MARY OF GUISE: EXAMINING THE FEMALE SCOTTISH CORRESPONDENCE OF THE WOMAN WITH 'A HART OF WARRE'

Eilidh Mc Donald

February 2022

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the University of Glasgow for the degree of Master of Philosophy by Research

School of Critical Studies,

College of Arts

University of Glasgow

Abstract

"Mary of Guise: Examining the Female Scottish Correspondence of the Woman with 'a Hart of Warre'" analyses how complex hierarchical social relationships between women in sixteenth century Scotland were negotiated in written communication. The corpus draws from the Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise, held in the National Records of Scotland; spans the period from 1543 to approximately 1554; and contains 15 letters to Mary of Guise from 9 correspondents.

This thesis asks whether the content of the letters or the proximity of the writer's relationship to Mary of Guise and social status relative to hers affect the ways in which the individual writers interact with Mary in their written communication. These variables are examined with reference to the material and pragmatic features of each manuscript; letter-writing conventions of the sixteenth century; the contemporary practices of women's letter-writing; the lexical features of each letter and the lexical patterns of each correspondent more broadly; and the social networks that link the correspondents to each other and to Mary of Guise herself.

The thesis finds that Mary of Guise's correspondents did not systematically utilise material pragmatic features as an element of their negotiation of politeness within their correspondence. This study reveals that relative social proximity (assessed via social network analysis in chapter three) does not appear to play a consistent role in the use of material pragmatic features; those correspondents with the closest social proximity to Mary of Guise, and those with the least proximity, vary in their use of significant space and scribal-autograph practices, with no consistent pattern across the correspondents of material pragmatic features being used to negotiate the hierarchical relationship between writers and recipient. Those from the more central ranks of Mary's correspondents are more likely to utilise material pragmatics in their negotiation of the hierarchical relationship between themselves and their recipient. This variation across correspondents suggests that material pragmatic features were not utilised universally and uniformly in the navigation of social relationships in sixteenth century written communication. As this thesis illustrates, all 15 correspondents follow elements of *ars dictaminis*— the *salutatio* and *conclusio*— but also utilise features of the familiar letter such as a more narrative structure in the centre portion of the letter, or an informal tone. Individual correspondents do not appear to align with either the *ars dictaminis* or the familiar letter consistently as part of their communicative practice when writing to Mary of Guise; nor does each individual's use of *ars dictaminis* or the familiar style seem to align with their social proximity to the Queen Regent. Correspondents also diverge from the norms of contemporary women's letter-writing practices— although many correspondents refer to male relatives in their letters, this is usually in impersonal, unemotional contexts. Some letter-writers also discuss national and international politics, a topic of conversation outside the genres sixteenth century women might have been expected to engage with. All of Mary's correspondents utilise elements of Scots lexis and grammar, indicating that the use of Scots was not perceived as informal or inappropriate when corresponding with social superiors.

List of Tables

Contents

Chapter Three: Analysing the Corpus

Chapter Four: Conclusion

Chapter One: The Linguistic and Material Study of Correspondence

1. Introduction

"Mary of Guise: Examining the Female Scottish Correspondence of the Woman with 'a Hart of Warre'" analyses how complex hierarchical social relationships between women in sixteenth century Scotland were negotiated in written communication. The corpus draws from the Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise; spans the period from 1543 to approximately 1554; and contains 15 letters to Mary of Guise from 9 correspondents.

This thesis asks whether the content of the letters or the proximity of the writer's relationship to Mary of Guise and social status relative to hers affect the ways in which the individual writers interact with Mary. These two variables are examined with reference to the material and pragmatic features of each manuscript; the contemporary practices of women's letter-writing; letter-writing conventions of the sixteenth century (such as *ars dictaminis*); the lexical features of each letter and the lexical patterns of each correspondent more broadly; and the social networks that link the correspondents to each other, to powerful members of sixteenth century Scottish society, and to Mary of Guise herself.

2. Defining Material Features

'Material features' refers to the physical features of each manuscript. These can include but are not limited to: script; hand; writing surface; ink; seals and other closing mechanisms; fold lines; damage; contractions and abbreviations; deletions; lineation; use of manuscript space; and punctuation. 'Script' refers to a specific model of writing with standardised allographs, which can develop both geographically and diachronically; while 'hand' is an individual's unique realisation of a script (Smith, 2012: 19). The transcriptions included in this thesis distinguish between 'autograph hand' and 'scribal hand', with two or more hands sometimes occurring in a single letter. 'Autograph hand' (also sometimes referred to as 'holograph') refers to text written in the sender's own hand (Evans, 2013: 1) while 'scribal hand' denotes text written in the hand of another—- whether that be a family member, servant, or trained scribe.

Writing surfaces used in sixteenth-century Scotland varied, with both paper and parchment being used (Stewart, 2008: 43-44). Writing surfaces might be selected based on convenience, cost, or purpose; paper was costly, and could be too rough, smooth, or absorbent to write on effectively, while parchment might be too chalky or slippery (Stewart, 2008: 43-44). Both had to be cut to size (Stewart, 2008: 43), and might be pricked and ruled to enable the letter-writer to write neatly (Wolfe, 2009: 23-25, 29, 33).

Ink was usually made in the home, with recipes utilising ingredients such as rainwater, beer, vinegar, and oak galls (Wall, 2009: 97). Variation in the colour and density of ink in a letter might indicate changes in scribe, suggest their level of skill, or evidence later additions to the manuscript (Starza Smith, 2013); or merely relate to the variable, chemically unstable nature of the ink.

Several methods were utilised to seal letters in the early modern period, before envelopes were used. Correspondence could be folded into rectangular letter packets and closed with a wax seal; fastened using a paper tab and slit mechanism; or tightly folded into a small packet which was then tied with silk floss and sealed (Wolfe, 2012: 169). The manner in which a letter was sealed could

indicate how private the contents of a letter were, the educational or social background of the sender, or their emotions towards the recipient (Wolfe, 2012: 169-184). 'Fold lines' refers to the creases created in early modern letters when folded into letter packets; letters folded into small packets might suggest an intimate relationship, or a need for privacy (Starza Smith, 2013). Different patterns could be used, including accordion folds, tri-folds, and catch folds (Dambrogio, Starza Smith, et al., 2016), which could suggest the formality of the letter, or that it was communication of an official nature (Daybell, 2012: 230). However, fold lines do not only indicate the way a letter was prepared for sending. Before beginning to write missives, scribes might fold the left side of the folio to create a margin by which to align their texts (Starza Smith, 2013), and creases might also indicate how a letter was stored after it was received, with the external parts of the manuscript often being dirtier (Daybell, 2012: 218, 230). 'Damage' describes marks on the manuscript, produced at any point during the document's transmission, including tears, water damage, and ink blots.

'Contractions and abbreviations' include common early modern abbreviations such as l^{d} for "lord" or "lady", depending on context, and w^{t} for "with"; but also, more idiosyncratic abbreviations and symbols that are important visual features of the manuscript and add to the audience's understanding of the document, such as Lady Home's use of the <c> shaped graph, interpreted as a macron. 'Deletions' are letters, words, or symbols which have been scored out by the scribe and are potentially indicative of whether the manuscript was a draft copy, or if it was written hastily.

'Lineation' refers to how the lines of text are divided in the original manuscript; this lineation is preserved in the transcriptions in chapter two and has not been modernised. 'Use of manuscript space' describes how the superscription, main letter text, subscription, signature, postscript, and endorsement are laid out on the folio. 'Significant space' refers to the segments of the folio left blank between different sections of the letter, with substantial significant space indicating the writer's wealth or respect for the recipient (Daybell, 2012: 98).

'Punctuation' describes graphs such as virgules, punctus, commas, and Tironian et. The punctuation of the original manuscripts is retained in the transcriptions given in chapter two, rather than being modernised, as punctuation practices in the early modern period differed from those of the present day and varied amongst individuals.

Material features can reflect meaning— for example, using a scribe might suggest deference on the part of the sender, or illiteracy, or even illness; and the script used might offer information on the writer's gender or education. These physical features reflect the life of a document, beginning with the process of its creation, following its journey to the recipient, and reflecting its afterlife. Here, 'afterlife' refers to the reception of manuscripts throughout their existence: how they are stored, interacted with, and understood by archivists, historians, linguists, and other audiences (Daybell and Gordon, 2016: 24, 25). The features defined in this section can be used as a mechanism to evaluate how Mary's correspondents communicated with her in extra-linguistic ways.

3. The Significance of Material Features in Letters

There is established scholarship analysing material features of correspondence and their communicative significance. Alison Wiggins has worked extensively on material features, focusing on the letters of Bess of Hardwick, an exceptionally rich sixteenth-century English noblewoman and businesswoman (Goldring, 2004). The 'Bess of Hardwick's Letters' site has a corpus of 234 letters spanning six decades and at least 158 letter-writers (Wiggins, Bryson, Starza Smith, Timmermann and Williams, 2013). Wiggins' research examines the breadth of the letter-writing process, situating

the practice within its contemporary context, and discussing the processes involved in creating, reading, and sending letters (Wiggins, 2017: 1-26). Additionally, Wiggins discusses the linguistic and palaeographic features of the corpus, and provides diplomatic, normalised, facsimile, and XML transcriptions of the letters (Wiggins *et al.*, 2013), allowing the reader to access all facets of this correspondence.

Daniel Starza Smith has worked on early modern English letters and specialises in the manuscripts of the sixteenth century poet John Donne (Starza Smith - Research Outputs - Research Portal, King's College, London, 2020, https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/daniel.s.smith.html, accessed 14 December 2021). His extensive contributions on the material features of early modern letters on the 'Bess of Hardwick's Letters' site (Starza Smith, 2013) and his work on letterlocking and virtually unfolding a corpus of 250,000 historic letter packets explore the physicality of letters, with the latter utilising innovative X-ray technology to analyse fragile documents while retaining their original form (Dambrogio, Ghassaei, Smith, Jackson, Demaine, Davis, Mills, Ahrendt, Akkerman, Linden, and Demaine, 2021). This research illustrates the many letterlocking techniques, allowing for analysis of the practices used to ensure the security and privacy of early modern correspondence (Dambrogio *et al.*, 2021).

Heather Wolfe focuses on material culture, examining the manuscript and print culture of early modern England, and the writings of early modern women— particularly focusing on the letters of Elizabeth Cary, Lady Falkland, a sixteenth century English playwright (Wolfe - Folgerpedia, 2021). Wolfe's study of women's handwriting and their acquisition of literacy enables a more nuanced and accurate understanding of how and why women's education and their script differed from men in the early modern period (Wolfe, 2009: 21, 23-25, 29, 33). Additionally, Wolfe's work on the early modern English practice of letterlocking with silk focuses on the minutiae of letter-writing, illustrating that even the most surface levels of materiality can indicate the writer's education, social network, or emotions and be manipulated as an extra-linguistic facet of written communication (Wolfe, 2012: 169-184).

Orietta Da Rold's work on medieval manuscripts and materiality, particularly her study of paper in medieval England, reveals the implications of paper usage in different literary contexts, influenced by scribal practices, and its subsequent domination over other writing surfaces in both high and low domains (Da Rold, 2020).

As demonstrated by this summary of previous research, material features hold communicative significance, and can be used as an analytical tool to examine social relationships in written communication. While Wiggins, Starza Smith, Wolfe, Da Rold and others have investigated different aspects of materiality, often in relation to female letter-writers in the sixteenth century, a similar exploration has not been conducted on the communicative role of material features in the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise.

4. Features of Women's Letter-Writing

In the early modern period, several key features distinguished women's letter-writing from men's writing. Firstly, women's education in this period usually focused on the skills deemed necessary to run a household, such as basic literacy and numeracy (Clarke, 2001: 21) — and thus, most women were taught to write in italic script, which was seen as simpler to master, rather than secretary script, a high-prestige script associated with male domains such as business (Starza Smith, 2013). Therefore, women's correspondence was often visually distinct from men's correspondence, and the

gender of a letter-writer could be presumed by the recipient at a glance, even before the contents of the epistle or its subscription were examined.

Secondly, the correspondents and domains deemed "suitable" for women in the early modern period were more limited. Early epistolary manuals such as Fulwood's 1568 *The Enimie of Idlenesse* and Day's 1586 *The English Secretarie* provided several models of women's writing; but the meagre examples given within these two manuals span only two genres: familiar letters— personal missives with "a plain, conversational tone, intimate language, and emotional expression", directed at friends, and influenced by Ciceronian letters (Schneider, 2005: 130-132) — and love letters, neglecting more formal genres such as letters of complaint (Barnes, 2016: 122). That is not to say that women's epistolary practice in the early modern period aligned with the limited range of genres and correspondents presented in letter-writing manuals of the time— which, after all, were exemplars rather than reflections of actual contemporary written communication.

Letter-writing was not restricted to upper-class women, with evidence of correspondence by landed and mercantile women (Daybell, 2009: 182); nor did women's letters engage solely with the everyday and non-political (Daybell, 2009: 181). It is true that a substantial proportion of extant women's letters from the early modern period have recipients of a domestic nature, frequently being written to family and friends; however, women such as Bess of Hardwick engaged in communication with a huge range of correspondents, cultivating what Daybell describes as "a pan-European news and intelligence network" (Daybell, 2009: 183, 184). Daybell's statement that the contents of early modern female correspondence exemplify the span of women's activities, ranging "from the household economy and estate management…to involvement in local, national, and European politics" (Daybell, 2009: 184) is reflected in the contents of Mary of Guise's female Scottish correspondence. The 15 letters in this corpus range from offering assurances of loyalty to complaints about debts and land disputes— and are all directed towards a social superior, the most powerful woman in Scotland at that time, Mary of Guise. This thesis will analyse the 15 letters of this corpus through the lens of sixteenth-century women's letter-writing practices, to see whether the corpus as a whole and individual correspondents align with or diverge from the norms discussed in chapter three.

5. Existing Scholarship on Women's Letter-Writing

There is a large body of research focusing on women's letter-writing, with analysis examining the practices of both individual correspondents and early modern female letter-writers more generally. Gillian Weir's 2009 research examines the orthography of early seventeenth century noblewoman Lady Katherine Paston and her correspondents and compares it to the rise of standardised spellings preserved in printed texts of the same period. Weir employs a questionnaire of common words to extract idiosyncratic spellings by individuals, which she then uses to reconstruct the personal orthography of Paston herself (Weir, 2009: 4). Weir also includes biographies of each of Paston's correspondents to contextualise the letters transcribed within her research (Weir, 2009: 26-31), a method adopted in this thesis to aid in analysing the corpus in the wider socio-cultural landscape of sixteenth century Scotland.

Graham Williams' 2009 study of the correspondence of Joan and Maria Thynne investigates the pragmatic features of this sixteenth-century corpus, looking at speech acts, politeness, and the possible social and linguistic implications of using scribes (Williams, 2009: 68-98, 99-128, 129-160).

Helen Newsome's work focuses on the correspondence of Margaret Tudor, the wife of King James IV, examining her holographic correspondence and the "memorials" she sent as part of her efforts in international diplomacy (Newsome, 2020: 403, 404).

Alison Wiggins' research on Bess of Hardwick's letters, briefly discussed on page 7, provides insight into all aspects of her correspondence, building up an understanding of Bess' written communicative practice and epistolary network (Wiggins, Bryson, Starza Smith, Timmermann and Williams, 2013).

James Daybell has published numerous books and articles on women's letter-writing in the early modern period, discussing a huge range of subjects within this broad topic, including materiality, gendered writing conventions, female education and literacy, rhetoric, the navigation of relationships in written communication, and the nature of privacy (Daybell, n.d.).

This brief summary of the various modern works published on women's correspondence emphasises the myriad ways in which the topic can be approached, looking at not only the linguistic elements of written communication, but also the material and socio-cultural factors involved in early modern epistolary practice. While modern scholarly approaches to women's letter-writing are less likely to edit and censor the works they examine, the publication and analysis of women's letters is not new; Margaret Cavendish's *Poems and Fancies*— a miscellany including epistles, that Schneider argues was instrumental in developing "an alternate epistolary community… [of] female intellects" (Schneider, 2005: 200)— was published in 1653. Lady Mary Montagu's eighteenth-century letters to friends, family, and contemporary public figures were published soon after her death— but the nature of some of these letters led editors to apologise for her "indiscrete prose and behaviour" (Barnes, 2016: 130). The trend of antiquarianism further inspired the publication of correspondence, with the Camden Society producing a series of editions focusing on the writings of early modern women, including Queen Elizabeth I and Mary Queen of Scots (Barnes, 2016: 132). Interest in this subject continued into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, resulting in publications such as Annie Cameron's 1927 text *Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine, 1543 to 1560*, which informed the transcriptions included in this thesis, but focused on the contents of these letters rather than the significance of their linguistic and material features.

6. Defining Pragmatic Features

Smith states that pragmatics describes "how language functions as a means of communication" in different situations, and operates under the constraints of Grice's Co-operative Principle, that communication must be as informative as is needed; truthful and evidence-based; relevant; and clear (Smith, 1996: 9). However, language is not just used as a tool to facilitate communication— it can also be used to construct and present identity, and to align with or diverge from the linguistic norms of those the speaker interacts with (Smith, 1996: 9, 10; Smith, 2020: 24).

In this thesis 'pragmatics' refers to the use of quantifiable features of language— across the correspondence as a whole, and within the language of individual correspondents— examining how grammatical and lexical features such as pronouns, terms of address, and formulaic opening and closing phrases are used to reinforce the social relationship between writer and recipient (Smith, 2020: 11, 22-23).

However, this thesis also seeks to examine the role of "extra-linguistic" material pragmatic features, including rhetorical punctuation and capitalisation, and folio layout (Smith, 2020: 11, 14, 22-23, 29, 30-31) in expressing and conforming with the hierarchical relationship between the writers and their

recipient, Mary of Guise. These linguistic and extra-linguistic features of communication are established and utilised by 'communities of practice'— groups of people who come together in a mutual endeavour, and as a result develop shared practices such as styles of communicating and established power relations (Smith, 2020: 30; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 2003: 130-131).

'Textual setting' refers to the physical features of the medium in which a text survives; "vectors of meaning" which reflect the history of each witness's transmission and reception (Smith, 2020: 25, 27-29). Smith discusses how the textual setting provides a more nuanced understanding of, not only the linguistic features, but also the reception and "socio-cultural functions" of a text (Smith, 2020: 28-29). This notion of examining not only the immediate linguistic features, but also the reception and social contexts encompassed in a document, is particularly relevant to the subject of this thesis, as the correspondence examined here is not isolated and static, but rather a series of interactions over time between the text, original authors and recipient, scribes, editors, and more modern audiences approaching the documents from a linguistic or historical scholarly perspective (Smith, 2020: 28, 29, 31).

7. Existing Scholarship on the Pragmatics of Letters

Mel Evans has conducted substantial research on the role of pragmatics in constructing identity, centring on the correspondence of Queen Elizabeth I (Evans, 2013: 1-29). Evans' research examines Elizabeth I's use of affirmative and negative 'do', the pronouns 'ye' and 'you', first and second person possessive determiners, multiple and single negation, and superlative adjectives, amongst other pragmatic features (Evans, 2013: 30-59, 60-73, 75-80, 81-89, 91-100, 123-134).

Magdalena Leitner's work focuses on impoliteness in early modern Scottish correspondence and in Scottish law courts, through the lens of the correspondence of King James VI, and the Breadalbane Collection, 1548-1583 (Leitner, 2015: 2) and is contextualised by social network analysis. Leitner's work expands beyond the study of politeness in address terms (Leitner, 2015: 73, 74), delving into metapragmatic commentary on written and verbal offenses and the private-public context which mediates the perception of these offenses (Leitner, 2015: 2, 13-38, 41-71, 73-92). Thus, there is established scholarship on the socio-historical pragmatic analysis of correspondence which demonstrates the communicative function of pragmatics in early modern correspondence. The works of both Evans and Leitner serve as structural and methodological influences on this thesis— Evans' research investigates chronological change in pragmatic features; while Leitner's focus on sixteenth century Scottish correspondence and the potential impact of social networks on pragmatic features of written communication provides a relevant model for contextualising Mary of Guise's female Scottish correspondence within the wider socio-cultural landscape of early modern Scotland.

8. Early Modern Letter-Writing Traditions

Letter-writing in the early modern period was formulaic, and polite correspondence was expected to follow the epistolary conventions established by compositional models. Several prevalent models of letter-writing existed in the early modern period; including the *ars dictaminis*, and models based on the letters of Cicero and Erasmus. *Ars dictaminis*, "the art of letter writing", dates from the eleventh century and was utilised throughout Europe until the beginning of its decline in the fifteenth century. Following *ars dictaminis*, the letter was divided into five parts: the *salutatio*, *exordium*, *narratio*, *argumentatio*, and *conclusio* (Witt, 1982: 8). While the four latter elements were

based on much earlier classical oratory traditions (Hubbell, 1949: 41), the first element, *salutatio*, appears to have been developed much later. *Ars dictaminis* provided exemplar letters for a wide variety of circumstances, providing the letter-writer with a range of suitable structures, greetings, and opening and closing formulae (Daybell, 2012: 63). The prescriptive nature of *ars dictaminis* extended to terms of address, and superscriptions and subscriptions— with this being the area of correspondence in which early modern letter-writers conformed most closely with epistolary standards (Daybell, 2012: 71). This is evidenced in the systematic use of address forms, and subscriptions and superscriptions, in the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise, as discussed in chapter three.

Cicero's letters were rediscovered in the second half of the fourteenth century, with Petrarch unearthing *ad atticum* in 1345, and Salutati uncovering *ad familiares* in 1392 (Daybell, 2012: 64). These discoveries aligned with the rise of humanism, which had begun to spread across Europe, and which championed a "conversational tone" that created intimacy through plain language (Schneider, 2005: 42), the antithesis of the medieval *ars dictaminis*. Cicero's familiar letters were informal letters offering advice and discussing current events— however, familiar letters in the late medieval and early modern period were used, not only to correspond with friends and family, but also with scholars and political figures (Schneider, 2005: 42).

Erasmus, whom Schneider describes as "*the* Renaissance authority on letter-writing", described the letter as a conversation between two friends separated by distance (Schneider, 2005: 29), a stance which advocated the familiar letter. In his 1522 text *de conscribendis epistolis*, one of the bestsellers of the early sixteenth century (Chartier, Boureau, Dauphin and Woodall, 1997: 70), Erasmus expressed the belief that all manner of emotions could be conveyed in written communication but did not describe how writers could convert the non-verbal aspects of face-to-face communication for letter-writing; despite his own aptitude evidenced in his personal correspondence (Schneider, 2005: 112, 117-118). The treatise served as a letter-writing manual which espoused humanist ideas (Leitner, 2015: 77). Erasmus' work inspired later letter-writing manuals such as Fulwood's *The Enimie of Idlenesse* and Day's *The English Secretarie* (Daybell, 2012: 65.

9. The Role of Lexis in Creating Meaning

The lexical features of Mary of Guise's female Scottish correspondence offer another avenue of analysis to identify if any of Mary's correspondents utilised distinct communicative behaviours in their letters— whether these idiosyncrasies occur in their lexis or orthography. In the early modern period, lexis could be used (as it still is today) to convey emotions, establish register, and indicate membership of specific social or political circles. One could argue that there was more potential for this sort of lexical manipulation in the early modern period, in fact, as closer proximity of loan periods where new words entered Older Scots from other languages may have meant that lexical associations were stronger and more familiar. For example, words originating from French— such as "companȝeon" and "possessioun"— were viewed as high-register (Smith, 2012: 43), and when deployed in written communication in the early modern period, could be used to indicate tone (Smith, 2012: 52), while Latinate words might express a literary bent on the part of the writer (Smith, 2012: 42, 43).

10. Orthographic Variation in Letter-Writing

Similarly, orthography may be employed in an idiosyncratic manner by correspondents. In the early modern period, the orthography of Older Scots was not yet standardised and fixed and therefore a wide range of possible spellings existed (Smith, 2012: 34). Writers could develop their own spelling systems— as mentioned on page 9, in the discussion of orthographic variation in the Paston letters. Finally, spelling could also vary diatopically, with different spellings being local to certain regions (Smith, 2012: 35), potentially providing insight into the geographical origin of individual correspondents.

Thus, the lexis and orthography of each of Mary of Guise's female correspondents could be meaningful elements of their communicative practice, whether their vocabulary selection was based on lexical connotations, or their spelling systems indicated the progress of standardisation in Older Scots over an individual's period of correspondence.

11. Socio-Pragmatic Analysis of Hierarchical Relationships

Leitner states that the most common social variables that govern politeness are power, and social distance (Leitner, 2015: 29), and that those of lower social status may manipulate language to confront hierarchical power relations (Leitner, 2015: 30). To incorporate these social factors into the analysis of Mary's female Scottish correspondence, it is necessary to categorise the correspondents based on their relationship to Mary; to the upper echelons of Scottish society; and to each other, to understand what role these relationships play in how they navigate hierarchical social relationships in writing.

Leitner utilises a "network-strength scale" to depict social relationships within and between groups, modified from Bax's scale for analysing eighteenth century correspondence; itself based on the work of sociolinguists Milroy and Milroy (Leitner, 2015: 87). Leitner's scale categorises correspondents based on seven factors: whether they are related by blood or marriage; live in the same household; have a contractual relationship; are members of the same clan or surname; are exchanging advice; live in adjacent regions; and support the same religion (Leitner, 2015: 87-88). Leitner also employs a scale to map emotional bonds as overtly expressed through correspondence, descending from "kin or friendship term with closeness modifier" to "enemy" (Leitner, 2015: 89).

12. Creating a Social Network-Strength Scale

This thesis modifies Leitner's network-strength scale to suit the unique characteristics of the corpus, thus, social network analysis is performed based on these six elements: relation by blood or marriage; existing familial relationship to Mary of Guise or the Scottish crown; contractual relationship; rank or importance within Scottish society; members of the same clan or surname; religious or political affiliation. This revised scale aims to describe not only how the correspondents related to Mary of Guise, but also how they related to each other, and is based on the biographies in chapter three, section 8.2**.** A brief paragraph on each of the factors within the network-strength scale summarises each correspondent's position within sixteenth-century Scotland. These factors indicate proximity or distance in relationships between correspondents, and are compared with the linguistic, material, pragmatic, and lexical analyses of the corpus to establish if any patterns exist. As Leitner demonstrates, social network analysis can be adapted for the field of historical pragmatics and utilised as a tool to illuminate patterns in data.

13. Organisation of the Thesis

The thesis aims to provide an understanding of sixteenth-century social and epistolary norms, and to establish a network of social relationships in order to contextualise the 15 letters of the corpus considered. It combines both quantitative and qualitative approaches, a methodology made feasible by the small scale of the corpus (Bax and Kàdàr, 2011: 5). Chapter one has elaborated on the terminology used throughout the thesis and provides a summary of existing scholarship on the subject of correspondence, and how this thesis fits within the current field of study. Annie Cameron's 1927 edition spans the entire Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise, and Roderick Lyall's 1996 work "The Construction of a Rhetorical Voice in Sixteenth-Century Scottish Letters" examines letters of petition included in the corpus of Mary of Guise's Scottish letters (Daybell, 2012: 70). However, neither of these studies approach the corpus with such a multi-layered analysis, nor do they focus specifically on the letters from women to Mary of Guise.

Chapter Two: Mary of Guise and her Scottish Correspondence

1. Mary of Guise

Mary of Guise, also known as Mary of Lorraine, was born on 20 November 1515 in north-east France (Marshall and Macleod, 2008: 7), and died in Edinburgh Castle on 11 June 1560, aged forty-five (Marshall and Macleod, 2008: 97). Her father Claude de Guise was the first Duke of Guise, and her mother Antoinette de Bourbon was the daughter of the Count of Vendôme (Marshall, 2004). Mary was the oldest of their twelve living children (Marshall and Macleod, 2008: 9, 13). Her paternal grandfather held the duchy of Lorraine— which was later inherited by Mary's uncle Antoine— and vast lands in France, and held titles in Naples and Sicily (Ritchie, 2002: 7-8). The House of Guise was landed and prestigious, respected in the French court; and well-positioned to expand its power.

Mary married her first husband, Louis d'Orléans the Duke of Longueville, the Grand Chamberlain of France, on 4 August 1534, when she was eighteen (Ritchie, 2002: 13). The couple had two children together; François, born on 30 October 1535, and Louis II, born 4 August 1537 (Marshall and Macleod, 2008: 17, 19). However, their marriage ended with Louis I's death on 9 June 1537, and their second son, Louis II, died several months later, in December 1537 (Marshall, 2004). Mary did not remain a widow for long; after King James V's wife Madeleine died, King François I suggested that to maintain the Franco-Scottish alliance, Mary should become James' next wife. The couple were married on 9 May 1539 and had three children. Their sons, James and Robert— born 22 May 1540 and 24 April 1541 respectively— both died as infants, in May 1541 (Marshall, 2004). Their only surviving child Mary, the future Queen of Scots, was born 8 December 1542. She ascended the throne at only six days old, after her father died 14 December 1542 (Marshall and Macleod, 2008: 45). Mary of Guise gave birth to five children over the course of her life, but only her daughter Mary survived to adulthood, her son François having died in 1551 at the age of fifteen (Marshall, 2004).

Mary of Guise was favoured by King François I, who had been a friend of her father and who had arranged both of her marriages (Marshall, 2006: 4; Ritchie, 2002: 13), and her daughter Mary was betrothed to the dauphin François II in a marriage that would ensure continued French financial and military support in Scotland (Marshall, 2004). She maintained a friendship with King Henri II, and had the political support of her brothers, the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine (Marshall, 2006: 10). These strong political connections with France were essential if Mary of Guise were to retain her fragile grasp on the Scottish throne, which was threatened by the machinations of King Henry VIII; the internal infighting between Regent James Hamilton, Earl of Arran and other Scottish lords; and the Protestant Reformation (Marshall, 2006: 6, 15). Mary of Guise spent much of her adult life attempting to balance the interests of her French allies against the quarrels of the Scottish nobility and the expanding Lords of the Congregation: a group of Scottish Protestant nobles concerned not only with religious reformation, but also with the potential political consequences of the proposed union of Mary Stewart, future Queen of Scots, and the French dauphin François II (Lynch, 1992: 190-191)— with her primary aim being to retain the throne for her daughter, Mary Stewart. She became regent on 12 April 1554, a position she maintained until her death in 1560 (Ritchie, 2002: 94).

2. The Surviving Correspondence

Mary of Guise had a substantial body of correspondence, in both Scots and French. The bulk of this correspondence exists in two publicly accessible collections, both housed in Edinburgh, although

some individual letters are held in other repositories, including the University of St Andrews Special Collections and Edinburgh University Library Special Collections (Letter from Mary of Guise to Antoine de Noailles, 1555. - Archives Hub, 2022; Collection: Letter from Mary of Guise to Lord Vigilius a Zuichem dated 1555 | University of Edinburgh Archive and Manuscript Collections, 2018). The Scots correspondence is contained in the collection of the National Records of Scotland, comprising part of the State Papers held in General Register House, under shelf mark SP2 (NAS Catalogue - catalogue record, 2022). The French correspondence is held in the National Library of Scotland, in the Advocate's Library, in a collection known as the Balcarres Papers, under shelf mark Adv.MSS.29.2.1-29.2.9a (Catalogue of Archives and Manuscripts Collections | National Library of Scotland | NLSMSS | Balcarres Papers., 2022). The latter consists mainly of letters from other members of the House of Guise (Wood, 1923: vii), while the former is comprised of letters from Scottish noblemen and women who were involved in the elaborate, changeable political landscape of Scotland in the sixteenth century. This thesis draws on the latter collection of correspondence to create a sub-corpus of the Scottish correspondence to analyse.

The Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise reflects the political tensions of sixteenth-century Scotland. This thesis looks more specifically at the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise, a subgenre of the corpus that has not received specific editorial attention. This smaller corpus consists of 15 letters, written between approximately 1543 and 1554, during Mary of Guise's attempts to retain control of the Scottish throne. There are 9 female correspondents whose extant letters are preserved in the Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise, and this selection of manuscripts enables an examination of how written communicative relationships between women were negotiated in the sixteenth century. Also included in the Scottish correspondence is a bond, written by Margaret Erskine, the Lady of Lochleven, between 1557 and 1558 (Cameron, 1927: 411-413). This has been excluded from the corpus of female correspondence examined in this study, as it is a bond rather than a letter, and the linguistic and pragmatic features may differ from the other letters and potentially cause inconsistencies in the data. This thesis aims to analyse how the material and pragmatic features, contemporary conventions in women's letter-writing, sixteenth century norms of correspondence, lexical features, and social relationships interact within the corpus of Mary's female correspondents. These six factors were selected to analyse the core questions of this thesis— whether the contents of the letters or the proximity of each writer's relationship to Mary and their social status relative to hers affect how the individual women interact with Mary.

There is one existing edition of Mary's Scottish correspondence by Annie I. Cameron, published by the Scottish History Society in 1927 and entitled *The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine*. While this edition provides transcriptions of each letter in the corpus and in-depth contextualisation of the political events surrounding the production of the letters, it is not suitable for conducting detailed linguistic or material analysis. The transcriptions do not follow the lineation of the witnesses, impose modern English punctuation, feature silent emendations and expansions, and neglect the material features of the manuscripts entirely. These omissions can perhaps be attributed to the text's focus on the history unfolding in the contents of the letters, rather than on the letters themselves; and to the early twentieth century editorial conventions in linguistics and transcription which are no longer utilised. Therefore, this thesis features transcriptions which use Cameron's as a basis, but which have been expanded through direct examination of the manuscript items to present original lineation, spacing, spelling, and notes on hand changes.

Segments of the Scottish correspondence have been the focus of more recent scholarly attention, with Roderick Lyall examining how Sir Adam Ottirbourn and Sir George Douglas construct their relationship with Mary of Guise through written communication, and how they use language with

the intent to manipulate or influence their recipient (Lyall, 1996: 129-131). Lyall's focus is restricted to two male letter-writers, writing in the late 1540s, and he examines their correspondence as part of a wider study of sixteenth century letters, therefore his analysis is fairly surface-level. Jeremy Smith's 2012 text offers transcriptions of three letters to Mary of Guise— from Katherine Bellenden; Henry, Lord Methven; and Marion, Lady Home (Smith, 2012: 102-106)— and briefly contextualises the political context in which the letters were sent (Smith, 2012: 102, 103-104, 105-106). Smith delves more deeply into the linguistic features of the letters, discussing use of Scots orthography and lexis, inflection, formulaic closing phrases, punctuation, and unusual idiosyncratic forms (Smith, 2012: 102-103, 104, 105-106).

While linguistic research has been conducted on several letters, as yet, however, there has been no comprehensive analysis of the Scottish correspondence focusing specifically on the letters written by women. The aim of this thesis is to examine the fifteen letters from women to Mary of Guise, to determine how her correspondents use the six factors mentioned above to construct and navigate their relationships with Mary. Similar linguistic analysis has been conducted on comparable corpora— including the letters of Bess of Hardwick, Queen Elizabeth I, Margaret Tudor, Lady Katherine Paston, and Joan and Maria Thynne— as is mentioned in chapter one. This thesis follows models and methodologies utilised in these earlier works, including Leitner's social network analysis and Weir's inclusion of correspondents' biographies, and Smith's and Evans' approaches to pragmatic analysis. These works have been selected as models and points of reference for this thesis, as they examine letter-writing in the sixteenth century and are therefore working with similar corpora.

The remainder of this chapter is dedicated to presenting the transcription policy; discussing the patterns and divergencies in the material features of the corpus; and providing diplomatic transcriptions of the 15 letters, complete with footnotes describing each manuscript's material features. Chapter three consists of short essays discussing letter-writing conventions of the sixteenth century, contemporary women's correspondence practices, and features of Scots lexis and orthography, interspersed with quantitative data relating to each of these points, extracted from the corpus. This is followed by a qualitative analysis of the data, examining whether individual correspondents align with the norms of sixteenth century written communication or diverge from them, and how they navigate their relationship with Mary of Guise, utilising social network analysis. Chapter four answers the research questions established at the beginning of chapter one, presents the findings of this study and offers future avenues of research on this topic.

3. *Transcription Policy*

The 15 texts transcribed in this thesis are informed by the transcriptions in Annie Cameron's 1927 *The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine*. However, Cameron utilises a semi-diplomatic transcription which does not accurately reflect all the material and linguistic features of the manuscripts such as the lineation, changes in hand, deletions, abbreviations, use of space, and fold lines. Therefore, I present my own diplomatic transcriptions in this thesis, which are informed by Cameron's, but more fully represent the above-mentioned features of the manuscript. I have expanded Cameron's transcriptions using the original documents, items SP2/1-SP2/4 of the National Records of Scotland with the aim of creating a clear and faithful representation of the Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise for the modern reader. These transcriptions utilise the following editorial policies:

1. As far as possible, the orthography of the original manuscript is followed, with the distinctions between *u* and *v*, and *i* and *j* maintained. Where the writer utilises *ȝ*, this letterform is retained. In the 15 letters of this corpus, the grapheme <y> is used to represent both *y* and *þ*; thus, the transcriptions also use <y> in these contexts, following Smith (Smith, 2012: 71). As with Smith, there is no distinction made between long-s and short-s (Smith, 2020: xv), or the different allographs of r (Cusack, 1998: xv). Ligatures such as -es, -er, and elaborated p are expanded in italics, with no attempt made to replicate their original forms.

2. The capital letters utilised in the original documents are maintained, rather than corrected to follow Present Day English grammatical conventions. Following Smith, in instances where it is unclear whether a form is intended to be a capital (Smith, 2020: xv), I default to modern grammatical conventions. I have chosen to transcribe *ff* as it appears in the manuscripts, rather than emending it to <F> (Smith, 2012: 72). The original form is retained to reflect the manuscript as closely as possible, allowing the reader to be aware of this early modern orthographic convention for capitalising <f>.

3. Ampersand <&> is used to represent all idiosyncratic symbols for the word "and", as it would be impossible to represent each unique symbol closely. Tironian *et* is treated separately, as its meaning may not be immediately obvious to modern day readers— see 8.

4. Interlineated words or letters are marked ⌊insertion⌋, following Smith (Smith, 2020: xvii).

5. Contractions and abbreviations are expanded in italics. Where abbreviations are represented with superscript letters, the abbreviation is expanded in italics, and the superscript letter is retained (Wiggins, 2013).

6. Words which are conjoined in the manuscript retain this form (Smith, 2020: xv), allowing the reader to access any idiosyncratic spellings, scribal errors, and Early Modern Scots lexical conventions in the witness.

7. Legible deletions are struck through, i.e., ~~legible deletion~~ (Wiggins, 2019: xiv), and illegible deletions are marked [*deleted*]. Where text is visible but illegible, this is transcribed [*illegible*], and the number of words is given. Where damage obscures parts of the text, this is marked [*damage*] (Cusack, 1998: xv).

8. The original punctuation of the manuscripts is retained as far as possible. Virgules are represented using </>, punctus using <.>, and Tironian *et* using <$_{7}$> (Smith, 2020: xv). Editorial discretion is used to determine whether marks are intended to be commas, punctus, Tironian *et*, or virgules; or if they are merely accidental pen strokes on the manuscript (Wiggins, 2013).

9. Numbers and dates are transcribed exactly as they are written in the manuscript and are often a combination of Arabic and Roman numerals. Square brackets are used to suggest possible letters or words where damage has rendered the text unclear (Smith, 2012: 71).

10. Cameron offers conjectural dates for the creation of each letter— these dates are retained and presented in italics within curled brackets above the folio number at the beginning of each transcription, i.e. {*1545*} (Cusack, 1998: xv). Each letter transcribed within this thesis follows the pagination found in the manuscripts, assigned by the National Records of Scotland as part of their archival process. This is the same system utilised by Cameron in her 1927 edition, although Cameron uses Roman numerals rather than Arabic. The letter numbers are given in bold, i.e. **Letter 36**, and presented beside Cameron's suggested dates.

11. The visual features of the manuscript are represented in several ways. Each transcription is divided up into the superscription, the main letter text, and the subscription and signature. These sections are labelled using square brackets in the left margin of the transcription, preceding each section of text (Wiggins, 2013). Postscripts or endorsements, if they occur, are denoted in the same way. These labels also serve to indicate changes of hand; for example, the transcription might read [superscription, unknown scribal hand], [letter text, unknown scribal hand], [signature, autograph hand].

11.1. Significant space and flourishes are also indicated in editorial notes within square brackets (Wiggins, 2013). Cursive flourishes on descenders are marked <'>, following Smith (Smith, 2012: 71).

11.2. More extensive descriptions of material features are provided in footnotes below each transcription. These footnotes describe later additions to the manuscript including foliation numbers and archive stamps, but also note any contemporary elements of the letter such as manicules, seals, ribbons, hand and script, slits, folds and creases, and damage. Footnotes describe the colour, location, and size of these features to represent the witness to the reader as fully as possible (Wiggins, 2013).

11.3. Folio numbers are emboldened and enclosed in square brackets in the right margin of the transcription, i.e., [**f17r**]; therefore, changes in folio are clear to the reader (Smith, 2012: 72).

4. Patterns in the Material Features of the Corpus

4.1. Patterns in Scribal and Autograph Letters

When looking at the corpus as a whole, it becomes possible to discern patterns, and deviations from these patterns. There are 15 letters within the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise, written by 9 different correspondents (Marion Haliburton writes five letters, and Elizabeth Campbell writes three, while the 7 other correspondents each write one letter). There is not a large difference between the number of entirely autograph versus scribal letters; with 53.3% of the 15 letters being entirely autograph, and 46.6% being scribal. This means that 55.5% of the 9 correspondents in the corpus wrote their letters in their own hand, while 44.4% utilised a scribe.

However, upon closer examination of the two most prolific correspondents, Marion Haliburton (Lady Home) and Elizabeth Campbell (Countess of Moray), patterns begin to emerge. 80% of Marion Haliburton's letters are entirely autograph, but her final letter to Mary of Guise, which Cameron dates to 1550 or later, is written in a different hand. Potentially this deviation in the pattern of her correspondence is due to the contents of the letter— which centres on a land dispute between herself and John Ottirbourn, and is written in a formal register, aligning with Starza Smith's statement that writing in one's own hand might be perceived as too informal (Starza Smith, 2013). 100% of Elizabeth Campbell's letters are written in a scribal hand, with only her signature being autograph. Elizabeth's letters to Mary of Guise all concern the debt that she owes to the dowager, and it may be that she employed a scribe in her communication with Mary in order to impart a tone of formality. However, letter 110 features a small <x> after the subscription, beside which Elizabeth has written her signature. The <x> is likely a mark made by the scribe to show Elizabeth where she needs to sign, perhaps indicating that she is not fully literate, as Daybell discusses (Daybell, 2001: 60).

93.3% of the corpus comprises of autograph signatures; even when scribes are used, it is the norm for writers within the Scottish female correspondence of Mary of Guise to sign their signature in their own hand. The exception to this is letter 116, ostensibly from the Countess of Atholl— however, Cameron argues that the entire letter is actually written in her father, John Stewart, the Earl of Atholl's hand. Having compared the hand of letter 116 to the autograph signature of letter 256 (also written by John Stewart), it is impossible to confirm Cameron's hypothesis, as only the signature of letter 256 is autograph and so there is not enough evidence of John Stewart's hand to make an adequate comparison.

4.2. Use of Script

While most women in the early modern period were taught italic script, rather than secretary script, letterforms from both these scripts are found mingled within the corpus. This mixing of multiple scripts is not unexpected, as the reader must remember that scripts are merely models, and that, in practice, writers would often utilise a variety of letterforms from different scripts and might use them interchangeably within one document. Italic <r> occurs in the corpus (letters 206, 251) along with two different secretary forms of <r> (see letters 36, 96, 110, 232, and 293). Secretary <h> is used frequently throughout the correspondence, as is secretary <s>, secretary <c>, and secretary <e>; these letterforms are all visually distinctive, with at least one of these four letterforms appearing within each letter of the corpus. Other letterforms such as <g> are less distinct, with their realisations in secretary and italic script often being similar.

4.3. Patterns in Punctuation

The punctuation-practices of the various correspondents can most effectively be indicated in a table (see table 1). This table demonstrates practices across the entire corpus.

	Elizabeth Keith	**Katherine Bellenden**	**Elizabeth Campbell**	**Countess of Atholl**	**Marion Haliburton**	**Marion Ogilvie**	**Janet Beaton**	**Margaret Robertson**	**Janet Keith**
Capitalisation	X	X	X	X	x	x	X	x	x
/		X		X	x	x		x	
&			X	X	x		X	x	
,		X					X		
//		X	X					x	
;			X						
⁊			X						

Table 1, punctuation practices within the corpus

It will be observed from table 1 that both Elizabeth Keith (Countess of Huntly) and Janet Keith (Countess of Montrose) utilise capitalisation as their only form of punctuation. Marion Ogilvie (Lady Gray) displays a slightly larger repertoire of punctuation in her correspondence, using both capital letters and virgules. Marion Haliburton (Lady Home) and the Countess of Atholl employ ampersands in addition to virgules and capitalisation. It is notable that, of these three correspondents, only Marion Haliburton pens her own letters, and thus the punctuation of the other two might be attributed to scribal rather than authorial choice. For the purposes of this discussion of material features, no further reference will be made to the distinction between scribal and authorial decisions, as it is difficult to reach a firm conclusion when working within such a small corpus with so few instances of individual correspondents' letters. Thus, when referring to features including folio layout, and seals and other closing mechanisms, the reader should remember that written correspondence was often a collaborative process in the early modern period, and that while author

and scribe might sometimes be the same person, a number of people could be involved in preparing the writing materials, drafting the letter, and readying it for delivery (Starza Smith, 2013).

Janet Beaton (Lady of Buccleuch) utilises ampersands, capitalisation and commas; however, readers should be aware that interpreting whether a mark is a comma or a virgule is often based on editorial discretion, rather than a concrete difference between the two, as their forms in the early modern period are frequently very similar. Katherine Bellenden also appears to use commas in addition to virgules and capital letters— furthermore, she uses double virgules in one instance. Margaret Robertson's punctuation practices share many similarities with those of Katherine Bellenden, as Margaret also uses double virgules once in her letter to Mary of Guise, in addition to ampersands, capitalisation and virgules. The letters from Elizabeth Campbell, the Countess of Moray, exhibit the largest repertoire of punctuation of the nine correspondents included within this corpus. Elizabeth, like Katherine and Margaret, employs double virgules, and uses them 3 times in letter 96; more than the latter correspondents. She also uses a semi-colon in letter 96 and is the only correspondent to do so. However, her idiosyncratic use of double virgules and semi-colons is not repeated in letters 110 or 111. Instead, letter 110 utilises Tironian *et*, ampersands, and capital letters— despite Attar's statement that ampersands and Tironian *et* are mutually exclusive (Attar, 2022). Potentially, this suggests that Elizabeth's use of ampersand alongside Tironian *et* in "tayne & maid" and "rest & peiss" are part of set phrases; or that the two symbols were used in conjunction in the early modern period. Finally, letter 111 features virgules and capitalisation.

Elizabeth Campbell's letters, and the letters of the corpus more broadly, illustrate that punctuation was not standardised, and that individuals could vary their punctuation between letters for a number of reasons. At this time, punctuation was often rhetorical, rather than grammatical as it is in Present-Day English; meaning that it reflected how the text would be spoken aloud, rather than dividing it up into grammatical units (Smith, 2012: 24). Therefore, punctuation usage and preferences might vary depending on whether a letter was being dictated to a scribe or written by the sender themselves, partially accounting for the variety of ways punctuation is used by the nine individuals within the corpus. The wealth of punctuation available to early modern letter-writers often resulted in clauses like the extract below, taken from letter 205, that illustrates just how much early modern and present day punctuation vary:

> ye french me*n* cu*m* to yis plas to Raman' / & ye
>
> c*un*tre brokin'

One example of punctuation being used for different purposes is the double virgule, which is utilised in several ways across correspondents. Katherine Bellenden appears to use the double virgule in the same way a Present-Day English speaker would use a dash; to indicate that the word is split over two lines, as demonstrated in the excerpt from f36r, lines 7-8, below:

> we suld haif maid money of our pe*n*ny //
>
> worthis to our greit skaith

Elizabeth Campbell seems to use the double virgule in the fashion as Katherine does, with the pattern being more evident due to a higher rate of usage. In lines 6-7 of f96r, it divides the word "withhalderis", as demonstrated below:

> ȝ*ou*^{r} doctheris schargis wsit on ye *wi*^{t}*h* //

haldaris of ye said hwsis

Campbell uses the double virgule in the same way between in lines 10-11 of f96r, dividing the word "answerit". It also occurs between lines 21 and 22 of the same letter, preceding a line-break:

at Elgyne ye xiiij //

day of m*ar*che

Margaret Robertson does not appear to use the double virgule to indicate that the word is split over two lines, as Katherine Bellenden and Elizabeth Campbell do in letters 36 and 96. It appears midline, as follows:

frome ye keping of

his said p*ro*missis // he hes laid to my charge […]

Thus, Margaret appears to use the double virgule following the same conventions of use associated with a virgule— to mark rhetorical punctuation, rather than using it as Bellenden and Campbell do, to mark words divided by lineation.

4.4. Patterns in Significant Space and Folio Layout

As with punctuation, significant space and folio layout varies between correspondents. Letters may have significant space both between the main letter text and subscription, and between the subscription and signature— or between the subscription and signature and below the signature. Thus, the following table (table 2) represents the two possibilities for significant space in each of the 15 letters, totalling 30 potential uses of significant space. These 30 data points are organised into three categories: letters with disproportionately small or large use of significant space, letters with proportionate use of space, and letters which have no significant space at all. The footnotes of each individual letter transcription, which begin on page 28, also describe the characteristics of the letter's significant space in more depth.

	DISPROPORTIONATE	PROPORTIONATE	NIL
Letter 17	X X		
Letter 36		X	X
Letter 96		X	X
Letter 110		X	X
Letter 111	X		X
Letter 116			X X
Letter 193	X X		
Letter 201	X	X	
Letter 205		X	X
Letter 206	X	X	
Letter 232	X		X
Letter 251	X		X
Letter 262		X	X
Letter 290		X	X
Letter 293	X		X
Total %:	33.3	26.7	40

Table 2, significant space within the corpus

Table 2 (on page 23) illustrates that 33.3% of the letters feature significant space that is disproportionately small or large compared to the space the main letter text occupies on the folio, while 26.7% of the letters contain significant space proportionate to the size of the folio and length of the main letter text. 40% of the letters lack significant space in one or more locations on the folio where one would expect to see it being utilised. Within these categories, there are variations in folio layout between individual manuscripts and between correspondents. Elizabeth Keith is the only correspondent within the corpus to utilise significant space between both the main text and subscription, and between the subscription and signature.

Katherine Bellenden, Elizabeth Campbell, and Marion Ogilvie all leave significant space between the main letter text and subscription in their correspondence. However, it is notable that Elizabeth Campbell utilises proportionate significant space in letters 96 and 110 but leaves almost half of the folio blank in letter 111— it is unclear why this use of space differs from her other correspondence, as the content of the letter is the same as its predecessors, and the same scribe appears to have written letters 110 and 111.

Marion Haliburton uses very little significant space between the subscription and signature in letters 193, 201, and 206; but letters 193, 201, and 206 have more significant space left beneath the signature than they do above it. Letter 205 breaks this pattern of larger significant space below the signature than above it, as the text of the letter fills much of the folio, and Marion Haliburton is attempting to utilise every available part of the manuscript. Letter 293 also breaks this trend, with a disproportionately large space between the subscription and signature. I posit that this deviation in pattern is due to letter 293 being scribal, whilst letters 193, 201, 205, and 206 are autograph.

Janet Beaton, Margaret Robertson, and Janet Keith all utilise significant space between the subscription and signature, but do not leave space between the main letter text and subscription. Finally, the Countess of Atholl does not leave any significant space on the folio at all, with the signature immediately following the main letter text.

Letters 96, 110, 111, 116, 232, 251, and 293 are scribal. Referring to these scribal letters using table 2, 66.7% of the letters which lack significant space in one or more locations are scribal. This suggests that scribes may follow conventions of significant space that differ from those used by correspondents writing autograph letters. 40% of the examples of disproportionate space are scribal, reinforcing the hypothesis that these sixteenth century scribes were aligning with different conventions on the use of folio space. Only 25% of the letters with proportionate significant space are scribal, while 75% of letters with proportionate significant space are autograph— this suggests that autograph letter-writers are more likely to use significant space in a systematic way, to overtly indicate respect, or disrespect, towards their recipient, Mary of Guise.

4.5. Patterns in Closing Mechanisms

When examining the corpus data on closing mechanisms, several patterns are distinct. Of the 15 letters, 40% utilise both seals and slits in the folio to secure the correspondence; 26.6% use seals alone; 20% use slits in the folio alone; and 13.3% do not utilise any extant method of securing the letter at all. Looking more closely at the correspondence which utilises both seals and slits in the folio, it is clear that this method is a convention associated more strongly with trained scribes, rather than with correspondents penning their own letters— 71.4% of the scribal letters in the corpus use both styles of closing mechanism, while only 12.5% of the autograph letters follow this method. Upon analysing the autograph correspondence, there is a less defined pattern of practice, with all

four variables occurring in varying amounts. Seals and slits are the most commonly-chosen methods, each comprising 37.5% of the autograph letter data, but 25% of the autograph letters have no extant method of closure, and 12.5% utilise both seals and slits.

The preference for using slits or seals is less marked, with 26.6% of the corpus as a whole utilising seals as the only closing method, and 20% utilising slits as the only method. This is also reflected when examining the corpus by comparing the data from scribal and autograph letters. Scribal letters were equally likely to utilise slits as they were seals— 14.2% of scribal letters use slits, and the same percentage use seals— and the same trend is evident in autograph letters, where autograph correspondence uses seals in 37.5% of examples, and slits in 37.5% of examples. There are no instances of scribal letters without closing mechanisms within this corpus, with both examples of this being autograph letters, comprising 25% of the data on autograph methods of letter closure. It is possible that this is merely an anomaly within the corpus which could be attributed to damage during the afterlife of the manuscript, rather than being a contemporary choice that would be significant within the corpus data.

There is a slight preference within the corpus for utilising horizontal slits (55.5%) over vertical slits (44.4%). The scribal letters incline towards horizontal slits (66.6%) over vertical slits (33.3%). This pattern is reversed within the autograph letters, with vertical slits being utilised in 66% of instances, and horizontal slits in 33.3% of instances. While this distinction in usage may hold significance, it is impossible to state that this is a defined pattern, as the corpus is so small.

Marion Haliburton's correspondence shows a marked tendency towards the use of seals as a closing mechanism, occurring as the only method of securing letters in 60% of the data, and used in combination with slits in 20% of the data— notably, her use of the seal and slit method only occurs in letter 293, which is scribal rather than autograph. 20% of the data features no closing mechanism at all, but as mentioned in the previous paragraph, this may be due to the preservation of the manuscript rather than being a contemporary choice by the writer. Elizabeth Campbell's correspondence also features variation in closing mechanism, with seal and slit occurring 66% of times, and a seal as the only method of securing in 33.3% of the data.

In the letters utilising seals (whether as the only method of closure, or in combination with slits), 70% of the correspondence uses only one seal to secure the letter packet; 20% of the correspondence utilises three seals; and 10% uses four seals. This data suggests that the convention was to use a single seal to secure the letter packet, as all of the instances of more than one seal used per letter occur in Marion Haliburton's correspondence. This indicates that the use of more than one seal to secure the letter packet was an idiosyncratic habit of Marion Haliburton rather than a more widespread practice.

All the extant wax seals within the corpus are red, as was the norm in the early modern period (Wolfe, 2012: 169). None of the letters within the corpus appear to utilise silk to bind the letters and ensure an extra layer of security— if silk had been used, one would expect the wax seals to be intact and unbroken, with the lengths of floss being cut to open the letter (Wolfe, 2012: 169-170). This practice was uncommon in Britain (Wolfe, 2012: 171), and thus is unlikely to have been used by writers within this corpus. However, while Wolfe dates the emergence of this practice in England to between 1579 and 1582 (Wolfe, 2012: 175), it is worth noting that the convention seems to have started in Europe, and was established in Scotland, likely due to the strong political and cultural links between Scotland and France, prior to its adoption in England (Wolfe, 2012: 174). There are no extant examples of using silk to secure the letters within this corpus, but neither are there surviving tabs, used in the tab-and-slit method of closure (discussed on page 6)— therefore, the lack of

evidence for silk binding does not confirm that this method was not used by the female Scottish correspondents of Mary of Guise; only that any evidence of its possible usage does not survive.

4.6. Patterns in Folding Methods

The number of fold-lines (used interchangeably with the term "creases" within this thesis) on a manuscript can illustrate the size of the final letter packet, with several fold patterns being used in the early modern period. I have attempted to decipher which fold patterns were used within the corpus by examining how dirty the creases and sections of each verso are and comparing these features to the various patterns documented on the letter-locking site (Dambrogio, Starza Smith, et al., 2016). Thus, these analyses should be taken as suggestions, rather than definitive statements on the fold patterns used.

66% of the letters have three visible horizontal crease lines visible, suggesting that this was the conventional number of horizontal folds used when preparing a letter for delivery in the sixteenth century. However, other folding practices also existed, as is illustrated by the corpus: 13.3% of the correspondence features five horizontal crease lines; 6.6% have one horizontal fold line; 6.6% have four horizontal fold lines; and 6.6% have eight horizontal crease lines.

There is less of a defined pattern in the number of vertical fold lines used throughout the corpus, with more variation occurring across individual correspondents: 33.3% of letters feature one vertical crease; 13.3% have two vertical creases; 13.3% have five vertical creases; 13.3% have six; 6.6% have three; 6.6% have seven; 6.6% have eight; and 6.6% have ten. These statistics reflect that the size of the folded letter packet varies greatly throughout the corpus, as the more folds there are on the folio, the smaller the sealed packet would have been.

The writers in the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise appear to utilise a range of fold patterns, with a double parallel fold being the most common (33.3% of the data), followed by several variations on the gatefold (totalling 46.6% of the data).

4.7. Manuscript Afterlives: Damage and Evidence of Archival Processes

Damage to manuscripts can cause obscure parts of the text and cause difficulty in transcribing their content, but it can also suggest how documents were stored by recipients, and later by collectors and archivists. It appears that all fifteen of the letters within this corpus were sent, as they have crease lines showing that they were folded into letter packets; and all fifteen versos have dirtier sections where the superscription is penned, indicating that this was the outer surface of the letter during its journey from writer to recipient.

Water staining occurs on 53.3% of the manuscripts, with 26.6% suffering so much damage that portions of the text are rendered unintelligible. Elizabeth Campbell's correspondence (letters 96, 110, and 111) have sustained the most damage— the extent of and pattern of the water staining on these manuscripts suggests that all three documents were damaged in the same period, likely during their afterlives in storage. 26.6% of the corpus has patches on the verso of the folio to repair damage; 6.6% of the correspondence has visible tearing that has not been repaired; and 6.6% of the manuscripts have substantial portions of the folio that are missing entirely.

The foliation numbers and archival stamps on the manuscripts are evidence of the systematic archival process. Each of the 15 letters has a Register House archival stamp located somewhere on

the recto, with most of these stamps occurring near the signature. Foliation marks can indicate the different ways documents have been categorised in broader collections, and all the foliation numbers in this corpus are written in pencil, which is less likely to permanently alter a manuscript than ink. Each letter has at least one foliation number, with 13.3% of the corpus featuring a foliation mark on both the recto and the verso. 33.3% of the letters within the corpus have two foliation numbers on the recto: most often, one of these numbers refers to the item's place within the book it is bound in, and one refers to the item's shelf mark within the collection as a whole, i.e., <SP2/2/116>. These foliation numbers reflect how manuscripts continue to be interacted with hundreds of years after they are first created, with the hands of modern archivists occurring on the same folio that their sixteenth-century authors wrote upon.

5. Annotated Transcriptions of the Letters

The following section consists of annotated transcriptions of the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise, which aim to reflect the original manuscripts as closely as possible. To that end, original spelling, lineation, and punctuation are retained. The reader is alerted to notable features in the footnotes, and where word-division differs from present day conventions, these are normalised within the notes. Items of Scots lexis are not glossed.

Letter 17 {*1543*}

[superscription, autograph hand][1] [**f17v**]

To ye quenis grace

[flourish]

[letter text, autograph hand][2] [**f17r**]

Madame[3] I co*m*mend my hartly seruice to 3our grace It pleis 3our grace I haue resavit 3our grace writing fra 3our servand yis berar makand me*n*tyoun y*a*^{t} my lord gou*er*no*u*^{r} hes rasit an*e* cursing on my lord and don*e* be his awvy*n* avyce to stop *ya*^{t} he cum no*ch*^{t} to 3our grace at yis tym*e* as 3o*u*^{r} grace Is Informyt Madam*e* I assuyr 3our grace 3e ꝼ will fynd y*a*^{t} Informa*cio*un*e* als fals as w*ther*is quhilk*i*s hes[4] ben*e* maid to 3our grace abefoir yair Is na syk l*ett*res Cumi*n* on my lord as 3it as 3e wrayt bot my lord wes Informyt y*a*^{t} syk l*ett*res wes to cum and hes gottin an*e* absolu*cio*n*e* fra my lord cardinall In ave*n*tuyr of ye samy*n* Madam*e* belief na w*ther* thing bot my lord wilbe ye samy*n* man he p*ro*mist to 3our grace and hes got[ti]n greyt laubo*uri*s be ye gou*er*no*uri*s waye to brak hy*m* fra 3our purpois and had ya ben*e* any alteratioun of purposis I suld no*ch*^{t} haf falit till adv*er*teist 3our grace w*i* ^{t}*h* deligens and aye salbe redy to do ~~syk~~ 3our grace syk plesuyr and s*er*vice as I ma at all tymes as knawis god quha mot haue 3our grace In keping et*er*nalye at huntlie ye xvj daye of august be

[1] There are three horizontal fold lines on the verso, the first of which has been patched across the width of the folio. There is one vertical fold line bisecting the manuscript, visible in the second quadrant. The superscription is located in the second quadrant, below the horizontal patch, parallel with the vertical fold line. There is a pencilled foliation number reading <17a> in the bottom left corner of the verso; and a patch in the right margin where water damage has occurred. There are 8 small vertical slits visible, 4 on each margin of the manuscript; one per quadrant. These would have been used to seal the letter closed. The paper used is very fine, and the letter text is visible on the verso.

[2] There are two pencilled foliation numbers, both reading <17.>, one in the upper right corner above the text, and one in the left margin in the significant space between the subscription and signature. Immediately to the left of the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. There is minor water damage in the left margin, which has obscured the first letter, <a>, in the last line of the letter text. Three horizontal crease lines are visible on the recto, the second of which bisects lines 7 and 8, causing parts of the text to fade. Ten vertical crease lines are visible, suggesting that the letter was folded into a very small letter packet for delivery.

[3] The <m> of *Madame* is an ornamental, two-line letter. The hand used throughout the document is very small, neat, and calligraphic.

[4] The <h> of *hes* is unclear, having been written and then corrected.

[significant space][5]

[subscription, autograph hand]

ȝouris grace hu*mi*ll seruatrice

[significant space][6]

[signature, autograph hand]

Elizab*e*^{t}*h* countes of hwntlye

[5] The significant space between the main letter text and subscription is substantial, approximately 7 inches wide.

[6] The significant space between the subscription and signature is also fairly large, around 3 inches wide.

Letter 36 {*1543*}

[superscription, autograph hand][7] [**f36v**]

To the quenis grace

[flourish]

[letter text, autograph hand][8] [**f36r**]

Madame[9] efter maist hvmill Comendationis of my puir s*er*uice to ȝo*u*^{r}

hienes I am adverteist y*a*^{t} ȝour grace belevis yat my husband and I /

ar awand greit sovmes of money to ȝo*u*^{r} grace for orknay and zetland

and will no*ch*^{t} pay ȝour grace and to yat effect maister thomas

makcalze*n* ȝour graces ma*n* of law , hes arreistit our schip and

guddis [*deleted*: 1 word] and haldin ye samyn yis mone^{t}*h* bygane quhairthrow ~~h~~ we

haif tynt ye mercat y*a*^{t} we suld haif maid money of our pe*n*ny //

worthis to our greit skaith and da*m*mage be ressoun y*a*^{t} I my*ch*^{t}

no*ch*^{t} cu*m* to get soverte to lows ye said arreistme*n*t becaus I haif

bein wnder greit seiknes and w*yth*ir trublis yis lang tyme bygane

ye q*uhi*lk I traist and ȝo*u*^{r} grace had bein weill informyt ȝo*u*^{r} grace

wald no*ch*^{t} haif gart trubill our geir in ye manar as it was

Madame ȝour grace sall wnderstand we haif no*ch*^{t} tane wp ane

pe*n*ny of orknay nor zetland nor will no*ch*^{t} get quhill efter yis

nixt belten and we ar informyt ȝour grace hes set ye said*is* land*is*

to my lord of hvntlie ye q*uhi*lk purposis to be yair or yan and to

tak wp ye said*is* frutis gif sabeis we suld pay na thing yairfor

---

[7] There is a pencilled foliation number reading <36a> in the bottom left corner of the verso; three dirty horizontal crease lines; and three small horizontal patches, in the right margin of the first two and final quadrants. This damage is not visible on the recto. There is also a visible vertical crease mark. The superscription is on the left of the third quadrant, parallel with the vertical crease. There are two more faint horizontal lines in the first quadrant, one in the third, and one in the fourth; suggesting that the letter packet was folded fairly small.

[8] There is one pencilled foliation number, reading <36.>, in the upper right corner above the text. At the top of the folio, immediately to the left of the main letter text, there is a Register House archival stamp, which aligns with lines 2 to 4. Three horizontal crease lines are faintly visible on the recto, the second of which bisects lines 9 and 10, and the second of which bisects line 21— however, these have not damaged the text. Eight vertical crease lines are visible, suggesting that the letter was folded into a very small letter packet for delivery.

[9] The <m> of *Madame* is an ornamental, two-line letter. The hand used throughout the document is neat and calligraphic.

will ȝo*u*^{r} grace be sa gracious to ws as to ratife our fyve ȝe^{r}*i*s tak quhilk our maister quhom god assoilȝe set to ws we sall mak ȝo*u*^{r} grace thankfull payme*n*t at ȝour grace plesour as I wrait to ȝo*u*^{r} grace of befoir for we think greit lak to gang fra our native rowmes q*uhi*lk my husband and his sur name hes brukit yir thre or four hundre^{t}*h* ȝe^{r}*i*s c*on*sidering y*a*^{t} we ar in will to mak als gude payme*n*t to ȝo*u*^{r} grace as ony yat ca*n* dissyre It beseikand ȝo*u*^{r} grace to schaw yis gentill ma*n* ye berar of yis bill quhat ȝo*u*^{r} grace intendis to do to ws and quhat we sall lyppin to and Eternall god keip ȝour grace and ȝo*u*^{r} gracis successioun in all haill and weilfair writtin at Edinburgh ye xxiij day of november Be

[significant space][10]

[subscription, autograph hand]

ȝour gracis hvmill s*er*uatr*i*s

[signature, autograph hand]

katherine Bellendyn [flourish]

[10] The significant space is fairly large, approximately 4 inches wide. There appear to be six vertical crease lines on the recto, especially clear in the significant space; although the digital nature of the document makes this hard to confirm. This suggests that the letter was folded up into a very small, discreet package.

Letter 96 {*1544-5*}

[superscription, scribal hand][11] [**f96v**]

To the que*n*is grace[12]

[significant space]

[flourish]

[letter text, scribal hand][13] [**f96r**]

Mademe eft*er* humill c*om*mendatione of my s*er*uice to ȝ*ou*^{r} g ⌊r⌋ ece

I thank ȝ*ou*^{r} grece of ȝ*ou*^{r} guid mynd and deid scha

wyn to me Be my Emē of caedar / as ȝit I

am no*ch*^{t} obeyit of my hwis of darnway nor ȝit of

ȝ*ou*^{r} grecis hwsis of Ros / no*ch*^{t}w*i*^{t}*h*standyng ye

quenis grecis ȝ*ou*^{r} doctheris schargis wsit on ye *wi*^{t}*h* //

haldaris of ye said hwsis / q*uhi*lk causis me to be ewill

obeyit of my hwsbandis Restis awcht to ȝ*ou*^{r} grece

& wderis / no*ch*^{t}w*i*^{t}*h*standyng I haif w^{r}*y*tyn owir to

mer*c*handis of Edinburgh to caus ȝ*ou*^{r} grec be ans //

werit of pte thre hu*n*dret punde of mwny*e*

and the lawe salbe had w*i*^{t}*h* diligens / quhowbeid

I had mwny In yis cu*n*tre I durst no*ch*^{t} send It

---

[11] There are three horizontal crease lines visible on the verso; the second and third creases are dirty, suggesting that this formed the outer letter packet. There is one vertical crease mark visible on the verso, and the superscription is located parallel to this, in the third quadrant on the right portion of the folio. There is the remains of a red wax seal, around the size of a ten pence piece, above the superscription, on the left portion of the folio.

[12] Cameron believes the superscription, letter text, and subscription to be written in the same scribal hand; and only the signature to be autograph. However, the letter forms <m> and <y> in the signature bear similarities to letter forms in the letter text. Additionally, it appears that the same ink has been used throughout the manuscript, and the letter forms are similarly loose throughout the witness.

[13] There are two pencilled foliation numbers, one in the upper right corner above the text which reads <SP2/2/96>, and one in the left corner in the significant space between the superscription and signature which reads <96.>. Immediately to the left of the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. There is water damage along the left margin, but the text is not obscured. Three horizontal crease lines are visible on the recto, the first of which bisects lines 7 and 8, and has very faint water damage towards the right margin. The second horizontal crease mark is between lines 14 and 15; and the third between lines 21 and 22, which has also suffered water damage near the right margin. There is one faint vertical crease visible in the significant space.

owir Be ressone of my s*e*rwandis at[14] war

spwilʒeit be ye get / quhow swne I haif pvtt

ordir heir sall hest me to ʒ*ou*^{r} grece & mak

compleit payment of all Restis bygane / I haif

ane tryst w*i*^{t}*h* my lord of huntlie In yis wlk / to[15]

se gyf I may pleis his l*ord*s*hip* / and y*air*eft*er* sall adv*er*teis

ʒ*ou*^{r} grece of all thyngis ; quhome god mot

haif In his kepyng at Elgyne ye xiiij //

day of m*ar*che be

[significant space][16]

[flourish]

[subscription, scribal hand]

ʒ*ou*^{r} grac at c*om*mand & s*er*uice

[signature, autograph hand]

eliʒab*e* ^{t}*h* contas of

mo^{r}ray

[14] Likely a scribal error intended to say *yat*.

[15] The word *to* is blotted and relatively obscured.

[16] The significant space is small but proportionate to the remaining space on the folio.

Letter 110 {*1545*}

[superscription, scribal hand][17] [**f110v**]

To the que*n*is grace[18]

[significant space]

[letter text, scribal hand][19] [**f110r**]

[Made]me efter maist hw*er*[t]le[20] c*om*me*n*dationе of my s*er*vice to ȝ*ou*^{r} grace

rasavit ane writting of ȝ*ou*^{r} grace yis xx day of nove*m*ber daitit

at stryvelyng ye xv day of october ₇[21] desyrand me to mak

gud and haiste payment of yis m*ar*tymes terme ₇ I beleif ye

maist effek of ye m*ar*tymes terme ₇ I*n*[22] money is dischargit

to me be ȝ*ou*^{r} grace assingnaisions maid to S*i*r watt*er* ogilby

& ye kny*ch*^{t} of caud*er* quhilk is I*n* ye haill v^{c} mark quhilk

yai haif tayne payment of at my hand by u*ther* allowans

y*a*^{t} is ordin*er* quhilk ȝ*ou*^{r} grace sall knaw at my comptes

as for ȝ*ou*^{r} grac fermes it is weill knawin ye tyme of ȝeyr

is no*ch*^{t} as ȝeit to sell ony fermis and m*er*cha*nt*i*s* no*ch*^{t} trava

lyng I*n* ye cu*n*tre^{t}*h* as I*n* pesable tyme ₇ y*er*fo*r* ca*n* no*ch*^{t} get ye

---

[17] There are two clearly visible horizontal crease lines visible on the verso, both found in the bottom half of the folio. The bottom crease is dirty, suggesting that this section of the folio formed the outer letter packet. A vertical crease mark is also visible, bisecting the bottom section, and the superscription is located parallel to this, on the right portion of the folio. On the left portion of this bottom folio, near to the left edge of the folio, is the remains of a red wax seal, around the size of a ten pence piece. There is substantial water damage along the entire right edge of the folio; smaller patches of water damage are also found on the left side of the folio. There are 8 small vertical slits visible, 4 on each margin of the manuscript; one per quadrant. These would have been used in conjunction with the wax seal to fasten the letter closed.

[18] The <t> of *to* and the <th> of *the* in the superscription are blotted.

[19] There is a pencilled foliation number reading <SP/2/110> in the upper right corner above the text. Immediately to the left of the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. There is significant water damage along the left margin of the recto, obscuring letters or words on 7 lines of the main text. Two faint water marks also appear in the right side of the recto, in the first half of the main text and in the significant space. Three horizontal crease lines are visible on the recto; bisecting line 8, between lines 17 and 18, and in the significant space.

[20] The scribe has initially written *herlie*, then written *hwerlie* over this as a correction. Both spellings are visible.

[21] Several small marks appear throughout the text, which I believe to be Tironian *et*. These punctuation marks are not used in letter 96, suggesting that different scribes have written letters 96 and 110, lending credence to Cameron's belief that neither of these are entirely autograph.

[22] The scribe uses a distinctive curled <i> grapheme to represent *in*, which recurs in letter 111, but does not appear in letter 96. This may suggest that the superscription, main letter text, and subscription of letters 110 and 111 are written by one scribe, and those of letter 96 by a different scribe.

money y*er*of haistelie w*i*^{t}*h*out I do my self gret Inco*n*venye*n*t

[&] skay^{t}*h* quhilk I wait ȝ*ou*^{r} grace desyris no*ch*^{t} co*n*siderand

[ye] gret cost and cu*mm*e*r* I haif tayne & maid I*n* putting

[ȝ*ou*^{r}] grace la*n*des & te*nn*a*n*dis I*n* rest & peiss quhilk I trast

[I hai]f done c*onf*ormand to ȝ*ou*^{r} grace mynd at my departing

[no*ch*^{t}] ye less ye money I may get sall do delygens and

[send] to ȝou ₇ as f*o*r precept*is* beseikis ȝ*ou*^{r} grace to send nayne

to me bot sik as will gif me day y*a*^{t} I may mak

payment one [without?] hurting me ₇ and sall mak als thankfull

payment to ȝ*ou*^{r} grace as ony u*ther* s*e*rwis ȝou will god

quha haif ȝ*ou*^{r} grace I*n* et*er*nall keeping at dyngwall

yis xxj day of nov*em*ber be

[significant space][23]

[subscription, scribal hand]

[flourish]

ȝ*ou*^{r} grace at c*om*mand of

my s*er*vice

[signature, autograph hand]

x[24] eliȝabe^{t}*h* contas of mo^{r}ray

[23] The significant space is fairly large, around 3 inches wide.

[24] There is a very small <x> written to the left of the signature, perhaps marking to the sender where her signature should be placed.

Letter 111 {*1545*}

[superscription, scribal hand][25] [**f111v**]

To the que*n*is grace

[significant space]

[flourish]

[letter text, scribal hand][26] [**f111r**]

Mademe[27] eftere hu*m*le c*om*mendation of my s*er*vice to ȝ*ou*^{r} g[r]ace / I haif

bene doand part of besynes & s*er*vice co*n*sernyng ȝ*ou*^{r} grace / and

hes put ȝ*ou*^{r} landis of ros to ye best poynt I my*ch*^{t} swa y*at* all

ye landit me*n* and u*ther*is Inhabetar*i*s of ye landis of ros are rade

to do ȝ*ou*^{r} grace s*er*vice and hon*ou*^{r} as yai be chargit and hes maid

provesione for keiping[28] of ȝ*ou*^{r} t*en*nandis fra oppressione and sorny[ng]

ye best I could howbeit ye same hes bene costlie to me as [ȝ*ou*^{r}]

grace may c*on*sider quhilk I [*damage*][29]

ȝ*ou*^{r} grace mynd schawing to me at departing / [*damage*]

understand y*a*^{t} ye m*ar*tymes terme I*n*[30] money will be na thing [*damage*]

effek by ȝ*ou*^{r} grace assingnations / and ye wittall sillv*er* of yis [*damage*]

---

[25] There are three visible horizontal crease lines on the verso, splitting the folio into four segments. The two uppermost creases are worn and dirty, suggesting that the second quadrant of the folio formed the outer letter packet. A vertical crease mark bisects the folio; the superscription is located parallel to this, in the right portion of the second quadrant. On the left portion of this quadrant, near the left edge, is the remains of a red wax seal, around the size of a ten pence piece. There is significant water damage along both the left and right margins of the folio— there are three patches on the left margin. The bottom right quadrant of the folio is missing almost entirely. There are 3 small horizontal slits visible in the right margin of the folio, and 3 in the left margin; one per intact quadrant. These would have been used in conjunction with the wax seal to fasten the letter closed.

[26] There are two pencilled foliation numbers, one in the upper right corner above the text which reads <SP 2/2/111>, and a fainter one reading <111> to the left of the first. Immediately under the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. There is extensive water damage along the right margin of the recto, which obscures the ends of lines 8, 9, 10, and part of lines 16 and 17. Three horizontal crease lines are visible on the recto, the first of which bisects line 8, obscuring much of the remaining text. The second and third crease marks occur in the significant space. A vertical crease mark bisects the folio.

[27] The <m> of *Mademe* is an ornamental, two-line letter.

[28] There is faint lettering above *keiping*, which may read "^{m}or". It is not clear whether this is smudging, or a scribal mistake.

[29] Cameron suggests that this line reads "req… that… consider[yng ?]".

[30] The scribe uses a distinctive curled <i> grapheme to represent *in*, which also occurs in letter 110, but does not appear in letter 96. This may suggest that the superscription, main letter text, and subscription of letters 110 and 111 are written by one scribe, and those of letter 96 by a different scribe.

I*n* ye yard / may no*ch*^{t} be payit to eftere c*an*dillmes y*a*^{t} schipis ma[y]

haif passaig w*i*^{t}*h*out ony gret skay^{t}*h* quhilk I traist ȝ*ou*^{r} grace

desyris no*ch*^{t} / y*er*for beseik*is* ȝ*ou*^{r} grace send na precept*i*s for na money

to me quhill ye said tyme / for I am weray lay^{t}*h* to disobey ony

thing ȝe will desyre me do / as knawis god [quha] I mot haif

ȝ*ou*^{r} grace ev*er* I*n* his keiping of cawd*er* y[is] [*damage*] nove*m*bere

[significant space][31]

[superscription, scribal hand]

[flourish]

ȝ*ou*^{r} grace at c*om*mand of my s*er*vice

[signature, autograph hand]

eliȝabe*th* contas of m*o*ray

[31] The significant space is large, approximately 7 inches wide. There is a line of smudged ink, several words long, approximately an inch below the main letter text to the right edge of the folio. This is illegible due to fading and water damage, but may have been intended as a postscript, or as part of the superscription. A flourish extends from the superscription into the significant space.

Letter 116 {*1545-6*}

[superscription, scribal hand 1][32] [**f116v**]

To the quenis

grace

[letter text, scribal hand 2][33] [**f116r**]

Mademe[34] Eftir maist hu*m*mill s*er*vice & prayar*is* [unto]

ȝour graice / pleis be reme*m*brit how[35] ȝo*u*r grai[ce]

wrait to my lord gou*er*no*u*^{r} & to my lord cardinall in [fa]

vour*is* of ȝo*u*^{r} graice trew s*er*vit*ou*r S*i*^{r} adame otir

bourn / & be ȝour graice request yat tym' S*ir* adem

was contenwat / Madem' pleis ȝo*u*^{r} graice

[ther] Is laitle an' somond*is* of tressvn' raissit o*n*

S*i*^{r} adem' & apon' his svn' Ihon' otirburn' quha ma

riit ye erle athollis cist*er* / And surle S*i*^{r} adem

Is haldin Innocent / & sic thing*is* allegit be

his small freynd*is* / Madem' he Is agit

& of greit exsperienc / And haldin' evir [in]

ty*m*mis passit of wisdom' / quharfor It suld no[cht]

---

[32] There are three horizontal crease lines visible on the verso, with the first and second creases being the clearest. There is one vertical crease mark, most visible in the second quadrant. The topmost quadrant is the dirtiest, suggesting that this formed the outermost segment of the letter packet. The superscription runs parallel to the horizontal crease mark, on the right side of the second quadrant. I suggest that the superscription may be in the hand of another scribe, as the script is much more calligraphic, and the ink is also much lighter than that of the recto (although this could also be attributed to fading caused by handling and storage of the letter packet). The paper used is fine, and the letter text is visible on the verso. Water damage extends along the left margin of the verso. There are 8 small horizontal slits visible, 4 on each margin of the manuscript; one per quadrant. These would have been used to seal the letter closed.

[33] There is a distinct pencil foliation number reading <SP2/2/116> in the upper right corner of the recto, above the text; and another very faint mark reading <116.> located immediately to the left of the first. There is a Register House archival stamp to the left of the subscription and signature. Water damage extends along the right margin of the manuscript, obscuring the final letter or letters of lines 1-3, 12-20, 28, 29, and 31. The words supplied by Cameron have been retained. Three horizontal crease marks are visible on the recto, bisecting line 7, between lines 16 and 17, and bisecting line 25; both the former and latter have caused the parts of the text to fade.

[34] The <m> of *Mademe* is an ornamental, two-line letter. The hand begins very neat and calligraphic, but over the course of the main letter text, the hand becomes looser and more scrawling.

[35] Several words throughout the main letter text are heavily blotted, making the loose hand more difficult to read.

be an' p*re*sumption' / nor sy*n*nist*er* Information' [that]

suld hurt sic a ma*n* In his faym' nor [gud]

is / ~~attor~~ att*ou*r he is now veseit be Infir[mite]

And f*o*r his svn' & ȝ*ou*^{r} grace s*er*vitrice his [spous]

yair can' no*ch*^{t} be Imput to yam' / quha suld [nocht]

be trowblit / thir p*re*miss beand consid*er*it [be]

ȝ*ou*^{r} grace gret wisdom' / we all ȝ*ou*^{r} gr[ace]

s*ervitouris* ye frend*is* of S*i*^{r} adem' his svn' & his

spois / traist*is* surle In ȝ*ou*^{r} grace help &

yat now as of befor ȝ*ou*^{r} grace will be

his gracios prync*is* & gud mastres / quham'

In to Is his & o*u*^{r}*is* ȝ*ou*^{r} s*ervitouris* confidens / to

get him & his svn' dischargit of all sic trow

blis / q*uhi*lk*is* we maist hu*m*[i]lle besek ȝ*ou*^{r}

grace to do ffor his Innocence & o*u*^{r} pwr[e]

s*er*vice / The eternell god conserve ȝ[*ou*^{r}]

grace of du*n*keld yis xiiij day of Ian*ua*ry^{e}

[subscription, scribe 2][36]

be ȝ*ou*^{r} grace mast hu*m*ell s[ervitrice]

[signature, scribe 2][37]

comptas of atholl

[36] There is no significant space between the main letter text and the subscription, or the subscription and the signature. Both the subscription and signature are squeezed into the bottom right corner of the manuscript.

[37] Cameron believes that the letter text, subscription, and signature are in the hand of John Stewart, the fourth Earl of Atholl, rather than the hand of his daughter (although it is unclear which of the Earl's two daughters with Elizabeth Gordon this letter is attributed to). Letter 256 is attributed to the Earl of Atholl, but as only the signature is autograph, it is difficult to prove or disprove Cameron's hypothesis.

Letter 193 {*1548*}

[endorsement, the 4th Earl Marischal][38] [**f192v**]

To the ry*gh*^{t} ho*noura*bll Si^{r}

Ihon [*illegible: 1 word*][39] quhiulk of is

kyn[cht] [*illegible: 1 word*] forth ofr

knycht [flourish]

[significant space][40]

wret ye of

EarlM*arischa*l[41]

[38] This endorsement is bound alongside letter 193. There are three horizontal crease lines visible on the verso, and three vertical crease lines. The first section of text is in the second quadrant, in the centre of the manuscript; and the second section of text in the bottom left corner of the manuscript. The hand is calligraphic. The middle two sections of the verso are the dirtiest, indicating that they formed the outer part of the letter packet, with the fold lines suggesting that the document would have been relatively small when folded. There is a small area of damage on the left margin, near the main endorsement, which has been patched. On the recto, a faint manicule in the centre of the document points towards the bottom edge of the manuscript.

[39] Three of the four lines of the endorsement are illegible due to fading and dirt. Lines 2 to 4 should be regarded as conjecture.

[40] The significant space is large, approximately 7 inches wide.

[41] Conjecture based on Cameron's notes. Cameron attributes this endorsement to William Keith, the 4th Earl Marischal, and suggests that the letter was referred to him on a personal basis, rather than in a professional capacity. According to Cameron, the Earl Marischal also endorsed letter 205 (Cameron, 1927: 281). However, upon examination of the manuscripts in General Register House, there is no extant evidence of an endorsement accompanying letter 205.

[superscription, autograph hand][42] [**f193v**]

To ye quenis grace

[flourish]

[letter text, autograph hand][43] [**f193r**]

Madem I co*m*mend[44] my hartly s*er*vis to ȝo*u*^{r} grace ples

ȝo*u*^{r} grace to ram*em*er of my wryting my dochter broht

it is fulfald lossing to god / my son'[45] alex*an*d*er* had co*m*it to

ȝo*u*^{r} grace vy^{t}*h* ye ferst tideng*is* bot my lord huntle

said he sold send / & ther eft*er* be at ȝo*u*^{r} grace

hem' self / my son' andro was at ye plas woning

prenssipall / & his cusing Iohn hom' vy^{t}*h* hem' ye lard

of coldonknous & ȝoung alex*an*d*er* hom' & ye lard of

melarstanis / thar wald na ud*er* of ye garesonis

past vy^{t}*h* my son' / well plis ȝo*u*^{r} grace to cu*m* to

ed*en*brught vy^{t}*h* all delygens & lay garisson*n*is in ye[46]

hom' / ther salbe ud*er* thing*is* doun' welgod / & ilk

man' wilbe welmyndit[47] / ther wilbe few Inglis men'

In scotland be lyf / ȝo*u*^{r} grace mon' / cass gret

---

[42] There are three horizontal crease lines visible on the verso; the final second and third creases are dirty, suggesting that this quadrant formed the outer letter packet. There are two vertical crease marks visible, splitting the manuscript into three segments, with the central segment being around an inch wider than the left and right sections. The superscription is in the third quadrant and runs parallel to the rightmost vertical crease. There are the remains of two red seals in the third quadrant; one in the left section, which is clearer and less damaged, and one in the right. A third red seal is visible in the fourth quadrant, close to the bottom edge of the manuscript. These seals would have been used to close the letter and ensure that any tampering was visible to the recipient.

[43] There is one pencilled foliation number reading <193.>, located near the left margin in the significant space below the signature. Three horizontal crease lines are visible on the recto; the first bisects line 8 and 9, the second lines 19 and 20, and the third is in the significant space below the signature. Immediately beneath the signature is a Register House archival stamp. There are the remains of two red seals in the left margin of the recto, one in the second quadrant and one in the third.

[44] There is a small <c> shaped graph above *commend* which may be a macron; however, it is completely different to the macron above *home* in line 7. I have interpreted it as a macron, but its form is unusual and thus noteworthy.

[45] Marion Haliburton's hand has an idiosyncratic mark occurring often after word-final <m> or <n>. I have chosen to interpret this as a flourish, denoted <'>, rather than as a macron.

[46] The word *ye* is blotted, obscured almost to the point of unintelligibility.

[47] The first few letters of *welmyndit* are blotted, and this transcription relies on Cameron's efforts.

delygens to be mad for support to ye plas of
adv*en*to*u*^{r} it be put at be Inglis men' / had ye hale
garisonis / past vy^{t}*h* my son' andro kelso had beyn'
won' to / all our asperans is in ȝo*u*^{r} grace thar for do
as ȝo*u*^{r} grace plessis / ȝ*ou*^{r} grace Ram*em*eris I dysirit
part of support / quhen' ȝo*u*^{r} grace thinkis expedient
I wald ȝe gef it to my dochte*r* to send to me for I haf
gret mist*er* / quhat ȝo*u*^{r} grace list c*om*mand wryt & it
sall be doun' well god quha preserv*e* ȝo*u*^{r} grace et*er*nally
wretin' of ed*en*borght ye xxviij day of dysse*m*bar be ȝo*u*^{r}
graceis humell s*er*veto*u*^{r}

[significant space][48]

[signature, autograph hand][49]

Maryonl*ady*hom*e*

[significant space][50]

[48] The significant space between the subscription and the signature is small, just under an inch wide, and is not proportionate to the remaining space on the folio.
[49] The hand used throughout the manuscript is very loose and sprawling.
[50] The significant space below the signature is large, approximately 3 inches wide.

Letter 201 {*1548-9*}

[superscription, autograph hand][51] [**f201v**]

To ye quenis gras

[flourish]

[letter text, autograph hand][52] [**f201r**]

Madem' I co*m*mend[53] my hartly s*er*wis to ȝo*u*^{r} grace plis ȝou to

be adv*er*tesit y*a*^{t} thar is cu*m*it / s*er*ten of Inglis me*n* to beryk

ma nor wes of be for / bot I be lef tha well no*ch*^{t} all

be thre thousand men / causs wait one ye fortht of

Inaresk sa mony as is nedfull / & maik for suir

adv*er*tisment in tha partt*is* / y*a*^{t} tha be no*ch*^{t} stoun on

als sua / I be seik ȝ*ou*^{r} grace to causs / my son / &

all ud*er* scott*is* me*n* y*a*^{t} ȝe ma for ga / to cu*m* in' yis

c*un*tre for ther welbe besyn*e*s about yis toun o^{r} ellis

In som ud*er* pairt In yis c*un*tre / ye french me*n* y*a*^{t} wes hey^{r}

cald not agre w*i*^{t}*h* ye capeden wes sent to tham

& said to hem' / tha aucht na s*er*vis to ye king &

we haf caussit hem' / to send for ud*er*is / sa mony as

plissis hem' / & pout tham a way / yis last Rad

was mad In Ingland / has doun na gud bot maid

our Inimeis harde / & quhill it be mendit ye

Inglis men' / well nev*er* trast to geit skath / ȝ*ou*^{r}

[51] There are three horizontal fold lines visible on the verso; and six vertical fold lines visible across the four quadrants of the manuscript. The superscription is on the right side of the second quadrant, running parallel with the second vertical crease. The quadrant featuring the superscription is dirty, suggesting that it formed the outer letter packet. The paper used is fine, and the letter text is visible on the verso.

[52] There is a pencilled foliation number reading <201.> in the lower left corner of the manuscript, in the significant space beneath the signature. Immediately beneath the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. Three horizontal crease lines are visible on the verso; the first bisects line 9, the second bisects lines 20 and 21, and the third occurs in the significant space beneath the signature. There are six vertical crease lines visible on the verso, suggesting that the letter would have been folded into a small letter packet for delivery.

[53] There is a small <c> shaped graph above *commend* which I have transcribed as a macron; however, it has a different form to the macron above *Madem'* in line 1. The same form also occurs above *commend* in the first line of letter 193.

grac maun / be v*er*e scherp batht on' ye franch men'

& on ye scott*is* men' / o^{r} it will no*ch*^{t} be weill

ȝet ad*er* to do as aferis to tham' / o^{r} lat it be

tha mecht nev*er* getin' sa gud ane tym' / p*ar*don'

me y*a*^{t} writt*is* sa hamly to ȝo*u*^{r} grac for In' /

gud feth it cu*m*is of ane gud hart ~~yis~~[54] as than' c[55]

y*a*^{t} loif*is* bath ye hono*u*^{r} of scotland & frans ford*er*

god keip ȝo*u*^{r} grace writin' of hom' ye

ix day of merch be ȝo*u*^{r} gracis s*er*vetor

[significant space][56]

[signature, autograph hand]

Marianl*ady*hom*e*

[significant space][57]

[54] The word *yis* has been scored out but remains legible.

[55] This <c> graph appears to be a scribal error, rather than evidence that the end of the last word on the line has been lost.

[56] The significant space between the subscription and the signature is around an inch wide.

[57] The significant space beneath the signature is around 2 inches wide.

Letter 205 {*1548-9*}

[superscription, autograph hand][58] [**f205v**]

To ye quenis grace

[flourish]

[letter text, autograph hand][59] [**f205r**]

Madem*m*[60] I co*m*mend[61] my hartly s*er*ves to ȝou*r* grace

s*er*tifying ȝ*ou*r grace y*a*^{t} ye hors me*n* of ther partt*is* of

Ingland y*a*^{t} wes at hatington' past by yis plas on'

tysday and it Is said be part of Inglis me*n* had

ye franch me*n* In dombar beyn' / half parte totham'[62]

thar had few Inglis me*n* past away / I exort ȝ*ou*r

grace to causs ye french me*n* y*a*^{t} sold cu*m* heir to yis

plas of hom' / to be heir wy^{t}*h* delygens / & y*a*^{t} tha

be honyt[63] me*n* y*a*^{t} will anser of ther lyf & honn*ou*^{r}

to ye king*is* henes of franc & ȝ*ou*^{r} grace / and

y*a*^{t} tha breng na man wy^{t}*h* tham to be thar sudar*is*

& s*er*vetor*is* / bot q*uhi*lk is well gifin' / for ȝ*ou*^{r} grace

is knawinof[64] Inglis me*n* / ye mallis tha haf to scott*is*

---

[58] There are three horizontal crease lines visible on the verso; the first and second are dirty, suggesting that the second quadrant formed the outer letter packet. A crease runs diagonally across the first quadrant, beginning towards the right margin of the folio and extending upwards to the upper left corner of the manuscript. At least five vertical fold lines are visible in the various quadrants of the verso; the superscription runs parallel to the right-most vertical fold line in the second quadrant. The remains of three red wax seals are visible: one near the centre of the first quadrant, and one at either margin of the second quadrant. There is evidence of wear or water damage on the left portion of the second horizontal fold line. The paper used is fine, with the letter text visible on the verso.

[59] There is a pencilled foliation number reading <205.> on the bottom left corner of the manuscript. In the bottom right corner, immediately above the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. Three horizontal fold lines are visible on the recto; the first bisects line 7, the second bisects line 17, and the third bisects line 27. There are remnants of red wax in the left margin of the folio, in the second and third quadrants. Five vertical crease marks are visible on the recto.

[60] Appears to be a macron rather than a flourish, as the descender of the <m> is visible below the line.

[61] A small <c> shaped graph appears above *commend* and is transcribed as a macron. This graph also appears above the same word in letters 193 and 201.

[62] Regularised as *to tham.*

[63] Regularised as *honest.*

[64] Regularised as *knawin of.*

└me*n*┘[65] [*illegible: 1 word*] & prenspale to us / & tha well noc*h*^{t} spai

nod*er* for [*illegible: 1 word*] cost nor travell to haf yis plas / &

thar is four of ye french me*n*is s*er*vand*is* y*a*^{t} is now

in yis plas past to Ingland & ane of tham'

toik capeden' nicollayis blak hors vy^{t}*h* hem' &

tha ar in northam / ȝo*u*^{r} grace moun' causs vevaris

to cu*m* vy^{t}*h* ye franch me*n* both of weyn' & flour

& ud*er* nessesares / for thar is lytell to geit In' yis

cu*n*tre / & tha ma sell it agayn' to └ye┘ soudartt*is* / &

brew beir to tham' / & tak up thar wagis thar for

& by in to tham agayn' / sa thay well be well

fornist & ȝo*u*^{r} grace to haf / na te*n*sall / eft*er* y*a*^{t}

ye french me*n* cu*m* to yis plas to Raman' / & ye

c*un*tre brokin' fra all assirans & som' punist for

of fenssis[66] doun / I well cu*m* & speik vy^{t}*h* ȝo*u*^{r} grace

q*uha*^{r} ȝo*u*^{r} grace sall knaw all thing*is* c*onser*nin' yis c*un*tre

& god presyrv ȝo*u*^{r} grac of hom' ye xx^{ti} day of march

be ȝo*u*^{r} gracis s*er*vatou^{r} at c*om*mand

[significant space][67]

[signature, autograph hand]

Maryonl*ady*hom*e*

[postscript, autograph hand][68]

ȝo*u*r grace moun' send in

french me*n* & spaingȝat*is* thar

[65] The word *men* is a scribal addition inserted in the margin.
[66] Regularised as *offenssis*.
[67] The significant space is small, less than an inch, as the writer has utilised as much of the folio as possible.
[68] This postscript continues on from the main letter text, filling the left margin of the recto beside Lady Home's signature. The text of the postscript is unclear, and thus its transcription is conjecture, rather than being definitive.

vagis ȝo*ur* grace wall xuty

tham & ye ma*n* wa^{s} tiend

Letter 206 {*1549*}

[superscription, autograph hand][69] [**f206v**]

To ye quenis grace

[flourish]

[letter text, autograph hand][70] [**f206r**]

Madem*m*[71] I co*m*mend[72] my hartly s*er*vis to ȝo*u*r grace

plis ȝo*u*r grace y*a*^{t} ye Inglis men / is marweliss

dysplessit / of yis last carmiss y*a*^{t} my son' / our

threw tham / & tha wellien' co*n*tant / and dystrow

all yis c*un*tre / q*uhar*[73] for I pra ȝo*u*r grace causs ye

leut*en*and vy^{t}*h* ye garissonis to sped tham our als

sua I be seik[74] ȝo*u*r grace / to be gud prenssis

to ye spang3artt*is* & lat tham cu*m* agayn' for

tha do lyk noble me*n* / & als suay / ye mour

he is als scharp ane man as Ryd*is* / beseking

ȝo*u*r grace to be gud prenssis un to him / I

wald ȝo*u*r grace caussit ye franch me*n* to cu*m* to yis

plas thar is not xxx In to it / & tha ar our

few quham / ye scott*is* me*n* Rid*is* forth / & gar

---

[69] There are three horizontal fold lines visible on the verso, the first two of which are dirty. Six vertical fold lines are visible on the manuscript; only two of these creases are dirty and distinct, suggesting that the letter had been folded in several different ways throughout its transmission. The superscription is in the centre of the second quadrant, running parallel with the distinct vertical crease in the right portion of the manuscript. There are the remains of two red wax seals in the first quadrant, one in the centre and one close to the right margin; and two more in the second quadrant, one on the left of the superscription and one beside the flourish.

[70] There is a pencilled foliation number reading <206.> in the upper right corner above the text. Immediately below the signature in the significant space there is a Register House archival stamp. Three horizontal crease marks visible on the recto; the first bisecting lines 7 and 8, the second bisecting line 18, and the third directly beneath the signature. There are six vertical fold lines faintly visible on the recto, suggesting that the letter had, at one time during its transmission, been folded very small. There are the remains of two red wax seals in the left margin of the folio, one in the second quadrant and one in the third. Towards the right margin of the second quadrant, a stain is apparent, and there are blotted spots of black ink beneath the signature.

[71] Appears to be a macron rather than a flourish, as the descender of the <m> is visible below the line.

[72] Lady Home utilises her habitual <c> shaped graph above *commend*, which also occurs in letters 193, 201, and 205.

[73] *Quhar* is abbreviated with a macron over the <q>.

[74] Regularised as *beseik*.

vev*ar*is cu*m* to tham / fo^{r}d*er* as accuris I sall adv*er*ttis
ȝo*u*r grace / ye spangȝatt*is* is awa*n*d bath mony
y*a*^{t} I caussit me*n* len' / tham / & als to ye pur
wyf*is* in yis toun for ther expenssis / & ye franch
me*n* / in lyk man*er* to ye wyf*is* y*a*^{t} ye pur folk*is* ma
furneis na mar / vy^{t}*h* out tha geit payment
as ȝo*u*r grace ma well consider / I dout no*ch*^{t} bot
ȝo*u*r grace well causs all to be payit & ye
et*er*nall god pry*ser*w ȝo*u*r grace wrytin' of hom' ye
xxviij day of march be ȝo*u*r gracis humell s*er*veto*u*^{r}

[significant space][75]

[signature, autograph hand]

Maryonl*ady*hom

[significant space][76]

[75] The significant space between the subscription and signature is small, around an inch wide.
[76] The significant space beneath the signature is larger, approximately 3 inches wide.

Letter 232 {*1550*}

[superscription, scribal hand][77] [**f232v.b**][78]

To ye qwenis grace

Drowrare of scotland

[letter text, scribal hand][79] [**f232r**]

Eftir maist humill co*m*mendatioun*n* of s*er*uice vnto ȝo*u*^{r} grace Pleis ye samin

ȝo*u*^{r} grace being reme*m*berit how oft tymes I spak for ye relief of my husband

yat I and his bairnis my*ch*^{t} haif ane lyfe and my spous to s*er*ue ye king of

france and ȝo*u*^{r} grace as his ˩o*u*^{r}˥ sou*er*anis maist derest moder / and now sen*n* ȝoure

graces depairting of scotland my said spous is deliuerit in my lord ambassato*u*^{r}*is*

and lieute*n*nent*is* keping In ye castell of blaknes quhair ȝo*u*^{r} grace may mak me and

my bairnis to haif support be releving of my said spous Beseiking ȝo*u*^{r} grace for

merite of god and ye s*er*uice yat his blude and myne may do That ȝo*u*^{r} grace

wilbe gratious quene and lady to him at yis tyme / owthir tobe relevit undir quhat

plegeis and conditionis ȝo*u*^{r} grace will think expedient and to remane in scotland

Or tobe relevit and cum in france to s*er*ue as ye king*is* maiestie and ȝo*u*^{r} grace

will gif co*m*mand ffor we ar aluterly heryit in tymes bigane as ȝo*u*^{r} grace

knawis ane pairt y*er*of / I neid no*ch*^{t} truble ȝo*u*^{r} grace wi^{t}*h* lang lettir for all

---

[77] There are five horizontal lines visible on the folio, with the first crease being very close to the second, and the fourth crease being very close to the fifth. There are three vertical fold lines visible, splitting the folio into four vertical segments. The superscription is located in the second quadrant, in the second leftmost segment, parallel to the central vertical fold line; and the hand is small, neat, and calligraphic. There is the remains of a defined red wax seal on the rightmost segment of the second quadrant, near to the right edge of the folio. There are eight small horizontal slits, 4 on each margin of the manuscript; one per quadrant. Staining is visible along the central vertical crease line, and the second quadrant is very dirty.

[78] The letter packet is a separate folio to that of the main letter text, rather than being on the verso of letter 232. The two folios are bound consecutively in SP2/3, with the letter text preceding the letter packet—indicated in the metadata. F232v.b has the same staining pattern as f232r, suggesting that the documents were stored together when the damage occurred.

[79] There is a pencilled foliation number reading <232.> in the left margin of the significant space; and flecks of ink in the significant space. Immediately to the right of the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. In the left margin of the recto, next to line 5 of the main letter text, is a pencilled mark which may read “lo” or “la”, abbreviations for *lordship* or *ladyship* respectively. There are five horizontal crease lines visible; the first bisects lines 1 and 2, the second bisects lines 7 and 8, the third is beneath line 19, and the fourth and fifth occur in the significant space. There are three visible vertical crease lines. 8 small horizontal slits are visible on the recto, 4 in each margin; on the verso of this folio, small dots have been inked to indicate where these slits should be made on the document.

ye mater hes bene saoft[80] reheirsit yat ȝe knaw ye samin and now w*i*^{t}*h*out ȝo*u*^{r}
help I and my bairnis wilbe heryit and distroyit be pouirte for euir
Quhilk ȝo*u*^{r} grace pleis help and o*u*^{r} prayeris and s*er*uice salbe euir to ȝo*u*^{r} grace
as knawis god Quha pres*er*ue ȝo*u*^{r} grace in lang lyfe and[81] prosperous estait
w*i*^{t}*h* ye / hevin at ȝo*u*^{r} depairting Writting of edinbru*ch*^{t} ye xviij day of No[82]
vember Be

[significant space][83]

[subscription, scribal hand]

ȝo*u*^{r} graces maist humill s*er*uant

[signature, autograph hand][84]

marion lady gray

[80] Regularised as *sa oft*.
[81] The <d> of *and* is blotted.
[82] A small mark appears at the end of line 18, which is likely to be an abbreviation mark or hyphen, indicating that the word *November* is continued onto the next line.
[83] The significant space between the main letter text and the subscription and signature is large in proportion to the folio, approximately 5 inches wide.
[84] The signature is autograph and utilises a much more open and sprawling hand than the rest of the manuscript.

Letter 251 {*1553-4*}

[superscription, scribal hand][85] [**f251v**]

To the Quenys grace

[flourish]

[letter text, scribal hand][86] [**f251r**]

Madame[87] eftir mast humyll co*m*mendatioun of s*er*uice, empleiss
3our grace be aduertisit I haif tareit heir thir aucht[88] days
bipast in houp of 3our cu*m*yng to this towne awating yaireupone
to haif spoking 3ou^{r} grace at lenth in all my necessar besinesss
ffor my suyr traist & asperance is onelie in 3our grace aboue ye
all uy*er*is of this realme I and I wy^{t}*h* all ffrend*is* p*er*tening me
salbe[89] 3our trew s*er*uito*u*^{r}*is* in all sic behalf*is* as 3e pleiss co*m*mand
ws. besekand 3our grace to send me aduertisme*n*t gif 3e intend
to be heir schortlie or no*ch*^{t} ffor I will await 3it ferder vpone
3our cu*m*yng. I haif co*m*mittit su*m* part of my mynd be toung to my
broder the berar heirof quhairto pleiss 3our grace geif credit
And god almy*ch*^{t}ing preserve 3our grace eternalie. Off
Edinburgh ye xxviij of Januar 1553 be 3our oratrix

[significant space][90]

[85] There are three horizontal crease lines visible on the verso, and two distinct vertical crease lines. The superscription is located in the second quadrant, parallel with the leftmost vertical crease. Cameron believes the superscription and letter text to be written in the same scribal hand, which is very neat and calligraphic, and only the signature to be autograph. There are 8 large vertical slits, 4 on each margin of the manuscript. In the right margin of the second quadrant, there is the faint remains of a red wax seal which is bisected by one of the vertical slits.

[86] There is a pencilled foliation number in the left margin of the significant space above the signature, reading <251.>. Immediately to the left of the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. Three horizontal crease lines are visible on the recto; the first is between lines 7 and 8, and the second and third are found in the significant space. Eight vertical crease lines are faintly visible, suggesting that the letter was folded into a very small letter packet for delivery. 8 large vertical slits are visible, 4 on each margin; three of those in the right margin obstruct the text.

[87] The <m> of *Madame* is an ornamental, two-line letter.

[88] There is a <v> grapheme above the word *aucht*, meaning eight, which may be a macron or obsolete tilde.

[89] Water damage in the left margin has caused minor smudging to the first word of lines 7, 8, and 9.

[90] The significant space is very large in proportion to the folio, approximately 5 inches wide.

[signature, autograph hand][91]

Janat betoun lady

of bwkclwtht

[91] The signature is autograph, and the hand is more angular and upright than that of the letter text. However, there are similarities between the letter form <b> used in the letter text and signature.

Letter 262 {*1554?*}

[superscription, autograph hand][92] [**f262v**]

To the Quenis

grace

[flourish]

[letter text, autograph hand][93] [**f262r**]

Madam*m*e eftyr maist hwmyll c*om*me*n*datione w*i*^{t}*h* serveis and prayarris ȝo*u*^{r} grace plaiswit[94] y*a*^{t} no*ch*^{t}w*i*^{t}*h*stending ye p*ro*missis my lord my husband maid to ȝo*u*^{r} grace y*a*^{t} I In all behalffis suld be wssit and traittit as his wyff and according to my facultye he neu*er*yeles at yis tyme Is far chengit frome y*a*^{t} purpoiss and frome ye keping of his said p*ro*missis // he hes laid to my charge and desyrit me to refar me to freind*is* twiching ye modefeing of my sustentatione / I was contentit y*a*^{t} he suld wissye[95] counsall of his awin freynd*is* as he thocht best / bot as for my pairt I wald refar y*a*^{t} matt*er* to nane udyr bot to ȝo*u*^{r} grace and sen syne he hes requyrit me na fordyr And gyff he co*n*tinew in ye sa*m*my*n* mynd he Is In on forss I man cu*m* and tak my sustentatione of ȝo*u*^{r} grace quhyll ȝo*u*^{r} grace p*ro*vide su*m* way y*a*^{t} I may have my honest leving q*uhi*lk being p*ro*vidit co*n*sidderand my lord is nodyr desyrus nor co*n*tentit w*i*^{t}*h* my co*m*panye I will cu*m* and spend the sa*m*my*n* in ȝo*u*^{r} gracis serveiss Atto*u*^{r} yis wednisday I hai [*damage*: f spo]kin[96] w*i*^{t}*h* my lord quhay hes declarit his mynd to me sayand y*a*^{t} he can [*damage*: in n]a way

[92] There are five horizontal crease lines visible on the verso, with the first and last of these occurring close to the top and bottom edges of the folio. There are seven vertical crease lines, with only the central line being distinct. The superscription is in the third segment, on the right portion of the folio, running parallel to the central fold line. There are 7 small horizontal slits visible; 4 in the right margin and 3 in the left margin. In the left portion of the third segment, there is a large patch— repairing a tear possibly caused by the horizontal slit. A water mark extends down the left side of segments two and three.

[93] There are two pencilled foliation numbers located in the left margin of the significant space, written in two separate hands, both reading <262>. Immediately to the left of the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. Water damage has stained the right side of segments two and three. The main letter text extends to the right margin of the folio. Five horizontal crease lines are visible; the first is between lines 2 and 3, the second bisects line 8, the third bisects line 19, and the last two are found in the significant space. There are seven vertical crease lines, suggesting that the letter was folded into a small packet for delivery. 7 small horizontal slit marks are visible. The hand used throughout the manuscript is small and calligraphic.

[94] Regularised as *plais wit*.

[95] Regularised as *wis ye*.

[96] A small tear in the right side of the folio has rendered the third last word of line 13 illegible and obscured the second last word of line 14. This tear has been patched on the verso.

stand co*n*tent w*i*^{t}*h* me allegand me to be p*ar*ticipant and fortefiar of ȝour brokin men q*uhi*lk maid ye spoilze vpone his gudd*is* / It may be weill knawin y*a*^{t} I wald desyr na skay^{t}*h* nodyr nodyr[97] to hy*m* me nor my bernis seing y*a*^{t} his skay^{t}*h* is bay^{t}*h* myne & my b*er*nis als weill as his Swa I I[98] have na refuge bot vnto ȝo*u*^{r} g ⌊r⌋ace And w*i*^{t}*h*out ȝo*u*^{r} grace put su*m* remade to yis besenes I p*er*saue na wdyr thing bot ye wtt*er* co*n*fusione of his hous me and my bernis And as to ye furnissing of me ye maist*er* my sone will schaw ȝo*u*^{r} grace of y*a*^{t} & all wdyr my affairris to quhome ȝo*u*^{r} grace plaiss gyff crydens Besekand ȝo*u*^{r} gud grace to adu*er*teiss me w*i*^{t}*h* my said sone quhat ȝo*u*^{r} grace thinkis best y*a*^{t} I do in all behalf*is* And ye lord god haiff ȝo*u*^{r} gude grace evir in his twischione & keping.
At per*t*ht ye xiiij day of november be ȝo*u*^{r} gracis hu*m*ble servitrice at co*m*mand and powar

[significant space][99]

[signature, autograph hand]

Margaret cowntess of Erroll.

[97] Dittography.
[98] Dittography.
[99] The significant space is around 3 inches wide, proportionate to the remaining space on the folio.

Letter 290 {*1547*}[100]

[superscription, autograph hand][101] [**f290v**]

To ye quenis graice

[flourish]

[letter text, autograph hand][102] [**f290r**]

Eftir mast hartlie c*om*m*en*dacoun of my humylle s*er*uice on to 3ou[r]

graice pleyss ye sami*n* be reme*m*brit on ye twa hundretht crovnis

I lent 3o*u*[r] graice y[a]t I may heff yam now againe in my mistir

and war w*i*[t]*h* It stand*is* me on meid I wald no*ch*[t] tharfor 3o*u*[r] g*raice*[103]

quhill 3e pleissit bot my s*er*uand ye p*er*svn[104] schew me 3our

3o*u*[r][105] graice was weill[106] rememorit and schew him in ane p*er*t

y*air*of and it vill pleiss 3o*u*[r] graice deliu*er* yam to ye berar

for ye steid and s*er*uice yat I my*ch*[t] or may do w*o*rs I sall be eu*er*

at 3o*u*[r] g*raicis* c*om*mand w*i*[t]*h* help of god quhai heff 3o*u*[r] g*raice* in his et*er*[107]

nall keping of kincardune ye vj day of m*er*che be 3our

---

[100] Cameron gives the date as 1547 or earlier.

[101] The manuscript is small— measuring about 5 inches in length, it is approximately one third the length of the average folio in this corpus. The compact size of the document may be due to a scarcity in resources or suggest that the sender is frugal with her writing materials. One horizontal crease line and two vertical crease lines are visible on the verso, dividing the folio into three vertical sections. The superscription is located in the central section, in the lower half of the folio, parallel with the horizontal fold line. There is the remains of a red wax seal, around the size of a ten pence piece, in the left margin above the superscription, bisected by a closing slit. The central segment of the verso is dirty, indicating that this formed the outer letter packet, and there is a small patch at the bottom of the right vertical crease, where the fold line has caused deterioration. There are 6 small vertical slits visible on the verso, 3 at the top and the bottom edges of the folio, which would have been used in conjunction with the wax seal to fasten the letter closed. The paper used is very fine, with the letter text and signature partially visible on the verso.

[102] There is a pencilled foliation number reading <290.> in the bottom left corner of the manuscript, in the significant space. Immediately to the left of the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. One horizontal fold line is visible on the recto, between lines 9 and 10. Two vertical fold lines are visible on the recto, dividing the manuscript into three. There is deterioration at the bottom of the left vertical fold line, which has been patched. Three small vertical slits are visible along the top margin of the manuscript, with the leftmost slit bisecting the <e> of *Eftir*. The hand used is neat and calligraphic and appears to have been utilised throughout the document.

[103] The scribe uses a calligraphic abbreviation, <gs> which is transcribed as *gracis*. This form is also used in lines 9 and 11.

[104] Regularised as *parson*.

[105] Dittography.

[106] Scribal error, looks like wetll due to serifs of double l.

[107] <g> shaped abbreviation mark or ligature jointed to the ascender of the <t>, which has been expanded to *eternall*.

g*raicis* humille s*er*vitrice at hir wt*er* powar

[significant space][108]

[signature, autograph hand]

Comitace of montross EM[109]

[108] The significant space is small, around 2 inches wide, but proportionate to the manuscript.
[109] There is a calligraphic flourish to the right of the signature that appears to read *EM*.

Letter 293 {*1550*}[110]

[superscription, scribal hand][111] [**f293v**]

To the Queneis grace

[letter text, scribal hand][112] [**f293r**]

Madam efter maist hertlie and hu*m*mill co*m*mandatioun'[113] of service I haif
resavit ane writting fra ȝow^r grace ye third day of yis Instant
moneyth of Iuly makeand mensioun' y*a*^t Iohne ottirburne of ye ryd hall
hes said y*a*^t he hes ye landis of monynettis in herytege his fait*her*[114] and
he hes had yame in lang possessioun' / trowth it is my lord my husba*n*d
set y*a*^t steiding to his fait*her* to haif doun' him se*r*tane profeitis and plesur
q*uhi*lk wes no*ch*^t ȝit doun' as ȝow^r grace sall knaw at mair lenth q*uhi*lk
quhair he sayis y*a*^t I alege y*a*^t his te*n*nandis hes rewin ye cowmoun
of thormetown' it is na alegeance bot in werray deid y*a*^t he hes tane
in in[115] s*e*werall to him self in corne and gyrss near twa myle of
eird and yis said cowmoun' partenis to the lard of Inn*er*weik and
ye lordschip of feirstoun' and me and I desyrit ye te*n*nandis yir twa
ȝeir bypast[116] to desyst fra brekin of ye ground and yai promeist y*a*^t

[110] Cameron gives the date as after 1550.
[111] There are four horizontal fold lines visible on the verso; the first and second creases are very close together, with the first of these crumpling the folio at an angle. Five vertical fold lines are visible in the second quadrant, dividing the folio into three sections; the two leftmost creases are very close together, as are the two centremost creases. There are also several creases in the first quadrant— the overall impression from these fold lines is that the letter may have been folded hastily, or perhaps refolded several times throughout its transmission. The superscription, written in a calligraphic scribal hand, is located in the upper part of the second quadrant and is bisected by the two centremost vertical fold lines. There is the remains of a red wax seal, around the size of a ten pence piece, to the right of the superscription. There are patches of fading along the third vertical fold line and in the upper right margin which may be caused by water damage. The paper used is fine, with the letter text visible on the verso.
[112] There is a pencilled foliation number reading <293> in the left margin of the manuscript in the significant space between the letter text and the signature. Immediately to the left of the signature, there is a Register House archival stamp. There are four horizontal fold lines visible on the recto; the first is between lines 9 and 10, the second between lines 20 and 21, and the third and fourth in the significant space. Five unevenly spaced vertical fold lines are visible on the recto.
[113] The scribe uses a flourish throughout the main letter text, as Marion Haliburton does in her autograph letters.
[114] The final grapheme used by the scribe in this abbreviation is unclear. I have interpreted it as <ther>, but equally it may represent <der>. This word is abbreviated in the same fashion in line 6.
[115] Dittography.
[116] Regularised as *by past*.

yai sould proseid na for*th*y*er* / no*ch*^{t}wi^{t}*h*standing yai haif me*n*nurit q*uhi*lk is
contrare ressoun' and gud que*n*tuence / and quhair he sayis y*a*^{t} I
Intend to make co*n*wocatioun' of o*u*^{r} sou*er*ane ladyis legeis wi^{t}*h* yair
catell and hors to eit and distroy ye corneis / trewlie I nev*er* I*n*tendit
sic ane thing / howbeit y*a*^{t} it my*ch*^{t} be doun' of rasone / I traist in ȝow^{r}
grace y*a*^{t} ȝe will causs me haif Iustyce quhe*n*su*m*eu*er* y*a*^{t} I will
co*m*plene of him or of ony wy*ther*is and I sall neue*r* make occacioun' of
ony Inobedyence to ȝow^{r} graceis awthorate bot sall be glad to
set it furth alss far as is in my possabelyte / ye tennandis of Iohne
otterburneis tuke in yis land in ye tyme of ye Inglismen quhe*n* yai
war assurit and did me mekall mair skay^{t}*h* he and his frendis in y*a*^{t}
tyme as ȝow^{r} grace sall knaw at mair lenth yai haif bay^{t}*h* maid me
ye falt and ye fyrst plent I neu*er* maid faill to na creatuar nor neu*er*
sall wi^{t}*h* ye grace of god quha mot presere ȝow^{r} grace in saule
and body writtin of thornetoun' ye fyft of July be ȝow^{r} graceis
hu*m*mill obedyent se*r*vitor[117]

[significant space][118]

[signature, autograph hand]

maryonl*ady*hom

[117] There is no space between the end of the main letter text and the subscription.
[118] The significant space between the main letter text and signature is fairly large in proportion to the letter text, around 3 ½ inches wide.

Chapter Three: Analysing the Corpus

1. Introduction

This chapter introduces the letter-writing conventions of the sixteenth century, and analyses whether the 15 letters of the corpus conform with or diverge from these practices, and how the 9 letter-writers use these standards to navigate the hierarchical relationship between themselves and their recipient, Mary of Guise. Next, the norms of women's letter-writing practices are discussed and compared to the corpus to see if these letters align with gendered letter-writing conventions. A brief discussion of the development and the lexical, orthographic, and syntactic features of Older Scots then provides context for the analysis of Scots features within the corpus. Material, pragmatic, thematic, and lexical patterns and variations are identified across the corpus as a whole. This is followed by biographies of each of the 9 correspondents, to contextualise the content of their letters, and to illustrate the social network that they all operate within, as female members of the Scottish nobility in the sixteenth century. Social network analysis of the 9 correspondents is performed, using two scales based on Leitner's work (as discussed in chapter one, pages 11 and 13), to understand the social distance separating the senders and the extent of the hierarchical relationship between the letter-writers and Mary of Guise, which the correspondents are attempting to encode in their written communication.

2. The Ars Dictaminis

The *ars dictaminis*, also known as "the art of letter writing", was the predominant method of composing letters in medieval Europe, from its beginnings in the eleventh century through to the expansion of humanism in the fifteenth century (Witt, 1982: 2). The *ars dictaminis* was a structured and formulaic rhetorical model which divided the letter into several distinct sections— although the exact number of sections described varied from scholar to scholar (Witt, 1982: 10-11). The earliest extant text on the *ars dictaminis* is *flores rhetorici*, written by the Benedictine monk Alberic or Alberico (Witt, 1982: 8) of Monte Cassino some time in the late eleventh century. Alberic divides the letter into five sections: the *salutatio*, the *exordium*, the *narratio*, the *argumentatio* or *petitio*, and the *conclusio* (Witt, 1982: 8). Each of the final four divisions, drawn from part of the much earlier Ciceronian model of oration (Hubbell, 1949: 41), are discussed briefly by Alberic. However, the opening section of the letter known as the *salutatio* is a newer creation that does not stem from Cicero's model and appears to have been coined by Alberic. In a later work, *breviarium de dictamine*, Alberic expands on the notion of the *salutatio* and presents the reader with examples of salutations (Perelman, 2004: 105). Salutations continue to be a major focus of later treatises and manuals on *ars dictaminis* (Witt, 1982: 6)— including in Adalbertus Samaritanus' 1115 *precepta dictaminum* (Perelman, 2004: 105) and in Lawrence of Aquiliegia's text *practica sive usus dictaminis*, circa 1300 (Perelman, 2004: 113-114).

As just discussed, the *ars dictaminis* is based, in part, on much earlier classical oratorial traditions described in manuals such as *de inventione*, composed by the Roman scholar Cicero, and the unattributed text *rhetorica ad herennium* (Witt, 1982: 6). In the medieval period, texts were frequently read aloud, with this practice extending to letters, especially those concerning public or official matters. In the context of this practice, the division between written and spoken communication was less distinct (Witt, 1982: 6), and there is a clear logic for modelling the structure of letters, which would be read aloud, on formal classical oratory rhetoric. The likening of letters to

oration is clear in Alberic's works, in which examples are drawn from the speeches of the Roman historian, Sallust (Witt, 1982: 9). However, it is clear that scholars and teachers of the *ars dictaminis* did not view letter writing and oration as being identical— Alberic does not include Cicero's *divisio*, *confirmatio*, or *confutatio* as separate, distinct sections of the *ars dictaminis* (Gutiérrez Arranz and Sola Buil, 1998: 1); and the strong focus on salutations is specific to the *ars dictaminis*.

In addition to its basis in classical oratory rhetoric, Perelman suggests that the *ars dictaminis* developed from earlier prototype letters commonly utilised around the seventh century that consisted of formulaic statements that could be amended to suit individual situations (Perelman, 2004: 99). Perelman argues that as medieval European society became more bureaucratic and literate, letters begun to be utilised in a broader and more complex range of commercial, political, and administrative functions over the course of the early medieval period. As a result of this expansion and consolidation of government, these template letters became less suited to fulfilling their original purpose and grew to be obsolete, replaced by the adaptable, multifunctional standard of the *ars dictaminis* (Perelman, 2004: 99).

While scholars have previously disagreed on the precise origins and creators of the *ars dictaminis*— with Franz-Josef Schmale suggesting that Adalbertus, rather than Alberic, was the originator of the genre— it seems likely that the *ars dictaminis* did not arise as the work of one single author writing in isolation in the early medieval period, but as a continuation of an established European tradition, as was argued by William Patt in "The Early *Ars dictaminis* as Response to a Changing Society" (1978, cited Perelman, 2004: 100).

The *ars dictaminis* did not distinguish between formal public letters and informal private ones, with the same formulaic approach also being applied to more intimate letters (Witt, 1982: 8). While the rigid structure of the *ars dictaminis* was well suited to formal, official letters that were often aimed at social superiors, its use in more private, personal communication between friends and family is described by James Daybell as "impeding emotional content and personality" (Daybell, 2009: 188). Conventions of the *ars dictaminis* centred on efficiency, brevity, and persuasiveness, with the prescriptive divisions of the letter discouraging tangents that did not "serve the central object of the composition" (Witt, 1982: 12). This style of composition was not intended to relay gossip, to converse, or to reflect— rather, it was intended as rhetoric to argue or to convince an audience of a specific point, much as Cicero's oratorial manual had been centuries previously. Similarly, the meticulous attention paid to salutations and forms of address dissuaded informality and served to delineate divisions in social hierarchy (Daybell, 2012: 64), meaning that any deviation from the standard "provoked social anxiety" (Daybell, 2009: 186).

While the *ars dictaminis* was taught in late medieval cathedral and monastery schools, and in universities throughout Europe (Daybell, 2012: 63-64), its use had begun to decline by the early fifteenth century, narrowing to the subgenre of diplomatic letters (Witt, 1982: 3). Given the incompatibility of the *ars dictaminis* with informal, intimate communication, it is unsurprising that the notion of letter-writing began to be reinterpreted by humanist scholars in the later Middle Ages. Central to this change in the conventions of letter-writing was Petrarch's discovery of Cicero's 'familiar' letters— defined by Erasmus as letters narrating events, telling of public or private news, complaining or congratulating, and offering advice (Daybell, 2006: 18)— to correspondents including Atticus and Brutus in 1345 (Stewart and Wolfe, 2004: 21). The discovery of these letters inspired Petrarch to establish a new critical theory of letter-writing and to publish a collection of his letters, *epistolae ad familiares*, in 1392 (Daybell, 2012: 64). The Dutch scholar Desiderius Erasmus created his treatise *de conscribendis epistolis* on the art of letter-writing, published as a whole in 1522 (Stewart and Wolfe, 2004: 22), in which he defined a familiar letter as making absent people

present, “as if you were whispering in a corner with a dear friend” (Jardine, 2015: 151). This new conception of familiar letter-writing as established by Petrarch and Erasmus began to replace the *ars dictaminis*, centring as it did on the concept of familiar speech that “hardly differed from the speech of everyday conversation” (Stewart and Wolfe, 2004: 21). Other Latin texts on letter writing proliferated in this period, such as Juan Luis Vives’ 1534 *de conscribendis epistolis*, and Christoph Hegendorph’s 1526 work *methodus epistolis conscribendi* (Stewart and Wolfe, 2004: 22).

The art of letter writing continued to evolve throughout the early modern period, with manuals being written in the vernacular as well as in Latin. The first manual to be published in English was William Fulwood’s 1568 *The Enimie of Idlenesse*, although it was essentially a translation of an earlier French work, *le stile et manière de composer, dicter, et escrire*, published in 1553 (Daybell, 2012: 64). Fulwood’s text explains the various parts of the letter and gives examples— many of which are drawn from the work of Erasmus and other Latin manual writers (Daybell, 2012: 64). Abraham Fleming’s 1576 *A Panoplie of Espistles* is similarly unoriginal, being heavily based on an earlier Latin work, with examples from classic writers including Seneca and Cicero (Daybell, 2012: 65).

Angel Day’s 1586 *The English Secretarie* was the first English text to provide unique examples of letter formulas, explain the parts of the letter, and to focus on instructing the reader (Stewart and Wolfe, 2004: 23). The revolutionary nature of Day’s work is evident in its numerous reprints between 1592 and 1635 (Daybell, 2012: 65). During the early modern period, manuals aimed at different areas of society began to be published: *The Treasure of the City of Ladies*, written by Christine de Pisan around 1405, and last published in 1536, provides models for female writers for various situations (Daybell, 2009: 186), and the 1589 text *The Marchants Avizo* by John Browne is aimed at young merchants (Daybell, 2012: 67).

Daybell suggests that Petrarch’s discovery of the ‘familiar’ letter, the subsequent development of humanist theories of letter-writing, and the vernacular manuals of the late sixteenth century resulted in a transition from the constrained and formulaic medieval *ars dictaminis* to a new, flexible style of letter-writing (Daybell, 2012: 65-66). However, it seems impossible to regard the two schools of letter-writing as entirely distinct— as this piece demonstrates, they are cousins in the same tradition. While the *ars dictaminis* recedes after the development of humanist theories of letter-writing, much of its formulae and divisions are still evident within later texts, including Day’s *The English Secretarie*. On whether there really is a divisible point between the two traditions, Malcolm Richardson’s summation that “If we define the *ars dictaminis* in terms of specific epistolary practices, including a five-part structure or formulaic language… then the English royal administration already employed the *ars dictaminis* in Anglo-Saxon times and continued to do so until the eighteenth century” (Camargo, 2001: 136-137) suggests that it may be impossible to say exactly when the tradition of the *ars dictaminis* begun and ended.

3. Ars Dictaminis within the Corpus

While the *ars dictaminis* was beginning to wane in popularity in the sixteenth century due to the trend of humanism sweeping the continent (Daybell, 2006:25), elements of the *ars dictaminis* are evident in all 15 letters of the corpus. The *salutatio*, which Camargo states identifies the writer and recipient of the letter and delineates their hierarchical relationship (Camargo, 2022), occurs in all 15 letters. Within this correspondence, Mary of Guise’s position of social superiority is always indicated in the superscription, where she is invariably addressed as “ye quenis grace”; and modified by the

title “Drowrare of Scotland” on one occasion, in letter 232. In every instance within the corpus, the first line of the letter text establishes the writer’s position in relation to Mary of Guise, situating the correspondent as her servant through the phrase “I commend my hartly seruice to ȝour grace”. While this opening phrase varies slightly across the correspondence— with some writers using “humble” rather than “hartly” (a Scots word meaning “sincere”), or modifying the statement with an invocation to God, as in letters 116 and 262— its repetition indicates that it is an established salutatory formula. It is unsurprising that the *salutatio* occurs consistently across the corpus, as its popularity and importance is emphasised in letter-writing manuals throughout medieval and early modern period (Witt, 1982: 6).

The *exordium*, defined as a statement designed to gain the recipient’s favour prior to the primary message of the letter (Camargo, 2022), is less common within the corpus. Letter 96 expresses thanks for Mary of Guise’s “guid mynd and deid”; and letter 232 states a desire for the writer’s husband to “serue ye king of france and ȝour grace”. The remaining 13 letters tend to follow the *salutatio* with either a statement that the writer has received a letter from Mary, or a brief summary introducing the letter’s subject matter. This interpretation of the *exordium* is not intended as a means of gaining favour, but it aligns with Camargo’s suggestion that the *exordium* functions by relating the letter’s request to “a general truth” (Camargo, 2022).

The *narratio* describes the topic of the letter to the recipient (Camargo, 2022), and occurs in all 15 of the letters. In letters 96, 193, 205, 206, 232, 262, and 293 (amounting to 46.7% of the corpus), the *narratio* is split into several different sections, often interspersed with elements of the *petitio*. It is possible to identify an element of *narratio* within each of the letters and align the correspondence with the structure of the *ars dictaminis*. However, in much of the correspondence, the *narratio* comprises most of the letter and is frequently in a more conversational tone. This narrative portion of the letter could be regarded as being closer to the tradition of the familiar letter, which had begun to be popularised in the early modern period (Schneider, 2005: 37). The familiar letter was used, amongst other purposes, to describe events and voice complaints, and of the 15 letters in the corpus, 13 of them (86.7%) align closely with one of these two functions. Letters 96, 116, 193, 201, 205, 232, 262, and 293 describe the events necessitating the letter in detail, providing Mary of Guise with a wealth of context, usually in a less formal tone. Letters 36, 110, 111, 206, and 290 use the *narratio* section as a vehicle for overt or implicit complaint aimed at Mary of Guise’s actions. In 46.7% of the correspondence, the *narratio* and *petitio* are mingled, possibly indicating that the writers are using a more informal style, associated with the familiar letter (Schneider, 2005: 42), rather than rigidly adhering to the structure of the *ars dictaminis* traditon.

The *petitio* (also known as the *argumentatio*) refers to the writer’s request (Camargo, 2022), which is often the primary purpose of the letter. In the majority of the correspondence, the *petitio* is overt, an explicit performative request, expressed through terms such as “beseik-” (60% of the letters) or “exort” (6.7% of the letters). However, the request or purpose of the letter is less explicit in letter 17, where Elizabeth Keith, the Countess of Huntly, writes to implore Mary of Guise to have faith in her husband’s continued loyalty. Letter 96 does not express an overt request; Elizabeth Campbell, the Countess of Moray, states what actions she has taken to resolve her husband’s debts but does not articulate a request for Mary’s leniency or patience. Letter 193 asks Mary to send support against the English, but Marion Haliburton, Lady Home, phrases her request as an obligation statement: “ȝour grace mon cass gret delygens to be mad for support…”. Letter 290, from Janet Keith, the Countess of Montrose is an instruction that allows no argument, demanding that Mary repay the debt she owes the Countess. Finally, letter 293 is also a request for Mary of Guise to

support Marion Haliburton and cause her "haif Iustyce" in her property dispute against John Ottirbourn.

The *conclusio* is a formal closing statement and utilises a similar structure in all 15 letters of the corpus. Each *conclusio* contains four elements: commending Mary of Guise into God's keeping, stating the writer's location, the date of writing, and expressing that the writer is her humble servant, reinforcing the hierarchical relationship between writer and recipient. Use of phrases such as "god keip ȝour grace" and "god conserve ȝour grace" vary between correspondents— with some letters, such as 232, being very effusive— and variations on several different subscription formulae are utilised, including "ȝouris grace humill seruatrice", "ȝour grac at command and seruice", "be ȝour oratrix", and "ȝour gracis humble servitrice at command and powar". However, as with the *salutatio*, the *conclusio* of all 15 letters features clear repetition of the same four elements, always in the same order, suggesting that this closing formula is an early modern epistolary norm.

Of the 15 items in the corpus, only letters 17 and 251 conform closely with every norm of the *ars dictaminis* structure. Most of the letters utilise a narrative structure that aligns with the conventions of the familiar letter and discuss a range of topics in a tone that is sometimes conversational. However, nor do the 15 letters of the corpus conform entirely with the principles espoused by the familiar letter, featuring only limited overt discussion of emotions (Schneider, 2005: 43). In letter 262 Margaret Robertson describes the deterioration of her marriage and states that her husband "…is nodyr desyrus nor contentit with my companye", and that she was "contentit" for him to seek advice from his friends. In letter 111 Elizabeth Campbell, the Countess of Moray, says "I am weray layth to disobey ony thing…". Marion Haliburton, Lady Home, contributes most of the corpus' discussion of emotion: in letter 201, she states that she "loifis bath ye honour of Scotland & frans", whilst letter 205 describes "… ye mallis tha [Englishmen] haf to scottis men" and letter 206 mentions that the Englishmen are "marweliss dysplessit". However, most letters utilise words such as "humble" and "thankfull" as part of their formulaic phrases, rather than to express true emotion. Much of the corpus focuses on discussions of property, debt, and politics, maintaining a degree of distance and formality, despite the intimate and expressive style of the familiar letter being utilised in a wide range of correspondence, including political diplomacy (Schneider, 2005: 42). Thus, the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise features elements both from the traditions of *ars dictaminis* and the humanist familiar letter and does not conform entirely with the conventions of either of these letter-writing forms.

4. Women and Letter-Writing in the Early Modern Period

In the early modern period, the education of women was generally far more limited than that of their male counterparts. Clarke describes women's learning as being constructed around "marital duty, household economy, and the bringing up of children" (Clarke, 2001: 20)— women, even those belonging to the upper ranks of society, would usually be taught some combination of reading and writing— usually in English, although occasionally noblewomen learned to write in Latin or French (Daybell, 2006: 93)— arithmetic, and needlework (Clarke, 2001: 21). These skills would enable them to manage their homes, read the Bible, and raise their children; in short, women were taught to function within their assigned roles in early modern society. Even with the expansion of humanism in the renaissance period, women were not expected to know how to write skilful and persuasive arguments (Clarke, 2001: 23). While the women that corresponded with Mary of Guise and the contents of their letters demonstrate that women did not necessarily remain within the confines constructed by early modern society— for example, Lady Marion Home recovered Home family

lands and negotiated the release of her son from captivity— the restricted nature of women's education and status in this society had the potential to affect their written communications in a variety of ways.

Handwriting in the early modern period was one aspect of written communication shaped by the differing levels of education between men and women. In the early modern period, highly-educated men were taught to write in secretary script, a style which had emerged in the early 1500s and was used throughout Europe (Simpson, 1973: 14, 15). Secretary script was principally used in business contexts, and was usually only taught to men (Starza Smith, 2013). While the more modern Italic script that spread across Europe in the sixteenth century was utilised by humanist scholars (Simpson, 1973: 17), it was also the primary script taught to women, as it was considered easier to acquire than secretary script (Starza Smith, 2013). Thus, to an early modern reader, the gender of a letter-writer might have been discernible at first glance, purely through the visual features of an autograph letter (Daybell, 2006: 75)— the writer's use of Italic script might indicate that the writer had a lower level of education, and was quite likely to be a woman. Clarke proposes that women's inability to access the standard education available to men in the early modern period meant that women often had much poorer handwriting, even if they were literate (Clarke, 2001: 39)— nonetheless, it was common for both men and women to apologise for their handwriting in this period (Daybell, 2006: 101). Starza Smith suggests that the perception of women having poorer handwriting could be used to the advantage of female letter-writers, to ingratiate themselves with their recipient and establish themselves in a position of vulnerability and inferiority that might encourage the addressee to grant their requests (Starza Smith, 2013).

However, literate women would not necessarily pen their own letters; there were many possible reasons to use a scribe in this period. The act of letter-writing itself was very laborious and time-consuming— the paper had to be cut and the surface prepared for writing upon; the quill-pens were trimmed and sharpened by hand; and the ink was usually produced by the household (Starza Smith, 2013). When writing, the pen would often run out of ink and require refilling; and, once written, the letter had to be folded elaborately, sealed, and addressed.

Scribes might also be used for more formal, official correspondence regarding legal matters— which women, due to a generally poorer quality of education, might have less knowledge of (Williams, 2013). Additionally, scribes were commonly employed when letters were directed at social superiors (Williams, 2013), where writing in one's own hand might have been perceived as being overly-intimate and informal (Starza Smith, 2013). According to Cameron's 1927 analysis of Mary of Guise's letters, 8 of the 15 epistles from female correspondents are autograph, potentially suggesting that the letter-writers perceived the relationship between themselves and the Queen Dowager as relatively informal and equal (Cameron, 1927: 21, 47, 158, 292, 296, 297, 395, 437). Conversely, Daybell posits that female letter-writers might have utilised their own hand when writing to officials with whom they had preestablished political relationships, as a sign of respect towards the recipient (Daybell, 2006: 108). Additionally, using a scribe to write more sensitive, political letters would reduce the privacy of such communications (Daybell, 2006: 108)— and thus letters written in the sender's own hand might serve as an added assurance that the letter was genuine and the writer's intentions were honest (Daybell, 2006: 113).

Certainly, some women would have utilised scribes due to low levels of literacy or a lack of confidence in their writing ability; Daybell posits that "laboured" autograph signatures suggest the women who wrote them were unused to writing (Daybell, 2001: 60), while scribal signatures might indicate women who were entirely unable to sign their names (Starza Smith, 2013). The varied reasons for utilising a scribe, discussed in this paragraph, make it difficult to determine levels of

female literacy in the early modern period, as many women may have used scribes out of convenience rather than necessity. Scribal manuscripts can also pose problems when trying to analyse the idiosyncratic spelling, lexis, syntax, and physical pragmatics of individual letter-writers, as often one cannot definitively ascribe these features to either the person dictating the letter, or the scribe copying it to paper.

As mentioned in the opening paragraph, women's education focused on their ability to competently manage their households. This resulted in a broad range of written communication by women, spanning a variety of topics. The female correspondence of Mary of Guise demonstrates the breadth of responsibilities women shouldered; frequently, these women wrote to the Queen Dowager regarding the financial affairs of themselves and their husbands, the debts they owed, disputes over family lands, the security of their tenants and dependants, and even to vow against accusations of treason (Cameron, 1927: 47, 130, 157, 297). The contents of these letters align with Daybell's statement that correspondence became increasingly essential to women in periods of crisis, personal though the crises represented in that correspondence might be (Daybell, 2006: 35). Although the corpus of Mary of Guise's female Scottish correspondence is very limited, it represents that women's letters covered a vast range of topics rather than being restricted to communications with friends and family on banal topics. Extant letters from the period show women communicating with officials in positions of power, alongside their servants, husbands, and children; with letter-writing increasingly being utilised for a variety of purposes (Daybell, 2006: 35), including requests, complaints, and instructions.

However, gender, education and status once again play a role in the preservation of letters from the period. The majority of extant letters from this period were written by men— Daybell attributes this to higher levels of literacy in men (Daybell, 2006: 36) and the continuing dominance of men in official, public, and legal written communication (Daybell, 2006: 37). A large proportion of surviving written communication by women comprises of letters written by literate, noble women (Daybell, 2006: 37). According to Daybell, around ten percent of known female letter-writers in early modern England were members of the working middle or 'mercantile' class: a stratum of society that is underrepresented in the extant written communications of women (Daybell, 2006: 37). Many of the surviving letters from working women are written by servants, but this correspondence also represents a varied audience, with missives written to their mistresses, family, kinfolk, and husbands (Daybell, 2006: 38, 41). The unequal preservation of epistolary material means that discussing the literacy, letter contents, and recipients of written communications from across the different strata of female society is complex. It is likely that some women in the lower ranks of society were able to read and write, and that they used letters to conduct their business and to maintain social networks (Daybell, 2006: 40)— but letters from women, especially lower-class women, were often preserved in a less intentional manner and thus evidence is limited and must be inferred from contemporary discussions (Daybell, 2006: 38, 41).

Daybell states that there were many conventions governing who it was "appropriate" for women to write to. While many women were engaged in communicating with officials— Bess of Hardwick was particularly prolific, writing to William Cecil Lord Burghley, the Lord High Treasurer; and Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester and a favourite of Queen Elizabeth I (Wiggins, Bryson, Starza Smith, Timmermann and Williams, 2013)— women often felt unable to write to male social superiors; or, if they were unmarried or widowed, to write to men outside their close acquaintance (Daybell, 2006: 42). This reluctance to subvert conventions of communication with men likely accounts for the majority of female written communication being addressed to family or to other women (Daybell, 2006: 40, 42). Daybell suggests that women felt obligated to maintain contact with their nuclear and

extended families (Daybell, 2006: 41), and tended to look to the male members of their families for advice and support in deference to their "social and economic importance" (Daybell, 2006: 43). Although such social conventions may have limited many women's written communication to a small number of 'acceptable' recipients, surviving letters offer insights into the thoughts, lives, and cares of a variety of women across the strata of society in the early modern period; women whose perspectives are often neglected in wider discussions of the renaissance period (Daybell, 2006: 43).

5. Conventions of Women's Letter-Writing within the Corpus

All 15 letters within the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise are written in a combination of italic and secretary script, as is discussed on pages 21 and 22 of chapter two. The proliferation of secretary script letterforms throughout the correspondence including <s>, <r>, <e>, and <c> indicates that all of Mary's female correspondents had, at the very least, a minimal education in secretary script as well as italic, controverting the contemporary belief that secretary script was more suited to the capabilities and purposes of men (Starza Smith, 2013). Secretary script was more laborious to produce, and took more time to master than italic script, thus women were generally taught to write in italic script as contemporary wisdom stated that they lacked the patience required to learn more complex and time-consuming scripts (Dawson and Kennedy-Skipton, 1981: 9, 10). However, while secretary letterforms are present in each of the 9 correspondents' repertoires, the majority of their letterforms are either italic, or neither conclusively one script nor the other. The dominance of the italic or italic-like script within the corpus could be linked to the gendered notions associated with scripts and who should learn/ acquire them in the sixteenth century, as is discussed in the previous section on women's letter-writing conventions. However, given the high social status of most of the correspondents, and the presence of secretary letterforms in their writing, it seems more likely that they utilise the italic-like script as it was more suited to being written quickly whilst remaining legible (Dawson and Kennedy-Skipton, 1981: 9).

It is notable that 8 of the 15 letters (53.3%) are autograph, and 7 of the 15 (46.6%) are scribal, rather than there being a strong trend within the corpus towards either scribal or autograph letters. This pattern is reflected in the writing practices of the 9 correspondents, with 55.5% of the correspondents using their own hand to write to Mary of Guise, and 44.4% of correspondents using a scribe to pen their letters for them. More than half of the writers use their own hand in their written communication to Mary of Guise, suggesting that they might not consider autograph letter-writing a sign of disrespect to their social superior (Starza Smith, 2013), or being indicative of equal social status with their recipient. There are several possible reasons to employ a scribe, including the formality of the communication or status of the recipient, an extent of authorial illiteracy, or authorial illness or infirmity that prevents the writer from undertaking the process of letter-writing themselves. Marion Haliburton wrote four of her five letters in her own hand, and utilised a scribe for her final letter, letter 293. It is likely that her use of a scribe in this instance is linked to the formality of letter 293, which focuses on a land dispute between herself and John Ottirbourn and requests Mary of Guise's intervention in the matter. This hypothesis is supported by her remaining four letters, which are autograph, centre around more immediate political concerns, and use a tone that is much more familiar and informal than letter 293. The use of a scribe is also often linked to poor levels of literacy— although 8 of the 9 correspondents are members of the nobility, with only Katherine Bellenden lacking a title (although she does have strong aristocratic connections), and thus it is likely that all 9 correspondents were fairly well-educated for the period. Use of a scribe might be due to the author's lack of confidence in their literacy, poor handwriting, or insufficient practice— certainly, Elizabeth Campbell, the Countess of Moray, uses a scribe to pen all three of her

letters to Mary of Guise, suggesting that she is unwilling or unable to write letters in their entirety. Letter 110 provides clear evidence for this theory, as the scribe has written an <x> beneath the subscription to indicate where Elizabeth Campbell should write her signature. She is apparently able to sign her own name, as she does in all three of her letters, but the <x> suggests that she may not be literate enough to read the letter herself and deduce where her signature should go. 14 of the 15 letters (93.3%) feature an autograph signature, even if the rest of the letter is scribal. However, letter 116, ostensibly written by the Countess of Atholl, features a signature that Cameron posits belongs to her father John Stewart, the Earl of Atholl (Cameron, 1927: 158). Cameron's theory on the hand responsible for letter 116 is likely to be correct, as the Countess of Atholl would have been a young child between 1545 and 1546 (Cameron, 1927: 158).

In the sixteenth century, women were generally expected to focus on raising their children and managing their households, with the realms of business and politics mostly dominated by men. As a result of this expectation of gendered social roles in the early modern period, one might expect the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise to include discussions of everyday events and concerns relating to the households of each of her correspondents. However, the contents of the corpus suggests the opposite— there is little focus on family in most of the correspondence, except where it relates to debt or politics, and many of the letter-writers write to advocate for themselves or others. The mid-sixteenth century was a tumultuous period in Scottish politics, with much debate over the role of France in Scottish affairs, constant scuffles and battles with England, and religious and political schism in the upper ranks of Scottish society catalysed by the Reformation (Marshall, 2006: 6, 15). Therefore, it is unsurprising that national and international politics is a dominant theme within the corpus, as demonstrated in table 3:

Terms relating to NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS	**Total occurrence of terms in corpus**	**Frequency used by**					
		Elizabeth Keith	Katherine Bellenden	Elizabeth Campbell	Marion Haliburton	Countess of Atholl	Marion Ogilvie
franc *franch* *french* *frans*	14	0	0	0	12	0	2
Ingland *Inglis*	12	0	0	0	12	0	0
spangȝarttis *spaingȝattis* *spaingȝatis*	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
lord	9	2	1	2	1	2	1
Total terms relating to POLITICS:	38	5.3%	2.6%	5.3%	73.6%	5.3%	7.9%

Table 3, mention of politics within the corpus

Table 3, above, illustrates that many of Mary of Guise's correspondents were affected by the political events of the period which impacted Scotland as a whole, or by the machinations of individual lords seeking to expand their influence and properties, evidenced by their inclusion of

these terms in their correspondence. Marion Haliburton, Lady Home, discusses France and French soldiers a total of 12 times, indicating an awareness of the extent to which Scotland relied on French military support against the English forces. Marion Ogilvie, Lady Gray, mentions France twice, both times in reference to her plea that Mary of Guise intervene in her husband's imprisonment and allow him to be free to serve her and the King of France, either on Scottish soil or in France. Marion Ogilvie's statement that her husband could serve France indicates just how closely the two powers were linked in this period, with loyalty to Mary of Guise almost being synonymous with service to France. Marion Haliburton is the only correspondent to explicitly refer to England or Englishmen, always in the context of the impact of the English military upon her family, tenants, and on the peace and stability of Scotland. However, in letter 110 Elizabeth Campbell, Countess of Moray, makes reference to disruption of travel, saying that she cannot repay her debts yet due to "m*er*cha*n*t*is* no*ch*^{t} travalyng I*n* ye cu*n*tre^{t}*h* as I*n* pesable tyme". Marion Haliburton is also the only correspondent to make mention of Spain, with all three occurrences referring to the "spangʒattis" soldiers, beseeching Mary of Guise to "lat tham cu*m* agayn" and requesting that the Queen Dowager must pay both the French and Spanish troops the wages they are owed.

While only two of the 9 correspondents make explicit reference to international politics, five of the letter-writers discuss the actions of Scottish lords using the term "lord"; it is possible to infer from context in which instances writers are referring to their spouses as "my lord", and when they are using the term to refer to the actions or position of other Scottish nobles. Elizabeth Keith, the Countess of Huntly, states that "my lord gou*er*no*u*^{r} hes rasit an*e* cursing" on her husband, and that he "hes gottin an*e* absolu*cio*n*e* fra my lord cardinall". The lord governor in question is James Hamilton, the 2nd Earl of Arran, who served as the Regent of Scotland prior to Mary of Guise's appointment to this position; whilst the lord cardinal is cardinal David Beaton, the Archbishop of St Andrews (Lynch, 1992: 204-205). There are three mentions of Elizabeth Keith's husband George Gordon, the 4th Earl of Huntly, within the correspondence due to his powerful position as Chancellor of Scotland (Marshall, 2001: 61). Katherine Bellenden makes mention of property seized due to her and her husband's debt, which Mary of Guise has given "to my lord of hvntlie". Elizabeth Campbell also mentions the Earl of Huntly in letter 96, saying "I haif ane tryst w*i*^{t}*h* my lord of huntlie" to discuss her debts with him. Marion Haliburton also makes reference to "my lord huntle" in letter 193. The Countess of Atholl refers to the 2nd Earl of Arran and cardinal Beaton in letter 116, reminding Mary of Guise that "ʒo*u*r grai[ce] wrait to my lord gou*er*no*u*^{r} & to my lord cardinall". Finally, Marion Ogilvie mentions "my lord ambassato*u*^{r}*is* and lieute*n*nent*is*" role in her husband's imprisonment at Blackness Castle in letter 232— it is likely that she is referring to D'Oysel, the Scottish imperial emissary, and the French lieutenant of Blackness Castle, respectively (Cameron, 1927: 341).

Table 4, occurrence of terms relating to male relatives within the corpus

Terms relating to MALE RELATIVES	**Total occurrence of terms in corpus**	**Frequency used by**					
		Elizabeth Keith	Katherine Bellenden	Elizabeth Campbell	Marion Haliburton	Marion Ogilvie	Margaret Robertson
emē	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
he	10	2	0	0	0	0	8
his	10	1	0	0	0	1	8
hym *him*	3	1	0	0	0	1	1
husband *hwsband*	6	0	2	1	1	1	1
my lord	8	4	0	0	1	0	3
son *sone*	8	0	0	0	6	0	2
spous	3	0	0	0	0	3	0
Total terms relating to MALE RELATIVES:	49	16.3%	4.1%	4.1%	16.3%	12.2%	47%

Contemporary sixteenth-century conventions of women's letter-writing might dictate that the contents of women's correspondence would focus heavily on their husbands and other male family members, given the limited social domains that early modern women could access— a notion which the evidence in table 4 on page 69 suggests that the corpus conforms to. Elizabeth Campbell is the sole correspondent to mention a less immediate relative, her "emē" or "uncle". Marion Ogilvie is the only letter-writer to use the term "spous"— it occurs three times in letter 232, which centres on the plight of Marion's husband and explains how much he is needed by his family. Table 4 shows that variations of the word "husband" occur six times throughout the corpus, utilised by five different letter-writers. Both Campbell and Bellenden refer to their husbands in the context of their debts, and Haliburton in reference to land ownership— only Ogilvie and Robertson mention their husbands within the context of their familial role, and both Ogilvie and Robertson discuss emotional, personal matters within their letters to Mary. "My lord" is also used several times throughout the corpus as a more formal way for the writers to refer to their husbands, perhaps functioning as a covert reminder of the correspondents' statuses. Of the 6 correspondents to write about male relatives, only Marion Haliburton and Robertson mention their sons— the former comments on the affairs of her sons, who are involved in the conflict with the English, while the latter designates her son as a figure of male authority entrusted to make decisions about her keep, in lieu of her husband. While 6 of the 9 correspondents mention their male relatives, only two do so to the extent that their communication necessitates third person pronouns "he" and "him", as indicated by table 4. Much of Margaret Robertson's letter is dedicated to relating her husband's thought process, and she relays the events of the marital breakdown largely in relation to his actions, within minimal discussion of her own opinions on the subject.

The central role of early modern women in the affairs of their households is illustrated in the female Scottish correspondence. Many of the letters focus on discussions of debts owed by the writers' husbands, which correspondents are responsible for resolving on their husbands' behalf. Table 5, below, collates all the terms from the corpus which relate to money and debt and functions as a visual summary of the depth and range of the writers' discussions on the topic.

Table 5, discussion of finances within the corpus

Terms relating to MONEY/ DEBT	**Total occurrence of terms in corpus**	**Frequency used by**			
		Elizabeth Campbell	**Marion Haliburton**	**Marion Ogilvie**	**Katherine Bellenden**
awand	2	0	1	0	1
cost	2	1	1	0	0
money	8	6	0	0	2
pay	2	0	0	0	2
payit	2	2	0	0	0
payment	8	5	1	0	2
pouirte	1	0	0	1	0
profeitis	1	0	1	0	0
punde	1	1	0	0	0
pur	2	0	2	0	0
restis	2	2	0	0	0
wagis	2	0	2	0	0
Total terms relating to MONEY/ DEBT:	33	51.5	24.3%	3.0%	21.2%

The *ars dictaminis* structure constructs correspondence around a central *petitio*, or request, as is discussed in sections 2 and 3 of this chapter (pages 60-64). Collecting all examples of variations on the words “beseik”, “consider”, “help”, “pleis”, “plesuyr”, “refuge”, “support”, “thankfull”, and “traist” in the body of the correspondence using concordance software illustrates the direct way in which the letter-writers expressed their appeals to Mary of Guise. Even those letters without a clear *petitio* section utilise terms linked to requests, as table 6, below, shows. This supports Daybell’s statement that correspondence was “increasingly essential to women in periods of crisis” (Daybell, 2006: 35). The letters of the female Scottish correspondence do not function solely as a way to maintain social networks, but serve primarily as a mechanism to seek assistance, express displeasure, or reiterate loyalty. Each of the letter-writers negotiate a relationship with Mary of Guise through their written communication, through their compliance with contemporary norms of polite correspondence that reinforce the hierarchical relationships between themselves and their recipient, demonstrated in table 6, whilst also enabling them to voice their concerns in a manner that is likely to be received, and possibly even acknowledged, by the most powerful and influential woman in Scotland at that time.

Terms relating to REQUESTS	**Total occurrence of terms in corpus**	**Frequency used by**								
		Elizabeth Keith	Katherine Bellenden	Marion Haliburton	Elizabeth Campbell	Countess of Atholl	Marion Ogilvie	Janet Beaton	Margaret Robertson	Janet Keith
beseik -and -ing	8	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0
consider -and -ing	6	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0
help	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
pleis -it -is	9	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	3
plesuyr	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
refuge	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
support	3	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
thankfull	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
traist -is	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
Total terms relating to REQUESTS:	37	2.7%	8.1%	18.9%	16.2%	13.5%	13.5%	10.8%	8.1%	8.1%

Table 6, terms relating to requests within the corpus

6. Older Scots in the Correspondence

The variety of Scots utilised in this correspondence is known as Older Scots, a term spanning the language spoken in much of Scotland from the twelfth century through to the eighteenth century (Macafee and †Aitken, 2002: 1.1.3). More specifically, the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise occurs during the transition period between Early Middle Scots and Late Middle Scots (Macafee and †Aitken, 2002: 1.1.3). Older Scots differed from Early Modern English in several ways: notably in orthography, lexis, and grammar.

Several letterforms were used in Older Scots that had never existed in, or had become obsolete in, Early Modern English— both <þ> and <y> could be used to represent [θ], although by the sixteenth century both graphemes were realised in a form closer to the latter, <y>, lacking the earlier distinction that had existed between the two letterforms (Smith, 2012: 27). Yogh, <ȝ>, was originally used to represent both [g] and [j], but by the sixteenth century the <g> grapheme had entered common usage, and <ȝ> was used mainly to represent [j], as is demonstrated throughout the corpus; although it could also represent [z] (Smith, 2012: 27). In Older Scots, [ʍ] was usually represented as <quh>, although variants such as <qhw> or <qwh> could also occur (Smith, 2012: 27). The graphemes <i> and <y> were interchangeable, as were <u>, <v>, and <w> (Macafee and †Aitken, 2002: 5.1), although <u> was generally reserved for word-medial usage, with <v> and <w> found in word-initial position (Smith, 2012: 28). Where Present-Day English utilises <sh>, Older Scots typically used <sch>; and <f> was sometimes used where Present-Day English uses <v> (Smith, 2012: 28). In this period, Scots was not standardised, meaning that spelling variation occurred in individuals, as well as diachronically (Smith, 2012: 34), as tables 8 and 10 exemplify.

The lexicon of Older Scots contained vocabulary borrowed from a range of other languages, with the most major contributing varieties being Old Northumbrian (a variant of Anglian Old English), French, Latin, and Norse (Smith, 2012: 40-43). The high prevalence of words from Old Northumbrian is to be expected, as Scots appears to have developed from Old Northumbrian in the same way that Middle English developed from Old Mercian (Macafee and †Aitken, 2002: 2.1, 2.3.3). However, contact with a range of different populations and language groups over the centuries meant that Old English and Scots evolved away from each other, with Scots being a distinct language with its own orthographic, lexical, and syntactic norms by the sixteenth century. French contributed to approximately 27.6% of the Older Scots lexis (Smith, 2012: 43), both during the Anglo-Norman expansion into Scotland by the eleventh century (Macafee and †Aitken, 2002: 2.3.1), and later as a result of the Auld Alliance which fostered a close cultural and political relationship between Scotland and France beginning in the thirteenth century and continuing into the sixteenth century (Macafee and †Aitken, 2002: 4.2.2.6). Latin also influenced the lexis of Older Scots, contributing around 8.4% of words to the language— most of which was linked to religion and learned topics (Smith, 2012: 42). A significant proportion of loanwords— 10.7%— may derive from either Latin or French, with there being uncertainty over when exactly these words arrived into Scots, and which of these two languages they were borrowed from (Smith, 2012: 43). Finally, Norse has a role in the development of Older Scots lexis, supplying around 8.4% of loanwords into Scots (Smith, 2012: 41) through settlement in Scottish burghs (Macafee and †Aitken, 2002: 2.3.3).

As mentioned on page 7 of chapter one, and pages 21 to 23 of chapter two, punctuation in this period was often based around rhetorical structure, rather than grammatical structure (Smith, 2012: 33), as is evident in the corpus. Coordinating conjunctions such as “and”, “yat”, “swa”, and “bot” are used throughout the correspondence as punctuation devices to link clauses (Smith, 2012: 34, 55, 61). As a result, many of the writers within the corpus have a distinctive “trailing” quality to their style that is reminiscent of the structure of speech (Smith, 2012: 62, 63). Older Scots varies from Early Modern English in its inflexional morphology, using <-in> and <-it> to mark the past participle (Smith, 2012: 48), as in “arreistit” in letter 36, and “haldin” in letter 116. The present participle is inflected using <-and> (Smith, 2012: 48), as in “desyrand” in letter 110. The plural is inflected with <-s> or <-is>, as seen in “assingnaisions” in letter 110 (Smith, 2012: 45); <-is> is also used to mark the genitive, as in “gracis”, letter 36. Adjectives were also occasionally inflected in the plural (Smith, 2012: 45), as is shown in the phrase “saidis frutis” in letter 36.

As just discussed, Older Scots did not have a fully standardised spelling system, and therefore spellings vary both across the correspondence as a whole, and within the letters of individual correspondents. Table 7, below, shows how individual writers use different spellings of the word "keep", with both <i> and <y> occurring; only Elizabeth Campbell demonstrates spelling variation within her lexis, using three different forms, while other individuals consistently utilise a single form within their individual lexis.

Variants of KEEP	**Total occurrence of word in corpus**	**Frequency used by**						
		Elizabeth Keith	Katherine Bellenden	Elizabeth Campbell	Marion Haliburton	Marion Ogilvie	Margaret Robertson	Janet Keith
keip	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
keiping	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
keping	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	1
kepyng	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
keeping	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total frequency of KEEP:	11	9.1%	9.1%	36.4%	9.1%	9.1%	18.2%	9.1%

Table 7, instances of <i> and <y> variation within the corpus

Different spellings of the word "grace", shown in table 8, below, effectively illustrate the extent of spelling variation available to writers of Older Scots. Of the 9 correspondents, only 2 (Elizabeth Keith and Janet Beaton) maintain a single form in every occurrence of the word "grace". The remaining 7 correspondents use a minimum of two spelling variations, with Elizabeth Campbell utilising a total of five different spellings across the three letters written to Mary of Guise. This variation in spellings of "grace" demonstrates how much orthographic variation could occur in a single word; and can be taken as an example of the extent to which orthography could vary across the entirety of Scots lexis at this time. Whilst "grace" occurs most frequently across the correspondence, four variant spellings are evident, suggesting that whilst "grace" might be the most widely-utilised form, the other four spellings were also acceptable in sixteenth century written communication.

Variants of GRACE	**Total occurrence of word in corpus**	**Frequency used by**								
		Elizabeth Keith	Katherine Bellenden	Elizabeth Campbell	Countess of Atholl	Marion Haliburton	Marion Ogilvie	Janet Beaton	Margaret Robertson	Janet Keith
grac	5	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0
gracis	8	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	2
grace	135	13	16	23	8	42	14	7	12	0
graces	4	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
graice	13	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	9
graicis	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
grec	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
grece	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
grecis	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
gras	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total frequency of GRACE:	175	7.4%	10.8%	18.3%	6.9%	28%	9.1%	4%	8%	7.4%

Table 8, variants of "grace" throughout the corpus

While it is possible for <qhw> and <qwh> spellings to occur in Older Scots, all 60 examples of this cluster within the corpus are spelt in the same way, using <quh>, which indicates this form is the dominant spelling in the mid-sixteenth century. However, while spellings of this cluster do not vary at all throughout the correspondence, table 9, below, illustrates the number of words containing this Scots orthographic convention (Smith, 2012: 43):

Variants using the <QUH> cluster	Total occurrence of <QUH> cluster variants in corpus
quhilk	26
quhyll	1
quha	8
quham	5
quhat	5
quhair	5
quhairthrow	1
quhairto	1
quharfor	1
quhai	2
quhen	2
quhensumeuer	1
quhow	1
quhowbeid	1
Total:	60

Table 9, examples of the <quh> cluster in words throughout the corpus

Variation within the spelling system of one individual is also evident within the corpus, as demonstrated by table 10, below— Marion Haliburton utilises three of the four variants of "shall" found within the correspondence, despite having a marked preference for "sall". Haliburton displays the most prolific spelling variation within the term shown below (one hypothesis for her unusually high incidence of variant spellings is that her contributions to the corpus are dominant). However, Elizabeth Keith, Katherine Bellenden, and Margaret Robertson all exhibit a degree of variation within their orthography.

Variants of SHALL	Total occurrence of word in corpus	Frequency used by								
		Elizabeth Keith	Katherine Bellenden	Elizabeth Campbell	Marion Haliburton	Countess of Atholl	Marion Ogilvie	Janet Beaton	Margaret Robertson	Janet Keith
sall	19	0	3	5	9	0	0	0	1	1
salbe	5	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
sold	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
suld	8	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	2	0
Total frequency of SHALL:	34	5.9%	14.7%	17.6%	35.3%	8.8%	2.9%	2.9%	8.8%	2.9%

Table 10, orthographic variation in individual correspondents

Old Norse is believed to have contributed to the evolution of the Scots pronominal system with the forms “scho” (“she”) and “thai” (“they”)— Norse linguistic innovations which improved upon the equivalent, less-distinct Old English pronouns “hēo” and “hīe” which were prone to cause confusion to speakers and writers— being established by the end of the fourteenth century (Smith, 2012: 49).

There is also a wealth of French-derived words within the correspondence, which are often identifiable by their inclusion of the <io> cluster and utilised for their high-style associations (Smith, 2012: 43). These include “informacione” in letter 17, “mensioun” in letter 293, “twischione” and “sustentatione” in letter 262, and “gratious” in letter 232.

Smith’s discussion on the use of coordinating conjunctions in Older Scots sentence structure and its subsequent prevalence in Older Scots written communication is demonstrated in much of the correspondence (Smith, 2012: 34, 55, 61). Table 11 collates the total instances of “and”, “yat”, “swa”, and “bot” within the corpus, and demonstrates how frequently each correspondent uses the four different conjunctions— demonstrating that all 9 correspondents rely upon coordinating conjunctions to structure their written communication to some extent. Of the 3998 tokens within the corpus, the conjunctions below occur a total of 182 times, meaning that they comprise 4.5% of the words within the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise. “And” is the sixth most frequent word in the corpus, with only the words “our”, “to”, “of”, “grace”, and “ye” occurring more often.

Conjunction	**Frequency used by**									**Total occurrence within corpus:**
	Elizabeth Keith	Katherine Bellenden	Elizabeth Campbell	Marion Haliburton	Countess of Atholl	Marion Ogilvie	Janet Beaton	Margaret Robertson	Janet Keith	
and	6	16	14	21	3	19	2	15	4	100
yat	4	7	5	30	2	3	0	11	2	64
bot	2	0	1	7	0	0	0	4	1	15
swa	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3

Table 11, frequency of coordinating conjunctions within the corpus

7. Patterns in the Corpus

There is no strong tendency towards either scribal or autograph letters within the corpus, with 53.3% of the 15 letters being autograph, and 44.4% being scribal. This suggests that the writers who produced autograph letters (Elizabeth Keith, Katherine Bellenden, Marion Haliburton, Margaret Robertson, and Janet Keith) did not associate the use of their own hand with informality and impoliteness, a concern that was occasionally expressed (Starza Smith, 2013). 93.3% of the signatures are autograph, even when the majority of the letter has been penned by a scribe. The exception to this is letter 116, and this deviation can likely be attributed to the young age of the ostensible writer, the Countess of Atholl. As table 2 on page 23 shows, 40% of the corpus is lacking significant space in one of more of the areas of the folio where it might be expected—in most cases, this is an absence of significant space between the main text and the subscription, or between the subscription and signature; although in some of the correspondence, significant space is absent from both areas of the folio. Daybell states that significant space was often used to indicate respect for the letter’s recipient, or sometimes to flaunt the writer’s wealth through their use of outsized folios (Daybell, 2012: 98). The systematic neglection of significant space in one or both locations on the folio within the corpus indicates that either significant space did not hold such strong connotations

of respect to Mary of Guise's female correspondents as Daybell suggests; or that the lack of significant space was intended as a deliberate snub by Mary's correspondents. This trend towards atypical use of significant space could simply be due to the letter-writers adopting the convention of leaving no space between the subscription and signature, or between the main text and subscription, and instead, where folio space allows, utilising significant space beneath the signature. This hypothesis is reinforced by letter 290, which conveys a less reverential tone by omitting "madame" from the opening salutation and phrasing the repayment of the debt owed to the writer, Janet Keith, more as a statement than a request. Letter 290 is blunter in its language than the other letters within this corpus, and the writer adheres minimally to many conventions of politeness in sixteenth century written communication— but it is one of only 26.7% of letters that utilise proportionate significant space. Therefore, it is likely that the female Scottish correspondents of Mary of Guise simply utilise different conventions of significant space than those used by other sixteenth century correspondents such as Bess of Hardwick and members of her communicative network.

All 15 letters within the corpus conform with the structure of the *salutatio*, with 93.3% of the letters using the same formulaic superscription, "to ye quenis grace". Letter 323 is the only missive in the corpus to deviate from this formula, following this phrase with "Drowrare of scotland". 33.3% of the letters use the exact same opening phrase, "Madame I commend my hartly seruice to ȝour grace"— with four of these instances being Marion Haliburton, and the other Elizabeth Keith. The remaining letters follow this structure very closely, with individuals substituting "hartly" with "humill", utilising the modifier "maist", offering their "serveis and prayarris", and so on. The traditional *exordium* of the *ars dictaminis* only occurs in 13.3% of the correspondence, whilst the remaining 86.7% either mention that they have received a letter or provide brief contextualisation for the *narratio*. All 15 letters feature the *narratio*, although 86.7% of these letters describe events in detail or voice complaints, aligning more with the functions espoused by the familiar letter. 46.7% of the corpus mingles the elements of *narratio* and *petitio*, and as a result, their writing appears less formal and more conversational. As the data represented in table 6, page 71, illustrates, 66.7% of the corpus feature an overt *petitio*, marked by use of the terms "beseik" and "exort". Letter 96 and letter 290 lack an explicit *petitio*, with the former merely making a statement, and the latter making a demand. Each of the 15 letters have a structured *conclusio*, which is even more formulaic than the *salutatio*. The conclusion follows the same pattern in every letter— the writer commends Mary of Guise into God's keeping; states the location they are writing from; gives the date; and expresses their position as her humble servant. That all 15 letters follow the same formula so closely indicates that this an established norm in sixteenth-century Scottish written communication, or at the very least, an established practice when communicating with Mary of Guise. Only letters 17 and 251 can be said to truly conform to all five elements of the *ars dictaminis* structure; however, aspects of the *ars dictaminis* are evident throughout the corpus. Much of the correspondence aligns with both letter-writing traditions: the *ars dictaminis* and the familiar letter.

There are several topics repeated throughout the correspondence, with discussions of politics, male relatives, and debt. Marion Haliburton and Marion Ogilvie are the only writers to make explicit reference to international politics, but there are also nine instances mentioning Scottish lords, in the letters of 5 different correspondents, as shown in table 3, page 68. 6 of the letter-writers discuss their male relatives, with Elizabeth Keith, Marion Haliburton, and Margaret Robertson dominating this topic. Money is also a frequent topic of conversation, mentioned a total of 33 times throughout the correspondence, as table 5 on page 70 demonstrates. Elizabeth Campbell is responsible for almost half of the occurrences of this theme within the corpus. All 9 correspondents utilise language

which relates to requests, emphasising that their letters do not merely serve as a means to socialise, but primarily as a tool to voice their opinions, express their complaints, and ask for assistance.

Individuals do not necessarily utilise a consistent orthography throughout their correspondence, as tables 8 and 10 on pages 73 and 74 demonstrate. However, it is possible to discern general patterns of lexis and orthography within the corpus— Marion Haliburton uses the spelling "grace" forty-two times, and "grac" only three times.

8. Social Relationships in the Letters

For the next stage of the discussion, it is necessary first to offer biographical outlines of Mary's correspondents, enabling a more precise estimate of their social standing in sixteenth century Scotland. In several instances, there is little biographical information surviving on the correspondents themselves, but the roles occupied by their families and husbands provide some context for the women's own position within the socio-political landscape of sixteenth century Scotland. This information is extracted and evaluated in the social network analysis performed in section 8.3.

8.2. Introducing Mary's Correspondents

The following section introduces each of Mary of Guise's 9 female Scottish correspondents in order of their appearance in the corpus, presenting known biographical details, and discussing the position held by their wider families within the socio-political landscape of sixteenth century Scotland.

8.2.1. Lady Elizabeth Keith

Relatively little information survives on Lady Elizabeth Keith, the Countess of Huntly. There is one extant letter to Mary of Guise, written in Elizabeth's own hand and dated 16 August 1543 (Cameron, 1927: 20-21). However, palaeographic evidence suggests that she also scribed a letter from her husband the Earl of Huntly to Mary of Guise, written on the same date (Cameron, 1927: 19-20); aligning with Cameron's statement that Elizabeth occasionally acted as her husband's secretary (Cameron, 1927: xxii). Elizabeth's own letter to Mary of Guise discusses her husband's opposition to the Governor of Scotland, the 2nd Earl of Arran, and promises that both she and her husband remain loyal to the Queen Dowager (Cameron, 1927: 21).

Elizabeth Keith was the daughter of Robert Keith, Master of Marischal, and Lady Elizabeth Douglas (whose father was the 2nd Earl of Morton). Her elder brother William Keith, the 4th Earl Marischal, was born in 1510 (Wasser, 2016), but Elizabeth's date of birth is unknown. William Keith had connections with the highest ranks of Scottish society— he accompanied King James V to France in 1536; in 1543, he was chosen to be one of Queen Mary's keepers; and he joined Mary of Guise when she travelled to France in 1550. His relationship with Queen Mary continued during her reign, serving as a member of the privy council, and as one of her personal attendants (Wasser, 2016). Elizabeth's aunt was Janet Keith, the Countess of Montrose (Wasser, 2016).

Elizabeth Keith married George Gordon, the 4th Earl of Huntly, on 27 March 1530 (White, 2004). Her husband George Gordon was the son of Margaret Stewart (an illegitimate daughter of King James IV) and John Gordon, master of Huntly (White, 2004). The couple had twelve children: nine sons and

three daughters. By 1559, their eldest surviving son, George Gordon, had married Lady Anne Hamilton, daughter of the 2nd Earl of Arran. After his father's death in 1562, he was subsequently found guilty of treason and condemned to death. However, he was later pardoned and succeeded his father as the 5th Earl of Huntly in August 1565, when the earldom was restored (White, 2004). Another son, Sir John Gordon, was less fortunate, and was executed in 1562, also for the crime of treason (White, 2004). Jean Gordon was the youngest daughter of Elizabeth and George. She married James Hepburn, the 4th Earl of Bothwell, in 1566, but divorced him a year later in 1567; he later married Mary Queen of Scots (Marshall, 2004). Jean's second husband was Alexander Gordon, the 12th Earl of Sutherland. The couple married in 1573, and went on to have seven children, with the marriage lasting until his death in 1594 (Marshall, 2004). She married her third husband, Alexander Ogilvy of Boyne, in 1599. After the death of her second husband, the 12th Earl of Sutherland, Jean managed the family estate; and when her son died in 1615, she raised her grandson (Marshall, 2004).

Elizabeth's husband George Gordon, the 4th Earl of Huntly, had maintained a close relationship with King James V in the years before the monarch's death in 1542. Historically, the Gordon family occupied a position of power in northern Scotland, which George strengthened through strategic marriages with other powerful families, bonds of manrent offering the Gordons' protection in exchange for service, and links with the burgesses in Aberdeen (White, 2004). This network of connections in the north of Scotland made George Gordon a valuable ally of James V, as he was able to raise a large military force to defend Scotland as a whole, as well as defending Huntly interests. In September 1532, George Gordon joined with James V and several other powerful Earls when Anglo-Scottish relations came under threat (White, 2004). James V rewarded George for his loyalty— granting him membership of the privy council in 1535, and sheriffdom of Aberdeen in 1541 (White, 2004). In 1536, George was named regent while James V travelled to France to arrange his marriage to King Francis I's daughter Madeleine. George briefly served as lieutenant of the borders in 1542 but was soon replaced by his successor after failing to retain military advantage after a battle against English forces.

After King James V's death in 1542, George Gordon was made a governor of the realm. He and the other governors were deposed in January 1543 by the 2nd Earl of Arran, who also imprisoned the Chancellor of Scotland, Cardinal Beaton (Marshall, 2001: 61). George Gordon fought against the Earl of Arran, campaigning for the release of the Cardinal, but eventually came to an uneasy peace with Arran when his opposition was unsuccessful. The two Earls continued to disagree, with Huntly advocating to continue the long-standing alliance with France and to maintain Catholicism as the dominant religion of Scotland, rather than aligning with England and Protestant reform as the Earl of Arran desired (White, 2004). Conflict between the two Earls grew more personal, with the Earl of Arran attempting to infringe on the Huntlys' control of Aberdeen.

Political division between various factions in the Scottish nobility resulted in George Gordon allying with the Earl of Arran in late 1543 and using his substantial influence in the north of Scotland to quell several uprisings. Thus, George Gordon was appointed lieutenant-general of the north, and of Orkney and Shetland. After the murder of Cardinal Beaton in 1546, the 4th Earl of Huntly was appointed as his replacement (Marshall, 2001: 61). In 1547, he commanded the rear-guard at the Battle of Pinkie, but his forces fled and he was captured and imprisoned in England until late 1548, when he escaped by promising to promote English interests in Scotland. He was welcomed back, given the earldom of Moray in 1549, and accompanied the queen dowager to France in 1550 (Marshall, 2001: 72). However, this position of favour was unstable— lacking the support of key allies in the north, Huntly failed to quash a clan Cameron uprising in 1553. Subsequently, he lost the

earldom of Moray, was fined, and imprisoned from March to October of 1554 (White, 2004). Although he became lieutenant-general of Scotland in 1557, he eventually signed the band of congregation in 1560 and aligned with the lords of the congregation, motivated by desire to protect his personal interests, rather than religious or political impetus (White, 2004).

When Queen Mary returned to Scotland in 1561, George Gordon attempted to court her favour— failing, as Queen Mary chose to seek her half-brother James Stewart as her advisor instead (White, 2004). The following year, George Gordon's son Sir John Gordon quarrelled with the rival Ogilvie family, and Queen Mary used this dispute as an opportunity to diminish the Earl of Huntly's influence in the north of Scotland, gifting the earldoms of Moray and Mar to her half-brother (White, 2004). The Earl of Huntly and his supporters met with the queen's forces on 28 October 1562 and were swiftly defeated, with George Gordon dying soon after (White, 2004). The family estate was looted, and their titles forfeited. Having lost their livelihood, Elizabeth and her daughter Jean were obliged to serve as ladies of Queen Mary's court, with their position in the royal court recorded by 1565 (Marshall, 2004). This determination to thrive despite their circumstances is also evident in Jean Gordon's short-lived marriage to James Hepburn, the 4th Earl of Bothwell— a union which ensured the return of the earldom of Huntly (Ewan, Pipes, Reynolds and Innes, 2006). The resolute nature of Elizabeth Keith's letter to Mary of Guise in 1543 and her actions after her husband's death embody a self-assured and indomitable woman who endured despite her misfortune. Elizabeth Keith died around 1565 (Marshall, 2004).

8.2.2. Katherine Bellenden

Although there is very little surviving information about Katherine Bellenden, it appears that she was a relatively important and well-connected woman. There is one extant letter from her to Mary of Guise, written on 23 November 1543, discussing the seizure of a boat that Katherine and her third husband had invested in. This boat had been repossessed as a result of Katherine and her husband's debts relating to their lands in Orkney and Shetland (Cameron, 1927: 46-47).

Katherine Bellenden was the daughter of Patrick Bellenden, Margaret Tudor's steward, and Marion Douglas, King James V's nurse (Royan, 2006). Thus, Katherine's family had connections with the Scottish royal family that would continue in future generations. Her brother, John Bellenden, was a clerk of expenses for King James V from 1515 to 1522, a role involving the household accounts of the royal family (Royan, 2006). Another brother, Thomas Bellenden of Auchinoul, served as director of the King's chancery and as a justice clerk (Finlay, 2004). Arguably Sir John Bellenden of Auchnoul, Thomas' eldest son and Katherine's nephew, was the Bellenden family member with the closest relationship to the Scottish royal family. He served as director of the chancery from 1543, and as a justice clerk— a role he inherited from his father— from 1546 (Finlay, 2004). He also served as a mediator by royal appointment between Mary of Guise and the Protestant lords of the congregation, before his eventual conversion to Protestantism. In 1560, he co-created "Discours particulier d'Ecosse", a treatise on Scottish laws of tenure, the judicial and financial offices, and the laws on treason for Mary Queen of Scots and her husband François II (Finlay, 2004), at the command of Mary of Guise (Ritchie, 2002: 237). It appears he had a close personal relationship with Mary Queen of Scots upon her arrival in Scotland, demonstrated by her attendance at his daughter's wedding in 1564 (Finlay, 2004).

The exact year of Katherine's birth is unknown. She was married three times— first, briefly, to Adam Hopper, the Provost of Edinburgh; and then to Francis Bothwell, who also served as Provost of

Edinburgh (Cameron, 1927: 47), and as a Lord of Session (Caldwell, 2004). Katherine worked in royal service from 1537, apparently as a seamstress (Stirling Castle - Court Life - Katherine Bellenden, 2011), and is described as "Master Francis Bothuilis wyfe" in the treasurer's accounts for July 1537, which detail payment for "purpure velvet" cloth (Scotland, 1877). It appears that Katherine and Francis had a son, Adam Bothwell, who became the bishop of Orkney (Finlay, 2004).

Katherine's third and final husband was Oliver Sinclair, whom she had married by 1542 (Caldwell, 2004). The couple had three children together: Henry, who succeeded his father and inherited Whitekirk, in Haddingtonshire (Caldwell, 2004); Oliver; and Isabella. Oliver Sinclair had been one of King James V's favourites (Smith, 2012), with the record of his service beginning in 1536, as an accountant for the king (Caldwell, 2004). Famously, Sinclair led the Scottish army in their defeat at the battle at Solway Moss in 1542 (Caldwell, 2004). Sinclair seemed to lack military experience, having only acted in such a role twice before, in that same year— transporting captured prisoners in August, and participating in a discussion of military tactics at Hume Castle in November (Caldwell, 2004). After the Scottish defeat at Solway Moss, Sinclair was subsequently captured, and was not released until 1543 (Smith, 2012). It seems he remained well-liked by the king even after his capture— James V was said to be distressed by the imprisonment of his favourite, and died before Sinclair was freed (Caldwell, 2004).

8.2.3. Lady Elizabeth Campbell

Lady Elizabeth Campbell, the Countess of Moray, was the second most prolific female Scottish correspondent of Mary of Guise, sending her three letters between 1544 and 1545 (Cameron, 1927: 130, 131, 148, 149, 150). Her letters protest the debts owed by her late husband James Stewart, the Earl of Moray, to Mary of Guise and to others (Cameron, 1927: xiii, xiv), and offer excuses for the delay in repaying the money owed (Cameron, 1927: 131, 149, 150). Elizabeth also describes a dispute between herself and the Sheriff of Elgin and Forres over her right to Darnway Castle, the seat of her late husband, the Earl of Moray (Cameron, 1927: 130).

Elizabeth was the daughter of Colin Campbell, the 3rd Earl of Argyll, and his wife Lady Janet Gordon (whose father was the 3rd Earl of Huntly). Her father Colin was appointed justice-general of Scotland in 1514; a role that was inherited by his son and heir after his death in 1529 (Dawson, 2004). He was a trusted ally of King James V, commanding military expeditions on his behalf, and was also appointed lieutenant of Lothian, Merse, and Teviotdale in 1528 (Dawson, 2004). The date of Elizabeth's birth is uncertain, although she was likely born some time after her brother Archibald Campbell's birth in 1498. In addition to Archibald, who became the 4th Earl of Argyll, Elizabeth had three other siblings: John Campbell of Lochnell; Alexander Campbell, who became the dean of Moray; and Agnes Campbell (Dawson, 2004). Aside from her late husband, the Earl of Moray, Elizabeth discusses one other family member in her letters to Mary of Guise— her uncle, John Campbell of Cawdor, who murdered his brother-in-law Lachlan Maclean of Duart in 1523 and later established his home at Cawdor (Mackillop, Munro and Munro, 2011). He is mentioned in her first two letters, dated March 1544 or 1545, and November 1545 (Cameron, 1927: 130, 149). Her final letter, dated November 1545, was written at Cawdor, in Nairnshire, several months before her uncle's death (Mackillop, Munro and Munro, 2011).

Elizabeth was married twice— first, to James Stewart, the 14th Earl of Moray (White, 2010) and illegitimate son of King James IV and his mistress, Janet Kennedy (Thomas, 2007). Elizabeth and James were married in 1529, and it appears they had one daughter, Mary, who died circa 1547

(Thomas, 2007). Their marriage ended when James Stewart died in late 1544 or early 1545 (Thomas, 2007). He had been closely associated with John Stewart, the Duke of Albany and former governor, having served in his army, and been appointed as lieutenant of the north by him in 1524 (Thomas, 2007). He was also associated with Queen Margaret, the mother of James V; for a time intending to marry her daughter, Lady Margaret Douglas. He was involved in an attempt by Queen Margaret to overthrow her ex-husband Archibald Douglas, the 6th Earl of Angus, between 1525 and 1526; and had previously been his brother, the future King James V's, keeper for six months between 1523 and 1524, before he assumed his throne (Thomas, 2007). His loyalty to the royal family continued into James V's reign, serving as the commander-in-chief of Scotland's army between 1532 and 1533, during the Anglo-Scottish war and being appointed to multiple posts, including warden general of the middle and east marches (Thomas, 2007). However, by 1537, James Stewart had begun to lose the King's favour, being removed from both his wardenship of the marches and his lieutenancy— albeit with a brief reprieve in November 1542, when he replaced the Earl of Huntly as lieutenant of the borders (Thomas, 2007). Elizabeth inherited her husband James Stewart's debts after his death in 1544 or 1545, and the letters detail her attempts to retrieve money from her own debtors (Cameron, 1927: 130). Elizabeth's focus on her livelihood and on the security of her tenants is demonstrated in her letters to Mary of Guise, where she gives reasons for being unable to repay the money owed to the queen regent (Cameron, 1927: 149).

Elizabeth married her second husband, John Gordon, the 11th Earl of Sutherland between November 1545 and June 1546 (White, 2010). John Gordon was the son of Alexander Gordon of Sutherland, and his wife Janet Stewart (the daughter of the second Earl of Atholl). John Gordon succeeded his father in 1546, and the following year fought at the battle of Pinkie, evading capture (White, 2010). His association with his kinsman, George Gordon, the 4th Earl of Huntly— a close companion of King James V who had served him as a privy councillor, and, after the king's death, was a governor of the realm and Lord Chancellor of Scotland (White, 2004)— likely played a role in John Gordon's appointment as acting lieutenant of the north of the Spey in 1547 (White, 2010). John Gordon's connections to the upper echelons of Scottish politics continued, accompanying Mary of Guise and her party to France in 1550, and receiving a tack of the earldom of Moray and a pension in 1555 as rewards for his loyalty. However, his involvement with the Earl of Huntly resulted in a charge of treason in 1562, after Huntly rebelled against Mary of Guise (White, 2010). Elizabeth and John's marriage ended with Elizabeth's death, some time before May 1548 (White, 2010). John went on to marry Helenor Stewart, and then Marion Seton— he and his third wife, Marion, were poisoned and died on 23 June 1567 (White, 2010).

Elizabeth Campbell had many political connections, through her correspondence with Mary of Guise, and through her father and both of her husbands. However, the Campbell family also played a significant role in the developing Scottish literary environment. Elizabeth Campbell's father, Colin Campbell, was a friend and patron of Hector Boece, the author of the 1527 text *Scotorum historia* (Dawson, 2004). *Scotorum historia* (nine copies of which are held in the National Library of Scotland's collection) was the first printed book to focus solely on the history of Scotland. Elizabeth's father had contributed to the creation of Boece's seminal work by sourcing key texts from Iona Abbey (Dawson, 2004).

8.2.4. Countess of Atholl

There is one extant letter from the Countess of Atholl, dated 14 January 1545 or 1546, which pleads for the Queen Dowager's intervention in the allegations of treason made against Sir Adam

Ottirbourn (Cameron, 1927: 158). The Countess of Atholl seems to be the eldest of John Stewart, the 4th Earl of Atholl, and his first wife Elizabeth Gordon's two daughters. However, there is no other surviving information about her— her name is not known, and nor is her date of birth, or the events of her life. The assumption that the anonymous "writer" is John Stewart and Elizabeth Gordon's eldest daughter is based on several facts. Firstly, the couple were known to be married by 26 May 1547 (Hewitt, 2006), a year or more after this letter was believed to be written, and therefore it is likely that they already had one daughter by the time their marriage first appears in official records. Secondly, their other daughter, Elizabeth (who went on to marry first Hugh Fraser, the 5th Lord Lovat; then Robert Stewart, the Earl of Lennox; and finally, James Stewart, the Earl of Arran) was not born until around 1554, nearly a decade after letter 116 is purported to have been written, and so she cannot be its alleged author (Marshall, 2004).

John Stewart's first wife was Elizabeth Gordon, daughter of George Gordon, the 4th Earl of Huntly, and his wife, Elizabeth Keith (Hewitt, 2006). After her death, he married Margaret Fleming, daughter of the 3rd Lord Fleming, on 1 April 1557 and the couple went on to have one son and five daughters (Hewitt, 2006).

The 4th Earl of Atholl played a very active role in Scottish politics— a devoted Catholic, he supported Mary of Guise in her successful bid to become Queen Regent and rejected the Lords of the Congregation's promotion of Protestantism (Hewitt, 2006). When Mary Stewart returned to Scotland and ascended the throne in 1561, John Stewart was made a member of the privy council, and continued to support her until her marriage to Bothwell in 1567 (Hewitt, 2006). His force confronted her at Carberry Hill on 15 June 1567, but he renewed his support in 1570 (Hewitt, 2006). After her abdication (Goodare, 2007), Stewart united with the Earl of Argyll and overthrew the regent, the Earl of Morton, in March 1578— as a result, John Stewart became Chancellor of Scotland on 29 March (Hewitt, 2006). He died a year later, on 24 August 1579 (Hewitt, 2006).

8.2.5. Lady Marion Haliburton

Lady Marion Home was the most prolific female Scottish correspondent in the collection, sending Mary five letters between 1548 and 1550 (Cameron, 1927: 280, 291, 295, 296, 438). Although her name is spelt in various ways across different sources, I will refer to her as Marion Home, as she signs herself within the five letters of the Scottish correspondence (Cameron, 1927: 281, 292, 296, 297, 439).

Marion Home (sometimes spelt Hume) was born Mariota Haliburton, the second daughter of Patrick Haliburton, the last Lord Haliburton of Dirleton (Cameron, 1927: 181), and his wife Margaret Douglas of Pumpherston (Swan, Innes, Reynolds and Pipes, 2006). She was born circa 1500 (Swan, *et. al*., 2006), and married George Home, the 4th Lord Home, around 1518 (Meikle, 2007).

She and her two sisters were co-heirs to her father's estate (Cameron, 1927: 281), and her marriage to George Home brought 1/3 of this land into ownership of the Home family (Meikle, 2007). This was rather fortunate, as, prior to their marriage, what was left of the Home family lands had been lost due to George's participation in the 1517 murder of Anthoine de Labastie (Meikle, 2007). Home lands had also been forfeited prior to this, in 1516, due to the treasonous actions of George's brother Alexander, the 3rd Lord Home (Macdougall, 2008). These family estates, lost by the actions of the brothers Alexander and George, were not fully recovered until 1524, and not officially ratified by the Scottish parliament until 1526 (Meikle, 2007). While Marion's role in the preservation of the

Home family fortunes began with her marriage in 1518, she continued to guard over the Home estate in the succeeding decades, as is documented in her letters to Mary of Guise.

Together, Marion and her husband George had three sons— Alexander, who became the 5th Lord Home; Andrew, who became the Commendator of Jedburgh Abbey and Restenneth; and Matthew, of Cloichtow. They also had one daughter, Margaret, who went on to marry Alexander Erskine of Gogar. George also had an illegitimate son named George (Meikle, 2007).

Despite problems with the Home estate early in their marriage, Marion and George Home's fortunes improved for a period. George Home held the office of Warden of the East March four times between 1528 and 1547, appointing his kinsmen as deputies (Meikle, 2007). However, by 1545, the Homes' support of the Franco-Scottish faction— which had guaranteed French money for the defence of Hume Castle (Meikle, 2007)— had rendered the castle a target for the invading English army and resulted in the destruction of family goods (Swan, *et. al*., 2006). George and his son and heir, Alexander Home, were captured at the Fawside (Cameron, 1927: 280), several days before the Battle of Pinkie in September of 1547. Lady Marion Home was believed to have bought the life of her son Alexander in exchange for the surrender of Hume Castle— Hume Castle was taken easily on 23 September of that year, only thirteen days after the battle (Cameron, 1927: 280). Marion discreetly negotiated the surrender of Hume Castle and the safety of her son Alexander without her husband's knowledge (Swan, *et. al*., 2006), and continued to safeguard the livelihoods of her people. On 28 March 1549, Marion wrote to Mary of Guise asking that the garrison of Spanish and French soldiers stationed at Hume Castle pay the money they owed to the local people for their expenses (Cameron, 1927: 297). George Home died that same year, with the knowledge that Hume Castle had been recaptured by the French, and his son Alexander was safe (Meikle, 2007).

Marion's last extant letter to Mary of Guise appears to have been written after 1550 (Cameron, 1927: 438), and she died circa 1563, at around 63 years of age (Swan, *et. al*., 2006). The five surviving letters that she wrote to Mary of Guise offer an insight into the written communication of women in the sixteenth century, and provide a portrait of Marion as a resourceful, intelligent, and loyal woman whose actions safeguarded her family, people, and the Home estate.

8.2.6. Lady Marion Ogilvie

Little information survives on Marion Ogilvie, with no extant record of her precise date of birth. Her father was James, 4th Lord Ogilvie of Airlie, but her mother's name is not known (Cameron, 1927: 342). Her eldest brother, James Ogilvie, died at the Battle of Pinkie on 10 September 1547, and thus the family title passed on to his son (Marion's nephew), also named James Ogilvie, who became the 5th Lord Ogilvie of Airlie (Marshall, 2001: 62-63). There is one extant letter written to Mary of Guise, dated 18 November 1550, which mentions her husband's imprisonment at Blackness Castle and asks for Mary of Guise's intervention (Cameron, 1927: 341-342). This letter states that the topic has been "sa oft reheirsit", suggesting that she had written other letters to the Queen Dowager on the same subject, which do not survive to the present day (Cameron, 1927: 342).

Marion Ogilvie married Patrick Gray, the 4th Lord Gray, on 21 September 1537, and together the couple had 15 children— six sons and nine daughters (Black Verschuur, 2006). Three of their children were betrothed to members of the Ruthven family, with whom there was an ongoing feud (Black Verschuur, 2006). Her husband Patrick Gray was the eldest son of Gilbert Gray of Buttergask and his wife Egidia Mercer, the daughter of Sir Laurence Mercer of Aldie (Black Verschuur, 2006). He

inherited his title from his half-uncle, the 3rd Lord Gray, in 1542, and also held the hereditary position of Sheriff of Forfar and was custodian of Broughty Castle (Black Verschuur, 2006).

Patrick was taken prisoner after the 1542 Battle of Solway Moss and incarcerated in Newcastle under the custody of Walter Strickland, and his release several years later was contingent on his service to King Henry VIII upon his return to Scotland. In compliance with this agreement, Patrick supported the 1543 treaty of marriage between Mary Stewart, future Queen of Scots, and Prince Edward of England, and voted to approve the vernacular bible (Black Verschuur, 2006). His apparent support of Protestantism resulted in his imprisonment at Blackness Castle in September 1543, but he was released in May 1544 and came to align with cardinal Beaton, whom he had previously opposed (Black Verschuur, 2006). This association with Beaton was beneficial, and likely motivated by financial gain rather than genuine religious or political fervour— he received part of the lands of Rescobie, in Forfarshire, in exchange for his loyalty (Black Verschuur, 2006). This gift of property was not sufficient motivation for the 4th Lord Gray to maintain his allegiance to the Scottish cause, and in 1547 he promised to surrender Broughty Castle to the English— a pledge which came to fruition in September 1547 and was compensated monetarily (Black Verschuur, 2006). His duties in service of the English also included bribing the Earl of Argyll (Black Verschuur, 2006). However, it seems that Patrick Gray was a double or even triple agent, as Mary of Guise wrote to him thanking him for his service and provided him with a small pension. His duplicity was eventually punished in November 1548, when he was charged with treason and told to surrender his home at Castle Huntly. He sought English protection for his household, and narrowly avoided execution as the Scottish lords advocated for him, but in 1549 was remanded in Blackness Castle once again, under the French ambassadors (Black Verschuur, 2006).

By 1554, Gray had been released— but he was imprisoned once again in 1558, this time by the English, after the raid of Swinton (Black Verschuur, 2006). In December 1559 he was apparently a free man once again and joined the Lords of the Congregation (Black Verschuur, 2006). Mary of Guise sent him a letter thanking him for his support in May 1560, and her daughter Mary Stewart sent a similar missive in October 1561 (Black Verschuur, 2006).

Although he was frequently embroiled in political schemes on both the Scottish and English sides, he managed to avoid involvement in the murder of Darnley and the subsequent abduction of Queen Mary (Black Verschuur, 2006). He voted in favour of Queen Mary's divorce from Bothwell in 1569 and was part of a group who sought Queen Elizabeth's assistance on her behalf in 1570. When King James VI was crowned in 1567 (Wormald, 2014), Patrick Gray was a member of the council selected to assist him (Black Verschuur, 2006). Patrick died in 1584 and was succeeded by his son, also Patrick, who became the 5th Lord Gray.

Marion Ogilvie was evidently a resourceful and resilient woman, determined to support her children despite the instability caused by their father's political activities. Her advocacy on behalf of her husband in letter 232 is a touching display of emotion, which is not found to such an extent in any of the other letters in the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise.

8.2.7. Lady Janet Beaton

Limited biographical information survives on Lady Janet Beaton of Buccleuch, much of which focuses on her various relationships. There is one extant letter written to Mary of Guise, dated 28 January 1553— the missive is very brief and inquires when the Queen Dowager will be arriving in Edinburgh, that Janet might speak with her (Cameron, 1927: 369-370).

Janet Beaton, born in 1516, (Marshall, 2004) was the daughter of Sir John Beaton of Creich (Marshall, 2006: 90). Her brother, Robert Beaton of Creich, was the captain of Falkland (Cameron, 1927: 369); and one of her sisters, Elizabeth Beaton, was the mistress of King James V and mother to his illegitimate daughter Lady Jean Stewart (Marshall, 2006: 90). Janet's father Sir John Beaton was one of the many nobles who accompanied Mary of Guise to France in 1550 (Ritchie, 2002: 72). Janet was also related to Cardinal David Beaton, a powerful advisor of King James V who, as a firm supporter of the Franco-Scottish alliance, was involved in arranging his marriages to both Princess Madeleine and Mary of Guise, and whose counsel contributed to the Battle of Solway Moss and James V's death (Sanderson, 2004). Her niece, Mary Beaton, was one of the four childhood companions of Mary Queen of Scots (Marshall, 2006: 142-143).

Janet Beaton was married several times. Her first husband was Sir James Crichton of Cranstoun Riddel (Caldwell, 2004); by 1543, he had died and she had married Sir Simon Preston of Preston and Craigmiller (Lynch, 2004). Simon Preston's family were well-established, having held the Preston lands since the twelfth century, and generations of the family had occupied the role of lord provost of Edinburgh. Simon Preston himself served as lord provost thrice, between 1538 and 1543, 1544 and 1545, and again in 1565 (Lynch, 2004). In 1538, he was one of the group of twelve who welcomed Mary of Guise to Edinburgh; his close connections with Scottish royalty continued in the reign of her daughter Mary Queen of Scots, hosting her at Craigmiller Castle several times after her arrival in Scotland in 1561. His support of Queen Mary persisted after the murder of her secretary David Riccio on 9 March 1566, when he gathered a militia of Edinburgh townspeople to act in her defence. He was appointed to the privy council on 5 November 1565 and made keeper of Dunbar castle— where Queen Mary was taken by the Earl of Bothwell on 24 April 1567 (Marshall, 2004). The Queen also stayed in his house in Edinburgh for a short time after surrendering at Carberry Hill on 15 June 1567 (Lynch, 2004). Janet Beaton and Simon Preston had divorced by June 1544, and Simon Preston died some time before March 1575 (Lynch, 2004).

Janet Beaton, by June 1544, had married Sir Walter Scott of Buccleuch (Cameron, 1927: 369). She was Walter's third wife, and the couple had five children together— two sons, named Walter and David, and three daughters, Grisel, Janet, and Margaret (Caldwell, 2004). Like Janet's previous husband, Walter Scott was an influential man. He was appointed warden of the west of the middle march by King James V in July 1528, and in 1529 he was granted the lordship of Jedburgh Forest (Caldwell, 2004). Walter played a key role in devising the successful strategy of the Battle of Ancrum Moor on 27 February 1545 and fought at the Battle of Pinkie on 10 September 1547 (Caldwell, 2004). Unlike many other Scotsmen, he continued to support Scottish interests in the various Anglo-Scottish wars that occurred throughout the 1540s, refusing the threats and bribes offered by the English (Caldwell, 2004). He was made warden of half of the middle march in 1550, and captain of Liddesdale in 1551 (Caldwell, 2004), reaping the rewards from his sustained support of the Scottish cause. Walter had maintained a family feud with the neighbouring Ker family— briefly halted by his marriage to his second wife, Janet Ker, whom he divorced— and he was murdered in Edinburgh on 4 October 1552 by a group of Ker noblemen due to this feud (Caldwell, 2004). Thus, by the time of her letter to Mary of Guise, Janet Beaton was a widow for the second time.

In 1559, Janet began an affair with James Hepburn, the 4th Earl of Bothwell. Hepburn was 19 years her junior, and the relationship did not appear to last any length of time, although it was rumoured that they were married (Marshall, 2004). The 4th Earl of Bothwell was prone to womanising, promising to marry Anna Throndsen, daughter of a Norwegian noble, who may have borne his child. In 1566, he married Lady Jean Gordon, the daughter of Elizabeth Keith and George Gordon, the 4th Earl of Huntly, and a member of Queen Mary's court. Hepburn was involved in the murder of Lord

Darnley, Queen Mary's husband, on 10 February 1566 (Marshall, 2004)— but at first avoided prosecution. Jean filed for divorce on 24 April 1567, accusing her husband of having an affair with a servant. That day, Hepburn abducted Queen Mary, held her at Dunbar Castle, and raped her— forcing the Queen to marry him. Although the union had initially been supported by several powerful nobles and members of the clergy, documented by the "Ainslie Bond", the 4th Earl of Bothwell's control over the Queen was soon deemed too powerful, and the couple surrendered to an army of Scottish lords at Carberry Hill on 15 June 1567. Confronted with evidence of his role in Lord Darnley's death, James Hepburn fled to Norway, and died a prisoner of king Frederick II in Denmark in 1578 (Marshall, 2004).

Janet Beaton died in 1569, around the age of 53, having outlived two husbands (Caldwell, 2004).

8.2.8. Lady Margaret Robertson

Very little biographical information survives on Margaret Robertson of Strowan, the first wife of George Hay, the 7th Earl of Erroll (Cameron, 1927: 383). The couple received dispensation to marry on 12 November 1528 (Cameron, 1927: 383), but letters to Mary of Guise from Margaret and from her husband George suggest that their relationship was very tumultuous (Cameron, 1927: 394). George Hay's letter is dated 28 May 1554, promising to "tak hame my wyif agane and trait hir with meself in houshald the best sort I can" (Cameron, 1927: 383), which suggests that he and Margaret have reconciled. However, Margaret wrote to Mary of Guise on 14 November 1554 stating that her husband had "chengit… from ye keping of his said promissis" made to Mary, and no longer wished to support her, despite she and their 9 children depending on him for their keep (Cameron, 1927: 393-394). Her son, Andrew, who became the 8th Earl of Erroll, is mentioned in letter 262 and seems to have had an equally difficult relationship with his father (Cameron, 1927: 383). In 1561, George Hay went on to marry Helen Bryson of Pitcullen (Cameron, 1927: 383).

It appears that Margaret's husband, George Hay, was a protestant, as Lord Patrick Gray identified him as a potential supporter of the English cause (Ritchie, 2002: 77). In an attempt to gain his loyalty, Mary of Guise nominated him to receive titles from King Henri II of France (Ritchie, 2002: 78).

The Hay family had held the earldom of Erroll since 1452, when William Hay, the 1st Earl of Erroll, was granted the title by King James II (McGladdery, 2004)— possibly in an attempt to retain Hay's loyalty to the crown. The Hay family also served as constables of Scotland (McGladdery, 2004).

8.2.9. Lady Janet Keith

Janet Keith was the daughter of William Keith, 3rd Earl Marischal, and his wife Margaret Keith (Wasser, 2016). The couple were married in 1531 and went on to have 12 children— 9 daughters and 3 sons (Wasser, 2016). There is one extant letter from Janet Keith to Mary of Guise dated 6 March 1547, which asks her to repay a debt.

Janet Keith married William Graham, the 2nd Earl of Montrose (Cameron, 1927: 437), who was born around 1495, and died in 1571 (Macpherson, 2004). The couple had at least one son, Robert Graham, who was killed on 10 September 1547 at the Battle of Pinkie, and whose son John Graham was born in 1548, after his death (Macpherson, 2004). Janet Keith had died by August 1547 (Cameron, 1927: 437), and her husband William Graham raised his grandson John Graham, who succeeded him as the 3rd Earl of Montrose in 1571 (Macpherson, 2004).

The Graham family had held the earldom of Montrose since 1503, when King James IV granted the title to William Graham, making him the 1st Earl of Montrose (McGladdery, 2004).

8.3. Social Network Analysis

The relationships of the various correspondents having been established, it is now possible to use social network analysis to illustrate the complex hierarchical relationships that existed between all the correspondents, and between each individual correspondent and their recipient, Mary of Guise. This analysis will use a modified version of Leitner's social network-strength scale (see chapter 1). Each correspondent is evaluated with regard to their relationships to the other correspondents within the corpus, and to Mary. This analysis is based on relation to each other by blood or marriage; existing familial relationship to Mary or to the Scottish crown; contractual relationship with Mary; rank and importance within sixteenth-century Scottish society; whether they share a surname or clan membership; and what their religious/ political affiliations are. This analysis is based on the correspondent biographies in section 8.2. The process and results of these evaluations are presented below.

8.3.1. Relations by Blood and Marriage within the Corpus

Elizabeth Keith was the niece of Janet Keith, as Elizabeth's father Robert and Janet were siblings. Elizabeth Keith also had familial connections with Elizabeth Campbell, as Elizabeth Campbell's mother was Janet Gordon, daughter of the 3rd Earl of Huntly, and so Elizabeth Campbell was the cousin of Elizabeth Keith's husband George. Elizabeth Campbell, in addition to her kinship with the Gordon clan, also had links with the Lords of Atholl through her second husband, whose grandfather was the 2nd Earl of Atholl. The nameless Countess of Atholl also had connections to the Gordons, as her mother was the daughter of Elizabeth Keith and her husband George. Thus, 4 of the correspondents are part of a familial network through their Gordon kinship. The remaining 5 correspondents do not have any kinship with the other letter-writers, although some of their children and grandchildren went on to intermarry.

8.3.2. Familial Proximity to Mary of Guise and the Scottish Throne

Elizabeth Keith's brother William had accompanied both King James V to France in 1536, and Mary of Guise in 1550, and was later one of Mary Stewart's personal attendants. Her husband George was James V's nephew and a close ally of the king's. Katherine Bellenden's family had multiple connections to the Scottish throne, as her father was Margaret Tudor's steward, and her mother had been James V's nurse. Furthermore, her husband Oliver Sinclair was one of the king's favourite courtiers. Elizabeth Campbell's father had been an ally of James V; and her first husband, James Stewart the 14th Earl of Moray, was James V's half-brother. Her second husband, John Gordon the 11th Earl of Sutherland, accompanied Mary of Guise to France. Janet Beaton's father escorted Mary of Guise to France, and her sister Elizabeth was James V's mistress. Moreover, her second husband Sir Simon Preston was a devoted supporter of Mary Stewart, raising a militia in her defence after Riccio's death. The remaining correspondents had no discernible personal relationship to Mary of Guise or the Scottish throne.

8.3.3. Contractual Relationships with Mary

Katherine Bellenden worked in royal service from 1537, and her third husband, Oliver Sinclair, had been a favourite of James V. Her brother John served as a clerk of expenses to James V, and her nephew was appointed to mediate between Mary and the Protestant Lords. Elizabeth Campbell's first husband, James Stewart, served as James V's keeper in his minority. Marion Ogilvie's husband, Patrick Gray, was apparently employed as a double agent against the English, receiving a pension from the Queen Regent.

8.3.4. Rank and Importance in Contemporary Scottish Society

Elizabeth Keith's husband was a central figure in sixteenth-century politics: he was lieutenant of the borders and of the north, served as regent when James V was in France, was a member of the privy council, and governor of the realm during Mary Stewart's minority. Katherine Bellenden was of a far lower rank— however, her first two husbands were Provosts of Edinburgh. Elizabeth Campbell also came from a well-connected family: her father was justice-general of Scotland and lieutenant of Lothian, and her first husband had been commander-in-chief of the Scottish army and one of James V's keepers. John Stewart, the Earl of Atholl, became Chancellor of Scotland after Mary Stewart's abdication. Marion Haliburton's father had been the last lord Haliburton, and her husband George was warden of the east march. Marion Ogilvie was the daughter of the 4th Lord Ogilvie, and spouse of the 4th Lord Gray, but otherwise, her family lacked notable influence. Janet Beaton's second husband was a Provost of Edinburgh, and her third husband, Walter Scott, was warden of half the middle march, lord of Jedburgh Forest, and an important military strategist. Margaret Robertson was married to the 7th Earl of Erroll, but otherwise seemed to lack any notable influence. Janet Keith was loosely connected to the Gordon clan through her niece, Elizabeth Keith's marriage to the 4th Earl of Huntly. Her husband was the 2nd Earl of Montrose, and her father had been the 3rd Earl Marischal.

8.3.5. Clans and Kinship

As mentioned in section 8.3.1, Elizabeth Keith, Elizabeth Campbell, the Countess of Atholl, and Janet Keith all had connections with the Gordon clan by various degrees, either by blood or marriage.

8.3.6. Religious and Political Affiliations

Elizabeth Keith's husband was Catholic, and part of the pro-French faction, as was Marion Haliburton's husband. Katherine Bellenden and Elizabeth Campbell were also Catholic, as was the Countess of Atholl. Marion Ogilvie's husband's affiliations varied, but it is likely that he was essentially Protestant and a proponent of the English cause. Janet Beaton's second and third husbands were staunch supporters of the Scottish cause. Margaret Robertson's husband was likely Protestant and part of the pro-English faction. Janet Keith's family and descendants appeared to be Protestant.

8.3.7. Results of Network Analysis

Based on the information summarised in sections 8.3.1 to 8.3.6, Elizabeth Campbell has the most familiar connection to the Queen Regent, followed by Elizabeth Keith and Katherine Bellenden.

These results have implications for their approach to letter-writing to Mary of Guise. Both Elizabeth Campbell and Katherine Bellenden use a proportionate amount of significant space in their letters, suggesting that although they have the social basis for a more familiar relationship with Mary of Guise, they still align with sixteenth century norms of material pragmatic politeness. However, Elizabeth Campbell does not seem to conform with notions of *ars dictaminis*, lacking an overt *petitio* in at least one of her letters. Likewise, Katherine Bellenden seems to conform more closely to the familiar letter, using the *narratio* portion of her letter to voice her complaints. Elizabeth Keith uses a disproportionate amount of significant space and is one of only two letters within the correspondence to align with every element of *ars dictaminis*, using her letter to express a plea. Of these three correspondents, Elizabeth Campbell is the only writer to utilise a scribe, suggesting the scribal-autograph distinction did not have much bearing on the expression of politeness within the corpus, as Elizabeth Campbell's letters are relatively informal in content.

According to the network analysis, the Countess of Atholl is the correspondent with the next strongest basis for a familiar relationship with Mary of Guise. Letter 116 aligns with the narrative style of the familiar letter, but the *petitio* is used to explicitly request Mary's assistance, aligning with *ars dictaminis*, and expresses loyalty. The Countess of Atholl also utilises disproportionate space and a scribe, although the latter is likely a necessity due to the age of the alleged author rather than an intentional expression of politeness.

Marion Ogilvie, Janet Beaton, and Janet Keith share a similar level of proximity to Mary of Guise based on the network-strength analysis. Marion Ogilvie utilises disproportionate significant space and utilises a scribe, aligning with material pragmatic notions of politeness. She also conforms with many of the elements of *ars dictaminis* and is the only correspondent to modify her superscription with the addition "Drowrare of scotland". Janet Beaton also uses a disproportionate amount of significant space and a scribe and is one of only two letters within the corpus to align with every element of *ars dictaminis*. Finally, Janet Keith uses a proportionate amount of significant space, but writes in her own hand and fails to comply with the *petitio* or *narratio*, using the latter section to voice a complaint to Mary. While Marion Ogilvie and Janet Beaton follow the expected norms of politeness one would associate with their social distance to Mary of Guise, Janet Keith does not, and communicates in a way which suggests a much closer social proximity to Mary than the network analysis indicates.

Marion Haliburton and Margaret Robertson are the two correspondents with the most distant social proximity to Mary of Guise; both correspondents write to Mary in their own hand, suggesting that this aspect of material pragmatics is not linked to the expression of politeness and social inferiority. Both Marion and Margaret utilise a familiar style, and use more terms linked to emotion than the other correspondents, aligning with the ideals of the familiar letter. Additionally, both correspondents write in a less formal tone that belies their social inferiority. Haliburton utilises disproportionate significant space in most of her correspondence, while Margaret uses proportionate space.

Chapter Four: Conclusion

1. The Research Questions Revisited

This thesis aimed to establish whether the proximity of the individual writers' relationships with Mary of Guise and social status relative to hers or the contents of their letters affect how the correspondents interact with Mary. These two questions were analysed in chapters two and three with reference to the material and pragmatic features, letter-writing conventions of the sixteenth century, features of women's letter-writing, elements of Scots lexis and grammar, and social network analysis.

As the social network analysis in chapter three illustrates, correspondents do not necessarily align with the material pragmatic features and sixteenth-century letter-writing conventions one might expect them to utilise based on their social status and proximity with Mary of Guise. Prior research in the field of material pragmatics, discussed on pages 7-8, 20-23, 65, 67, 75, and 76, suggests that writers were likely to utilise significant space in a systematic way to express politeness, where width of space correlated with the difference in social status between the writer and recipient.

The use of a scribe rather than the writer's own hand in correspondence is also believed to be indicative of social distance, with autograph hand correlating with familiarity, and scribal hand with formality. However, analysis of the material pragmatic features of the corpus in chapters two and three does not reveal systematic practices in either the use of significant space or scribal-autograph distinction across the correspondents.

Social network analysis would suggest that the correspondents with high social status and proximity to Mary would be likely to use less significant space and write in their own hand, than those letter-writers in the lower ranks of sixteenth-century society. However, while Elizabeth Campbell, Elizabeth Keith, and Katherine Bellenden have the closest proximity to Mary of Guise, both Campbell and Bellenden use proportionate significant space, aligning with contemporary notions of politeness, while Keith uses disproportionate significant space. Furthermore, Campbell utilises a scribe despite her proximity, while Keith and Bellenden write autograph letters. Therefore, no consistent pattern of material pragmatic politeness is evident in those closest in status to Mary, with each of these three correspondents varying. The Countess of Atholl, Marion Ogilvie, Janet Beaton, and Janet Keith— those correspondents who have less proximity to Mary of Guise— conform more closely with conventions of politeness expressed through significant space and scribal correspondence, as four of them utilise disproportionate significant space and three write with a scribe. This suggests that those in the middling ranks of society are more likely to use material pragmatics to negotiate their relationship of social inferiority with their recipient. Janet Keith is the exception to this pattern— although she is only of middling social status, she writes with her own hand, a norm which previous research associates with familiarity. Marion Haliburton and Margaret Robertson are furthest in social distance from Mary, but both use their own hand in most of their correspondence. Haliburton utilises disproportionate significant space in a consistent pattern within her autograph letters, while Robertson utilises proportionate significant space. While Haliburton does not share a similar social status to Mary of Guise, she is the most prolific of her female correspondents (based on the extant letters of the Scottish correspondence), and this frequency of communication may have more bearing on her material pragmatic features than her social status does. Both those at the highest and lowest ends of the social scale vary in their use of proportionate space and hand, suggesting that material pragmatic norms do not form a large part of their negotiation of social status in written

communication. A stronger alignment with pragmatic material conventions is evident in those correspondents found in the centre of the social scale.

Witt suggests that *ars dictaminis* was beginning to decline by the fifteenth century, to be replaced by the familiar letter, as discussed on pages 61 to 64 (Witt, 1982: 3). However, all 15 letters in the corpus include formulaic *salutatio* and *conclusio* that vary very little between individuals, with this convention of letter-writing being relied upon by each of the correspondents to negotiate their relationship with the Queen Regent. Generally, the writers all follow some form of the *exordium*, with only Elizabeth Campbell and Marion Ogilvie aligning with the format outlined by *ars dictaminis*. Most of the correspondence (86.7%) diverges from the structure of the *ars dictaminis* in the central portion of the letter, as discussed on pages 63-64, instead utilising a more familiar tone than is espoused by the *ars dictaminis* and instead conforming with two of the familiar letter's common contents: relating events and voicing complaints. Much of the correspondence conforms with the *petitio* section of *ars dictaminis*, with all letters utilising terms which explicitly relate to requests, illustrated in table 6 on page 71. Whilst Elizabeth Campbell and Janet Keith use terms including "beseik" and "pleis", one could argue that their letters do not actually express an overt *petitio*— Campbell's letters merely state her inability to repay her debts, while Keith's letter comprises a demand that the Queen Regent repay her debt to Keith. Therefore, the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise demonstrates the use of both *ars dictaminis* and elements of the familiar letter to negotiate individuals' relationships to Mary.

The correspondence does not necessarily align with the topics established by women's letter-writing conventions (see pages 64-71, and tables 3 to 5). As table 4 shows, 6 of the correspondents refer to male relatives, aligning with a topic of discussion expected by female letter-writers. However, only 2 of these correspondents refer to their male relatives in personal or emotional terms. Both Marion Ogilvie and Margaret Robertson refer to their husbands in a personal context, with the former expressing a plea for her husband's release in a formal letter which aligns with every element of *ars dictaminis*. The latter uses a less formal style throughout her letter, which focuses on her marital problems in an intimate way, suggesting a closer degree of familiarity between writer and recipient than the relationship that exists between the two. Robertson's use of terms which explicitly describe emotion aligns with the style of the familiar letter, but most of the corpus does not discuss emotion at all. The remaining 4 correspondents who refer to male relatives do so in passing, and usually when discussing debt or politics, rather than relating information about their well-being or actions in a social manner, as one might expect from sixteenth century women's letters. However, the discussions of national and international politics shown in table 3, page 68, diverge from the domains that sixteenth-century women would be expected to discuss. Thus, 6 of the 9 correspondents overtly display an awareness of and interaction with national or international politics. While finances and debt, discussed on 70, form part of women's duties in running their households, the 4 correspondents who discuss money are wholly responsible for negotiating their husbands' debts— or, in the case of Marion Haliburton, advocating for the wages of soldiers to be paid, and the renumeration of her tenants. Thus, one could argue that this topic of correspondence falls outside of the realm of expected responsibility. As table 6, page 71, shows, all 15 letters within the corpus utilise terms of request, aligning with Daybell's statement on how women used letters (Daybell, 2006: 35). However, while Marion Haliburton uses the most instances of terms relating to request (18.9%), her style of writing is relatively informal and familiar, suggesting that her position of inferiority to Mary of Guise did not influence either her topics of correspondence or the ways in which she expressed these topics.

All 15 of Mary's correspondents use a combination of Scots lexis (such as "hartly", "skaith", "lypinn", "restis"), orthography ("deligens", "haif", "quhat", "ʒit") and grammar ("quhilkis", "haldin", "obeyit"), suggesting that Scots was not seen by the letter-writers as a factor which could be used to create tone. However, use of high-style French-derived words such as "commendation", "oppressione", and "gratious", dotted throughout the letters, are used to create a formal tone.

2. Summary of Findings and Suggestions for Further Research

This thesis found that the proximity of the writer's relationship with Mary of Guise, and their social status relative to her, only played a role in the material pragmatic features of the correspondents in the centre of the social strata present within the corpus— namely, the Countess of Atholl, Marion Ogilvie, Janet Beaton, and Janet Keith. Those who belonged to the upper and lower echelons of society did not appear to use material pragmatic features to negotiate their relationship with the recipient in a systematic way, with the remaining 5 correspondents all varying in their letters.

All 15 correspondents conformed with the opening and closing elements of *ars dictaminis*, the *salutatio* and the *conclusio*, in positioning themselves as Mary's inferiors. However, most writers did not utilise the *exordium* in the conventional manner, nor did they align with the formality of the *narratio*, regardless of their letter content. Instead, most letters followed a more informal narrative format, as espoused by the familiar letter. All 15 letters utilise terms associated with requests, suggesting that the notion of *petitio* is followed throughout the corpus. However, Elizabeth Campbell and Janet Keith do not formulate explicit requests within their letters— whilst they utilise similar lexis to the rest of the correspondents, the former letter makes a statement, whilst the latter expresses a demand. Only Elizabeth Keith and Marion Ogilvie conform with every aspect of *ars dictaminis*, with both of their letters seeking to obtain or retain the goodwill of their recipient. The content of each letter does not necessarily align with the formality used in its structure— both Marion Ogilvie and Margaret Robertson request favours from Mary of Guise, but the former expresses herself through the formal structure of *ars dictaminis*, whilst the latter frames her request in the style associated with the familiar letter, including references to emotion that are absent throughout the majority of the corpus. The style of communication adopted by each letter-writer appears to be idiosyncratic, rather than a systematic pattern based on social status or content being evident throughout the corpus.

There are many elements of this corpus which offer avenues for further development. Given the high proportion of autograph letters in the female Scottish correspondence of Mary of Guise, in comparison to wider patterns of scribal use present in other similar corpora, such as the letters of Bess of Hardwick, and the letters of Joan and Maria Thynne, a more detailed analysis of the autograph letter-writers and their correspondence is likely to reveal factors which potentially link aspects such as the correspondents' social status, education, or topics of communication.

Marion Haliburton, as the most prolific of Mary's female Scottish correspondents, could also be examined in more detail, to discover any patterns in her hand, material pragmatics, lexis, grammar, and orthography. Her correspondence also presents the opportunity to examine changes in tone and familiarity of style, and lexis and orthography diachronically, albeit over a limited period of time.

The wealth of research on women's letter-writing, and on individual female letter-writers, offers the opportunity to compare features of this corpus to the letters of other sixteenth century women, or other Scottish letter-writers, from comparing formulaic *salutatio* and *conclusio*, to examining diatopic changes in sixteenth-century orthography. Future research could compare this corpus with

similar corpora which represent the other side of such communication— including the letters of Queen Elizabeth I, and Queen Margaret.

Bibliography

Archives.collections.ed.ac.uk. 2018. *Collection: Letter from Mary of Guise to Lord Vigilius a Zuichem dated 1555 | University of Edinburgh Archive and Manuscript Collections*. [online] Available at: <https://archives.collections.ed.ac.uk/repositories/2/resources/83265> [Accessed 29 January 2022].

Archiveshub.jisc.ac.uk. 2022. *Letter from Mary of Guise to Antoine de Noailles, 1555. - Archives Hub*. [online] Available at: <https://archiveshub.jisc.ac.uk/search/archives/8d2f0be3-bdb1-306a-aa2d-8341cdbd321f> [Accessed 29 January 2022].

Attar, K., 2022. *Tironian sign*. [online] Oxford Reference. Available at: <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780198606536.001.0001/acref-9780198606536-e-4884> [Accessed 30 January 2022].

Barnes, D., 2016. Editing Early Modern Women's Letters for Print Publication. In: Ross, S. C. E. and Salzman, P. (eds) *Editing Early Modern Women*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 121–138.

Bax, M. and D. Z. Kádár. "The historical understanding of historical (im)politeness". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 12:1-2 (2011), p. 5.

Bess of Hardwick's Letters: The Complete Correspondence, c.1550-1608, ed. by Alison Wiggins, Alan Bryson, Daniel Starza Smith, Anke Timmermann and Graham Williams, University of Glasgow, web development by Katherine Rogers, University of Sheffield Humanities Research Institute (April 2013). Available at: <https://www.bessofhardwick.org> [Accessed14 December 2021].

Black Verschuur, M., 2006. *Gray, Patrick, fourth Lord Gray (1515x20–1584), nobleman*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11347?rskey=ddd1cf&result=1> [Accessed 16 February 2022].

Caldwell, D., 2004. *Scott, Sir Walter, of Buccleuch (c. 1490–1552), border chieftain*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-24923?rskey=xSXHp6&result=1> [Accessed 7 September 2021].

Caldwell, D., 2004. *Sinclair, Oliver (d. in or before 1576), courtier*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-25630?rskey=5DJEIj&result=1> [Accessed 3 November 2020].

Camargo, M., "The Waning of Medieval Ars Dictaminis" *Rhetorica* 19, no. 2 (2001), p. 136-137.

Camargo, M., 2022. *ars dictaminis and ars dictandi*. [online] Oxford Reference. Available at: <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780198662624.001.0001/acref-9780198662624-e-0507> [Accessed 13 February 2022].

Cameron, A., 1927. *The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine.* 1st ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. xiii, xiv, xxii, 19-21 ,46- 47, 130-131, 148-150, 157-158, 280-281, 291- 292, 295-297, 341-342, 348, 369-370, 383, 393-395, 411-413, 437-439.

Catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk. 2022. *NAS Catalogue - catalogue record*. [online] Available at: <https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx?reference=SP2&st=1&tc=y&tl=n&tn=n&tp=n&k=mary&ko=a&r=&ro=c&df=1500&dt=1600&di=y> [Accessed 15 January 2022].

Chartier, R., Boureau, A., Dauphin, C. and Woodall, C., 1997. *Correspondence: Models of Letter-Writing from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Polity Press. p. 70.

Clarke, D., 2001. *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing*. 1st ed. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., pp. 20-21, 23, 39.

Cusack, B., 1998. *Everyday English 1500-1700: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, p. xv.

Da Rold, O., 2020. *Paper in Medieval England: from Pulp to Fictions*. 1st ed. [ebook] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available at: <https://www-cambridge-org.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/core/books/paper-in-medieval-england/1170CB3703A4A9C956B5508AF9F0F22A#fndtn-information> [Accessed 14 December 2021].

Dambrogio, J. and Starza Smith, D., et al. 2016. *Dictionary of Letterlocking* (DoLL). Last updated: 30 December 2017. Abbreviated on this page: (DoLL 2016). All images except when noted are courtesy of the Unlocking History Materials Collection. Available at: <https://letterlocking.squarespace.com/folds>. [Accessed 3 February 2022].

Dambrogio, J., Ghassaei, A., Smith, D.S., Jackson, H., Demaine, M.L., Davis, G., Mills, D., Ahrendt, R., Akkerman, N., Linden, D. van der and Demaine, E.D. (2021) "Unlocking history through automated virtual unfolding of sealed documents imaged by X-ray microtomography," *Nature Communications*, 12(1), p. 1184. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21326-w.

Da Rold, O., 2020. *Paper in Medieval England: From Pulp to Fictions*. 1st ed. [ebook] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.pp. 94 - 142. Available at: <https://www-cambridge-org.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/core/books/paper-in-medieval-england/writing-on-paper/B747919C3A01B5B60E523AAF33FEC4A1> [Accessed 18 December 2021].

Dawson, G. and Kennedy-Skipton, L., 1981. *Elizabethan handwriting, 1500-1650*. 2nd ed. Chicester, Sussex: Phillimore., pp. 9-10.

Dawson, J., 2004. *Campbell, Colin, third earl of Argyll (d. 1529), magnate*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-4482?rskey=9D15ol&result=1> [Accessed 1 December 2020].

Daybell, J. and Gordon, A., 2016. *Cultures of Correspondence in Early Modern Britain*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press., pp. 24-25.

Daybell, J. and University of Plymouth., n.d. *Professor James Daybell - University of Plymouth*. [online] Plymouth.ac.uk. Available at: <https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/staff/james-daybell> [Accessed 14 December 2021].

Daybell, J., "Letters" in *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing*, ed. L. L. Knoppers, p. 181-193. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009., pp. 181-184, 186, 188.

Daybell, J., 2001. Female Literacy and the Social Conventions of Women's Letter-Writing in England, 1540-1603. In: J. Daybell, ed., *Early Modern Women's Letter Writing, 1450-1700*, 1st ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave, p.60.

Daybell, J., *Women Letter-Writers in Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, pp. 18, 25, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 75, 93, 101, 108, 113.

Daybell, J., 2012. *The Material Letter in Early Modern England*. 1st ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 63-67, 70-71, 98, 218, 230.

Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S., 2003. *Language and Gender*. [ebook] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.130-131. Available at: <https://web-p-ebscohost-com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzEyNTAzOF9fQU41?sid=8a871bfe-87c8-49c4-8f54-1c751ab5e0f0@redis&vid=0&format=EB&lpid=lp_129&rid=0> [Accessed 4 June 2022].

Evans, M., 2013. *The Language of Queen Elizabeth I*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 1-29, 30-59, 60-73, 75-80, 81-89, 91-100, 123-134.

Finlay, J., 2004. *Bellenden, Sir John, of Auchnoul [of Auchinoul] (d. 1576), judge and legal writer*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-2044?rskey=erbG9U&result=2> [Accessed 3 November 2020].

Folgerpedia.folger.edu. 2021. *Heather Wolfe - Folgerpedia*. [online] Available at: <https://folgerpedia.folger.edu/Heather_Wolfe#Publications> [Accessed 14 December 2021].

Goldring, E., 2004. *Talbot [née Hardwick], Elizabeth [Bess] [called Bess of Hardwick], countess of Shrewsbury (1527?–1608), noblewoman*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26925?rskey=YSbh2v&result=1> [Accessed 29 January 2022].

Goodare, J., 2007. *Mary [Mary Stewart] (1542–1587), queen of Scots*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18248?rskey=qaHBnQ&result=1#odnb-9780198614128-e-18248-div1-d135321e2408> [Accessed 16 February 2022].

Gutiérrez Arranz, J. M. and Sola Buil, R.J., review of "The Late Medieval Epistle" *Disputatio : An International Transdisciplinary Journal of the Late Middle Ages*, ed. C Poster and R. J. Utz, *Prolepsis: The Tübingen Review of English Studies* (1998), p. 1.

Hewitt, G., 2006. *Stewart, John, fourth earl of Atholl (d. 1579), magnate*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26491#odnb-9780198614128-e-26491-headword-2> [Accessed 16 February 2022].

Hubbell, H. M., Cicero, *De Inventione* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 41.

Jardine, L., 2015, *Erasmus, Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 151.

Kclpure.kcl.ac.uk. 2020. *Daniel Smith - Research Outputs - Research Portal, King's College, London*. [online] Available at: <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/persons/daniel-smith(82ac5416-842f-4614-bfb8-17822afc6ecf)/publications.html> [Accessed 14 December 2021].

Leitner, M., 2015. *Conflicts in Early Modern Scottish Letters and Law-Courts*. Ph.D. University of Glasgow, pp. 2, 13-38, 41-71, 73-92.

Lyall, R., 1996. The construction of a rhetorical voice in sixteenth-century Scottish letters. *Prose Studies*, [online] 19(2), pp.127-135. Available at: <https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/doi/abs/10.1080/01440359608586581> [Accessed 15 January 2022].

Lynch, M., 1992. *Scotland: A New History*. 2nd ed. London: Pimlico, pp. 190-191, 204-205.

Lynch, M., 2004. *Preston, Sir Simon, of Preston and Craigmillar (d. in or before 1575), administrator and provost of Edinburgh*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22729?rskey=Y11tGw&result=1> [Accessed 7 September 2021].

Macafee, C. and Aitken, A., 2002. *A History of Scots to 1700*. [online] Dsl.ac.uk. Available at: <https://dsl.ac.uk/about-scots/history-of-scots/> [Accessed 15 February 2022].

Macdougall, N., 2008. *Hume [Home] family (per. 1424–1516), Scottish nobility*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-54234#odnb-9780198614128-e-54234-headword-5> [Accessed 21 October 2020].

Mackillop, A., Munro, J. and Munro, R., 2011. *Campbell family of Cawdor (per. 1511–1821), highland chiefs, landowners, and politicians*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-70941#odnb-9780198614128-e-70941-headword-2> [Accessed 1 December 2020].

Macpherson, R., 2004. *Graham, John, third earl of Montrose (1548–1608), magnate and lord chancellor of Scotland*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11207?rskey=Z15PkQ&result=1> [Accessed 16 February 2022].

Manuscripts.nls.uk. 2022. *Catalogue of Archives and Manuscripts Collections | National Library of Scotland | NLSMSS | Balcarres Papers.* [online] Available at: <https://manuscripts.nls.uk/repositories/2/resources/16378> [Accessed 15 January 2022].

Marshall, R. and Macleod, I., 2008. *Mary of Guise, Queen of Scots*. Edinburgh: NMS Enterprises, pp. 7, 9, 13, 17, 19, 45, 61-63, 72, 97.

Marshall, R., 2004. Mary [Mary of Guise]. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18250> [Accessed 22 June 2021].

Marshall, R., 2004. *Gordon, Jean, countess of Bothwell and Sutherland (c. 1546–1629), noble-woman*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-66292#odnb-9780198614128-e-66292> [Accessed 25 September 2021].

Marshall, R., 2004. *Hepburn, James, fourth earl of Bothwell and duke of Orkney (1534/5–1578), magnate and third consort of Mary, queen of Scots*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13001> [Accessed 25 September 2021].

Marshall, R., 2004. *Stewart, Elizabeth, countess of Arran (c. 1554–1595?), noblewoman*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-69924#odnb-9780198614128-e-69924> [Accessed 16 February 2022].

Marshall, R., 2006. *Queen Mary's Women: Female Relatives, Servants, Friends and Enemies of Mary Queen of Scots*. Edinburgh: Birlinn Ltd., pp. 4, 6, 10, 15, 90, 142, 143.

McGladdery, C., 2004. *Graham family (per. c. 1250–1513), nobility*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-54211?rskey=hZCJWN&result=1#odnb-9780198614128-e-54211-headword-5> [Accessed 16 February 2022].

McGladdery, C., 2004. *Hay family (per. c. 1295–c. 1460), nobility*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-54228?rskey=cIOgq0&result=1#odnb-9780198614128-e-54228-headword-5> [Accessed 16 February 2022].

Meikle, M., 2007. *Hume [Home], George, fourth Lord Hume (d. 1549), nobleman*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13641#odnb-9780198614128-e-13641> [Accessed 21 October 2020].

Newsome, H., 2020. The function, format, and performance of Margaret Tudor's January 1522 diplomatic memorial. *Renaissance Studies*, [online] 35(3), pp.403-424. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/rest.12678?saml_referrer> [Accessed 14 December 2021].

Nrscotland.gov.uk. 2021. *State Papers | National Records of Scotland*. [online] Available at: <https://www.nrscotland.gov.uk/research/guides/state-papers> [Accessed 23 June 2021].

Perelman, L., "The Medieval Art of Letter Writing: Rhetoric As Institutional Expression" in *Textual Dynamics of the Professions: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities*, ed. C. Bazerman and J. Paradis, p. 97-119. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004., pp. 99, 100, 105, 113, 114.

Ritchie, P., 2002. *Mary of Guise in Scotland, 1548-1560*. East Lothian: Tuckwell Press Ltd, pp. 7-8, 13, 72, 77-78, 237.

Royan, N., 2006. *Bellenden [Bannatyne], John (c. 1495–1545x8), poet and translator*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-2045?rskey=erbG9U&result=3> [Accessed 3 November 2020].

Sanderson, M., 2004. *Beaton [Betoun], David (1494?–1546), cardinal and archbishop of St Andrews*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1823?rskey=yuKd69&result=1> [Accessed 28 September 2021].

Schneider, G., 2005. *The Culture of Epistolarity*. Newark: University of Delaware Press., pp. 29, 37, 42-43, 112, 117-118, 130-132, 200.

Scotland, 1877. *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland v. 6*. [ebook] Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, p.332. Available at: <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=chi.097511995&view=1up&seq=422&skin=2021> [Accessed 3 November 2020].

Simpson, G., 1973. *Scottish Handwriting 1150-1650: An Introduction to the Reading of Documents*. 1st ed. Edinburgh: Bratton Publishing Ltd., pp.14, 15, 17.

Smith, J., 1996. *An Historical Study of English*. 1st ed. London: Routledge, pp. 9, 10.

Smith, J., 2012. *Older Scots: A Linguistic Reader*. Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, pp. 19, 24, 27, 28, 33-35, 40-43, 45, 48, 49, 52, 55, 61-63, 71-72, 102-106.

Smith, J., 2020. *Transforming Early English*. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. xv, xvii, 11, 14, 22-25, 27-31.

Starza Smith, D, 'Epistolary Tools and the Letter-Writing Process', in *Bess of Hardwick's Letters: The Complete Correspondence, c.1550-1608*, ed. by Alison Wiggins, Alan Bryson, Daniel Starza Smith, Anke Timmermann and Graham Williams, University of Glasgow, web development by Katherine Rogers, University of Sheffield Humanities Research Institute (April 2013). Available at: < https://www.bessofhardwick.org/background.jsp?id=158> [Accessed 14 December 2021].

Starza Smith, D, 'Folds and Creases', in *Bess of Hardwick's Letters: The Complete Correspondence, c.1550-1608*, ed. by Alison Wiggins, Alan Bryson, Daniel Starza Smith, Anke Timmermann and Graham Williams, University of Glasgow, web development by Katherine Rogers, University of Sheffield Humanities Research Institute (April 2013). Available at: < https://www.bessofhardwick.org/background.jsp?id=159> [Accessed 14 December 2021].

Starza Smith, D, 'The Material Features of Early Modern Letters: A Reader's Guide', in *Bess of Hardwick's Letters: The Complete Correspondence, c.1550-1608,* ed. by Alison Wiggins, Alan Bryson, Daniel Starza Smith, Anke Timmermann and Graham Williams, University of Glasgow, web development by Katherine Rogers, University of Sheffield Humanities Research Institute (April 2013). Available at: < https://www.bessofhardwick.org/background.jsp?id=143> [Accessed 27 January 2020].

Stewart, A., 2008. *Shakespeare's letters*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 43-44.

Stewart, A., and Wolfe, H., *Letterwriting in Renaissance England*. Washington: University of Washington Press, 2004, pp. 21, 22, 23.

Swan, E., Innes, S., Reynolds, S. and Pipes, R., 2006. *The Biographical Dictionary of Scottish Women: From Earliest Times to 2004*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 138, 206.

Thomas, A., 2007. *Stewart, James, earl of Moray (1500–1544/5), nobleman*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at:

<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26478?rskey=gy3zFc&result=4> [Accessed 1 December 2020].

Wall, W., 2009. Women in the household. In: L. Knoppers, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern women's Writing*, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 97.

Wasser, M., 2016. *Keith, William, third Earl Marischal (c. 1510–1581), magnate*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15276?rskey=0cHThV&result=1> [Accessed 16 February 2022].

Web.archive.org. 2011. *Stirling Castle - Court Life - Katherine Bellenden*. [online] Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20110707050231/http:/www.stirlingcastle.gov.uk/katherinebellenden> [Accessed 3 November 2020].

Weir, G., 2009. *Orthography in the correspondence of Lady Katherine Paston, 1603-1627*. M.Phil. University of Glasgow, pp. 4, 26-31.

White, A., 2004. *Gordon, George, fifth earl of Huntly*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11035#odnb-9780198614128-e-11035> [Accessed 20 June 2021].

White, A., 2004. *Gordon, George, fourth earl of Huntly (1513–1562), magnate*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11034?rskey=2XyGG5&result=2#odnb-9780198614128-e-11034-div1-d700372e221> [Accessed 1 December 2020].

White, A., 2010. *Gordon, John, eleventh earl of Sutherland (1525–1567), magnate*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11060?rskey=8vR0FX&result=9> [Accessed 1 December 2020].

Wiggins, A., 2013. *Bess of Hardwick's Letters | The complete correspondence, 1550-1608*. [online] Bessofhardwick.org. Available at: <https://www.bessofhardwick.org/background.jsp?id=188> [Accessed 20 June 2021].

Wiggins, A., 2019. *Bess of Hardwick's Letters: Language, Materiality, and Early Modern Epistolary Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge., pp. xiv, 1-26.

Williams, G, 'The Language of Early Modern Letters: A Reader's Guide', in *Bess of Hardwick's Letters: The Complete Correspondence, c.1550-1608*, ed. by Alison Wiggins, Alan Bryson, Daniel Starza Smith, Anke Timmermann and Graham Williams, University of Glasgow, web development by Katherine Rogers, University of Sheffield Humanities Research Institute (April 2013). Available at < https://www.bessofhardwick.org/background.jsp?id=179>. [Accessed 27 January 2020].

Williams, G., 2009. *Pragmatic Readings of the Letters of Joan and Maria Thynne, 1575-1611 With Diplomatic Transcriptions of Their Correspondence*. Ph.D. University of Glasgow, pp. 68-98, 99-128, 129-160.

Witt, R., "Medieval "Ars Dictaminis" and the Beginnings of Humanism: a New Construction of the Problem", *Renaissance Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1982), pp. 2-3, 6, 8-12.

Wolfe, H., 2009. Women's Handwriting. In: L. Knoppers, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern women's Writing*, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.23-25, 29, 33.

Wolfe, H., 2012. 'Neatly sealed, with silk, and Spanish wax or otherwise': the Practice of Letter-locking with Silk Floss in Early Modern England. In: S. Cerasano and S. May, ed., *In the Prayse of Writing*, 1st ed. London: The British Library, pp.169-184.

Wood, M., 1923. *Foreign Correspondence with Marie de Lorraine, Queen of Scotland, 1537-1548*. 1st ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, p. vii.

Wormald, J., 2014. *James VI and I (1566–1625), king of Scotland, England, and Ireland*. [online] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-14592?rskey=eGt1P9&result=2> [Accessed 16 February 2022].