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‘I that been thy native and humbl servitor’: John Bellenden’s *Chronicles of Scotland* and the ‘advice to princes’ Tradition *

Ryoko NAKANO

During the reigns of James III and James IV, when the royal patronage system was firmly established in Scotland, the so-called ‘advice to princes’ genre became very popular in the kingdom. Texts in this genre were intended to offer intellectual advice to sovereigns as well as to do them honor so that authors might gain favour from rich patrons. In fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Scotland, just as in England, where Erasmus presented his *Education of a Christian Prince* to Henry VIII in pursuit of patronage, many authors began to produce advice books in order to obtain a royal support.¹ For instance, Gavin Douglas, a noble churchman, dedicated his *Paloice of Honour* to James IV, who gave him the provostship of the church of St Giles in Edinburgh; similarly, John Ireland offered *The Meroure of Wysdome* to James IV seeking his support.²

Nor was patronage restricted to royalty alone. During this time in Scotland other groups emerged as promoters of literary activity: specifically, non-royal patrons such as nobles, burghers and clergymen. With their own power and riches, such patrons could support various cultural activities, just as did the kings. For example, Gavin Douglas was commissioned to translate Virgil’s *Aeneid* by Henry, Lord Sinclair, a member of a book-
loving family. Besides the Sinclair family, such families as Crichton, Seton, and Guthrie are said to have devoted themselves to the promotion of literary culture around the sixteenth century. The fact that patronage could come from different sources, and not necessarily from those of royal blood, meant that the audiences that authors had in mind came to consist of two major strata, royal and non-royal. Often the interests of non-royal patrons conflicted with those of royalty and so, as A. A. MacDonald has suggested, both 'the literature criticising, and that adhorting, princes' were circulated in Scotland.

The genesis and later transmission of one famous work, Hector Boece's *Scotorum Historia*, demonstrates how the competing claims of powerful patrons could influence the overall shape of a text in the 'advice to princes' tradition. Boece, a humanist historian, wrote the first full-scale history of Scotland entitled *Scotorum Historia* in Latin in 1526 and had it published by Jocodus Badius Ascensius in Paris in 1527. His history, which was written and presented to James V in anticipation of the beginning of his adult reign, aimed to teach the young king how to rule his realm properly by showing both the errors and the successes of James's predecessors. For the purpose of pleasing his sovereign, Boece shows James V to be a direct descendant of Fergus, the first king of Scotland, and in this way he demonstrates that the history of Scotland, and thus the lineage of the present king, is as old and as venerable as that of Rome. Boece also criticises powerful nobilities, frequently describing the misfortunes of those nobles who gain so much power that they overwhelm their kings.

This history was well received by James V, who, because he was not proficient in Latin, commanded John Bellenden, a clergyman, to translate it into the vernacular language. Bellenden was closely associated with the royal court because he had once served as a clerk of expenses at the court, and many of his family members also occupied places there, but he had...
been dismissed by the time he was commissioned to furnish his translation of the *Scotorum Historia*. John Bellenden’s situation was made more complex by the fact that the Bellendens were related to the Douglas family, with whom James V was on bad terms during the period. Indeed, this was the very reason why Bellenden came to lose his job at the court in 1522: he was a strong supporter of the Douglases. The Bellendens were also connected with such powerful families of the gentry as the Sinclair family and the Bannatyne family. It was actually after he received the precept of remission from the king that Bellenden started his translation, and all of these factors put Bellenden in a very difficult situation when he was preparing the work: he was caught between the pressures of the two political factions.

Bellenden’s translation of Boece’s *Scotorum Historia*, the *Chronicles of Scotland*, was written in 1531. The common consensus is that at that time the work comprised a Table of Contents, a Preface, and the history itself, and that a Ballad which follows the history now was not included then. But the need to produce a manuscript copy, which would be prestigious enough to be presented to a king, meant that it was only in 1533 that he finally dedicated the work to James V. During the two-year interval between completing his translation and dedicating the manuscript copy, Bellenden composed a Ballad consisting of twenty-five 8-line stanzas, and put it after the history. Some years after this, a printed edition of the *Chronicles of Scotland* appeared in Edinburgh, produced by the royal printer Thomas Davidson, and this edition contains several important revisions to the original manuscript version. According to Sally Mapstone and E. A. Sheppard, who examined the extant manuscripts of Bellenden’s *Chronicles*, four manuscripts (MSS in the Pierpont Morgan Library, in University College of London, in the Longleat House, and in Trinity College of Cambridge) show the important process of Bellenden’s revisions.
When any one of the manuscripts is compared to the printed version, it is readily apparent that almost all the texts were rewritten in the printed version, and that Bellenden used these two media differently, under the presumption that their readership was very different. The reader of the manuscript version was, of course, the king himself, and so it contains many direct appeals to his magnanimity, with the minimum of criticism about him, while the readers of the printed version were those who were well off and, although they could not read Latin, were educated enough to purchase such books, and so it has far less to say about the vices and virtues of sovereigns.

Although an increasing amount of scholarly attention has recently been paid to the ‘two-pronged’ audience of Bellenden’s chronicle, these studies have mainly focused on the relationship between Boece’s original, written in Latin and therefore intended for an educated elite, such as members of the aristocracy and the clergy, and Bellenden’s vernacular translation, regardless of its form, which was intended for a wider, general readership among rich families with growing power. Yet to date no one has properly explored whether Bellenden was conscious of this kind of readership when he was revising his own work, and if so, how he tailored each translation to its supposed readers. In fact, a comparison of the print and manuscript versions of the chronicle shows how Bellenden’s consciousness of these two very different groups of readers greatly affected his revision work.

One of the striking differences between the manuscript versions and the printed one is that the author addresses the king more often in the former than in the latter, and the forms of address are different from each other. In the Preface to the manuscript versions, the following address to James V can be found:
I that been thy native and humbl servitor since thy first infance, for
love and vehement affectione, whilk I bear therto, has translatet the
history of Scotland since the first begining therof in vulgar lan-
guage, and though the harg was importable, thron tedious labour
and fear of this huge volume, whilk has impeached my feeble eng-
yne, haveand no craftie witt, nor that pregnant eloquence to decore
the samen, yet I am constrainit for short tym to bring this my transla-
tione to light, naked of all perfectione and rethorie as implume birds
full flight, not those lefe I lonlie beseech thy magnify ceme to
accept my labor with sirk benevolence as they been dedicat to thy
grace [...]. (fol. 13)\textsuperscript{14}

In the corresponding part of the printed version, however, most of the
above passage has been omitted, and only the following lines remain: ‘I
then hes bene your humyl seruitour sen your first infance, hes translatit the
history of scotland sen the first begynnyng thairof in your vulgar langage.’
(fol. 149)\textsuperscript{15} There are two things worth noticing about this revision. The
first is that direct, exhortatary addresses to the king - such as ‘thy magnify’
and ‘thy grace’ - have been excised in the printed version. The second is
that the forms of address have been changed from ‘thee’ and ‘thy’ in the
manuscript version to ‘you’ and ‘your’ in the printed text. This change
should be due to James V’s coming of age. When Bellenden dedicated the
manuscript version to James V, the king was still under the custody of the
Douglas family, whereas, when the printed version was presented to him,
he must have been fully independent from them.\textsuperscript{16}

In addition to these changes, the printed copy also contains material
not present in the manuscript versions. According to Sally Mapstone, who
has examined both manuscript and printed versions of the chronicle, ‘a fur-
ther laudatory sentence on the Douglases is added’ in the printed version.\textsuperscript{17}
This shows Bellenden’s ardent support of the Douglas family, and Mapstone suggests that the ‘presence of this pro-Douglas material in a text presented to the king illustrates a recurrent facet of earlier Scottish political writing, that texts directed towards the monarch frequently arise out of and reflect the viewpoints of an aristocratic constituency.’

Although the printed version was again dedicated to James V, just as were the manuscript versions, Bellenden probably believed that the printed text would be purchased by non-royal readers as a public document, in contrast to the manuscript, which would almost certainly remain in private hands. Thus he replaced those passages in the manuscript version that would appeal only to the king, with sentences that were designed to appeal to non-royal readers. Hence favorable depictions of the Douglases are more abundant in the printed version than in the manuscript version, revealing the author’s strong support for this family. When Bellenden made such serious changes in his new, printed *Chronicles*, he must have needed to camouflage them from the king’s eye so as not to damage his newly restored relationship with him.

One important technique Bellenden employed was to make a good use of the ‘advice to princes’ genre in his work. Retaining the framework of this genre, originally intended to praise and educate one’s sovereign, Bellenden could hide his true allegiances in code. Examining Bellenden’s prefatory letter to the king and the Ballad that appears at the end of his *Chronicles*, we can infer that Bellenden intentionally changed the way that the ‘advice to princes’ genre was incorporated in his work in the printed version. The Preface, which precedes the history of Scotland in the manuscript version, was greatly revised, given a different title (the ‘Epistle’), and put at the end of the history in the printed version. In the Epistle, but not in the original Preface, Bellenden refers to Erasmus, as well as to Erasmus’s work, *The Institution of the Christian Prince* (1517), a typical exam-
ple of the ‘advice to princes’ genre.

Janet Hadley Williams claims that mentioning Erasmus here must have had great significance for James V:

Its opening allusion not simply to Erasmus, but to his *institution of christin kingis* [*Institutio Principis Christiani*, 1517], flatteringly inferred a link between James V and the Emperor Charles V, for whom Erasmus has written the *Institutio*.20

Indeed, James V must have been pleased to have been compared to such a powerful contemporary ruler as Charles V. He may even have been able to compare himself to Henry VIII, to whom Erasmus later dedicated the *Institutio*, or to Francis I, the patron of Guillaume Budé, who was very influential in the life of James V.21 The mere mention of Erasmus, then, is a clear piece of flattery intended to improve Bellenden’s relationship with his patron.

However, Bellenden did not simply limit himself to mentioning Erasmus by name in the Epistle. When the Preface is compared to the Epistle, it is noteworthy that Bellenden changed the texts greatly adding to the latter many passages discussing various differences between true kings and tyrants, where totally different passages from Seneca about the general Regulus, who courageously tried to save his men at the expense of his own life, can be found in the Preface. The passages that treat the subject of the differences between true kings and tyrants are, although traditionally believed to have been composed by Bellenden, are in fact rough translations from *The Institution of the Christian Prince* by Erasmus, and it seems that these passages were inserted to the Epistle regardless of their original context in Erasmus.22 Bellenden reads:
One tyrant likes riches, an king likes honor conquest by virtue.
One tyrant governs his realm by slaughter, dread, and false, one 
king good his realm by prudence, integrity and favor. One tyrant 
suspects all them that has riches, great income. One king holds such 
men for his most helpful friends. One tyrant loves none but uane 
fleschours vicious and wicked limmars, by whose counsel he reigns 
in slaughter and tyranny. One king loves men of wisdom, grave and 
science knowing well that his great matters may be well dressed by 
their prudence. Truth is that kings and tyrant has many hands, 
many eyes, and many bodily members. (Bellenden, fol. 149v)

These passages seem to have been based on the following passages from 
Erasmus:

A tyrant's aim is to follow whatever takes his fance; a king's, on the 
other hand, is to follow what is right and honourable. For a tyrant, 
reward is wealth; to a king, it is the honour which follows from 
virtue. A tyrant governs by fear, deceit, and evil cunning; a king 
through wisdom, integrity, and goodwill. Those citizens who 
are distinguished for their moral quality, judgement, and prestige 
are held in suspicion and distrust by the tyrant, whereas the king 
hold fast to them as his helpers and friends. The tyrant is pleased 
either with fools on whom he imposes or with wicked men whom 
he puts to evil use in protecting his tyrannical position or with flat-
terers from whom he hears what he enjoys hearing. To a king, by 
contrast, every wise man by whose advice he can be helped is very 
welcome; [...] Both kings and tyrants have many hands and many 
eyes, but these parts are very different. (Erasmus, pp. 27-28)
Note that the corresponding numbered lines closely reflect each other, supporting the theory that Bellenden used Erasmus's text as the basis for the passages in his own work. According to Lisa Jardine, this way of contrasting two extremes, in this case tyrants and good kings, was often employed in educational works designed to give moral instruction:

Erasmus adopts a traditional moral educational strategy - that the teacher should rhetorically 'color' two extreme alternatives, and present one course of action as unequivocally desirable and praiseworthy, while its opposite is abhorrent and to be shunned.24

From this we can recognise that Bellenden, by conflating Erasmus's work into his history, intentionally gave his printed work the appearance of the style of a text in the 'advice to princes' tradition.

This point is reaffirmed by the textual changes that Bellenden made to the Ballad. The Ballad that appears in the manuscript version was revised for publication in print, and appears in the printed version with a different title, the 'Proheme of the History'. Of the twenty-five stanzas in the original Ballad, one stanza was deleted and five stanzas were newly added in the 'Proheme of the History'. Of the five newly added stanzas, two stanzas are written in the manner of the 'advice to princes' tradition, in that they contrast two extremes of behaviour in order to suggest a moral lesson. After arguing that the king could learn from his Chronicles what kind of person is truly noble, Bellenden goes on to describe what noble people are like by nature, and follows this with another stanza describing what villains are like by nature. In offering these examples as a contrast between two extremes, Bellenden clearly situates his work within the
‘advice to princes’ tradition.

In addition to these two stanzas, Bellenden also inserts an additional stanza in the Proheme of the History in which he argues that the life and the governance of the king is the mirror of the people:

[This history] Schow how the kingly life and governance
The murrour of leyuing to his peple bene.
for as he luffis, be his ordinance
The same maneri ar with his peple sene.
And thairfore kingly hes na oppin rene
To vse all pleseris as thaym lykis best.
The hiear honour and office thay sustene
Thair vicse is ay the hiear manifest. (fol. 5)

This idea — that, as king’s behaviour is imitated by his people, he must lead a irreproachable life — is also based on Erasmus, who asserts that the king’s life is ‘open to view: [...] The common people imitate nothing with more pleasure than what they see their prince do’ (p. 21). The fact that, although Bellenden had already incorporated this idea in his Preface, he dared to add to it further in the Proheme of History proves Bellenden’s great reliance on Erasmus’s work. It would initially seem likely that Bellenden sought to give a moral education to his king, and drew upon the ‘advice to princes’ tradition for this purpose. This moral purpose is revealed by the fact that he used Erasmus’s work as his exemplar, rather than a text with an overt political agenda such as Machiavelli’s *The Prince* (1513).

Bellenden’s work is more sophisticated than this, however, and there is evidence to suggest that he used Erasmus in this way, placing his own chronicle safely within the uncontentious ‘advice to princes’ tradition, pre-
cisely to disguise his true intentions from the king. For his discussion of the major causes leading to the corruption and demise of kings is very different in the Epistle to the one that appears in the Preface. In the latter, Bellenden claims that the nobles surrounding the king are responsible for the king’s corruption, while in the former he discusses the king’s responsibility for his own ruin. The Preface reads:

[M] or selt for conques of guds then comonwell, thyron whois corruped counsell thy noble antecessers sumtymes wer abused and brought to sirk miserie that they tint not only ther lyf and triumphant dominione, bot remains in memory to most lamentable regrate, [. . .] whilk thing was occatione to thy noble elders to declyn fra virtue, when partiall and suspitious persons wer depend-ing their hynesses, or cloathit with ther antherster, as mor clearly shall appear in the reading of this volum not the lefe, be most excel-lent prerogative of natur thy hynes, shall shortly gave perfyt cognoscence who been presently abusers of thy commonwell [. . .].

(fol. 13)

Here it is the nobles around the king who are to blame for the monarch’s decline, and in this way they echo Boece’s original text. According to Janet Hadley Williams, Boece was unhappy with the situation at court around 1526, when although James V was officially of age, he was still in Angus’s custody. Consequently Boece describes the many misfortunes caused by over-powerful nobles, as Williams points out:

In 1526 the king might have been officially of age, but he was still in Angus’s custody; Boece’s timing therefore gave added meaning to his moralising stress, significantly placed within his epistle to
James V, on the unfailing fate (disgraceful death) of those kings and, *much more so*, those nobles ‘puffed up with unbridled power’. Within the text itself such deserved ends for the overmighty are recurring feature. (Williams, p. 184) [emphasis in the original]

By contrast, all of these passages are excised in the corresponding part of the Epistle, and the subject matter is treated quite differently in another part of the Epistle, in the discussion of the difference between true kings and tyrants:

Ane tyrane luffis nane bot vane fleschours vicius and wickid lym­maris, be quhais counsell he ragis in slauchter and tyranny. Ane king luffis men of wisdome, gravite and science, knawing weill that his gret materis may be weill dressit be thair prudence. (fol. 149v)

Here the destruction of the king is attributed to his own wrong choosing of the counselors. This essential change, which was probably made for the sake of the Douglasses, is effectively obfuscated by Bellenden’s use of Erasmus’s ‘advice to princes’ passages, which were originally written for the benefit of the royal patron. In this way Bellenden makes subtle changes to the argument of his work, transferring his support from James V to the Douglasses, whilst using the ‘advice to princes’ tradition to mask that shift in allegiance.

The preceding discussion points to the fact that John Bellenden made full use of the two different media — manuscript and printed book — to reach two separate audiences, and used his understanding of the supposed readers of each to manipulate them. In doing so, he made sophisticated use of the influential figure of Erasmus and the ‘advice to princes tradition’, so as to disguise his true intentions. Furthermore, Bellenden’s use of Erasmus
out of context simply to allow him to pursue his own political ends reflects
the growing tendency of writers in this period to use Erasmus in this way.
The very fact that Erasmus made such books as Adages (1500), elements of
which could (and did) appear in markedly different contexts, in recognition
of the fact that his writings were used to support wildly divergent view­
points, may suggest that Erasmus himself intended his works to be used in
such ways. In the introduction to the Adages, where Erasmus discusses
how the proverbs in this work can be used, he points out that it is perfectly
acceptable for other writers to make use of the proverbs in any way they
see fit, regardless of their original context:

To begin with, there is no reason why you should not occasionally
fit the same wording with different meanings [. . .]. Sometimes a
saying can be turned ironically to mean the opposite [. . .]. Occa­sionally it happens that the change of one small word may make the
proverb fit several meanings [. . .]. In a word, you may freely
arrange this comparison in any way which it will fit. This method
applies to almost every instance where a transference is made from
a person to a thing or vice versa.28

Bellenden’s considerable reliance on Erasmus’s The Education of a
Christian Prince reveals the importance of that particular work, and the
‘advice to princes’ genre in general, to those authors who strove to gain
secure patronage from their sovereigns in the literary world of the sixteenth
century. In particular, many writers may well have used the genre in order
to camouflage any aspects of their writing that might have been unfavor­
able to their patrons. Examining Bellenden’s use of this genre in his
Chronicles and the relationship between the various changes that he made
when transferring his work from the private to the public medium clearly
reveals the hitherto obscure voice of the author behind the text.
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7 See Sheppard, pp. 20-21.

8 Bellenden’s sister married Oliver Sinclair, and the Bellendens seem to have

According to Jamie Cameron, James V was on bad terms with magnates throughout his life, especially the Douglases: ‘The verdict is that the king could not establish a working relationship with his magnates, hence their lack of support for him at the end of the reign. James V is seen as an example of complete failure. John Knox simply stated that some called him a murderer of the nobility. [. . .] The touchstone to crown-magnate relations throughout the entire personal reign of James V is considered by some historians to be the tension between the king and the Douglases.’ James V: The Personal Rule 1528-1542, ed. by Norman Macdougall (East Linton: Tuckwell, 1998), pp. 2-3.

All extant manuscript copies also contain the Ballad, but that Sheppard claims that it must have been inserted later, probably when the presentation manuscript was prepared c. 1531-33. See Sheppard, p. 57.

As Davidson did not indicate a publication date, we cannot be sure when it was published. Sheppard suggests that it was published between 1533 and 1538; see Sheppard, p. 73. My limited research show that at least 11 manuscripts and 31 printed copies are now in existence. Among these, the one presented to James V is now held in the Pierpont Morgan Library.


All the citations from the manuscript version are taken from National Library of Scotland MS Adv.33.4.15. This manuscript is considered to have been transcribed from the manuscript held at University College London MS Angl. 1.

All the citations from the Chronicles of Scotland are taken from Hector Boethius, Chronicle of Scotland, trans. by John Bellenden, The English Expe-
rience: Its Record in Early Printed Books Published in Facsimile, 851 (Amsterdam: Theatrum, 1977).

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Sally Mapstone of Oxford University for her suggestion about the relationship between James’s age and the form of address. Janet Hadley Williams discusses James V’s coming of age in terms of the woodcut in the title page of the Chronicles and Scotorum Historia; see Williams, ‘James V of Scots as Literary Patron’, in Princes and Princely Culture 1450-1650, ed. by M. Gosman and others, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2003), i, pp. 173-98 (191).


Of the four important manuscripts listed above, the MS in the Pierpont Morgan Library was presented to James V. The MS held in the University College of London was owned by Alexander Seton, a noble, and then given to the Maitlands, also a powerful noble family in Scotland. The MS in the Trinity College of Cambridge was owned by Richard Roll, a clergyman. The MS in the Longleat House was found in Scotland and brought to England by John Thynne, though its former history is unknown.

Williams, p. 191.

Williams suggests that James V’s commission to Bellenden to translate Livy’s History of Rome was a ‘gesture in emulation of Francis I, whose interest in Roman history was well known’ (p. 194).

It has never been noticed that those passages discussing the difference between tyrants and true kings are taken from Erasmus. E. A. Sheppard attributes it to Bellenden’s original: ‘In Davidson’s version there is rather more original matter; but it is Bellenden’s own additions that have been altered. One notes in particular a long and elaborately rhetorical outburst on the distinction between kings and tyrants, enlarged from a sentence or two in ms. M. [. . .].’ (p. 66).


Erasmus, p. 27.

In the Preface Bellenden writes: ‘[F]or the lyfe of kingis drawis thair subdittis to Imitation of thair werkis worthy or vnworthy, and the same cumis to lycht
be impulsion of fortoun that nothing sufferis to be hyd’ (fol. 149).

26 For a detailed comparison of Machiavelli and Erasmus, see Harry R. Burke, ‘Audience and Intention in Machiavelli’s *The Prince* and Erasmus’ *Education of a Christian Prince*’, *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 4 (1984), 84-93.

27 Williams, p. 184.