and deeds often to the worst. Oppressed with fantasie, which hath ever mastered his reason, a general disease in many poets. His inventions are smooth and easy; but above all he excelleth in a translation.  

When his play of a Silent Woman was first acted, there was found verses after on the stage against him, concluding that that play was well named the Silent Woman, ther was never one man to say Plaudite to it.

with ten times his work, was gentle, good-natured, easy, and unamiable.” (Vol. i. p. 241.) For the words here printed in italics, Drummond's MSS. furnish no kind of authority. Neither does Sibbald’s transcript contain “The Character of several Authors, given by Mr Drummond” himself, which is inserted in his Works, p. 225. The summing up of Jonson’s character remains indeed as unqualified as ever, and it is by no means a flattering picture. The only question however is, whether Drummond was a competent and unprejudiced observer—we and the impression left on his mind, after several days social intercourse, be a correct delineation of Jonson’s personal character and disposition—points which need not be here discussed. Mr Gifford admits, “that forbearance was at no time our Poet’s (Jonson’s) virtue,” while Drummond’s testimony was not required in order to satisfy us of Jonson’s overweening vanity, of his occasional arrogance, and his spite and jealousy of some of his contemporaries; but, on the other hand, he possessed many redeeming qualities, and a warm-hearted humanity, which had been sacrificed to an imaginary envy of Shakespeare. His character cannot be better drawn than in the words of Mr Campbell, with part of which we may conclude.

It is true that he [Jonson] had lofty notions of himself, was proud even to arrogance in his defence of censure, and in the warmth of his own praises of himself was scarcely surpassed by his most ardent admirers; but many fine traits of honour and affection are likewise observable in the portrait of his character, and the charges of malice and jealousy that have been heaped on his name for an hundred years turn out to be without foundation. In the quarrel with Marston and Dekker his culpability is by no means evident. He did not receive benefits from Shakespeare, and did not sneer at him in the passages that have been taken to prove his ingratitude; and instead of envying that great poet, he gave him his noblest praise; nor did he trample on his contemporaries, but liberally commended them.” (Specimens of the British Poets, vol. iii. p. 142.)

Jonson himself and his friends maintained that his translations were the best parts of his works; a conclusion in which Gifford and other modern critics are by no means disposed to acquiesce. See Works, vol. ii. p. 474, note.

XVIII.—Observations on Forteviot, the Site of the Ancient Capital of Scotland,

By William F. Skene, Esq.

[Read to the Society January 23, 1832.]

Having had occasion lately to visit some of the remains of antiquity in Strathearn, generally ascribed to the Picts, I was led to consult the few authorities we possess on this subject, with a view to ascertain the accuracy of the traditions relating to them; and these investigations have led to the remarks which I now take the liberty of submitting to this Society.

There are few traditions which have obtained more universal belief than that, at some unknown period, Abernethy was the metropolis of the Pictish dominions. This fact has been confidently stated by our earlier Scottish historians, and repeated again and again by an innumerable host of imitators and followers.
Our later antiquaries, too, have very generally fallen into this error; and by one writer we even find it made the subject of an instructive moral reflection, "that of the extensive capital of the once powerful nation of the Picts there remains now not a vestige saving a single tower." As to the use or object of this tower, however, being equally destitute of a roof and a door-way, these imagina-
tive writers have been somewhat puzzled. By some it is supposed to have been the tomb of the Pictish kings; by others either the steeple of their church, or the "point from which the Pictish Monarch frequently enjoyed the beautiful and varied prospect which extended on all sides around him."

I need scarcely say, that the tradition of there having existed at Abernethy an extensive metropolis, is as inconsistent with the state of civilization to which Scotland had at that time reached, as it is unsupported by our older and more authentic chronicles. In fact, the whole story is a mere dream of the fabulous historians, and must take its place among those numerous fables which own authentic chronicles. In fact, the whole story is a mere dream of the fabulous historians, and must take its place among those numerous fables which own.

Indeed the only chronicle in which the name of Abernethy occurs at all is the Pictish Chronicle, which is of great antiquity; and there we find Necton, a king of the Picts who reigned about the year 470, described as founding a church at Abernethy, and dedicating it, along with the surrounding territory, to God and St. Brigid.

This is further corroborated by Fordun, who gives the following account of the foundation of the church there, and quotes an ancient chronicle of Abernethy. Postquam illic introductit beatus Patricius Sanctam Brigidam, sanctamque ecclesiam collegiatam de Abernethy. Postquam illic introductit beatus Patricius Sanctam Brigidam, sanctamque ecclesiam collegiatam de Abernethy.

These boundaries, which retain their names to this day, include the village of Abernethy, and the surrounding territory to the distance of a mile and a half or two miles on every side.

1 Pictish Chron. "Secundo anno insularivit Nectonius Abernethige Deo et Sanctae Brigidae, prenese Dairlugtach, quæ cantavit libellus super istam hostiam ; optulit iligant Nectonius magnus filius Wirp, rex omnium provinciarum Pictorum, Aperneithige Sanctae Brigidae unque ad diem judicii cum suis finibus quæ positæ sunt à lapide in Apurfeirt usque ad lapidem juxta Cairful, id est, Leithoul, et inde in altum usque ad Athan."

2 Fordun, iv. 12.

3 Quaedam de nobilis Pictorum gener. Adom. ii. 11. Ilo in tempore quo Sanctus Columbanus Pictorum provincias per aliquem demusulatur dies, quibus omn eum toti plebesei familia. Adom. ii. 12.
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Viewing these facts, then, in connection with the description given by Tacitus of the election of Galgacus by the Caledonians to oppose the invasion of Agricola, it appears perfectly plain that there was at first no hereditary line of sovereigns among the Picts, but that one of these chiefs alone could be elected monarch; and that when this election was disputed, the one of the competitors who was most nearly connected with the last monarch was called to the throne, and this connection, it would appear, was generally by the female line.

After some time, however, the power and talent of some chief would enable him to change the principle of election into that of hereditary succession; and this appears to have been finally accomplished by Constantine the son of Fergus, who ascended the Pictish throne towards the end of the eighth century, and in whose family the monarchy remained for some time.

On the death of Ewen, the last king of this line, there succeeded a short period of anarchy and civil wars, until at length the celebrated Kenneth Macalpin succeeded in re-establishing the hereditary succession in his own family in 843.

Previously, then, to the introduction of hereditary succession among the Picts, when they had not been as yet civilized, and were still acquainted with commerce and manufactures, —when their agricultural knowledge was rude, and their occupations still continued to be war and hunting,—large towns would be unknown to them, and their capital would be merely the palace of the Pictish monarch, and would vary in situation according to the territory of the tribe which that monarch was hereditary chief. After the establishment of hereditary succession, however, the residence of the chief in whose family that succession was perpetuated would then for the first time become the permanent residence of the Pictish monarchs, and capital of the whole nation.

Keeping these facts, then, in view, we must now turn to the Irish annalists, the earliest and most authentic sources of our history.

In Tigernac, the most ancient of these, we find that, previously to the introduction of hereditary succession in the family of Constantine, two of the Pictish monarchs are styled indiscriminately Reges Pictorum and Reges Fortun. This is exactly in accordance with the practice of the Celtic annalists, who frequently use the name of the capital town for that of the territory.

Thus the kings of Ireland are frequently styled kings of Tara, those of Ulster kings of Eamann or Armagh, and in the Laws of Eowel dha the king of England is termed king of London.

It is therefore probable that Fortren was the royal residence of these two kings, and would be situated in the territories of the tribe of which they were hereditary chiefs.

The annals of Ulster style all the kings of the family of Constantine the son of Fergus also kings of Fortren; from which it would appear that Constantine was of the same tribe with the two former kings, and that in his reign Fortren was established as the permanent metropolis of the whole Pictish nation.

The next place which is mentioned in these Chronicles as a royal residence is under the reign of Kenneth Macalpin, who is mentioned in the Pictish Chronicle as having died "in palace suo Fothuirtabhaict," afterwards called Forteviot.

The question therefore remains, Is this Fothuirtabhaict the same place as Fortren, or not?

This is however distinctly proved by the old history of the foundation of the church of Kilkenny or St. Andrews, written about A.D. 1140, which places that event in the reign of Angus, the brother and successor Constantine. This Angus is styled by the annals of Ulster Rex Fortren, while the history of St. Andrews expressly says that his residence was the Urbs Forteviot.

It is thus plain that Fortren and Forteviot are the same place, and that when Kenneth succeeded in re-establishing the hereditary monarchy, he took up his residence at the old capital of Fortren, then called Fothuirtabhaict.

Forteviot appears to have remained the metropolis of Scotland, and the chief residence of the kings of the race of Kenneth, down to the reign of Donald the son of Constantine and the fifth in succession from Kenneth.

In his reign we learn from the ancient Chronicles that it was destroyed in a battle which took place between the Scots and the Danes, during one of those formidable invasions which at that time harassed Scotland. In this battle the Scots succeeded in checking the progress of these invaders, though with the loss of their own king Donald, who was killed in the conflict.

This event affords another strong corroboration of the fact which I have advanced, that Fortren and Forteviot were the same place; for the Pictish Chronicle narrates the event in the following terms: "Oppidum Forteviot occisum est a gentibus;" while the Annals of Ulster say, "Ivar O Hivar, killed by the men of Fortren."

In the same Chronicle we find, in the succeeding reign, mention made of the royal city of Scoan, from which it seems probable, that on the destruction of Forteviot by the Danes, the kings of Scotland had crossed the Tay, and
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taken up their residence at the more defensible place of Scone, where they were less likely to be surprised. This is the first time we find Scone mentioned in these Chronicles, and it probably continued to be the capital of Scotland till the reign of Malcolm the Third.

On the successful result of Malcolm's invasion of Scotland, for it can scarcely be deemed less, he appears, from the constant tradition of the country, and from other circumstances, to have made the more ancient metropolis of Scotland once again his principal residence, and to have erected a palace at Forteviot.

His son Alexander I. likewise resided some time there, and, from a circumstance I shall mention immediately, seems to have made some additions to the building erected there by his father. From this place, too, we find some of the charters of Malcolm IV. to have been dated. He appears to have been the last king who resided at Forteviot, as from this time we lose all sight of it, and his successors probably removed their general residence to Stirling.

From these remarks, then, it will appear that Forteviot is the only place which can claim the honour of having been the most ancient capital of Scotland, and that after its destruction by the Norwegian pirates in 904, Scone became the principal seat of the kings of Scotland until the reign of Malcolm the Third, when Forteviot again became the residence of the kings of Scotland, until at last, deserted by its royal occupants, it gradually fell into decay and insignificance.

The present village of Forteviot stands on the banks of a small rivulet called the May, near its junction with the river Earn, and about ten miles farther up the great strath of the Earn than Abernethy. About three quarters of a mile to the east of the village the ground rises and forms an eminence of considerable extent, on the top of which are the remains of a pretty extensive hill fort, constructed after the usual style of these strongholds.

The situation of this fort is naturally very strong, being partly surrounded by a moat, while a natural embankment extends along the south side of the eminence, and forms an eminence of considerable extent, on the top of which are the remains of a pretty extensive hill fort, constructed after the usual style of these strongholds.

The interior is about 130 feet in diameter, while the ramparts extend at a distance of about twenty feet from each other.

Immediately to the west of this stronghold, and on the top of another eminence, which is separated from it by a small ravine only, and which forms one side of the covered way formerly mentioned, there is a large tumulus, partly built with stones, but which I believe has never been opened.

This fort commands an extensive view of the great plain or strath of the Earn, which extends on all sides around it, and forms the centre, as it were, of a circle of large forts situated on the top of the neighbouring heights, which bound the place on the south and north, and which, from the extensive prospect they command, would effectually guard against the unseen approach of an enemy.

This fort, then, has every appearance of having been the ancient Fortren; it was afterwards probably the citadel of the more extensive Urbs Forteviot or Fothuirtabhaict of the kings of the line of Kenneth, and in all likelihood continued to be so until the royal residence was removed to Scone.

Tradition points out a piece of high table-land close to the present village of Forteviot, as the site of the palace which was afterwards built there. The ruins of this palace were still to be seen so late as the year 1772, and the building appears, from an account of its condition at that time, which I shall read immediately, to have been destroyed by fire.

The ground on which the palace stood, and which is called by the country people the Holy Hill, has been almost entirely swept away, along with the ruins themselves, by the encroachments of the May.

Henry Adamson, author of a curious and scarce book called the "Muses Threnodie," describes a visit to these remains in the year 1639 in these terms:

"Right over to Forteviot did we hy.
And there the ruined Castle did we spy.
Of Malcolm Ken-more, whom Mackduff, then Thane
Of Fyffe (as cal'd'), from England brought again,
And fiercelie did persue tyrant Makbeth,
Usurper of the Crown, even to the death;
These Castles mine when we did consider,
We saw that wasting time makes all things wither."
And in a note the editor of the work, which was republished in 1774, adds, "The ruins of this palace remain at Forteviot, on the other side of Earn, almost opposite to Duppline."

The following account is given of those ruins in 1772, by the minister of Forteviot. "Hard by the village of Forteviot is a heap of rubbish, on an eminence commonly called the Holy Hill. From its present ruined condition, one would naturally be led to imagine that the elements have combined to raze it to the foundation; for the burnt stones and embers of which it is composed evidently prove that its destruction has been effected by fire; and the water of May (a river so called) continues to sweep away yearly more or less of its remaining ruins."

There is now not a vestige of these ruins to be seen on the spot where they once lay. But a very singular stone was discovered a few years ago, lying in the bed of the May, immediately under the Holy Hill.

This stone is represented in the Plate, fig. 1, and has every appearance of having formed a part of the ancient palace, probably the top of the gateway. The diameter is about five feet, and the stone is about a foot and a half broad and one foot thick. The sculpture is very rudely executed in bas-relief, and has apparently been done in the eleventh or twelfth century.

That this is the probable period to which we must refer this stone, is further corroborated by the form of the stone itself being semicircular, as there is every reason to think that the semicircular arch was introduced into England in the eleventh century, and may have been brought from thence into Scotland by Edgar, who finally established the family of Malcolm Kenmore on the throne of Scotland, by the assistance of the Norman and Saxon barons of England.

The subject of the sculpture consists of three figures, one of whom is separated from the other two by means of a cross, now somewhat defaced. It will be remarked that the single figure is represented with a head-dress of a more ornamental description than the other two, which marks him out as of a higher dignity. It is probably a rude attempt to represent a crown, and the other two figures are perhaps meant as followers or guards of the royal person. The animals introduced seem to have a symbolical meaning, to investigate which would lead into too great detail at present.

On comparing these figures with the heads as represented on the coins of our earlier kings, I was much struck with the resemblance which the principal figure on this stone bears to the coins of Alexander the First. There is but one coin of this king now in existence, and it is deposited in the Museum of the Antiquaries of Scotland. (Plate, fig. 2.)

It will be remarked, on comparing the head on the coin with that on the Forteviot stone, that there is a very strong resemblance both in the character and expression of the face, and in the sort of rude coronet which is represented on the head, which renders it exceedingly probable that this stone formed a part of an addition made to the palace by Alexander the First, and that the principal figure is intended as a representation of him.

This stone, which is now preserved at Freeland, the seat of Lord Ruthven, is the only remnant now to be found of the ancient capital of the kings of Scotland, and forms a curious, and perhaps the only specimen, of the state of the fine arts at that early period of our history.

I have been led into greater length in these remarks than was perhaps necessary; but I trust that any attempt, however feeble, to elucidate the local antiquities of our country, will be received with indulgence.