

Meyer, from whom I took this reference, gives the measure of this hymn as iambic dimeter.⁵ But it does not observe coincidence of quantity and accent. On the other hand, it consistently reveals four accents to a line in both strophe and refrain, and we might therefore infer a rhythm made up of an alternation of weak and strong tones, or graphically $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$, a rhythm which holds for every strophe. If this inference is correct, the Bangor hymn is not far removed from the tone scheme of *St. Léger*.

Between the end of the seventh century and the end of the tenth there was time and to spare. During this interval we may suppose that devout poets did not fail to write hymns in strophes of six octosyllabic lines with alternation of weak and strong tones. That these compositions were not numerous may be argued from their absence from many standard collections, though this absence may be due to accident only and not to any lack of popularity. But to go further and assume the existence of strophes divided, as the *St. Léger* strophe is, into groups of lines rhyming together, requires more proof than mere correspondence in length of strophe and verse accentuation would furnish. And it is for the purpose of strengthening the general assumption that *St. Léger* had a Latin model that I would call attention to a Latin strophe of like structure and of the same approximate date.

In the year 997 Gerbert, archbishop of Rheims, sent a copy of Boethius' *Arithmetica* to Otto III, the young emperor of Germany. With the volume went also some verse of Gerbert's own. Otto answered the gift with a letter and the archbishop's poetry with a stanza, in which he regrets his deficient training in poetical composition, a deficiency which he promises to atone for in the near future :

Amavit Christus Comgillum,
Bene et ipse Dominum
Carum habuit Beognoum
Domnum ornavit Aedeum,
Elegit sanctum Sinlanum
Famosum mundi magistrum.

Refrain : Quos convocavit Dominus
Coelorum regni sedibus.

⁵ *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, I, p. 221; also Gröber, *Grundriss*, II, p. 112.

Versus numquam composui,
Nec in studio habui.
Dum in usu habuero,
Et in eis viguero,
Quot habet viros Gallia,
Tot vobis mittam carmina.⁶

In number of lines to the strophe, in number of syllables to the line and in the arrangement of rhymes Otto's maiden attempt, as we see, is a strict counterpart to the framework of *St. Léger*. Of course there is this difference that Otto's verse was to be read and not sung. And because it was to be read, perhaps, the accentual scheme seems to vary. For the first four lines it would be $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$, for the last two $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ or $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$,⁷ it being understood that the signs mean accented and unaccented syllables respectively, and not long and short. Now this very variation in the accents of the stanza is a proof of the care with which Otto counted his syllables. They remain the same in number throughout, whatever changes of accents the lines undergo. Otto's model is not known. It could not be one of Gerbert's strophes, for they are metrical. But his model must have resembled, in all essentials, the model of the *St. Léger*, and both models probably belonged to the same period.

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

PETER BUCHAN AND *IT WAS A' FOR OUR RIGHTFU' KING*

In commenting on Burns's Jacobite song, *It Was A' for Our Rightfu' King*, the editors of the Centenary Edition of Burns's poetry write as follows :

"The facsimile of the ms. of this noble and moving lyric was published in Scott Douglas's Edinburgh Edition; and in stanza v, line 3, there is a deleted reading—'Upon my abs'—showing that Burns changed the line in the

⁶ J. Havet, *Lettres de Gerbert* (Paris, 1889), p. 172.

⁷ Undoubtedly Otto followed the same model as *St. Léger*. For were his strophe to be sung, the lines would show four accents :

$\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ and $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$
or
 $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$

process of copying out. Apart from this, the touch of the master, either as marker or as editor and vamer, is manifest throughout. Yet Hogg, in his *Jacobite Relics*, gravely informs you that 'it is said to have been written by Captain Ogilvie,' of Invergubarity, who fought for James VII at the Battle of the Boyne in 1690.¹ Who said it? or when and where was it said? All that Hogg leaves to the imagination. It was certainly not said by either Burns or Johnson (who must have known; for there is no earlier copy than that which was written by Burns, and published in the *Museum*). We can scarce go wrong in assuming that Hogg's informant was Peter Buchan. Now, neither Hogg nor Buchan knew that Burns had sent the thing to the *Museum*. Moreover, his name had never been associated with it. Thus, the ingenious Buchan, still bent on fathering everything on somebody, had full scope for his idiosyncrasy. . . . Moreover, Hogg's statement, not only lacks the thinnest shadow of corroboration, but is demonstrably false; for the song in the *Museum* is modelled on the same originals as *A Red Red Rose*²; and these, as we have seen, trace back to the blackletter *Unkind Parents*, published, as Mr. Ebsworthe points out

(*Roxburghe Ballads*, VII. 554), before Captain Ogilvie could ever have 'turn'd him right and round about Upon the Irish shore.'"³

The rest of the note in the *Centenary* deals with the relations between Burns's lyric and the chap-book ballad *Mally Stewart*, and shows clearly the use Burns made of the earlier song.

The passage in this note to which I wish to call attention, is that which ascribes to Peter Buchan the "fathering" of the song upon Captain Ogilvie. This ascription, I am convinced, is quite unwarranted, for if Buchan had ever thought of Ogilvie in this connection, he could hardly have failed to make some reference to him in the notes to the song, a version of which is among the unpublished pieces in the Harvard University, *Buchan Ms.* no. 25241. 10. 5.⁴ Neither this redaction nor Buchan's comment on it has ever been published, so far as I can ascertain. I therefore reprint them entire, placing Burns's *Museum* version, the original, parallel.

BUCHAN

It's for our gude an' rightfu' king,
I cross'd fair Scotland's strand;
It's for our gude an' rightfu' king
I e'er saw Irish land, my dear,
I e'er saw Irish land.

Now a' is dane that can be dane,
And a' is dane in vain;
Fareweel my luve an' native land,
Now I maun cross the main, my dear,
Now I maun cross the main.

BURNS

It was a' for our rightfu' king
We left fair Scotland's strand;
It was a' for our rightfu' king,
We e'er saw Irish land,
My dear—
We e'er saw Irish land.

Now a' is done that men can do,
And a' is done in vain,
My love and Native Land fareweel,
For I maun cross the main,
My dear—
For I maun cross the main.

¹ Hogg's note, vol. I, p. 186, reads as follows: "This song is traditionally said to have been written by a Captain Ogilvie, related to the house of Invergubarity, who was with King James in his Irish Expedition, and was in the battle of the Boyne. He was a brave man, and fell in an engagement on the Rhine." The rest of Hogg's note has no reference to the authorship of the song.

² It is hard to see why the editors drag in these various songs, which surely did contribute to *A Red Red Rose*, as models for *It Was A' for Our Rightfu' King*, when the relationship between the latter and *Mally Stewart*, is, as

they point out, much closer. At least, the word "modelled" is misleading.

³ *Centenary*, III. 433. In this connection one is tempted to ask whether, if the *Unkind Parents* was certainly published before Captain Ogilvie reached Ireland, he might not have used it as a model, supposing him, for the moment, to have written the song?

⁴ This ms. contains material which Buchan published as *Ancient Ballads and Songs of the North of Scotland*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1828, and a number of pieces which he withheld from the press.

He turn'd his high horse head about
 All on the Irish shore ;
 An' gae the bridal reins a shake,
 Says,—Adieu for evermore, my dear,
 Says,—Adieu for evermore.

Now sodgers frae the wars return,
 An' sailors frae the main ;
 But I maun part wi' my true love,
 Nae mair to meet again, my dear,
 Nae mair to meet again.

Fan day is gane, an night is come,
 An' a fa'in fast asleep ;
 I maun spend my silent hours
 For my true love to weep, my dear,
 For my true love to weep.⁵

Buchan's note is as follows :

“ This beautiful ballad I took down from the recitation of old James Ranken, who had learned it in his early years. My reason for particularizing the reciter of this ballad more than any of the others is, that since it was taken down, I have found a copy of it very much alike, in the notes to Canto third of *Rokeby*, a Poem,⁷ from which some people might have imagined I had copied it. The author of *Rokeby*, Walter Scott, Esq., now Sir Walter Scott, seems to think this ballad relates to the fortunes of some follower of the Stewart family. How far the worthy baronet is right, I will not pretend to say. Everyone has a right to judge, though not condemn, as he pleases.”⁸

The existence of this “ Rankinized ” version of Burns's song,—for there can be no doubt, I believe, that the stanzas Rankin recited are simply clumsily disguised plagiarisms,⁹—and of

⁵ *Buchan ms.*, p. 729.

⁶ *Centenary*, III, 182.

⁷ This is Burns's song, of which Scott seems unconsciously to have lifted four lines. He printed the entire song in his notes. See the Oxford edition of Scott's poems, p. 394.

⁸ *Buchan ms.*, Notes, p. 219.

⁹ If one were inclined to believe in the genuineness of the version which Buchan himself later came to suspect, a fact indicated by his suppressing the song when he published his two volumes in 1828, I should point out to him (1) that the song does not appear in print till Vol. v of the *Museum* was published, in 1796, before which time no one seems to have dreamed of its existence; (2) that the differences between the two versions in stanza 3, line 1, and in stanza 5, lines 1 and 2, indicate pretty

He turn'd him right and round about
 Upon the Irish shore,
 And gae his bridle reins a shake,
 With adieu for evermore,
 My dear—
 And adieu for evermore!

The sodger frae the war returns,
 The sailor frae the main,
 But I hae parted frae my love
 Never to meet again,
 My dear—
 Never to meet again.

When day is gane, and night is come,
 And a' folk bound to sleep,
 I think on him that's far awa
 The lee-lang night, and weep,
 My dear—
 The lee-lang night and weep.⁶

Buchan's note, is interesting, since it relieves Buchan of responsibility for the Ogilvie myths. He will not “ even pretend to say ” whether or not the song refers to the fortunes of the Stuarts ; had he dreamed of foisting the lyric upon the unfortunate cavalier, surely he would not have written as he did in his ms.

As a matter of fact, Buchan does not seem to have been guilty of intentional misrepresentation concerning the songs and ballads he published. James Rankine, the blind beggar whom he hired as collector, was notoriously untrustworthy, and occasionally deceived his employer. But Buchan intended to be honest. James Hogg, on the other hand, delighted in deception ; his *Jacobite Relics* are full of egregious misstatements. To him we may safely look as the author of the Ogilvie legend, but not to Peter Buchan, whose name the editors of the *Centenary Burns* seem pleased to connect with Hogg's.

FRANKLYN BLISS SNYDER.

Northwestern University.

clearly that Burns's version is the older. In these lines Burns was using, quite characteristically, the ordinary language of the popular ballads. (For examples of “ turning right and round about ” see *Young Hunting*, A, 16 ; *Willie and Lady Maissy*, B, 15 ; *Johnie Scot*, A, 14 ; *James Harris*, F, 3 ; for parallels to the other lines referred to consult Prof. Child's list of commonplaces.) The changes must have been made for the purpose of disguise. Were it necessary, more arguments to the same effect might easily be added.