34

Despite its presence in the written medium, classical Gaelic was probably little understood in the wider Scottish Gaelophone world (outwith an influential but numerically small caste of classical Gaelic ‘literati’ on the south western fringe of the Gaidhealtachd) and did not long survive the severing of ties with Gaelic Ireland at the start of the seventeenth century. By 1695, while noticing classical Gaelic manuscripts
in the possession of a few families such as the MacNeils of Barra and Macdonald of Clanranald in the southern Hebrides, Martin Martin commented that the panegyric verse produced by the remaining classical Gaelic poets was ‘understood by very few’. Edward Lhuyd (ca1699) was the only person to record someone in either Scotland or Ireland, John Beaton in the Isle of Mull, reading classical Gaelic (a passage from Kirk’s Bible) before this orthographic tradition fell into disuse. Lhuyd observed that, although Beaton was ‘from the Highlands, he was pronouncing as the Gaels of Ireland do.’

The following table shows versions of The Lord’s Prayer, from 1567, 1659 and 1796, to illustrate some of the differences between classical Gaelic and the vernacular over what is basically the same text. The first column shows Carswell’s classical Gaelic of 1567, the second shows prose printed by the Synod of Argyll in 1659 and the right hand column shows vernacular Scottish Gaelic from 1767 in the first Gaelic New Testament. Speakers of modern Gaelic (apart perhaps from linguists) may find Carswell’s text difficult to follow, but might find the language used by the Synod of Argyll in the mid seventeenth century, which Thomson described as representing ‘the vernacular language with a half-hearted attempt at keeping up the fiction of a standard literary language,’ a little more familiar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foirm na N-Urrnuidheadh, (1567)</th>
<th>Forseadul Cheasnuighe (1659)</th>
<th>An Tionnadh Nuadh (1796)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR N-ATHAIR-NE atá ar neamh go mo beandaighthe fh’ aimh</td>
<td>AR Nathairne ata ar Neamh Go ma beannuigte hainmsa</td>
<td>Ar n-Athair ata air neamh, Gu naomhaichear t’ ainnm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go dtí do righe</td>
<td>Ga dtí do Rioghachdsa</td>
<td>Thigeadh do rioghachd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go ma dènta do thoil adtaalmhuin mar atá ar neamh</td>
<td>Dentar do tholaí air dtalmaign mar ata Neamh</td>
<td>Deanar do thol air an talamh mar a nithear air nèamh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tabhair dhúinn aniu ar narán laitheamhail;</td>
<td>Tabhair duinn a nuigh ar naran laitheamhuil</td>
<td>Tabhair duinn an diugh ar naran laithiell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agas maith dhúinn ar fiacla, amhalt mhitmaoid-ne darr bfhéileamhnuibh;</td>
<td>Agus maith duinn ar fiacla, amhuil mhaithmuid dar bhfeileachamhnuibh</td>
<td>Agus maith duinn ar fiacha, amhuil mar a mhaithneas sinne d’ar luchd-fiacl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agas ná léig a mbuaidhreadh sind, acht saor sind ó olc</td>
<td>Agas na leig ambuaidhreadh sinn, acht saor sinn ó olc:</td>
<td>Agus na leig am buaireadh sinn, ach saor sinn ó olc:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Óir is leat-sa an righe, an neart agas an ghlór, trí bhioth sior, Biodh amhluidh.</td>
<td>Oir is leatsa an rioghachd, an cumhachd, agus an gloir gu siorruidh, Amen.</td>
<td>Oir is leata an rioghachd, agus an cumhachd, agus a’ ghlin, gu siorruidh. Amen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXT
Another feature which would militate against the easy adoption of these early religious texts may also have been that most Gaelic speakers were simply not used to reading the language, their education, as noted above, typically having consisted of Latin and Scots. Nevertheless there are clear similarities between the language in all three texts shown above, and the printing of classical Gaelic did provide an influential template which could be modified to accommodate the vernacular during the course of the eighteenth century. Classical Gaelic, moreover, was perceived as having a higher status than the vernacular, not only due to the precedent of religious printing but through the association of classical Gaelic with learned families who had tended to monopolize literate professions in the Gaidhealtachd. This meant that classical Gaelic forms were borrowed into the Scottish Gaelic translation of the Bible (1767-1801). The classical form of the language was drawn in the direction of the vernacular to make it what Donald Meek called an ‘acceptable middle road’ between the classical and the vernacular forms. One result of this was an enriching of the vernacular with higher register forms of classical origin.\textsuperscript{42} This could give a similar effect in the Gaelic Bible to that achieved in the English King James Bible of 1611, which had consciously drawn on antique forms of language, resulting in an archaic higher register.\textsuperscript{43}

Had it not been for the efforts of the Argyll family, Scottish Gaelic orthography, for better or for worse, may have followed the road taken by Manx and signposted by the \textit{Book of the Dean of Lismore} and the \textit{Fernaig Manuscript}, which use the twenty-six-letter alphabet and orthographic style of Scots and English rather than the eighteen-letter classical Gaelic orthographic system. A transcription of two quatrains from a poem in the \textit{Book of the Dean of Lismore}, when placed side by side with Watson’s reconstruction of the same lines using classical Gaelic, illustrates the difference between the Scots and Gaelic orthographic conventional systems.\textsuperscript{44}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Original Scots orthography} & \textbf{Watson’s interpretation} \\
Ac so geil di clinn ʒəltəɾ & Ag so Gaoidheal do chloinn Ghalbair \\
tag rair fille farda a ʒəna & ag réir fileadh, feirrde a ghné \\
ga ta misse er daill o wron’w & gé tá mise ar dál ó a bhronnadh \\
is kist dawe is ollamh ai. & ’s ciste dámh is ollamh é
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
Needless to say, there are no yoghs in Gaelic orthographic systems nor are the letters <v>, <w>, <k> used above (or <j>, <q>, <x>, <y>, <z>) used in Gaelic, either classical or modern. A large number of the poems in the manuscript seem to have been composed in the medium of classical Gaelic, some of the poems being of Irish (geographical) origin and others produced in classical Gaelic within the Campbell sphere of influence in the southern Scottish Gaidhealtachd. However, other poems in the collection seem to have been in vernacular Scottish Gaelic. Readers familiar with Gaelic will struggle to read the original Scots orthographic version, not least because the unfamiliar sixteenth-century Scots orthographic norms present another layer of difficulty. If this were not enough, the difficulties presented by the unfamiliar Scots orthography obscures the language of the scribes’ texts: some of these probably originating from classical Gaelic and some from the vernacular.46

These two important and substantial duanaire (song or poetry collections), the Fernaig Manuscript and the Book of the Dean of Lismore, were not isolated instances of such orthographic treatments of Gaelic, although they are exceptional in scale. A range of fragmentary attempts at writing Gaelic survive in the hand of Gaelic speakers who were fluent and comfortable in Scots and English but who clearly had little or no knowledge of traditional Gaelic orthography or letters. Despite its restricted geographical range in Scotland, classical Gaelic, having been designed for a distinctively different dialect of Gaelic in Ireland, was, nevertheless, much more fitted for serving the purposes of Scottish Gaelic orthography, than the English or Scots systems. Despite this it took some time, as noted above, before the classical Gaelic system was adapted to Scottish Gaelic in the mid eighteenth century. Paradoxically, it may have been the sheer prevalence of Scots language writings among Gaels and their comfort and widespread usage of written Scots and English but oral Gaelic (together with growing antipathy to Gaelic in the lowlands) – in other words written Scots but with extempore translation into Gaelic of religious materials – which delayed the development of Scottish Gaelic as a written language.47
Scottish Gaelic, though, had a prolific oral literary culture, represented by poetry, song and prose tales. Yet, the oral nature of this vernacular culture militated against the survival of much Gaelic ‘literature.’ Many of the songs from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the Fenian tales and folktale in Gaelic oral tradition were not collected and written down until much later than their dates of composition. Similarly, while much poetry still popular in oral tradition during the later eighteenth century and onwards has tended to be preserved, much of the poetry of earlier centuries has been irrevocably lost.

Despite this, when collectors of Gaelic song started work from the mid eighteenth century onwards, following the perceived threat to Gaelic culture in the wake of the failure of the last Jacobite rising (1745-46) and the Hanoverian regime’s measures in the Highlands, a great corpus of earlier material was preserved. Over 500 songs in vernacular Scottish Gaelic have been recovered pre-dating 1730. These include ‘clan’ poetry and elegiac works by poets such as Eachann Bacach and An Clarsair Dall, and the blistering response to the political events and conflict of the seventeenth century by poets such as Iain Lom, whose works circulated widely in oral form. They provide a vigorous and dynamic vernacular Gaelic commentary on the upheavals of war and political unrest in the mid seventeenth century: the equivalent, in oral Gaelic culture, of the English language propaganda ‘broadsides’ of the civil war period.

Scots as a literary language
Older Scots, which, for many of the years covered by this chapter, was still perceived to be a dialect of English, can be further subdivided into three periods: Early Scots (1375-1450), Early Middle Scots (1450-1550) and Late Middle Scots (1550-1700). The beginning of the period is, of course, marked by John Barbour’s Brus, ca 1375, the first significant extant literary text written in Scots. If we examine the linguistic features of the first few lines of this text, we can see that at this point there are already very clear differences between Scots and the southern dialects of Middle English:

EXT

Storys to rede ar *delitabl
*Suppos yat yai be *nocht bot fabill,  
Yan suld storys yat *suthfast wer  
And yai war said on gud maner  
Hawe doubill *plesance in heryng.
Ye first plesance is ye *carpyng,  
And ye toyer ye *suthfastnes  
Yat schawys ye thing rycht as it wes,  
And suth thyngis yat ar *likand  
Tyll mannys heryng ar *plesand.  
(I.1-10)\textsuperscript{53}

\textbf{EXT}

In terms of spelling, we notice that the sound /x/ (which Scots speakers pronounce at the end of *loch*) was spelt <ch>, while southern English texts preferred <gh> (e.g. <rycht> vs Chaucer’s <right>), and that initial /ɔ/ was spelt <sch> instead of <sh> (e.g. <schawys> vs Chaucer’s <sheweth>). Another important difference to bear in mind, particularly as far as later (mainly, post 1450) texts are concerned, is the use <i> or <y> to mark a long vowel (e.g. <guid> ‘good’), while in English length was normally marked by a following <a>, <e> or by the doubling of the vowel. Whereas these are just visual differences, others actually go back to differences in pronunciation: e.g. <suld> suggests that the word should be pronounced with /s/ not with /z/ (cp. Chaucer’s <should>); similarly, <gud> and <suth> suggest that /œ:/ has been fronted to /ø:/ and then to /y:/ (cp. Chaucer’s <go(o)d(e)>, <so(o)th>), while <schawys> indicates that /a:/ has not become /æ:/ as in southern English. Albeit not represented in this fragment, the use of <qu(h)-> instead of <wh->, which points to the fact that the initial cluster still retained some aspiration (i.e. it was pronounced as /ʍ/ instead of /w/), is also very characteristic of Older Scots.\textsuperscript{54}

From a morphological perspective, the presence of <-is/-ys> to mark the plural (e.g. ‘thyngis’) and genitive of nouns (e.g. ‘mannys’), as well as the third person singular present indicative forms of verbs (e.g. ‘schawys’),\textsuperscript{55} and the use of the Norse-derived <-and> to mark the present participle of verbs (e.g. ‘likand’) are very characteristic of early Scots texts (cp. <-es> and <-ing/-yng> in the Chaucerian corpus). The use of <-and> for the present participle maintains the Old English morphological difference between this verbal form and deverbal nouns (e.g. ‘carpyng’, ‘hering’).\textsuperscript{56}

As we have seen, these phonological and morphological features clearly differentiate Early Scots from other varieties of English, particularly its southern varieties. Given that *The Brus* is aimed mainly at those who were in a position of power (i.e. the ‘Lordings! who chooses now to hear’, I.445) rather than at the
commoners, and that it voices a strong desire for freedom, it may seem tempting to interpret Barbour’s decision to compose the poem in his native variety in a patriotic light. However, we need to remember that, at this stage, English had no standard and all its dialectal varieties were considered to hold a similar sociolinguistic status (think, for instance, that in Chaucer’s contemporary *The Reeve’s Tale* no one makes fun of the students’ northern accent and, in fact, they end up getting the better of their southern hosts). It is then not surprising that a Scottish man should write a poem aimed at the court in Scots (although it is, of course, noteworthy because he was the first we knew who did so). Thus, it is not his dialectal choice, but rather his language choice, that should attract our attention, because similar chivalric or (pseudo-)historical near-contemporary texts, such as Peter Langtoft’s (d. ca1307) chronicle, *Vita Edwardi Secundi* (ca1326), Sir Thomas Gray’s *Scalacronica* (1355) and John of Fordun’s *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* (ca1360), were commonly written in French or Latin. Thus, from a linguistic perspective, Barbour’s text should be interpreted as an example of the increasing status of Scots in the face of French and Latin (as well as Gaelic).

The vocabulary of the *Brus* shares many terms, as we would expect, with other English dialects, with a large proportion of words (e.g. ‘suthfast’, ‘heryng’, ‘thing’, ‘mann’, etc.) of Old English origin (52%) and French origin (37%), although there are also many other terms which are characteristically Scots. Surprisingly, though, given the prevalence of Gaelic in the kingdom, the *Brus* contains only eight words of Gaelic origin. When looking at the use of loans in Older Scots literature, we can see that, while Germanic terms (mainly Norse, Dutch, Flemish and Low German) tend to be everyday words and, therefore, not particularly associated with high style or formal registers (e.g. the Norse-derived ‘yai’, ‘carpyng’, ‘tyll’), French terms are, generally speaking, somewhat more formal, commonly associated with particular lexical fields, such as government, law, literature (e.g. ‘story’, ‘fabill’) and the arts and knowledge in general, and leisure (e.g. ‘delitabill’, ‘pleasance’, ‘plesand’). Thus, it is very important to pay attention to an author’s lexical choices, both in terms of meaning and etymology, because this is one of the key elements that help establish the tone and style of a text.

Compare, for instance, the vocabulary of two of William Dunbar’s (*ca*1460-1520) poems:
The first poem honours Chaucer as an eminent figure in the English literary tradition, which Dunbar sees himself part of; it emphasizes the relationship between language and power (e.g. ‘flour imperiall’, ‘tryumph riall’), and places Chaucer, who has managed to take the language, through rhetoric and elaboration (e.g. ‘rose of rhetoris’, ‘anamalit’, ‘illumynit’) to a position that it had never achieved before, right in the centre of that relationship. The poet is presented as a craftsman, a maker, who, through his choices, can enhance the status of his language. Thus, the selection of heavily Latinate and French vocabulary, with its association with knowledge, power and sophistication, is fully appropriate; in fact, this poem can be considered to be one of the best examples of the aureate diction which characterizes some of the works of Dunbar and his contemporaries. In the second poem, which represents a flying (or verbal fight) between Dunbar and his near-contemporary Walter Kennedy, although
we encounter some Romance terms (e.g. ‘rebald’ and ‘poysonit’, perhaps seen as appropriate because, after all, Kennedy was also a makar), we are faced with a predominance of Germanic terms (e.g. ‘tak knyfe, swerd nor aix’). Their association with unsophisticated, everyday speech makes them perfect choices for the topic of the poem. Similarly, the few Gaelic forms that Dunbar employs in his poems are of disparagement, reflecting the low status of Gaelic in the south and east by the mid sixteenth century.65

Albeit very important, vocabulary is by no means the only linguistic feature that determines the tone of the poems. The first poem is characterized by fairly complicated syntax, partially due to the use of the rhetorical device known as hyperbaton, or departure from ordinary word-order: for instance, the expected word order has been altered in the first few lines, and, sandwiched between the two appellatives in apposition (viz. ‘O reverend Chaucere, rose of rhetoris all’) and the remaining of the sentence, we find the second element of the comparison, within which we have two embedded subordinate clauses, namely, ‘That raise in Britaine’ and ‘evir quho redis ryght’. This sentence contrasts with the short, simple and colloquial sentences that open the second fragment: ‘Thow speiris, dastard, gif I dare with the fecht: / ãe, Dagone dowbart, thairof haif thow no douwt’. The need of lexis and syntax to work together so as to maintain decorum is clearly acknowledged by James VI in Chapter III of Ane Schort Treatise Containing Some Reulis and Cautelis to be Observit and Eschewit in Scottis Poesie (1584), a work with literary and patriotic interests very much in line with Du Bellay’s The Defence and Illustration of the French Language (1549) and Puttenham’s The Arte of English Poesie: ‘Ye man also take heid to frame your wordis and sentencis according to the mater’.66

The ‘frame’ of the two poems also differs in terms of their stanzaic forms. The formality and high style of the The Goldyn Targe, a love allegory, are emphasized by the demanding rhyming scheme of the nine-line stanza (aabaabbab), which Dunbar may have borrowed from Chaucer’s Complaint of Anelida, the first text where it occurs, or from Gavin Douglas’s Palace of Honour. Thus, topic, form and tradition are all fully in line in this poem. On the contrary, The Flying uses the ballade form, an eight-line stanza rhyming ababbcbc (in this case, though, without refrain). Dunbar commonly used this stanza for serious or celebratory poems, but, as far as this poem is concerned, the effect that he was aiming for is significantly different. Notably, while both poems include some level of alliteration, the latter is particularly heavy in
The Flyting, where it works together with the other elements of the poem to create a low-style composition. In Older Scots, as in Middle English, there were, broadly speaking, two different types of poetic structure: the native alliterative poetry, which was based on unrhymed lines structured through sound similarity at the beginning of specific stressed syllables and which reappeared in the fourteenth century, and the poetry based on foreign models structured through metrical feet and rhyming schemes. This syllabic verse could still be combined with alliteration in Late Middle Scots to deal with serious topics, but purely alliterative verse was, from the sixteenth century onwards, relegated to comic or insulting texts, as suggested by the fact that in his Revis and Cauteleis James VI calls it ‘tumbling verse’, and suggests that it is particularly appropriate for ‘flytings’.

Interestingly, we also find that in his more formal poem Dunbar has chosen a form which imitates English spelling and perhaps pronunciation, viz. ‘quho’ instead of ‘quha’. A sprinkling of such forms is relatively common in Early Middle Scots literature, particularly in high style texts, even those which emphasize their Scottishness. They are a linguistic sign of significant cross-cultural relations, and, possibly, a hint of the status of English in some Scottish circles.

After all, we need to remember that, although Dunbar’s actual role in James IV’s court is somewhat problematic, his main audience, at least as far as The Golden Targe is concerned, were the educated courtiers surrounding the king. Indeed, the association of Anglicized forms with more formal and elevated texts can be seen in both literary and non-literary texts. For instance, Meurman-Solin points out that Gilbert Skeyne’s (ca1522-99) Ane Breve Descriptioun of the Pest, a learned text composed in a Latinate style, has a higher degree of Anglicization (and a lower degree of clearly Scottish forms) that his rather less formal Ane Breif Descriptioun of the Qualiteis and Effectis of the Well of the Woman Hill besyde Abirdene. Yet, while audience and style had a significant impact on the adoption or rejection of Anglicized forms during the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, the picture that texts paint is a very complicated one, with many other issues such as the author’s dialectal origin, age, gender, education and socio-economic status, and the text’s genre, source and circulation (i.e. printed vs manuscript) having a bearing as well on Anglicizing and de-Anglicizing trends. Furthermore, the pace of Anglicization and the pattern of change also differed as far as each feature was concerned; for instance, the use of <wh-> instead of the Scottish <q(u)h-> appears to have spread later than the
Anglicization of the third person plural subject pronoun (i.e. the adoption of <they> instead of <tha, thai, thay>).\textsuperscript{72}

The complexity involved in the study of Anglicizing trends in Scots increases even more when we consider that, on the one hand, the Anglicized forms could be attributable to a scribe or a printer rather than to the author himself.\textsuperscript{73} On the other hand, while the term looks Anglicized, an Older Scots pronunciation may actually have been intended. The fifteenth-century romance \textit{Lancelot of the Laik} (ca1460-79) exemplifies these problems. It is only recorded in a slightly later manuscript, Cambridge, University Library MS KK.1.5 (late 1480s);\textsuperscript{74} thus, we cannot collate various versions of the text to try to disentangle authorial from scribal forms. While some Anglicized forms may indeed be attributable to the scribe, it may also be the case that the anonymous author followed English models such as Chaucer and Gower not only in style and ideas but also in the actual language he used.\textsuperscript{75} Alternatively, he might have been trying to imitate other highly Anglicized Scottish texts (e.g. \textit{The Kingis Quair}).\textsuperscript{76} What is clear is that in some cases a Scottish rather than English pronunciation of an English-looking form is needed for the poem to rhyme successfully. For instance, ll. 1571-72 have ‘withstand’ and ‘lond’ in rhyming position, while ll. 2857-58 rhyme ‘hond’ with ‘Scotlande’ and ll. 3083-84 rhyme ‘Desyrand’ with ‘honde’; thus, <o> in these terms should be pronounced /a/ rather than /ɔ/, as in southern English. Similarly, ll. 2439-40 rhyme ‘multitud’ with ‘wod’, which indicates that the latter term should not be pronounced with English /o:/, but with the fronted Older Scots phoneme, commonly spelled with <u> (cp. <gud> and <suth> in the \textit{Brus}).\textsuperscript{77}

Anglicized forms can then be informative about possible cultural and literary connections, but can also be very problematic. In any case, we see that these forms become increasingly common in the Late Middle Scots period, following the Reformation and especially after the movement of the court of King James VI to London in 1603.\textsuperscript{78} The second edition of the king’s \textit{Basilicon Doron} (or ‘The King’s Gift’), a book about how to govern addressed to his son, shows the immediate linguistic effects of such political change. While the 1599 text is indisputably Scots, the 1603 text, printed in London, exhibits instead the linguistic traits of the developing Standard English.\textsuperscript{79} The new British sphere of James’s power affected not only this text but also the compositions of courtly poets, who, like the king, began to
use English rather than Scots, bringing to an end a period during which Scots had flourished as the main literary language of Scotland.

Very quickly after the Union of the Crowns, English became the most influential language in Scotland, at least as far as the written medium is concerned. This can be seen not only in James’s attitude to his own texts, discussed above, but also in official papers such as the Privy Council Register and the estate papers of families such as the Hamiltons and the Mackenzies. Yet, this written ‘English’ often retained Scotticisms to varying degrees. The Scottish burghs were quick to embrace this linguistic switch. Edinburgh, anticipating the royal succession, gave a licence in 1601 to an ‘Erasmus Drurye, Englishman, to keip and hald a wryting skoill’. Aberdeen had, by October 1607, hired an Edward Diggens, Englishman, to teach English to the youth of Aberdeen over the age of ten years old. Diggens had previously been employed at Dumfries and Glasgow, ‘Instructinge the youth to wreit fair and Perfyitlie’. Written Scots usage did not disappear overnight in 1603, however, and continued to be used widely both in Scotland and on the continent in diplomatic and mercantile correspondence. Yet, the increasing drift towards Anglicization on the page during the seventeenth century almost certainly masks the continued use of Scots speech, with ‘north Britons’ of later generations requiring elocution lessons to bring their speech in line with the southern English standard.

**Libraries and circulation of printed materials in Scotland**
The accounts of David Wedderburn (ca1562-1634), merchant-burgess of Dundee, give us an insight into the range of reading materials possessed by a wealthy individual. Wedderburn not only shared and lent from his collection but also carefully noted who borrowed his books. Wedderburne had copies of the Fables of Aesop, his edition of Hector Boece, ‘lately weill bund,’ was lent to a number of people and an English book of Arithmetic (in 1607) which some unnamed rogue borrowed but did not return. An entry in his *compt buik* notes that ‘The gudwyfe of Pitlathy’ borrowed his copy of Chaucer and the ‘Gude man of Ardowny boruit’ his Chronicles, and ‘Young Creich’ borrowed his Ortelius.’ He ordered a copy of ‘Eneme to Athesme’ and lent the ‘Cronics of Ingland, Scotland and Irland’ to a Thomas Abercromby for ‘xx dayes to reid on’. He lent the ‘Frenshe Academy and ane uthir buik’ to an Alexander Peirson. Other works he named as having lent included a paraphrase on the New Testament, his ‘Blundeville book,’ Plutarch, a Latin Bible,
Ovid, Homer’s Iliad, John Mairis Chronicle, Drake’s Voyages, an Hebrew Bible, Smyth’s ‘Sermons,’ a ‘law buik,’ and works by or relating to Ortelius, Socrates, Erasmus (in English), Morcelphis and Doctor Faustus.

The list made by Wedderburn (in the lowlands) of such works lent shows an eclectic taste and a culture of borrowing and reading of expensive books (none of which was in Gaelic). This suggests that, even if the actual number of volumes in circulation may not have been high, such works could have a wider impact due to these patterns of lending. A list (ca1660) of the items in the library of a Gaelic speaking Highlander, Mr James Fraser, shows a similarly eclectic selection of works, albeit reflecting his religious calling. The fact that most of these were in English and only two out of the fifty-three items in Fraser’s collection were in or related to Gaelic is indicative of the status of the language in Scotland. Patterns of book ownership expanded greatly in the mid seventeenth century as presses proliferated and printed materials were used as a propaganda tool in the civil war period. The possession of a manuscript copy (the Selden MS) of James I’s The Kingis Quair (1423), in Scots, by Dòmhnall Gorm, one of the chiefs of the Macdonalds of Sleat (ca1592), bearing not only Dòmhnall’s signature in Gaelic script, but also a quatrain of classical Gaelic verse, is a further reminder that these cultures did not exist in isolation from each other even if the relationship between the languages was an unequal one.
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