

I.

NOTICE OF A PORTRAIT GROUP OF MARGARET TUDOR, THE REGENT-ALBANY, AND A THIRD FIGURE; THE PROPERTY OF THE MARQUIS OF BUTE, AT CARDIFF CASTLE, GLAMORGANSHIRE. BY Æ. J. G. MACKAY, F.S.A., SHERIFF OF FIFE AND KINROSS. (PLATE IV.)

For the following description of this picture I am indebted to notes by Mr J. M. Gray, Curator of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, at Edinburgh, which I have supplemented in a few points from another description by the well-known art critic, Dr Jean Paul Richter, with which I was favoured by Mr John G. Godwin, Librarian of the Marquis of Bute, and from personal inspection during a visit to Cardiff in April 1893.

The size of the picture is $32\frac{1}{2} \times 45\frac{1}{2}$ inches. It is painted on oak panel (apparently in three longitudinal pieces, though, from the modern parqueting which protects the back, this is uncertain). It represents *three standing figures, a little under life-size*—Albany, Margaret Tudor, and a third person, unknown, behind Margaret, to the right. The background is brown, but a green curtain, with yellowish lights in it, covers most of the background behind the heads of the two main figures who face the spectator. The man (Albany) has ruddy brown hair, beard, and eyebrows, no moustache, dark grey-blue eyes. His upper coat, bordered with brown fur, has wide dark-green sleeves to the elbows, enriched with yellow slashings. Sleeves appear below this to the wrists, which are pink in the lights, crimson in the shadows; the same colours appear again at the throat and breast. At his breast is a brooch, with what seems to be a shield of arms, probably on a stone. A ring, with diamond and ruby, is on the forefinger of his left hand. A purse with gold clasp, and bag of full-coloured cloth of gold, is held between the thumb and forefinger. With his right he receives what seems to be a white handkerchief, edged with gold embroidery, from the folds of which appears a pink-and-white or lilac-coloured carnation. A red purse, with steel clasps, open, hangs at his waist in front. Margaret Tudor has ruddy brown hair and eyebrows (a little lighter in tone than those of Albany). Her eyes are brown, similar in colour to that of her



PORTRAIT GROUP OF MARGARET TUDOR AND THE REGENT ALBANY.

(The property of the Marquis of Bute.)

hair, but a little darker. She wears a white head-dress, a piece of white cloth laid across her shoulders and upper part of her arms, and a black dress with standing collar, embroidered inside with white lace, which again appears at the wrists. At her breast is a small posy of flowers, apparently a pink and some foliage, almost like that of a moss-rose. Round her neck there is a small black necklace. Below her waist, on each side, appears an upper petticoat of black silk, opening in front and disclosing a brown under-dress. From her waist hangs a rich girdle, with round gold clasp, set with a red stone, the girdle itself being of silver, enriched with gold. From the central circular clasp hangs a round pendant, with a decorative figure-subject, and inscribed "Manet enim - angelus - domini - gladium - habens - et - secet - te - in - medium - Daniel 13 -". She has a small ring on the little finger of both hands, and rings on the forefinger and third finger of the right. The left hand holds a pair of grey leather gloves. The third figure has an embrowned face, ruddy moustache, hair, beard, and eyebrows; the eyes are light grey. He wears a scarlet uniform, edged with dark blue or black facings. The initial "R," in black, edged and decorated with gold lace, appears on the left side of his breast. The right side of his person is hidden by that of Margaret Tudor. The picture is a good deal retouched, very obviously in the red costume of the servant and in his left hand; but the faces of the main figures seem fairly preserved: the chin of the Queen is repainted. The servant points to a red butterfly (*Vanessa urtica*, the small tortoise-shell butterfly) fluttering in the background. On a table before the two main figures are a brown book or portfolio loose in its binding, papers beneath it, a round object, possibly the handle of a white bone or ivory seal, and a pair of scissors, two inkstands conjoined with sand-boxes, in one of which are three quills. There are also several gold pieces scattered on the table near Margaret Tudor.

This picture nearly a century ago attracted the attention of Scottish antiquaries, but has not yet been fully explained. It was engraved in 1799 by Mr Harding of Pall Mall, for Mr Pinkerton's Scottish Gallery, and has been reproduced by Mr Small in the preface to his edition of the Works of Gavin Douglas, and by Mr Grant in his "Old and New Edinburgh."

The lady of the picture is Margaret Tudor. Mr Gray notes that her face resembles that of the portrait at Newbattle, belonging to the Marquis of Lothian, though the brow is squarer and the face seems younger. The peculiar upper lip, turned up at the corners, may be noticed in both portraits.

Margaret Tudor, elder daughter of Henry VII. and Elizabeth of York, married in 1503 James IV. when only 14 years of age. Within less than a year of his death at Flodden in 1513 she rushed into a second marriage with the young Earl of Angus, grandson of Angus "Bell-the-Cat," who, though already a widower, was a little younger than herself. Soon after the birth, in 1515, of their only child, Margaret Douglas, afterwards Countess of Lennox, she quarrelled with her husband, who had been unfaithful to her, and commenced proceedings for the divorce she eventually obtained from the Court of Rome in 1528. She was the grandmother both of Mary Stuart and of Darnley.

The principal male figure is neither James IV. nor Angus, as has been suggested, but John Stuart, Duke of Albany. A comparison of this portrait with one of Albany by the French painter Clouet, formerly in the Howard collection, of which a *fac-simile* has been published by Lord Ronald Gower, proves this, and the apparent ages, of the man about forty, and of the woman about thirty, correspond with the relative ages of Margaret Tudor and Albany, but not with those of Margaret and either of her husbands.

John, Duke of Albany, son of Alexander, Duke of Albany, brother of James III. by his wife Agnes De La Tour D'Auvergne, married in 1505 his first cousin, Ann De La Tour D'Auvergne, whose younger sister, Magdalen, became in 1518 wife of Lorenzo De Medici the younger, nephew of Leo X., and died in giving birth to Catherine De Medici. Ann, the wife of Albany, died in June 1524, without issue, leaving her great estates to her niece Catherine De Medici.

The blood of the Tudors and the Stuarts, represented by Margaret and Albany, and the parts they played in history, give this picture, in which they are brought together, an historical and romantic interest. Albany, though he served in several campaigns, was more of a civilian

and diplomatist than a soldier or general, but, unlike a good diplomatist, he was hot-tempered. He used—Dacre the English Warden of the Marches reported—when angry to throw his hats, one of which is represented in this picture, into the fire. More than ten perished at one of their interviews. Imprudent in speech, he lost the support of Hume the Chamberlain of Scotland, when they first met, by a disparaging remark on his short stature; and he incensed Dacre by asking publicly, “What man is this Lord Dacre? Is there none of you that is Borderers that can at such meetings fall into altercation with him and do me a pleasure?”¹ He was lavish, fond of hawking and hunting, of games, cards and dice. He could show energy, as his first residence in Scotland proved, but he had no staying power. Tempted by the Regency and possible succession to the Scottish Crown, he made three visits to Scotland, each shorter than that preceding. But his heart was in France. He spoke French, signed his name in French, and called Francis I. his master. Skelton the English poet called him a coward, and Wolsey called him a fool, but both were prejudiced. More impartial judges saw in him a singular combination of vacillation and determination, qualities apparently antagonistic, but due to the conflict between his French and his Scottish interests. When the conflict was closed by James V. attaining manhood and marrying a French Princess, Albany’s conduct became consistent. His aim was to keep Scotland dependent on France and attached to the Pope. In this he succeeded so far as the Royal House of Stuart, of which he was a cadet, was concerned, but failed as regards the nation, which moved towards England, and took part in the Protestant revolt.

Margaret was like her brother, so far as a woman could be and her circumstances allowed. She was amorous, fond of dress and jewels, addicted to intrigue, strong-willed, fickle and treacherous, not without ability and tenacity, as her correspondence shows, but in the end distrusted by every one because of her double dealing. These portraits make no revelation of the character of either Margaret or Albany, which I have drawn from history. Their faces look away from each other

¹ Brewer’s *Calendar of Papers of Reign of Henry VIII.*, iii. p. 797.

towards the spectator, either as if concealing their feelings, or as people sitting for portraits often appear—almost without character.

What is wanting in them is, however, made up for by some incidents of the picture I shall afterwards notice, and by the third figure—the man in the background behind Margaret, whose extended right hand points to a butterfly floating in the air between the two principal figures. His livery of scarlet and black or dark blue answers to the royal livery of England at that time. Both these colours were used for the tunic¹ which the heralds wore underneath their long gown of sad or murrey colour, and before they donned the tabard in the discharge of official duty, presenting letters of greeting or defiance from their Royal master, or making proclamations in his name. His attitude is that of a spy or detective pointing out something which the principal figures do not disclose.

The artistic interest of the picture is considerable, though its partial restoration renders it difficult to say how considerable that interest may have been. It has been classed by Dr Waagen as possibly by Holbein, one of the greatest masters of portraiture. Other critics have called it by the vague name of the School of Holbein. But the probable date of the picture is adverse to either attribution. It may be assumed that it must have been painted before 1524, when Albany finally left Scotland, for after this date he never met Margaret Tudor. Holbein did not come to England till 1526,² and there is no reason to suppose that he ever saw either Albany or Margaret Tudor, though more than one of her portraits or supposed portraits have been attributed to him. The two principal figures, though scarcely worthy of the brush of Holbein, are well painted, both in general aspect and in details, especially in the hands, a crucial test of the art of the portrait-painter. They certainly leave the impression of good likenesses. The third figure is evidently also a portrait; and though some judges have deemed it an afterthought, inserted by another and inferior artist, personal inspection of the picture does not favour this criticism.

Without pretending to solve all the questions this picture suggests,

¹ Noble's *History of the College of Arms*, p. 49.

² Woltmann, *Holbein and his Times*, p. 294.

the historical relations which existed between Margaret Tudor and Albany, and the view taken of them by Henry VIII. and Wolsey, along with a passage in the recently published 14th volume of the Exchequer Rolls, enable us at least to approach a solution of the most important points.

Towards the close of the year 1521 a rumour began to circulate in Europe that Margaret Tudor, who had returned to Scotland in 1517 from her brother's court, where she had been well received, and loaded with the presents she most valued, dress and jewels, and Albany who had come back from France in the autumn of 1521, had not merely forgotten their old enmity, the cause of Margaret's flight to England, but had become close allies. Scandal added that they were too intimate for persons each of whom had a living spouse.

The first notice of this intimacy, and also of a possible marriage between Margaret and Albany if she succeeded in divorcing Angus, appears in a letter of Wolsey¹ from Calais to Henry VIII. in the middle of November 1521. He had been four months in France, engaged in the conference which ended in an alliance between England and the Emperor, and a declaration of war with France. After mentioning that it was reported that Albany had come to Scotland, which he could not believe, as Francis I. had promised to detain him in France, he proceeds:—"Signifying unto your Grace that I have not onely written unto your Oratour in the Courte of Rome to impeche and lett the sute made in that Courte by the Queene of Scottis for a divorce betwixt her and her housbande the Erle of Anguishe; but also have caused the Poope's Oratour² here being to write in moost effectuell maner to His Holinesse, for stopping of the same, by meane whereof the said divorce shall not procede, when the Poope shall be informed that the same is procured oonely for mariage to be made betwixt the Duke of Albany and the Queene there, whereby the destruccion of the young King shall ensue."³

¹ Brewer, *Calendar*, iii. p. 742. He returned from Calais on 28th Novem., p. 779.

² This was Clerk, who had written to Wolsey on 10th October 1521, "The Queene of Scottis is suing for a divorce. Albany is her Factor."—Ellis, *Historical Letters*, 3rd ed., i. 262.

³ *State Papers, Henry VIII.*, i. p. 91.

On 18th December 1521 Dacre transmitted to Wolsey certain Articles¹ subscribed by Lords Angus, Hume, and Somervell at Kirke of Steele on the 14th, containing, amongst other charges against Albany, this (5)—“that on Albany’s coming to Scotland he visited the Queen at Stirling, and went in her company to Linlithgow and so to Edinburgh. On the second day after their arrival the Duke received the keys of the castle, where the King was, from the Captain, and delivered them to the Queen, who gave them back to him.” On which Dacre, in a separate paper transmitted at the same time, gives—“The opinion of me Lord Dacre, under the correction of the King’s Highness and your Grace, to the Articles afore written (5). It is true that there is marvelous great intelligence between her and the Duke, as well all the day as much of the night; and in manner they set not by who know it. And if I durst say it, for fere of the displeasure of my Sovereign, they are over tender, whereof if your Grace enquire of the Bishop of Dunkeld of his conscience, I trust he will show you the truth.” It did not require any appeal to the conscience of Gavin Douglas to stimulate him to corroborate any charge against Albany, whom he called the “Wicked Duke,” or against Margaret, with whom he had quarrelled, and who declared, Tudor-like, as she had made him Bishop of Dunkeld, she could unmake him.

On 20th December Dacre again reported to Wolsey, from whom he had apparently first heard² of the alleged design of Albany’s marriage with Margaret Tudor, that—“aid must be given to the Scotch Lords, or the young King will be destroyed, and a Frenchman will be king and marry Henry’s sister.”³

The scandal had become so public that it passed into the diplomatic correspondence of other Courts. The Bishop of Badajos, who heard the report from Wolsey on 12th December, informed Charles V. of it. Charles V. answered the Bishop⁴—“as to what the Cardinal, *i.e.* Wolsey, says about Albany, they (*i.e.* the English) will be cured of trusting to French promises. But he does not think any Pope would have given

¹ *State Papers Calendar*, iii., No. 1897. Pinkerton, ii, p. 1888, No. 3.

² *Ibid.*, iii., No. 1883, 19th December, Dacre to Wolsey.

³ *Ibid.*, iii., No. 1886.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 1858.

the Duke the dispensation he would require, especially as he has children by his present wife, la fille de Boulogne. [This is an error.] He would be more likely to do it without dispensation, trusting to get absolution afterwards."¹

Early in the following year, 1522, the subject was brought formally before the Scottish Estates by a letter from Henry VIII., in which he charged Albany with endangering the life of the young King, and compassing "the perdition" of his sister by furthering her divorce from Angus with the object of marrying her himself. About the same time Henry instructed his envoy Sir Thomas Cheyne to declare to Francis I. that Albany proposed to marry Margaret after her divorce, and to exhort Francis to discountenance Albany's proceedings.²

The Estates answered this charge on 11th February, in terms as dignified as they are creditable to their good sense. "We see nane appearance quhy your Grace belieff or giff credence that our said Governour quha hes been recevit with sa gret Honour and had so tender familiarite with Popes and gretest Princes in Christendome, wold sa neglect his fame and conscience as ymagine or think ony harm or displeasure to our Souveraine Lordis Person, nor to induce ony Princess to leiff her lawful Husband for his cause, nor he to separate himself fra his ane spousit wyff, being ane Lady sa vertuous and be quham he has sa grete Lordschippes and Possessiouns, and in gude faithe we firmlie belieff that the Quenis Grace your sister nor he nouthar ar nor hes been myndit thereto in any manner."³

The answer of Queen Margaret is of the same date as the answer of the Estates.⁴

"She has received," it begins, "her brother's sharp and unkind letter, reproaching her for being so foolish as to suppose the cunning of Albany to be for her good, and for contemplating a divorce from Angus with a view of marrying Albany. Henry trusts too easily to false reports. Nothing is dearer to her than her son's weal. It is not to Henry's

¹ *State Papers of Henry VIII., Calendar*, No. 1887, 20th December 1521.

² *Ibid.*, iii., No. 1991.

³ *Privy Seal Register*, 11th February 1521.

⁴ Albany's letter of 11th February 1522, *State Papers Calendar*, iii., No. 2038, also contains a repudiation of the charge.

honour to suffer such slanders as my lord Cardinal spoke in Council, that she loved the Governor to her dishonour." Unluckily, she added, that "her divorce from Angus" had never been contemplated either by herself or Albany. As the divorce suit had already begun, and was well known to Wolsey and the English Court, through the letters from John Clerk, the English envoy at Rome, it was impossible this falsehood could be credited. Its expression gave little chance that the rumour of her intrigue with Albany would be set at rest by her mere denial. The report that Margaret Tudor and Albany desired to marry was not unnaturally revived in 1524, after the death of Albany's wife. It is twice referred to by Dr Magnus, the English envoy to Scotland, in his correspondence with Wolsey towards the close of that and the beginning of the following year. "I conceive," he writes in the second of these letters,¹ which contains the last reference to the subject I have noticed, dated Edinburgh, 24th January 1525, "by my Lord Cassillis that Harry Stuart reported that over and beside such matters as Grosselles (a French agent of Albany) proposed in open presence, he wrote, sent, and delivered sundry other secret letters to the Queen's Grace for procuring a marriage between the Duke of Albany and the Queen's Grace; which letters the said Harry saith came into his hands, and because he allegeth he was one of the principal takers furth of the young King, and putting his Grace to large and liberty, and that therefore he thinketh if ever the Duke shall come again to Scotland it will cost him his life. He therefore hath so instanced, solicit, and laboured the Queen's Grace that her Grace is nothing inclined nor mynded neither to the said Duke of Albany nor to the devotion of France, but clearly to follow the high pleasure of the King's Highness her brodir. And yet some suspect that her Grace has written privy letters into France, which in anywise I cannot concur nor believe, but suppose the contrary to be true."

It is difficult to say what schemes may at different points of time have passed through the busy brain and fickle heart of Margaret Tudor. The sequel is well known. Margaret at last, in 1528, procured a papal divorce, largely through the use of Albany's influence and purse, and

¹ 22nd December 1524. *State Papers of Henry VIII.*, iv. p. 276.

she married, when a third legal marriage became possible, not Albany, but Harry Stuart, created Lord Methven, with whom she had been too intimate before, and from whom, not long after her marriage, she was divorced.

It is very unlikely, though not perhaps impossible, that Albany desired to marry her, though he undoubtedly wished to procure her name and influence, waning, but not yet lost, in support of his Scottish policy. It is more possible that Margaret may have had such a design. She certainly at this juncture desired to please Albany, and she succeeded in getting from him the money she so sorely needed, and his powerful aid at Rome in favour of her divorce. But the question whether there was more between them than a rapprochement of interest, has been deemed one of the open questions of Scottish history.

The correspondence quoted, with one important letter still to be noticed, throws considerable light on the approximate date of the picture, which is our immediate subject. It cannot have been painted prior to October 1521, as Albany had not returned to Scotland till that month, and it was, as we have seen, in that month that the rumour of a possible marriage of Albany and Margaret Tudor was set on foot, apparently chiefly by Wolsey, not without plausible grounds, combining the intelligence he received from Rome, Scotland, and the Borders. It cannot have been painted later than May 1524, when Albany finally quitted Scotland. But we can arrive, I think, nearer its actual date, and may even probably fix the scene it was drawn to represent. Albany, after coming to Scotland on 19th March 1521, returned to France on 15th October 1522. It was during this period that the scandal of too intimate relations between Margaret and Albany was most plausible and most actively propagated by their enemies in Scotland and by the English Court. Though each had a living spouse, the diplomatists of that age, to whom the facts were well known, did not count this an insuperable obstacle, and history, more impartial than diplomacy, is too well aware of the facilities for the dissolution of marriage at this period in the hands of the Court of Rome, to consider such a double divorce impossible. That of Angus was ultimately procured; that of Albany would have been more difficult, for the necessary dispensation to allow him to marry

his first cousin had no doubt been granted in regular form. Possibly the contingency contemplated was her death, as she died, we have seen, shortly after, may already have been in declining health, and at no time appears as an important factor in Albany's life. It is on the same period, and a small portion of it, that it is now necessary to concentrate attention. This period is the fortnight from Candlemas, 1st February to 14th February 1522, during which Thomas Benolt, the English Clarencieux herald, was in Edinburgh. He came as the envoy from Henry VIII. to demand the return of Albany to France, to accuse him of the design of marrying Margaret Tudor, and to defy him if he declined to leave the kingdom.¹ Benolt had already been sent to Scotland in 1516 to act as a spy on Albany.² With the adroitness of a diplomatic spy, he had made himself agreeable both to Margaret and to Albany,³ and had nearly persuaded Albany to visit the English Court. His return in 1522 was partly due to the request of Margaret herself.

The letters he carried to the Scottish Estates and the answers he received have been already quoted. A letter from him to Wolsey,⁴ written on 15th February 1522, gives a full and interesting account of his reception, and deserves special attention. "He reached Edinburgh," he says, "on Saturday, 31st January, Candlemas Eve, and found the Queen lodging in the house of a Burgess." On presenting his letters, she, after reading them, was marvellously abashed, and said, "she perceived the King held her in heinous displeasure owing to ill reports. She only desired Albany in Scotland because before he came she was ill treated, and had as simple living as any poor gentlewoman. She had been compelled to part with her jewels till Albany commanded the Comptroller to pay her. She had been well treated since his arrival, and she desires nothing to her dishonour, which she regards as much as any poor gentlewoman or princess. Her son is well kept, and has

¹ Leslie's *History of Scotland*, i. p. 182 (Scottish Text Society's Ed.). Noble's *History of the College of Arms*.

² Pinkerton, ii. p. 158, *State Papers, Henry VIII.*, August 1516, No. 2253, instructions to Clarencieux, and No. 2295, 9th August 1516. Letter, Clarencieux to Wolsey, 29th August 1516. Clarencieux to Wolsey, No. 2314.

³ 30th November 1516, No. 2610, Clarencieux to Wolsey.

⁴ *Letters and Papers, Henry VIII.*, iii., No. 2054.

nothing to fear from the Duke. On Sunday, Candlemas Day, Albany sent for Clarendieux to Holyrood, and he delivered Henry's letters in the presence of the Lords. After dinner Clarendieux had a private meeting with him in his chamber, when he complained of the bitterness of Henry's letter, protested that he never did anything to the hurt of the young King, and declared that he had returned to Scotland because he had sworn on the evangels an oath nothing would induce him to break. The Lords had appointed him Governor, and he would risk his life and goods for them, and would not fail them for the sake of the King his master, his wife, or all he had in France. As to the charge of his damnable abusion of the King's sister, moving her to leave her husband and marry him, he said that when he was last in Rome the Queen desired him to sue for a divorce, and that he obtained a Bull, which he sent her, but did not show Clarendieux. He swore by the Sacrament he saw between the Priest's hands that day that he might break his neck if ever he minded to marry her. He marvelled the King should think so ill of his sister, and that the Cardinal should have said in the Council he kept the Queen as his wife or concubine. One wife was enough for him. Henry had complained that his sister was not well treated, but the fact was she was well treated, and by his means. On the following Saturday, the 6th, Margaret sent for Clarendieux. He went, and found Albany with her. She expressed her gratitude to Albany, and said it would continue so long as he acted honourably. Albany replied that he would never act otherwise. He also said he was always willing to be friendly with England; but if the King made war on his nephew he would defend him. This conversation was in French, that Albany might understand it, as Clarendieux himself, who had often been in France, also no doubt did. On Monday, 8th, Clarendieux met the Lords in Parliament at the Tolbooth, and desired to have his letters read openly. He was greeted with many grim looks, both from high and low, and was desired to withdraw. On his return he was told that they had unanimously invited the Duke, and would not dismiss him." The letter concludes with a reference to Albany's preparations for war, which Clarendieux had observed, and states that Albany had written to France by a pursuivant, who is now

with him at Norham. "The pursuivant," he says, "is but a simple fellow; wherefore I trust to find means to see his papers, and to show your Grace the effect of them." A postscript adds, that he had something to communicate to the King alone from Albany. From the tone of this letter two things appear plain: that Albany and the Queen denied there was any ground for the scandal as to their intimacy; and that, notwithstanding, Clarencieux did not quite trust them, and reported to the English Court what he had seen and heard, without comment, but not without suggestions which persons already suspicious might read between the lines.

The Exchequer Rolls furnish another piece of evidence in support of the view here submitted. In the Account rendered on 31st May 1522 by Robert Barton the Comptroller, whom Margaret familiarly calls "Our Comptroller Robin Barton" in one of her letters, but Gavin Douglas "that sea revar and pirate Albany had made Comptroller," there occurs without further date this entry, of which I give the translation:—"From the sums for which the Accountant has to answer for, there is allowed to him in respect of the delivery made to Margaret, Queen of Scotland, £6408 : 1 : 4 by the precept of the Lord Governor and the Lords of Council, on account of the failure of payment of her conjunct infeftment on account of the disturbance of the country, on condition that when peace ensues she should repay that sum, for which she pledged her conjunct infeftment."¹ Is not this transaction glanced at in the picture? It is impossible to say more than that the scene painted singularly fits what would have been necessary to convey it to the spectator. The coins on the table, and the two purses on Albany's person, point to the possession and delivery of money on his side. The handkerchief, if passing from the Queen to Albany, may cover a deed which may well be the mortgage of her conjunct infeftment, which she had signed or was prepared to sign with one of the pens on the table; or if it is passing from Albany to the Queen, may cover money given her in exchange for the mortgage. The mysterious third figure may be the English envoy pointing his finger at Albany and the butterfly as proof of his suspicions. I strongly suspect the visit of the

¹ *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*, xiv. p. 459.

Clarencieux herald to Edinburgh was the occasion which gave rise to the painting of this picture, and that one of the interviews between Margaret and Albany, which took place about that time, is represented by it. We may perhaps detect in the third figure in the Royal livery, whose dress bears an R for Rex on its breast, Clarencieux himself. Could we see through the portly figure of Margaret, we might perhaps find H for Henricus on the other half of the front of his coat. It is so far adverse to this conjecture that he does not wear a tabard, but the tabard was only worn on solemn occasions, and a herald of that time, like an officer of our own, might prefer not to wear full uniform when summoned to a semi-private interview with a lady.

But let us now look again at the picture, to see whether it does not make further revelations as to its purport. Several of the objects on the table—the ink-bottle, the book, and the loose papers—may be the ordinary properties a painter might introduce into any of his works. Sir George Reid, *P.R.S.A.*, who favoured me with his opinion on the subject, was good enough to show me a photograph of a well-known portrait by Holbein of Jorg Gysen, a German merchant of the London Steel Yard, now in the Museum of Berlin, in which there is an ink-bottle almost identical in form with that in the present picture. But certain details of the present picture are certainly not ordinary properties, and have a symbolic or satiric meaning. These are, (1) the medal which hangs from the finely chased and inlaid silver and gold belt of Margaret Tudor, (2) the carnation inserted in the handkerchief Albany receives from Margaret Tudor, and (3) the butterfly to which the third figure points.

The inscription still legible round the medal is, “*Manet Enim Angelus Domini Gladium Habens Et Secet te in medium,*” Daniel xiii.

The thirteenth chapter of Daniel, in the Vulgate, contains the story of Susanna and the Elders, and this text is the end of verse 59. To follow the story, it is well to give the passage from verse 31; but it is needless to recall the other particulars of the charge against Susanna by the Elders of “*companying with a young man.*”

“Then said Daniel unto them, Put these two aside one far from another, and I will examine them. So they were put asunder one from another. And

he called one of them, and said unto him, O thou that art waxen old in wickedness, now thy sins which thou hast committed aforetime are come to light: for thou hast pronounced false judgment, and hast condemned the innocent, and hast let the guilty go free; albeit the Lord saith, The innocent and righteous shalt thou not slay. Now then, if thou hast seen her, tell me Under what tree sawest thou them companying together? who answered 'Under a mastick tree.' And Daniel said, 'Very well; thou hast lied against thine own head; for even now the angel of God hath received the sentence of God to cut thee in two.' So he put him aside, and commanded to bring the other, and said unto him, 'O thou seed of Chanaan, and not of Juda, beauty hath deceived thee, and lust hath perverted thine heart. Thus have ye dealt with the daughters of Israel, and they for fear companied with you: but the daughter of Juda would not abide your wickedness. Now therefore tell me Under what tree didst thou take them companying together?' who answered, 'Under an holm tree.' Then said Daniel unto him, 'Well; thou hast also lied against thine own head: *for the angel of God waiteth with the sword to cut thee in two that he may destroy thee.*"

The ground of the medal represents this scene. It contains five figures—a boy, Daniel, a woman, Susanna, the two Elders, and an angel bearing a sword. It is scarcely necessary to point the application. Margaret Tudor asserts, by wearing this medal, her innocence of improper relations with Albany, and that a Daniel will come to judgment to condemn the false witness of Wolsey, Gavin Douglas, and Lord Dacre.

The carnation is, though not so certainly, most probably, symbolic. It was no doubt a favourite flower of the formal garden, and of the lovers of flowers, painters or poets, men or women. Its common English name was the Gylly or July flower, but it was often called the "coronation" from its shape, or "carnation" from its flesh colour. A carnation in full bloom in Scotland in February, the probable date of this picture, would no doubt have been a marvel; but it is not necessary to assume strict accuracy on such a point by the painter, especially if the flower had a symbolic meaning as well as natural beauty to attract his art,

Pictoribus atque poetis
Quidlibet audendi semper fuit equa potestas.

That the carnation had a meaning in the language of flowers is shown by a pretty passage in "Colin Clout's Calendar," written about 1579 for the month of April, where Spenser writes—

“Bring hither the pinke and purple collumbine
 With gilly flowers ;
 Bring coronations and sops in wine,
 Worne of paramours.”

“All these,” says the gloss, “be the names of flowers. Sops in wine, a flower much like to a carnation, but differing in size and quantity.”

The carnation in this picture is red and white, so possibly it is the variety which got the name of “sops in wine.”

The carnation may perhaps indicate that, in spite of the denial of the medal, the artist, who probably knew the truth no more than the diplomatists of whom he may have been the interpreter, insinuates there was some ground for the rumour that Margaret and Albany were lovers.

The butterfly can scarcely be deemed a mere accident, apart from the design of the picture. Insects, no doubt, as larger animals, were favourites with the artists of the 16th century, as in the well-known story of Holbein painting a fly on the picture of a brother artist as the token of the visit of a master. But a finger pointing to a butterfly means something more than a butterfly. Pinkerton's observant eye and historical knowledge led him to conjecture that this represents what he calls *l'Amour Voltige*—the flying or fickle love of a royal coquette ; nor has any better suggestion since been made. If so, the interpretation would be, that the figure in the background—the English envoy or spy—declares by his attitude there was a secret understanding, not without an amorous tinge, though of a transitory nature, between Margaret and Albany.

On the questions by whom and for whom this picture was painted, it is impossible to offer any suggestions which are not mere conjectures. This is unfortunate, as the discovery of this might give another clue to the meaning of the picture. Dr Waagen, who saw it at Luton, in Bedfordshire, to which it had been sent by the 1st Marquis of Bute from Cardiff, says in his *Treasures of Art* :—“As far as the ruined state of the picture allows the judgment, it may be a genuine picture of the earliest period of Holbein's residence in England.” If the date of this picture is 1522, it cannot be by Holbein, who did not come to England till 1526. The art of portraiture in England did not, however,

commence with Holbein, although he was its earliest great master. The attribution of portraits to him was a natural wish of their owners, but the more accurate art criticism of the present time has shown that many works ascribed to him were painted before his arrival in England in 1526, or after his death in 1543. Of the painters who practised this art in England in the earlier part of the reign of Henry VIII., the following names have been preserved as artists employed by the King:—John Broune, Andrew Wright, Vincent Volpe or Fox, Anthony Toto, Bartholomew Jenni, Luke, and Gerard Hornebaud, and two women, Susanna Hornebaud and Alice Carwilliam, who were painters of miniatures. It is not easy to ascertain the exact dates during which these artists painted in England; but from a learned paper on “The Contemporaries and Successors of Holbein,” addressed by John Gough Nichols, F.S.A.,¹ to the English Society of Antiquaries, I learn that while most of these are not proved to have painted in England earlier than Holbein, the following probably did: *John Broune*, whose patent as serjeant-painter is dated December 20, 1511, held that office more than twenty years, and one of his official duties and privileges was to furnish tabards for the heralds. In his will he bequeathed to his servant Bagnal after his death “his grete Boke of Armys and boke of trickyns of armys, and boke of armys and badges in his study.” He was at one time alderman of London, and a man of wealth, whose portrait, though not the original, which was burnt, may still be seen in the Paynter Stainers’ Hall in Trinity Lane.

Vincent Volpe’s work was of a different kind. He supplied, in 1514, banners and streamers for the “Great Henry.” In 1531 he was paid for painting plats of Rye and Hastings, and it is conjectured he may have executed some of the curious military pictures, between plans and bird’s-eye views, still on the walls of Hampton Court.

Luke Hornebaud, a Flemish painter, was certainly in England as early as 1529, when his wife was buried at Fulham; and Gerard, possibly an elder brother, was made a denizen by letters-patent, and appointed Painter to the King in 1524. The portrait of Henry VIII. now at Cardiff, as well as the portraits of the same monarch at

¹ Read March 13, 1862.

Warwick and Kimbolton, are now ascribed by the best judges to Gerard Hornebaud rather than Holbein, to whom they had been formerly attributed. Either of the Hornebauds may quite possibly have been in England as early as 1522, and perhaps, of the artists whose names are known, Gerard Hornebaud is, from his association with the Royal service, the most probable author of the picture here in question. But it may also quite well have been painted by some unknown artist, and as a work of art it is superior to Henry VIII's portrait at Cardiff. The existence of the office of Serjeant-Painter in Henry's reign, and the connection of the holder of that office, as well as of other painters in the Royal service, with the College of Heralds, have a special bearing on the present inquiry. It seems not impossible that the picture is the work of one of these who had accompanied the Clarenceux herald to Scotland in 1522.

If the external history of the picture could be ascertained, it would throw additional light upon its author and the purpose for which it was painted. But this point also is attended with considerable difficulty, although Mr Godwin, whose opinion is entitled to great respect, entertains no doubt that it originally belonged to the family of Windsor.

The picture, so far as its history can be traced, has always been associated with Cardiff, for its removal to Luton Hoo, in Bedfordshire, where it was when the engraving was made in 1799, was due to the first Marquis of Bute having in 1772 formed a collection of pictures for the gallery his father the third Earl of Bute had built at that seat, and it was brought, after a fire at Luton, to its old home at Cardiff.

Cardiff was acquired by the marriage of John, fourth Earl and first Marquis of Bute, in 1766, to Charlotte Jane, eldest daughter and co-heiress of Herbert, second and last Viscount Windsor of Ireland, and Baron Mountjoy of the Isle of Wight. His father, Thomas, who received the titles of Windsor and Mountjoy respectively in 1695 and 1711, succeeded to the Cardiff estate through his marriage in 1702 with Charlotte, widow of a son of Lord-Chancellor Jeffries, daughter and heiress of Philip, seventh Earl of Pembroke, on whose death in 1683 that title passed

to his brother, but the estate of Cardiff to his daughter. By his will in 1729, Thomas, Lord Windsor, bequeathed his pictures, "family and others," to his son Herbert.

Many family portraits, both of the Windsors and the Herberts, are still at Cardiff, as well as the portrait of Henry VIII. already mentioned, and one of Queen Elizabeth. The period is long between 1522 and 1766, and it is of course possible that the Herberts or the Windsors may have acquired the picture by marriage into some other family or by purchase; but it seems most probable that it originally belonged to one or other of these families. The founders of both were amongst the new nobility of the Tudor period. Sir William Herbert, first Earl of Pembroke of the Herbert line, married a sister of Queen Katharine Parr, and was one of the executors of Henry VIII. The chief part of his life belongs, however, to the later period of Henry VIII.'s reign, the reign of Edward VI., when he was created Lord Herbert of Cardiff in 1551, and that of Elizabeth, during which he died in 1569.

The founder of the Windsor family, whose elder branch became Earls of Plymouth, was Sir Andrew Windsor, a gentleman of ancient family lineage and large estates in Berkshire. He became, though not a great, yet a considerable personage in the early period of the reign of Henry VIII., and was made a Knight of the Bath at the coronation in 1509, along with twenty-five others of the "most able persons and honourable blood not yet knighted." He was created a Knight Banneret on 16th August 1513 for his valour in the Battle of the Spurs. He accompanied Princess Mary on her marriage with Louis XII., and he went with Henry VIII. to the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520.

In the Parliament of 1529 he was summoned to the House of Peers as Baron Windsor of Bradenham in Berks. In 1535 he became Keeper of the King's Wardrobe, an office he held till his death in 1543. The circumstances of his life must have brought him into intimate contact with the officials of the Royal Court, and there can be little doubt he must have known well Thomas Benolt, the Clarencieux herald, who was also present at the Field of the Cloth of Gold. It

may be suspected, though it cannot be proved, that it was for Sir Andrew Windsor this picture was painted, or at least that he became its owner, and that from him it has descended, along with the other Windsor portraits, to the Marquis of Bute.

I have thought it worth while to bring under the notice of the Society so early a specimen of the art of portrait painting in Britain, and so good an illustration of the light to be derived from the combined study of Art and History. And I deem it a fortunate circumstance that I have been able to do this in a building where the close neighbourhood of the Historical Portrait Gallery of Scotland and the Scottish National Museum of Antiquities affords facilities for this combined study.