Image and Reality in Popular Historiography: the Scottish Image of the Turk

Although the fifteenth century was to see the retreat of Moslem power in Western Europe, Turkish advances in the Mediterranean and East were to proceed with frightening regularity. Just as Christendom had profited by divisions within the Moslem world in the thirteenth century, so the Turkish world, encouraged by the prevalence of discord among the Christians, would expand in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

From her position on the sidelines of Western Europe and because of her somewhat "antiquated" point-of-view, Scotland's reactions to the vicissitudes of the Renaissance version of the "Eastern Peril" were, in many respects, more telling about the Scots themselves than the Turks, as is so often the case with nascent popular history. The fact that the Scottish frame of reference and mode of expression often lagged behind the rest of Europe should hardly seem surprising. Just what assumptions the Scots held about the Turks and how these assumptions, in turn, occasionally influenced Scotland's relations with the rest of Europe will be separately considered below.

The relative paucity of records for sixteenth-century Scotland, vis-a-vis the Turk, is not in any way compensated for by the fact that Scotland possessed what might reasonably be called an oral rather than a written tradition much later than the rest of the isle; our knowledge of Scottish sermon literature, which should be a rich source for material on the Turks since, at least until the Reformation, they were invariably denounced therein as the most dangerous
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threat facing the "true religion," remains essentially fragmented until well after the death of John Knox (1572). The extent of our loss is made particularly clear in the letters of James IV and James V. Both make numerous allusions in their correspondence to "orators" who were sent out periodically to inform the people of the "dangerous Turks."¹

What written proof we have of Scottish interest in the Turks, in both the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, indicates that their concern fell into two main categories: 1) the "brave Turk," an organized and dangerous military power, and 2) the "infidel Turk," a menace to the "true religion" which, as far as the Scots were concerned, was initially Catholicism and later Calvinism.

Drawing heavily upon the diplomatic and personal correspondence of James IV and James V and the later poetic endeavours of James VI, the individual Turkish warrior emerges as a brave and resolute fighter, capable of eliciting not only fear but respect, however reluctant, from many Scots, in spite of his being one of the "... cruel enemies of the faith." Taken collectively, it is usually the military organization and loyalty of the Turkish forces to the Great Turk which prompts Scottish comment. There is, however, surprisingly little mention of either Turkish organization or loyalty in terms of governmental policy or foreign alliances; perhaps there had been inadequate contact, at least at the royal level, for such speculation. Perhaps it was general ignorance.

If we take a closer look at Scottish conceptions of the "militant Turk," we find, generally speaking, that the Turks of the early sixteenth century were thought of as being remarkably similar to the vague figures that populated some of the more worldly accounts of the later crusades, also splendid examples of popular history. That is, for men like James IV of Scotland (1488-1513), the sixteenth-century Turk immediately, albeit erroneously, brought to mind good horses, flashing swords, and Christian Europe on the march.² It is only by the latter part of the century that the Turks even begin to take on the shape of men rather than phantoms in Scotland. Even at that, as late as James VI's Lepanto (1585)³, it is the abstract courage, pride, and loyalty of the Turks which seems to dominate the Scottish mind. Obviously, one would have to delve no further to appreciate what the Scot of the Renaissance valued in men.

In terms of the sheer number of references which can be
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documented, however, the second of our categories, the "infidel Turk," must be considered to be the more significant. For the Scots, as for most of their Western contemporaries in the sixteenth century, the Turk was, first and foremost, "The Infidel." As such, he was customarily hailed as the natural enemy of all Christians.

Although the general lack of sustained comment on the Turk and the contradictory nature of those that are available make it difficult to document the beliefs of the Scots on the nature of Islam, it is clear that many of them believed that Islam had been raised up by the Christian God to punish the past iniquities of His "true believers." Moreover, perhaps because of their willing acceptance of the divine origin of the Islamic faith and their understandable desire to emphasize, albeit indirectly, the ultimate mercy of their own God, the Scottish sources imply that, from the first, the Turks were thought to possess individual souls and to hate idolaters. It should be noted that Islam's opposition to idolatry, judging from the increased frequency of its citation, became more and more important to the Scots as the sixteenth century progressed and the Scottish forces of the Reformation did battle with "Idolaters" close to home. Again, this can be interpreted as a comment on the Scots, by the Scots.

Although after the middle of the sixteenth century, when the "New Kirk" found itself locked in conflict with the "Auld Faith," there is some indication that a few anonymous Scottish "reformers" tried to emphasize additional similarities between the "True Christian" and the "True Turk," Scottish sources are still generally silent on the formal tenets and structure of Islam. Accordingly, it is from random and isolated references to the Turk as the "enemy of the cross," the "heartless heathen," and the "faithless one" that our assumptions concerning Scottish conceptions of the Turk must ultimately be drawn.

In brief, in our subsequent considerations of the Scottish response to the Turks of the Renaissance, we are dealing with a people who can respect and even admire the physical prowess and courage of the Turk as much as they despise his faith, without displaying any desire to know more. This in itself tells us much of Scotland in the sixteenth century.

In the last half of the fifteenth century and the first of the sixteenth, when the very foundations of Scottish society were in a state of rapid transition and, in some cases, decay, few men could,
with impunity, look only to their own affairs, least of all the traditionally bellicose lords of the realm. Ironically, Scotland's semi-feudal character and inherent suspicion of authority guaranteed that alliances among these great lords would only be resorted to on occasion and then only for specific purposes, in spite of the known weakness of the Scottish crown. On the other hand, even the specter of temporary opposition from the lords was enough to force the crown into close and permanent cooperation with the tottering but wealthy "administrators" of the Scottish Catholic Church, which merely served to isolate it still further from the Scottish people.

In the face of such division, only an obvious and, preferably, remote threat, such as the need for concerted action against the "Auld Enemy," England, could be relied upon to produce even an appreciable degree of solidarity among the contending factions in Scotland. Ideological considerations and distant "causes," before the Reformation, had a tendency to divide rather than unite the Scottish realm. Renaissance Scotland was a nation divided against itself, perpetually on the brink of strife, and habitually supporting causes others had already given-up for lost. Religious causes were no exception.

Even in an age of what might be deemed "conspicuous religious consumption," James IV of Scotland (1488-1513) often appeared to be conspicuously pious: at the same time, his appropriation of the Church's wealth and the most lucrative sees for royal use like his less pious peers was deplored openly. In an age of contradiction, James was a paradox.

While the correspondence, both public and private, of James IV's contemporaries often suggests their reasons, pragmatic as well as spiritual, for fearing the advance of the Turk, and the songs, sermons, and ballads of his own people indicate their appreciation of the personal qualities possessed by the Turkish warrior, James tended to look on the Turk from a strangely subjective point of view.

In the first place, it seems reasonable to conclude from James's extant correspondence that he envied the collective force at the disposal of the Great Turk; there is no reason, however, to believe that he was at all familiar with the institutional aspects of the Janizaries. James has no similarly reliable force at his disposal. In fact, more often than not, like his predecessors, he frequently found himself in the hands of an armed force rather than at its head. His
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precarious political position probably goes a long way toward explaining why his estimation of the Turk differed, at least in emphasis, from that held by the majority of the Scots. His was an appreciation of the group rather than the individual. The respect of the Scottish people for the prowess of the individual Turkish warrior undoubtedly stemmed more from the social and economic milieu in which they found themselves than envy. The unsettled nature of the realm made warfare a fact of life and created a standard by which men were invariably judged; moreover, the poverty of the land made military skill one of the few Scottish commodities which found a consistent and ready market abroad.

Secondly, without too much exaggeration, it can be said that James IV actually regarded himself as a paladin of the cross: a champion sworn to take the offensive against the infidel. It is possible that the expensive silver ship which James sent, in 1508, to his patron saint, St. James of Compostela, was meant to symbolize his dedication to the crusading ideal, his espousal of the apostle’s zeal in defence of the faith, although the concept of a religious crusade against the East was already in abeyance in much of Europe. To briefly quote R.L. Mackie, one of James’s more recent biographers:

For “the Crusade against the Infidel,” to every other sovereign in Europe, to the Pope himself, a useful phrase in the jargon of diplomacy, was, to James, something different: he saw himself, in the near future, leading a great fleet to the shores of Palestine, and then, at the head of the united forces of Christendom, advancing sword in hand against the Turk.

At least in James’s official correspondence, the Turk is always the “enemy of the cross,” and the “heartless infidel”; rarely, if ever, is there any indication that there could be, at any time, another basis for opposition to the Turk except religion.

In spite of the fact that Scottish merchants, mercenaries, and travellers are known to have had direct dealings with the Turks, no significant accounts, to the best of my knowledge, are extant now or seem to have been brought to James’s attention then. Yet, perhaps, the fact that James’s appraisal was so obviously anachronistic constitutes one of the few things he had in common with his people;
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although, to say this is to rely heavily on inadequate sources.
It is, indeed, curious, considering the number of Scottish
mercenaries who are known to have served against the Turk both in
Europe and the East, that the Scottish people, as reflected in their
chronicles, displayed so little sustained interest in the Turks' physical
characteristics, non-religious customs (i.e. "drinking") and economic
condition. When Scottish chronicles do, on rare occasions, make
reference to any of the above, they do so in a vague manner, with
little apparent involvement. The same stereotyped phrases repeat-
edly appear: the "cruel Turk," the "sooty Infidel," the "wanton
enemy of Christ," et al. This suggests that only in a realm as far
removed from the mainstream of European life and the actuality of a
Turkish invasion as Scotland could religion, religion unsullied as yet
by political and doctrinaire considerations, safely be given priority.
Only in such a remote realm could the Turk, a phantom-figure rather
than a living-reality, safely be lumped with "... things that go bump
in the night." Accordingly, for what must have been essentially
personal or religious reasons, James IV eventually tried to make his
desire for a crusade into a reality. To secure the materials necessary
to outfit a fleet for use against the Turks, he sent agents throughout
Europe. Their services and James's few successes are duly recorded in
all the major chronicles, although none clearly indicates a "why"
behind the king's efforts. It is a dangerous omission. A modern
reader could interpret it as an indication of disapproval or
indifference on the part of the chroniclers. Hopefully, the thoughtful
reader will accept neither of these interpretations. Preferably, he will
conclude that the chroniclers simply assumed that all would
understand what motivated their king: the "fanatical Turk" was the
common enemy of the Christians everywhere.

In the process of recruiting men like the now "notorious"
Bartons,8 James came to realize his need for a southern port from
which to launch his attack on the East: Venice and Marseilles were
his first choices, in spite of the fact that neither the Venetian Doge
nor the French king ever attempted to hide their lack of enthusiasm
for a Scottish crusade. Like most of Christian Europe, they were
more inclined to combine against each other than to join forces
against the Turk, although neither would have denied the abstract
worth of such an undertaking. To cite an obvious example: in 1509,
although Venice was still openly acknowledged as a staunch enemy
of Islam, the "scourge of the cross," the Pope, Julius II, readily joined forces with Louis XII, the Emperor Maximilian, and Ferdinand of Spain in the League of Cambrai for the avowed purpose of "liberating" territory which was, in fact, under Venetian rather than Turkish control. Only when the Italian situation changed and the Venetian interdict, like the French alliance, was no longer in the best interest of the papacy, did the pope display any interest in James's scheme for sailing against the Turks from Venice. The diplomatically naive James was greatly encouraged.

Using the Venetian ambassador in London, Andrea Badoer, as his agent, James offered his services as Captain-General to Venice, on condition that when he had fulfilled his obligations to the Republic he could then lead their combined forces against the Turk. Sadly for James, after prolonged negotiations, the Venetian senate, ironically, chose to confer its Captain-Generality on the Marquis of Mantua, whom they had captured the previous year and had only recently released at Julius' explicit request. The Venetian refusal, however, did not deter James. He was indeed, a "perfect" popular hero.

Since Venice was closed to him, Marseilles would have to do. Accordingly, he requested, in the most flattering terms imaginable, the co-operation of the French, the same French whom he would have been fighting had the Venetian senate accepted his earlier offer. Despite the massive dose of flattery employed, Louis XII was only prepared to be politely evasive with James's envoy, Andrew Forman, the bishop of Moray. In fact, Louis did not become even marginally receptive to James's ideas until late in 1511, after the pope, Spain, and Venice had formed a Holy League against France; a league which was soon to be joined by England and the Empire. At that point, Louis, at long last, replied favorably to the question posed much earlier by Forman. He promised to levy a tithe on all French territory after peace has been established with the pope and, eventually, to provide James with as much cavalry, infantry, and munitions as he might need to fight the Turks. Disregarding a letter from Julius which commanded him to join the Holy League, or at least to remain neutral, James, with his crusade in mind, subsequently pursued an actively pro-French policy. Although the campaign of 1512 ended disastrously for the French, Louis resolved to invade Italy again the following year, with James invading
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England at the same time. Louis kept promising James that France would be, when the war with the Holy League was over, his staunch ally in the "holy voyage and enterprise" the Scottish king planned against the Turk.

The end was, however, near for both James and his crusading ideal. In 1513, while invading England, he fell at Flodden Field and Scotland was plunged into a further era of minority and internal strife. James's sporadic involvement with the wars of the Holy League is important here as a dramatic illustration of James's abiding and personal interest in the Infidel; for most Scots, Flodden had no connection at all with the East. It merely represented another episode in the long annals of Anglo-Scottish warfare. That was real history.

Pitscottie's Chronicles of Scotland implies that the active resumption of the "Auld Alliance" by James IV against England was primarily due to Henry VIII's repeated demands for a French pension and his refusal to allow his sister Margaret, James's queen, to take possession of part of her inheritance. No mention is made that James's resumption of the alliance came only after France had agreed to support James's idea of a crusade against the Turk. Apparently, even among the court chroniclers "The Crusade" as an ideal had little appeal. Yet, the fact that Pitscottie's chronicle does specifically mention that both "spretuall" and "temporall" lords, high and low, fell at Flodden indirectly indicates that more was probably involved than mere pensions and jewels, since it is generally accepted that the Scottish clergy, with the exception of the bishops and abbots, no longer fought as a matter of course in Scotland. Interesting speculation is, indeed, possible.

The years after 1513 were of relative isolation and general discord for Scotland. There was little time for foreign considerations, least of all for an Eastern power that was thought to be effectually, if abstractly, curtailing the possibility of invasion. Moreover, as the sixteenth century progressed, Catholics, of any and all nationalities, rather than Turks, began to be regarded as the "true instruments of Satan" in Scotland. Increasingly, there is some evidence that similarities between the "Reformed faith" and the "Turkish heresy" were sought by Scots of the court as well as the cloth (i.e., their mutual abhorrence of idolatry); although, whether the similarities eventually discerned by the learned were appreciated by the vast
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majority of the Scottish people remains a moot point. Too much should not, however, be made of this. Generally speaking, at the popular level the Scottish Reformation tended to emphasise the differences between variant creeds, whether Christian or Moslem, rather than their similarities.

In many ways, the reign of James V (1513-1542) was a transitional period for Scotland, in attitude as well as religion. James V's correspondence frequently refers to the need for a crusade against the Turk; but, unlike his father, he displays no willingness to go himself. For James V, as far as the "common enemy of the Cross" was concerned, it was enough to promise, periodically, to provide money and work for peace. England demanded his undivided attention.

The various Scottish chronicles dealing with the reign of James V are among our most valuable sources of information for the period. However, they contain only isolated, usually unflattering, references to the Turks: "Servant of Satan," "Turbaned Fiend," et al. In truth, these brief references probably reflect nothing more than the chroniclers' proclivity for already hackneyed similes and their thorough grounding in traditional misconceptions about the Turk: social, political, and economic.

English "chroniclers" of the same period had already come of age about the Turk. In England, only the "religiously concerned individual" (if such a designation can, indeed, have any validity in an age when all were more or less preoccupied with religion) habitually punctuated his utterances, written and oral, with traditional rather than accurate references to the Turk. John Foxe is perhaps the most obvious example. In his Acts and Monuments, he illustrates this traditional tendency well into the reign of Elizabeth; although, like the Scot John Knox (1507?-1572) in his History of the Reformation in Scotland, Foxe at the same time clearly indicates in his sustained references and passages that he actually regards the papacy, not the Turk, as the gravest threat to the Christian faith. In fact, both Knox and Foxe work hard to link the pope and the Turk together whenever possible. On one occasion, Foxe categorically states that... "neither can in stories be found any greater cause which first made the Turks so strong, to get so much ground over Christendom as they have, than the pestilent working of ... the pope ..." This at a time when the Ottoman Turks were still moving with frequent
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success against the Holy Roman Empire, Orthodox Spain, and Christian Venice. Interestingly enough, for the Englishman Foxe, as with most of his Scottish contemporaries, e.g., Knox and George Buchanan, when sixteenth-century Catholics do manage to triumph, even over the "cruel Turks," it has to be attributed to divine providence rather than any inherent merit they possess. The creed rather than the deed was triumphant.

Foxe's writings also contain one of the clearest and earliest indications we have that a certain degree of indifference about the Turk was becoming or had already become common in England — and by extension was probably beginning to make itself manifest in Scotland as well. Foxe pointedly justifies a lengthy relation of the atrocities perpetrated on newly captive peoples by the Turks and the sustained inhuman treatment accorded Christians who failed to convert with the following explanation:

... because we Englishmen, being far from these countries i.e., those taken by the Turks and little knowing what misery is abroad are less moved with zeal and compassion to tender their grievances, and to pray for them, whose troubles we know not.

The ignorance and indifference which Foxe refers to in these lines was felt to exist in the decade of the 1560's, a time when the Emperor Maximilian II (1564-1576) was sustaining heavy losses in Transylvania and elsewhere. In spite of the fact that "... the Turk hath prevailed so mightily," Foxe presumes many of his supposedly educated English readers to be either ignorant or apathetic. In such a statement, we have an implicit acknowledgement of change. The popular image of the Turk was changing. The Christian "infidel" at home and the "politician" at court already had become the dominant factors in the national life.

While there is no evidence that the Scottish library of James VI ever contained a copy of Foxe's Acts and Monuments, similarities in attitude and internal evidence in his own writing leads me to believe that, if James was not personally familiar with Foxe, he at least marched to the same tune, a tune already archaic in the southern part of the isle. Although James lacked the crusading spirit of his grandfather, he habitually paid lip service to a traditional Turkish bias, despite his own rather advanced ideas on religious toleration.
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and his avowed abhorrence of fanaticism of any kind.

In any attempt to discern and evaluate the image of the Turk in Scotland during the sixteenth century, James VI's quasi-epic poem, Lepanto, is invariably discussed, and justifiably so, notwithstanding the fact that there is a definite lack of competition from other Scottish sources. To say that the execution, rationale, and reception of Lepanto are illustrative of the basic differences between a James IV and a James VI; of the changes wrought by almost a century; and of the then current outlook of the Stewart king is to say enough. To say that Lepanto represented the current outlook of the Scottish people is to say too much. In philosophy, religion, outlook, as well as tolerance, James was usually atypical of his subjects and his age, a statement possibly true of most Stewarts.

On the basis of internal evidence, the composition of Lepanto can be said to have occurred during the summer of 1585; it was an indirect response to the conclusion of the Treaty of Nemours (1585), which temporarily united France with Hapsburg-dominated Catholic League. Prior to the successful conclusion of this treaty, James apparently had favored the formation of an anti-Hapsburg league, led by Scotland and France, the latter of whom, for commercial reasons, had already openly allied herself with the Turk (1569). Christendom's unity against the Infidel, the unity to which James pointedly gives lip service in Lepanto, was, in fact, being ignored with ever increasing regularity by those in the very highest places as the sixteenth century progressed. Only as a folk-figure, as a perjorative phrase, did the "Cruel Turk" retain his position in Scotland.

Although Lepanto was revised periodically before its first official publication in 1591, the content remained essentially as initially conceived; and, James's imitation of and admiration for Virgil and the classic form is both patently and painfully clear. James's Lepanto is concerned almost entirely with the actual battle (1571); the Holy League is mentioned, but little is said about the event which prompted its creation, a Turkish attack on Cyprus, or the diverse religious and/or political motives of the national participants. This omission may reflect James's personal preference for action, literally speaking, or a conscious move on his part to offend as few people as possible. It should be remembered that in 1585, when James was actually composing Lepanto, he, the
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Protestant king of Scotland, was still holding out hope of future toleration to English Catholics and hinting at his own eventual conversion in an attempt to ensure the support of Catholic Europe if his ultimate succession to the English throne were ever seriously challenged.31

In James's work, as in Foxe's Acts and Monuments,32 Satan himself is accused of having stirred up the "circumsised turband Turks" against the Christians;33 and, it is God himself who decrees that the "Baptised race" has endured enough. Understandably, Satan probably seemed an ideal foe, especially as the formation of the Holy League was, at the same time, carefully depicted as the direct result of Venetian pleas for assistance rather than papal efforts. Yet, probably because his nameless Spanish hero is Don Juan of Austria, James felt compelled to defend himself against possible criticism in the preface to the 1591 edition. As a reigning Protestant monarch, whom the Catholic Church had been encouraged to think it might eventually win over, James's position at home and in England was in need of defense! To this end, James adeptly emphasizes, especially in the angel chorus near the end of the poem, that as God defended the Christians from the Turks so He would even more readily defend the Protestants against Roman Catholicism;34 moreover, he clearly points out that Catholics and not Turks are, in fact, the real "anti-Christ."35

Like his countrymen earlier in the century, James's depiction of the Turk is not completely without respect.36 The Roman Catholic forces win at Lepanto, but they are bravely opposed. The Scottish situation had apparently not changed enough to alter completely their scale of values. Valor was still to be admired.

Apart from the dramatic opening scene in heaven, James kept to the facts as he knew them; and, while he did manipulate them slightly for the sake of poetic effect, it is clear that he did not do so with the intention of favoring the Protestant or Catholic cause. In Lepanto it can be seen quite clearly that James was inclined to view the struggle between East and West in both religious and political terms. For example, when James refers to the "faithless Turkes," his frame of reference is religious, but his meaning is also political.

It is generally accepted that James's detailed knowledge of the battle came from French and Latin translations of Italian sources, for there were, apparently, no sufficiently detailed accounts of the Battle
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of Lepanto available in English or Scots until long after James’s poem had been published. Such a lack of detailed English and Scottish materials implies that fancies and phrases about the "murderous Turkes" were in greater demand and had a greater hold on the popular imagination than did the facts. The sixteenth-century Scot still feared the Turk in the abstract and admired in him what he most admired in himself; but, in fact, he had come to consider his enemies closer to home with greater concern.
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1 Since I have endeavoured to include representative epithets for the Turks and have limited myself to those encountered repeatedly, I will omit individual citations. Most examples have, in fact, been drawn from the chronicles, diaries, and diplomatic correspondence of the day.

2 James IV’s somewhat anachronistic approach to international relations can also be seen quite clearly if one examines Anglo-Scottish relations during the reign of Henry VIII (1509-1547), James’s English brother-in-law. For example, see: Great Britain, Public Record Office (P.R.O.), Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII, vol. 1, part 2 (London 1920), 873.

3 A Turk speaks before Lepanto: "The ALI-BASHA visied all/With bolde and manly face/Whose tongue did vtter courage more/Then had alluring grace;/He did recount among the rest/What victorie Turks obtained/On catife Christians, and how long/The OTTOMANS race had raignd./He told them als, how long themselves/Had victours euer bene,/Euen of these same three Princes small,/That now durst so conuene,/And would yee then giue such a lie/Vnto your glories past,/As let your selues be ouerthonne/By loosers at the last?" James Craigie (ed.), The Poems of James VI of Scotland, Scottish Text Society, vol. xxii, part i (Edinburgh 1955), 228 and 230, ii. 517-32.

4 Composita Thesauriorum regum Scotorum, Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland (C.T.S.), vol. iv, pp. 40-41: "The second day of Mai 1508, payit to Robert Bertoun [Barton], quhill he offerit for the King in Sanct James in Spazne."


6 For assorted accounts of Scots who had pleasant sojourns "in Turkie" and elsewhere in the East, see Ibone Leslie’s The Historie of Scotland, Scottish Text Society, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1868), especially vol ii passim. Also see Archibald Francis Steuart (ed.) Papers Relating to the Scots in Poland: 1576-1793, Scottish History Society, (Edinburgh 1915), passim.

7 For example, see part 1 of Robert Lindesay of Pitscottie The Historie and Chronicles of Scotland, (ed. A.J.G. MacKay), Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh 1899).

8 Note 4 above. Robert’s brother, Andrew, was eventually (1513) condemned as a pirate by the English for his attacks on Portuguese merchant vessels; it is more than possible that Robert was also involved, even though he was still technically in James’s
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service. For additional information see W.S. Reid, Skippet from Leith: The History of Robert Barton of Over Barnton (Philadelphia 1962).


11 C.S.P. Venetian, II, 30.

12 Ibid., 36-38.

13 Mackie, King James IV, 204-205.


15 Although a high ranking Scottish churchman, Forman did not possess James’s conviction. He was not personally interested in another crusade against the Turk. What he was concerned with was his own advancement in the Church and a good return for his efforts. Apparently, even the Church had more “modern” ideas than James IV. Mackie, King James IV. 205.


17 Mackie, King James IV, 221-222.


19 Similar “oversights” can be found in most modern accounts of the era, e.g., see: P. Hume Brown, History of Scotland, 3 vols. (Cambridge 1909), I, 321.

20 Lindsey of Pitscottie, part 1, 253.

21 Ibid., 261.

22 Ibid., n. 2.


27 Ibid., 763.

28 Pratts, Acts, iv, 83.

29 Craigie, Poems of James VI, xlviii.


31 D.H. Willson, King James VI and I (New York 1956), 148-149.

32 Pratt, Acts, IV, 83.

33 Craigie, Poems of James VI, 204.

34 Chorvs Angelorm: “In giuing them such victorie/That not aright him feare:/For since he shewes such grace ti them/That thinks themselues are just/What will be more to them that in/His mercies onelie trust?/And sith that so he vses them/That doubt for to be sau’d./How much more them that in their hearts/His promise haue engrau’d?/And since he doth such fauour shew/To them that fondlie pray/To other Mediatours then/Can helpe them any way;/Ohow then will he fauour
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them,/Who praiers do direct/Vuto the Lambe, whome onely he/Ordaind for that
effect?/And since he doth reurnge their cause/That worship God of bread,/ (An
errour vaine the which is bred, But in a mortall head)/Then how will he reuenge their
cause/That onelie feare and serue./His dearest Sonne, and for his sake/Will for no
perrils sverue:/And since that so he pities them/That beare vpon their brow./That
marke of Antichrist the whoore/That great abuser now./Who does the truest
Christians/With fire and sworde inuade/And make them holie Martyrs that/Their
trust in God haue laid,/How will he them that thus are vade,/And beares vpon their
face/His speciall marke, a certain signe/Of euerlasting grace? .... Craigie, *Poems of
James vi*, 251 and 254, 11, 965, 1004.


36 The condemnatory references in *Lepanto* seem to be more "traditional" than real.