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Most of the papers of Sir John Kirk (1832–1922) have been on loan deposit in the National Library of Scotland since 1989, but towards the close of 1998 the Library secured by private treaty sale (with the invaluable assistance of the Heritage Lottery Fund), the permanent accession of the papers to the national collection. Interesting additional files received included sixteen letters of David Livingstone to John Kirk which joined other letters between these two eminent Scots already in the Manuscripts Division of the Library.

The acquisition attracted a considerable amount of media attention, probably stimulated by the association of John Kirk with the great, iconic figure of David Livingstone. The more in-depth articles and radio interviews picked up on the fact that Kirk himself was a figure worthy of attention in his own right, a major player at a crucial time in the history and development of east-central Africa.

Just as the West’s partition of Africa had a long prelude, so did John Kirk’s involvement with the continent, and his background influenced the course of his career there, his attitudes and interests. He was born in the parish of Barry in Angus, the son of the local minister, John Kirk. John Kirk, senior, a keen student of science, passed on his own passion for botany to John, junior. The father left the established Church of Scotland at the Disruption of 1843 to join the Free Church, and much of the evangelical passion for service and practical humanitarianism can be seen in his son. In 1847 he came to Edinburgh University, passing through the general Arts and Science classes before concentrating on medical studies from which he graduated in 1854.

Shortly after Kirk took up his first post as a physician at Edinburgh Royal Infirmary, a call for medical volunteers whisked him off to the Crimean War. There he not only practised medicine, but pursued his botanical interests, collecting plants on Mounts Ida and Olympus, and also indulged in his hobby of photography. His original Crimea photographs are not in the Library collection, but, thanks to the family, the Library has received copies of the images from his album.

John Kirk, David Livingstone’s chief assistant on the Second Zambesi Expedition, was an accomplished botanist and zoologist. His surviving expedition notes and photographs (among the earliest taken in East Africa) form a unique record of the journey. The Kirk Papers at the National Library of Scotland also include letters, notes and photographs that vividly document his twenty years as British Consul in Zanzibar, then a centre of the slave trade.

On his return from the Crimea, Kirk appeared to be veering towards a botanical career. Urged by the great botanist, William Hooker, and others to apply for a natural history professorship in Canada, he was diverted from that course by the invitation of David Livingstone to join his ambitious, government-supported Zambesi expedition. Kirk must have been particularly excited by the scientific prospects of the expedition. He is also likely to have shared Livingstone’s belief that the opening of central Africa to Christianity and legitimate commerce would deal a death-blow to the violence and inhumanity of the slave trade.

The Zambesi expedition of 1858 to 1863 was the most elaborate and disaster-ridden of David Livingstone’s great ventures into the interior of Africa. Success depended upon the navigability of the Zambesi river and its tributary, the Shire, far into the interior, but this dream was destroyed by the reality of seasonal shallows and impassable rapids. Problems with the steamboats brought out in sections from Britain were compounded by problems with personnel. Kirk was not blind to Livingstone’s shortcomings as a manager of men – the great explorer functioned better in a solo role, without the burden of running a large expedition. He wrote to his brother, Alick Kirk, ‘the Doctor is a first rate fellow when alone, but he is easily put up to mischief by those who have the will’. However, when the travails of the expedition were nearing an end he commented ‘he is always very good company, and indeed he and I have never had one split’, and that Livingstone ‘has perseverance to obstinacy which takes him through’.

‘He and I get along nicely’ was another comment by Kirk about his relationship with Livingstone. It is clear particularly from their later correspondence that the older man developed a great respect, and a strong sense of friendship and obligation towards his young colleague. The relationship had survived Kirk’s capsize and narrow escape from death in the Kebribassa rapids on the Shire river in 1860 when many of his journals and specimens were lost – an extremely risky venture insisted on by Livingstone and described in one of Kirk’s surviving journals. Later, they laboured together in a vain attempt to save the life of Livingstone’s wife, Mary, who died of malarial fever at Shupanga in 1862. Despite losses, the botanical and zoological specimens sent home by Kirk were among the positive results of the expedition, laying some of the foundations for The Flora and Fauna of Tropical Africa which was published in instalments from 1868 to 1917. Also of major significance were the mapping and surveying of an interior previously obscure to most Europeans with the exception of a handful of Portuguese officials and traders. Kirk’s equable temperament and obvious efficiency
reinforced mutual respect and enabled him to avoid any serious clash with his leader. Livingstone’s correspondence with Kirk following their return to Britain in 1864 shows a warm regard and determination to help the younger man’s career. He expressed hopes that Kirk would write up the scientific side of the expedition. Kirk had been offered a post at Kew, but Livingstone was already aware of his preference for a consular post in Africa and began to lobby influential friends. His efforts eventually bore fruit on New Year’s Day 1866, in Bombay, when Livingstone persuaded the Governor, who had the patronage of the Zanzibar consulate at that time, to appoint Kirk as medical officer. He told Kirk that he had said he knew no defect of temper or character in him, and from Kirk’s hatred of the slave trade and knowledge he would be invaluable there. Soon after his arrival on the island in 1866 Kirk was appointed Vice-Consul. By 1868 he was Acting Political Agent, and he was appointed Consul-General in 1873 and Agent and Consul-General in 1880.

The life of the Sultanate was dominated by ivory, slaves and cloves. Slave gangs carried ivory from the interior to the coast from which the product, and they themselves, were carried to the island where slaves provided the labour that underpinned the economy. Kirk commented that the Arab-Swahili masters could ‘do nothing, not even clip their own whiskers, without the servants and slaves they own’, but it was the clove plantations that were more and more becoming the economic foundation of the Sultanate, and they were being expanded with slave labour from the mainland.

The same year that Kirk arrived in Zanzibar, Livingstone returned to Africa for what was to be his last great series of journeys, this time primarily to discover the sources of the Nile and the Congo rivers. Kirk now found himself at the end of the explorer’s supply route to Ujiji, and it was this personal agency that was to cause him considerable trouble and vexation. By 1869 Livingstone was already reporting trouble on the supply trail, with stores lost or stolen, and the situation was exacerbated by his long absences from his Ujiji base and the fact that only one of his letters actually reached Kirk during this time. Kirk began to wonder if Livingstone was still alive. In 1871, into this worsening situation, came the flamboyant figure of Henry Morton Stanley. Having taken a strong dislike to Kirk, Stanley did not hesitate to follow up his famous meeting with Livingstone at Ujiji in November 1871 with accusations that Kirk had neglected to supply his old travelling companion. The ailing Livingstone’s initial readiness to accept these complaints (he later protested that he did not mean to blame Kirk personally) were turned by Stanley and his formidable press machine into a general accusation of negligence against Kirk. The press attacks came thick and fast, and Kirk’s friends were indignant at the calumnies of what one called ‘that scoundrel, Stanley’. Significantly, Livingstone’s children, Oswell and Agnes, came to Kirk’s support and the tide turned fairly quickly, but sufficient damage was done to force the government to conduct an official investigation; Kirk was cleared of any personal blame for the failure of supplies. This is a verdict that has been confirmed by all subsequent historical analysis of the evidence. Livingstone died in the late spring of 1873 in the Ilala region of modern Zambia, and Kirk was on home leave from Zanzibar when the body reached the coast in early 1874.

Kirk’s personal influence over the Sultanate had been materially enhanced in 1870 by the succession of Seyyid Barghash. Kirk had already established a
good personal relationship with Barghash, reinforced by medical attendance on members of his family. Up to this time little or no effort had been made by the Sultan to prevent his subjects from shipping slaves into Zanzibar, but the British government was now pressing strongly for an effective ban. By 1873, with clear evidence of increased slaving, the pressure on Barghash was intense, culminating in the threat of a British naval blockade of the island if a treaty was not concluded. After prolonged argument, Kirk was able to persuade him to sign the treaty in June 1873, the threat of a blockade and the Consul’s own personal influence combining to avoid use of force.

Kirk was not so optimistic as to expect that the trade would die overnight. Smuggling of slaves continued, but the great public slave market was now closed and measures against slavers were legally sustainable. Barghash was rewarded in 1875 by an official visit to Britain, where he stayed at Windsor with Queen Victoria and toured several cities with the Prince of Wales. The slave trade was far from dead, however, and Kirk had to persuade the Sultan to promulgate stronger measures in 1876. It was now more effectively circumscribed and increased prosperity coming into Zanzibar from the rubber trade also served to soften the effects of the fall in slaving. The de facto protectorate probably reached its apogee in 1884 when the Sultan proclaimed that he would not cede any rights to any part of his empire to any other power or association without consulting the British government.

The Sultan’s writ on the coast ran (with varying degrees of effectiveness), from just south of Djibouti to Portuguese Mozambique, and the power behind the throne was the great Belozi (Consul), as John Kirk was known in Swahili. When time permitted, Kirk also continued his botanical researches and his photography. Despite the difficulties of the Zambesi expedition, unique images of this journey survive in his papers and there is a rich series of photographs of people and places in Zanzibar and on the adjacent mainland areas where Kirk travelled on his official duties. Approximately three hundred photographs, mostly taken in Africa, can be found in the collection; perhaps the star of the collection is a fine panorama of Zanzibar harbour.

While no other major European power was seriously interested in the region this indirect imperium was effective, but the situation was changing rapidly by 1884. Bismarck’s Germany was beginning to show interest in East as well as West African colonial ventures. The German explorer, Karl Peters, an old rival of Kirk and Livingstone, arrived in Zanzibar with three companions to spy out the land. The well-heeled German party soon busied themselves persuading interior chiefs to sign treaties with Germany. In 1885 German intentions became even more evident when Friedrich Gerhard Rohifs arrived in Zanzibar as German Consul to provide a counterweight to Kirk.

From this time until his departure from Zanzibar in 1887 Kirk found himself, against his natural inclinations and sympathies, having to play a very different diplomatic game. Foreign Office policy was now one of positive engagement with Germany and tacit acquiescence for her forward policy in Africa. The German claims to an inland protectorate confined Zanzibar’s control to the coastal strip and geo-politics dictated that German claims would soon encroach also on the coast. Barghash protested, but Kirk now had the difficult task of explaining to him that German demands had to be appeased. Kirk
carefully preserved his personal file of telegrams between himself and London during this period, providing a fascinating record of the partition of Africa on this part of the continent.

Kirk was clear that ‘the Sultan cannot stand alone, and the longer he opposes German aspirations, the more he will lose’, but he defended the Sultanate’s interests as far as he could, strongly enough to arouse the ire of Bismarck and the unfavourable attention of the powerful Lord Salisbury, Prime and Foreign Minister from 1885, never a man to brook much opposition and one determined to promote Anglo-German amity and the peace of Europe by encouraging Bismarck’s colonial policies. By the time of Kirk’s recall home in 1887, Zanzibar’s territories were confined to the islands and a small coastal strip opposite. However, he had secured a strategic mainland bridgehead by persuading the Sultan to give concessions on the Mombasa coast of what is now Kenya to William Mackinnon’s East African Association, which in 1888 became the Imperial British East Africa Company.

Retirement, at the comparatively early age of fifty-five, did not end Kirk’s involvement with Africa. He continued to play an important role in the imperialist movement in Britain, was British delegate to the Brussels Slave Trade Conference in 1889–90, and in 1895 conducted an inquiry into the Brass River conflicts in Nigeria.

The Library has very recently acquired on deposit the correspondence of Livingstone’s son-in-law, Alexander Low Bruce, a leading Edinburgh businessman, which includes over thirty letters from Kirk, showing the extent of his involvement with the Scottish led and run African Lakes Company and with the Imperial British East Africa Company. The latter interest is clear also from Kirk’s own papers, notably in a small but important series of letters from the young Frederick Lugard, the Company Commissioner in Uganda. The extent of Scottish investment and personal involvement in these companies is very evident from the Bruce Papers, and may provide some new insight into the role of an important group of Scots, of whom Kirk was one, in a range of empire-building organisations in the 1890s.

There is also the question of Kirk’s more general influence. It cannot be without significance that two of the most noted African empire-builders, Sir Harry Johnston and Lord Lugard were admirers of his policies and methods. Johnston called him his counsellor and friend, and Lugard, in his Times obituary of Kirk in 1922 specifically stated that Kirk was the ‘wise and sympathetic administrator on whom I endeavoured to model my own action.’

Was Sir John Kirk a founding father of indirect rule? Further study of the papers described above might help to provide an answer to this question.

### Note on sources

Direct quotations in this article are from material in the Kirk Papers (NLS, Acc. 9942). Inventories of the Kirk Papers and of the papers of Alexander Low Bruce (NLS, Acc. 11777) are available in the Library. Dr Reginald Foskett edited The Zambesi Journal and Letters of Dr John Kirk 1858–63 (Edinburgh, 1965), (NLS, NF.1214.d.15), and there has been a recent full biographical study of Kirk by Dr Daniel Liebowitz, The Physician and the Slave Trade: John Kirk, the Livingstone Expeditions and the Crusade Against Slavery in East Africa (New York & Basingstoke, 1998), (NLS, HR.200.0578). Both books have been consulted during preparation of this article. Readers interested in the Livingstone–Kirk correspondence are also advised to consult G.W. Clendennen & I.C. Cunningham, David Livingstone: A Catalogue of Documents (NLS: Edinburgh, 1979), (NLS, NRR) and I.C. Cunningham, David Livingstone: A Catalogue of Documents: A Supplement (NLS: Edinburgh, 1985), (NLS, NRR).
For someone researching the women’s suffrage movement in Scotland the National Library of Scotland might not seem an obvious place to find source material, but I ended up spending more time there than in any other single place. Before describing my discoveries, I had better provide a quick sketch of events for those unfamiliar with the story.

The campaign for women to be granted the vote began in 1867 when both the English and Scottish Reform Acts gave many more men the vote, and John Stuart Mill’s women’s suffrage amendment was defeated. Three societies were formed, one in London, one in Manchester and one in Edinburgh. All of them campaigned vigorously, but ‘constitutionally’, collecting millions of signatures on petitions to parliament, and trying to educate the public about the need for women to concern themselves with politics. A suffrage bill came up every year, but with no success, and the Reform Act of 1884 gave the vote to more men but not to women. By this time there were many more suffrage societies, and new ones were formed in Glasgow in 1902 and Aberdeen in 1904, but the campaign methods remained constitutional. It was Mrs Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughter Christabel, and their Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU), who galvanised the scene in 1905.

Women, they said, would no longer ask for the vote, they would demand it. The new policy was called ‘militancy’ and created a lot of publicity for the movement. Initially militancy mainly meant heckling speakers at political meetings (which was normal for men but militancy if women did it), and demonstrations outside the Houses of Parliament which – since any demonstration in that precinct was illegal – resulted in arrests and imprisonments. As time went on and the government remained obdurate, militancy escalated into arson and bomb attacks on property; in prison the women went on hunger strike, resulting in the horrors of forcible feeding.

In the Edwardian period there were three suffrage organisations, the Pankhurs’ WSPU, the breakaway Women’s Freedom League (WFL), which also called itself militant but did not advocate violence, and the National Union of Women’s Suffrage Societies (NUWSS), the umbrella organisation for the six ‘constitutional’ or non-militant societies. The latter were the suffragists while the militants were the suffragettes. The enormous publicity generated by the suffragettes made many more women aware of the iniquity of being denied the right to vote for their MPs, and suffrage societies were formed the length and breadth of Britain. Most of the women who got involved, while taking part in by-elections, processions and other forms of campaigning unheard of before the advent of the Pankhurs, remained law-abiding. Suffragists greatly outnumbered suffragettes, though it was the exploits of the suffragettes that initially raised their awareness of the issue.

My intention of researching the women’s suffrage movement in Scotland began when the prison files on suffragettes at the National Archives of Scotland (formerly the Scottish Record Office) were opened to the public in 1987. These were fascinating but gave no real indication of how much activity there was in Scotland. General histories of the suffrage movement all focused on London, with only the odd references to other parts of England, let alone Scotland. One booklet had been published on the movement in Scotland, but the scale of action was not clear from it.

In retrospect, knowing so little of what I would find, it seems amazing that the ESRC agreed to fund the project, but competition was not so fierce in those days, and their referees felt that the research was worth doing. I began, naturally, with what I knew, i.e. the prison files at National Archives of Scotland. They were really the climax of the story, rather than its beginning, but they gave me the names of the Scots-women most active in the movement. This seam of enquiry was soon quarried out, and I wondered if the project was really viable. But then I went to the National Library, and any such fears were put to rest.

I knew, from secondary sources, that the WSPU published its own journal, Votes for Women (initially monthly, but from April, 1908, weekly), but would Scotland feature in it? There was only one way to find out, and I called up the journal in the Library. And right from the first issue (October 1907) the importance of Scotland was clear. A Liberal government had come to power with an overwhelming majority, and a cornerstone of WSPU policy was to oppose the government candidate in all elections and by-elections until women were granted the vote. Scotland was a Liberal stronghold, while the prime minister, Campbell-Bannerman, and his successor, Asquith, held Scottish constituencies, as did some cabinet ministers. ‘An active campaign is in prospect for Scotland this autumn’, wrote Christabel Pankhurst in November 1907. ‘Encouraged by our reception in October, when new and widespread interest was aroused, we intend to do everything in our power to deepen the impression already made.’ That suggests an organisation imported
from England into Scotland, but there were Scotswomen ready and eager to take part, and for a while Votes for Women had its own ‘Scottish WSPU’ page. This ended when Helen Fraser, the WSPU’s first Scottish organisier, defected to the NUWSS, but Scottish news continued to be reported in depth.

With Scotland featured in every issue of Votes for Women, it was clear that I was going to be spending a lot of time in the Library noting all the relevant material — and what a joy to be able to look at the original journal rather than microfilm. Here is an extract (by G.M. Conolan) from 8 October 1908:

On Thursday a bill-distributing party went to Paisley, where we were amused to find many people regarded the calling of a meeting to discuss the question of Votes for Women as a ‘very sensible idea.’ We were obliged to disclaim any credit for the originality of our plan, mentioning the thousands of meetings held by our members during the last year, only to be met with a gentle, ‘Yes, Yes; but not in Paisley!’

**Votes for Women** was meant to be inspirational, and it is amazing what an impact it still has three-quarters of a century after it was written. To read it is to enter into the enthusiastic, optimistic, determined mindset of Edwardian suffragettes. Nor was it the only suffrage journal in the Library, for the WFL’s The Vote and The Common Cause are also to be found there.

The Women’s Freedom League was formed in October 1907, when a number of WSPU members objected to the Pankhurts’ autocratic style of leadership. According to Christabel Pankhurst, the WSPU was waging a ‘war’, and orders from on high were to be obeyed. The group that formed the WFL disagreed and believed that a democratic structure had to be in place to make policy decisions. The WFL president, Charlotte Despard, had been educated in Scotland, and one of the leading members, Teresa Billington-Greig, had converted the first group of Scotswomen to militancy in 1906 (and she herself married a Scot and made her home in Scotland), so it is not surprising that the WFL always had a strong base in Scotland. The WSPU always had many more members than the WFL, and a dramatic profile; also, its charismatic leaders produced autobiographies, so that the WFL has received far less attention from historians. By concentrating on Scotland — which naturally received extensive coverage in The Vote — I was able to redress this balance somewhat. (I decided that had I been alive at the time, the WFL was the organisation that I would have joined!) Furthermore, unlike the WSPU, which disbanded as soon as the Great War broke out in August 1914, the WFL continued to campaign and publish The Vote during the war years, until a limited franchise was granted in 1918. The organisation survived and campaigned on feminist issues until 1961.

Unfortunately, because there was no copyright obligation to deposit journals, the collection of suffrage journals at the Library is incomplete. For example, the NUWSS journal, *The Common Cause*, was published from 1909, but the first volume available in the Library is not until 1913, so that I had to look at the earlier ones in London. In 1909 a ‘Scottish Federation’ was formed to unite all the Scottish societies, and one learns from *The Common Cause* of 9 April 1914 that by that date there were sixty-three such societies.

Suffrage journals were not the only source on the movement in Scotland, for National Library holdings of daily newspapers provided an amazing amount of material. (Some, like *The Scotsman* and the *Glasgow Herald*, had to be read on microfilm, but others, like the *Edinburgh Evening Dispatch* and the *Dundee Advertiser*, were still available in their original form.) By 1912 there was scarcely a day without mention of the suffragettes in the press.

The papers covered both national and local events, and the local coverage is the most interesting. For example, in March 1914 Emmeline Pankhurst, who was supposed to have returned to prison under the ‘Cat and Mouse Act’, was scheduled to speak in Glasgow. She was smuggled into the hall, and when she appeared on the platform a group of policemen came storming into the hall to arrest her. She was defended by the women on the platform, many of whom were brutally treated by the police. Naturally the story received national coverage, but only in the letters pages of the *Herald* does one get the observations and opinions of those present. In the same month, after the first suffragette had been forcibly fed in a Scottish prison, historic Whitekirk church in East Lothian was burned down. Again, this received national coverage, but it was the letters pages of *The Scotsman* that were filled with the views of east coast residents.

From the beginning of the Edwardian campaign editors perceived two issues. The first was whether women should be granted the vote, and the second was whether militant tactics – particularly the destruction of property – were justified. They equivocated on the first one but were unanimous in attacking militancy, while simultaneously providing the ‘oxygen of publicity’ to those very actions. On 16 December 1912 a WFL member concluded a letter to the *Edinburgh Evening Dispatch*:

I would ask the Editor a straight question. Why are the militant acts of the women chronicled so faithfully, and their peaceful acts – the holding of meetings, the general educative campaign – practically ignored?

The editor of the *Dundee Advertiser* (a Liberal paper) constantly condemned the suffragettes, yet printed many letters like the following, from Lila Clunas, a leading Dundee WFL member, on 29 April 1913:

In this country in the past men have defied the law, and to-day their names are revered. We have John Hampden, we have the Covenanters, who carried their defiance of the laws to the battlefield, as Drumclog and Bothwell Brig testify. Here in Dundee we have a statue erected in honour of a man who was outlawed. When women have the vote the need to defy the law will cease.

Leading articles reveal what the suffragists were up against. On 20 January 1913, when Asquith had allowed...
 commented: 

completely alter its nature), the editor 
a women’s suffrage amendment to his 
Franchise Bill, the editor of The Scotsman 
opined:

Time and experience have proved that there 
are men in Parliament and in office who are 
prepared to run all the risks of the transfer 
of the voting and governing powers from 
the hands of their own sex to the untried 
hands of women. It is therefore a move-
ment that like the letting in of waters, must 
be stopped in its beginnings. It must be 
met in all its forms and at all its stages by 
stout and persistent opposition.

But surely not all editors were so 
intransigent? The Dundee Courier, as a 
Unionist paper, was tactically in favour of 
anything that the Liberal government 
opposed. On 28 January 1913, after the 
Franchise Bill had been withdrawn (the 
Speaker of the House having insisted that 
a women’s suffrage amendment would 
completely alter its nature), the editor 
commented:

The women’s cause is just. There is no 
principle of representation which can deny a 
vote to the taxpayer, whether male or 
female. But the matter is not one for haste. 
It is not a matter which can be forced upon 
the country because the most militant 
section of the Suffragettes chooses to annoy 
and exasperate politicians and the public. It 
is certainly not a subject for legislation 
before the will of the people has been 
determined by means of a general election. 
… Women’s Suffrage can wait. There are 
more pressing things to consider.

With friends like that, who needed 
enemies? Straightforward reporting 
provides a factual record and also reveals 
attitudes. In January 1914 two suffrage 
organisations petitioned Edinburgh 
presbytery to receive a deputation, and on 
the 8th the Edinburgh Evening Dispatch 
recorded the discussion within the 
presbytery. The Rev. Dr Burns moved 
that no action be taken as this was beyond 
their scope and a controversial matter 
(though he professed himself a ‘strong 
supporter’ of votes for women). Professor 
W.P. Paterson moved that the deputation 
be received. Dr Burns, he said, had voiced 
an objection often heard in this 
degenerate modern days. That objection 
was that the church should having 
nothing whatever to do with any matter 
which had a political complexion. Shades 
of John Knox! He himself, he continued, 
… had strong prejudices against the whole. 
He had a suspicion at the bottom of his 
heart that it was the business of men to 
administer the affairs of the country, and 
that it was not the province of women. But, 
were they to refuse to hear a deputation from 
women, speaking to this question, which 
involved the very gravest moral issues?

After further discussion the presbytery 
agreed to receive the deputation.

I began my project worried that I 
would find insufficient material; I ended 
up with reams of transcripts from 
Scottish newspapers that I could not fit 
into the book. There are many angles of 
the story that could be explored by 
future researchers from this source alone. 
And in fact the National Library of 
Scotland possesses an additional relevant 
source as well, this time in its Special 
Collections. I mentioned earlier Mrs 
Pankhurst’s arrest in Glasgow in March 
1914 and the behaviour of the police at 
the time.

Janie Allan, a member of a wealthy 
Socialist shipping family and a leading 
WSPU supporter, was present at the 
time and determined to hold the police 
to account. To that end she collected 
evidence from others who were there at 
the time. For example, Ellen Gonie, MA 
commented:

The police behaved in a very hysterical 
brutal fashion. With baton in hand they 
struck at everyone who came within their 
reach; no mercy was meted out to 
perfectly non-opposing persons.

This material is in ‘Miss Janie Allan’s 
Suffrage Material’, along with 
correspondence between her lawyers 
about the possibility of an unofficial 
enquiry (the Scottish Secretary having 
rules out an official one), letters from 
Christabel Pankhurst to Janie Allan, etc.

The historiography of the women’s 
suffrage movement in Britain has 
continued to evolve, moving away from 
the central charismatic figures to examine 
the phenomenon from a variety of 
different viewpoints, including art, 
literature and theatre. There is 
undoubtedly much more to be done on 
the Scottish dimension – with the 
National Library of Scotland as the 
obvious starting point.

Note on sources

At the National Library of Scotland 
extensive material on the Scottish Women’s 
Suffrage movement is to be found among 
its collections of books, manuscripts and 
newspapers. Of particular significance for 
those researching the Scottish experience 
are the Women’s Freedom League journal, 
The Vote (NLS, Y.151), the Women’s 
Political and Social Union journal, Votes for 
Women (NLS, P.62) and the National 
Union of Women’s Suffrage Societies 
journal The Common Cause. Vols 5–9, 
1913–17. (NLS, Q.92). Among manu-
script holdings, ‘Miss Janie Allan’s Suffrage 
Material’ (NLS, Acc. 4498) is highly evoc-
ative: following the arrest of Mrs Pankhurst 
at a rally in Glasgow in 1914, Janie Allan 
sent questionnaires to eye-witnesses, and a 
number of completed forms are included in 
the collection. Additionally, there are news-
paper cuttings and correspondence between 
Janie Allan and her lawyer, Christabel 
Pankhurst and others on the possibility of 
mounting an enquiry into the behaviour of 
the police at the event. An important 
resource for researchers is The Women’s 
Suffrage Movement: A Reference Guide 
1866–1928 by Elizabeth Crawford 
(NLS, Hist.25.W.C.).
From an early age, Robert Louis Stevenson’s imagination was well-stocked by his inspirational nurse, Cummy, with Deacon Brodie folklore and apocrypha. There has never been any doubt as to his fascination with the character of Deacon William Brodie, hanged for burglary in 1788. But in 1983 I noted in *Edinburgh*, the literary anthology I edited with Graham Richardson, ‘Brodie is somewhat dubiously identified as the inspiration for Stevenson’s Jekyll and Hyde’. Since writing those words I have engaged in a process of literary detection which has revealed far more of the relationship between Brodie and Jekyll and Hyde.

My original objection to an identification of the figure of Deacon Brodie with that of Jekyll and Hyde will become clear on reading the account of the judicial pronouncement of doom on Brodie, as recorded by Aeneas Morrison, the solicitor to his confederate, George Smith:

Mr Brodie... affected coolness and determination in his behaviour. When the sentence of death was pronounced, he put one hand in his breast and the other in his side, and looked full around him. It is said that he accused his companion [Smith] of pusillanimity, and even kicked him as they were leaving the Court...

What has this swashbuckler to do with either Jekyll or Hyde? Hyde, when the reader first hears of him (from Enfield speaking to Utterson), is genteel, but in its meanest and most fraudulent sense, answering the demand for compensation of the girl on whom he has ‘trampled’ (a term possibly implying rape):

‘If you choose to make capital out of this accident’, said he, ‘I am naturally helpless. No gentleman but wishes to avoid a scene’, says he. ‘Name your figure.’

Perhaps the most powerful twentieth-century illustrations to *Jekyll and Hyde* were by S.G. Hulme Beaman for an edition published in 1930 by John Lane at the Bodley Head.
Brodie’s theatricality. We know that he is speaking falsely, but this is theatre concealed, not proclaimed:

‘My poor Utterson … you are unfortunate in such a client. I never saw a man so distressed as you were by my will; unless it were that hide-bound pedant, Lanyon, at what he called my scientific heresies…’

As G.K. Chesterton put it in his invaluable Robert Louis Stevenson (1927) ‘Mr Hyde indeed possesses the cosmopolitan charm that unites all nations; but there is something decidedly Caledonian about Dr Jekyll.’

In his ‘The Decay of Lying’, Oscar Wilde, the son of a doctor of genius, summed up the spirit of the work: ‘the transformation of Dr Jekyll reads dangerously like an experiment out of the Lancet.’ That, in fact, was what its last chapter was, save that Dr Jekyll regrettably failed to communicate it to the Lancet.

In Stevenson’s day, dramatic tales of auto-experiment to further scientific knowledge were common lore. James Simpson, in particular, had famously conducted his first trial of chloroform on 4 November 1847 when, with his colleagues Keith and Duncan, he inhaled. According to the account of an onlooker, Professor Miller:

On awakening, Dr Simpson’s first perception was mental. ‘This is far stronger and better than ether’, said he to himself. His second was to note that he was prostrate on the floor, and that among the friends about him there was both confusion and alarm. Of his assistants, Dr Duncan he saw snoring heavily, and Dr Keith kicking and alarm. Of his assistants, Dr Duncan he

My opinion was that Simpson’s auto-experiment answered the problem of the inspiration for Jekyll’s. I therefore looked with a scornful eye on the title of John S. Gibson’s Deacon Brodie: Father to Jekyll and Hyde (1977), for all of the charm and value of the book’s Brodie content.

H. Belhys Baildon recalls in his memoir Robert Louis Stevenson (1901) that Stevenson, ‘brimful of the story of Deacon Brodie’, read to him, ‘probably in 1864, portions of a proposed drama on the subject’.

Edmund Gosse refers to this in his bibliographical notes to the Pentland Edition of Stevenson’s Works (1907), vol xiv. He has it that ‘The earliest draft of Deacon Brodie appears to have been written in 1869… in April 1879… a version which differs greatly from that which is here reprinted was produced in collaboration with [William Ernest] Henley. It was privately printed, in a very small issue, in 1880. Stevenson took no great interest in the play’. He goes on, ‘In 1888, having wholly rewritten Deacon Brodie without relation to Stevenson, Henley reprinted that play, with his own name first, instead of Stevenson’s, on the title-page.’ (By this time their friendship had been ruined by Henley’s detestation of Stevenson’s wife, Fanny.) Gosse concludes with the assurance that for Stevenson, ‘the play was a purely artificial thing… he made a more or less languid attempt to supply the public with the sensation that they wanted.’

A reading of the text printed in the Pentland and all other editions of Stevenson’s works (save the Bigelow–Scott New York edition of 1908) gives no reason to doubt Gosse’s conclusion, nor to credit Gibson’s confident assumption that the next stage of the play was Jekyll. Gibson’s final argument reviving Chesterton’s insistence that Jekyll is set in Edinburgh, if anything, strengthens the case for the main inspiration coming from Simpson and his counterparts.

Nevertheless, my recent research in the National Library of Scotland has now convinced me that while Deacon Brodie may not be the father of Jekyll and Hyde, the play Deacon Brodie is at least a progenitor of Jekyll and Hyde. The Library has a corrected proof and the text in the Bigelow–Scott New York edition of 1908. Not all the proof corrections are employed in the latter, or in Henley’s final edition of 1888, but for our present purposes the Brodie–Jekyll relationship begins to fall into place.

We are also happily now in a position to draw on Dr Ernest Mehew’s splendid edition of The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson (8 vols 1994–95). It has no evidence on the 1860s versions beyond noting Stevenson’s interview to the New York Herald (8 September 1887):

When I was about nineteen years of age I wrote a sort of hugging-mugger melodrama, which lay in my coffer until it was fished out by my friend WE Henley. He thought he saw something in it, and we started to work together.

In September 1878 he wrote from France to Henley authorising him to ‘Supply as you think fit’ but insisting he himself would draft the unwritten ‘last tableaux’. By 19 September he is telling Henley ‘make nobody Scotch, but the Bailie, Mrs Dickson, Ainslie, and a super or two. You must not load [Irving’s London] Lyceum with a whole Scots company’. (Their hopes rested, fruitlessly, on a production by Henry Irving.) On 21 September he compliments Henley on Brodie and his fellow-thieves’ meeting in the first act, by October he is sending his own rewrites happily signed ‘Adieu Beaumont or Fletcher/Yours Fletcher or Beaumont’. On 29 November Stevenson tells Charles Baxter ‘The great drama of Deacon Brodie, or The Two Lives nears an end.’ On 6 December he tells his mother ‘The play is my old Deacon Brodie, worked up by Henley and me in collaboration’, a clear statement that whatever the Brodie of 1880 may be, it is still the Brodie of 1869 (with whatever obligations to the Brodie of 1864).

The 1880 text opens on the Deacon’s sister Mary telling her lover:

… when I think I might die, and no one know how good a brother I have had, I feel as if I must run out into the street and cry his goodness to the whole town.

The irony of this (from a passage absent from the 1888 text), becomes horribly evident by the last lines of the 1880 play: the Deacon is making a desperate effort to implicate Mary, her lover, his uncle, his mistress, in the crimes for which he now faces arrest:

I had but one pleasure in life; it was to fool and juggle and jockey you one and all. I’ve done it always, damn you; and damn you, I’ll do it once more! (He snatches his hanger from the table, and rushes upon Hunt, who parries and runs him through. He reels across the stage, and falls.) Rogues all! – Rogues – Rogues. (He dies.)

Before Hunt enters, Brodie shouts at his mistress, and at the sister who
intercedes for her, holding up Brodie’s child: ‘Off, drabs! I’m waiting for the rope.’ This certainly polarises a Jekyll reputation and a Hyde reality, if little more: perhaps Jekyll’s last statement throwing overwhelming blame on Hyde while admitting he is Hyde, has a faint echo of the Deacon’s death. So have Hyde’s last words, in their hypocrisy: “Utterson, for God’s sake, have mercy!” apparently still hoping through the closed door that Utterson will think him Jekyll. But the real link in the 1880 Brodie is not to Utterson but to Hastie Lanyon, whose name seems to derive from Mary’s lover, Walter Leslie, somewhat mingled with that of her uncle, the Procurator-Fiscal William Lawson. Leslie in Act III unmasks Brodie, who has just made a burglarious entrance through a window with intent to rob Leslie’s house (in a passage dropped from the 1888 text):

BRODIE: Leslie, you were once my friend. You found something to love, something to honour in me. O that was a part of me! It was not a lie; it was a part of me you loved. Have you not had ill thoughts yourself? It must be; we have all our secret evil. Only mine has broken loose; it is my maniac brother who has slipped his chain; it does not change the part of me you loved. Look at me. If you knew how my heart leaps up to be found out, perhaps, perhaps, you might forgive me. …

LESLIE: (at work unchaining and unbolting door) I open this door for you to go out of this house, you and your friendship, out into the night.

Stevenson reported to Sidney Colvin (mid-January 1879, Letters II. 297):

‘… the last tableau is the most passionate thing in the English drama since the Elizabethans. It is, by God.’

Henley took over: ‘He’s quite right, Colvin. It is an admirable thing. The third act is what a good third act should be. We neither of us slept last night after having completed it; and small wonder.’ Henley then went on to talk of the part of Smith the Englishman (whom the real Brodie may have kicked out of the dock): it was his own creation, Stevenson (21 September 1878 (Letters II. 277) having acknowledged his parentage –

when you have neither time, power, nor inclination to make a character, how lovely to make one out of string, in two or three phrases, by the word of one’s mouth and the Waverley nib of one’s right hand.

After Stevenson’s death, Henley’s final note to his contemptibly bitter review of Graham Balfour’s biography (Pall Mall Magazine XXV, December 1901) ended ‘I will but say that Stevenson’s interest in other people’s writing – writing well or writing ill – was small.’ As a judgement on the man who threw his own work aside to buttress the efforts of his wife or his step-son, of the man who identified Sherlock Holmes (when in the South Seas) as originating in Joseph Bell and wrote his ‘My First Book’ in tribute to Conan Doyle’s contribution to the same series in the Idler, this is blatant, malevolent nonsense; but it does mean Henley felt Stevenson did not admire Henley’s work enough. The final Brodie–Leslie dialogue is therefore Stevenson’s in whole or in principal part. If not so far superior to Restoration and eighteenth-century drama as he imagined, it is far above most of the rest of the Stevenson–Henley Brodie texts, and its ghost plays its part when Jekyll writes to Lanyon (on discovering that he has become Hyde when outside his own house and bereft of means to re-enter):

Dear Lanyon, – You are one of my oldest friends; and although we may have differed at times on scientific questions, I cannot remember, at least on my side, any break in our affection. There was never a day when, if you had said to me, ‘Jekyll, my life, my honour, my reason, depend on you’, I would not have sacrificed my fortune or my left hand to help you. Lanyon, my life, my honour, my reason, are all at your mercy; if you fail me to-night, I am lost. You might suppose, after this preface, that I am going to ask you for something dishonourable to grant. Judge for yourself…

The note is, of course, wholly uncharacteristic of Jekyll, but the cloying professions of affection and sacrificial readiness mingled with desperate pleas do nicely for Hyde, and are clearly inherited from Brodie 1880. Leslie’s swoon (whence he recovers in nice time to resume his courtship of Mary Brodie in the last act) becomes Lanyon’s mortal illness. Utterson visits him only to be told:

‘I wish to see or hear no more of Dr Jekyll… I am quite done with that person; and I beg that you will spare me any allusion to one whom I regard as dead.’

And here is Jekyll writing to Utterson in reply to a letter of enquiry about Lanyon:

‘I do not blame our old friend … but I share his view that we must never meet. I mean from henceforth to lead a life of extreme seclusion; you must not be surprised nor must you doubt my friendship, if my door is often shut even to you. You must suffer me to go my own dark way…’

Lanyon’s posthumous disclosure to Utterson begins its final paragraph:

What he told me in the next hour I cannot bring my mind to set on paper. I saw what I saw, I heard what I heard, and my soul sickened at it; and yet, now when that sight has faded from my eyes, I ask myself if I believe it, and I cannot answer. My life is shaken to its roots; sleep has left me; the deadliest terror sits by me at all hours of the day and night; I feel that my days are shaken to its roots; sleep has left me; the deadliest terror sits by me at all hours of the day and night; I feel that my days are shaken to its roots; sleep has left me; the deadliest terror sits by me at all hours of the day and night; I feel that my days are shall die incredulous. As for the moral turpitude that man unveiled to me, even with tears of penitence, I cannot, even in memory, dwell on it without a start of horror.

The ultimate heart of darkness is fittingly the briefest, Jekyll’s Statement
simply recording ‘I received Lanyon’s condemnation partly in a dream.’ The critical ancestry of Jekyll within the Brodie–Leslie duet is ‘we have all our secret evil. Only mine has broken loose; it is my maniac brother who has slipped his chain; it does not change the part of me you loved’.

The ominous emphasis given to door and window in Brodie is made matter of high mystery in Jekyll, Brodie being revealed to Leslie on entry through a window and Jekyll just managing to save himself from turning into Hyde while speaking to Utterson and Enfield at his window, while Hyde’s connection with Jekyll is initially revealed by a door and Brodie’s confidence in his own alibi during his final burglary is shattered by the discovery that the door, behind which he supposedly lies on a sick-bed, is ‘Open, open, open! Judgment of God, the door is open!’ The opening of Jekyll’s door by Utterson at the end seals Hyde’s doom.

The final evidence for Brodie (though not, of course, for Brodie) as the father of Jekyll and Hyde lies in the very point Gosse had so strongly – and misleadingly – denied: Stevenson’s hand on the final text. In February 1883, after incessant reminders to Henley, a fresh copy of Brodie was sent him at Marseilles whence he settled for over a year at Hyères, writing in late February 1883 to his collaborator (Letters IV. 80–81):

I have also read with care Deacon Brodie. Acts I and II will do. Act III is passed by me. Act IV must go to the door. I bar it. It won’t do, sir. It’s rot, the robbery tableau is a colossal error; after having worked up people to the pitch of Act III, to treat them to cracksmen business and real moonlight and a pasteboard murder, is the extreme of dramatic imbecility.

… it must end absolutely in the reverse key. Brodie has a new revirement; he dies the gent…

The movement of Brodie’s character from Jekyll to Hyde had begun and within a few days Stevenson was telling Henley, amongst other revisions:

Tableau X. The open door finishes him flat. After a brief hell’s volcano of nastiness, he settles down and the death is to have a strong glow of pathos in it. Scenes I, II and III stet. IV and V much changed. VI a transformation. Act III. I would also remodel as to Brodie’s character touching it kindlier here and there.

Henley wanted full publication of Brodie in place of the private limited 1880 edition and Stevenson refused until it had been revised, remarking to Colvin in June 1884 that it was ‘dam bad’ (Letters IV. 309). Henley continued to push the old text for production (with a part for his brother) if he could not get its publication. Stevenson returned to England in time for his family (but not himself) to see the London production on 2 July 1884, and while still collaborating with Henley on other plays was still writing to him in January 1886 that if other projects failed ‘in the name of God let us rewrite the Deacon and have done with it’. Apart from anything else, he needed the money. Eventually in late March 1887 he told Colvin ‘I am nearly through a revision of Deacon Brodie which had to be done’ (Letters V. 180, 371–72). At this point there is no mention of Henley. But whichever of them bore most responsibility for the revisions published by Henley in the 1888 text, its major alteration met Stevenson’s demand for the redemption of Brodie:

BRODIE: (behind the table). One moment, officer: I have a word to say before witnesses ere I go. In all this there is but one man guilty; and that man is I. None else has sinned; none else must suffer. This poor woman (pointing at Jean) I have used; she never understood. Mr Procurator-Fiscal, this is my dying confession. (He matches his dagger from the table, and rushes upon Hunt, who parries, and runs him through. He reels across the stage and falls.) The new life… the new life! (He dies.)

In any case, any influence the play had on Jekyll had been worked out by 1886 whose first days saw Jekyll’s publication. If anything, the resolved battle with Henley as to Brodie’s ethics may have proved crucial in unlocking the genius confronting Jekyll and Hyde, as the artist in Stevenson writhed in protest against the banality of pure evil in his Brodie, and suddenly found means of turning that banality to his creative purposes. As my mentor and friend the late W.W. Robson wrote when dealing with Kidnapped (The Definition of Literature and Other Essays, 1982):

It is as if for him ‘Lowland’ and ‘Highland’ stand for two possibilities of man, possibilities that might ideally be realised in the same individual. And what David [Balfour] unwittingly seems to register is that the individual who does not realise them both is lacking in something. I suspect that the true moral of Jekyll and Hyde is to be found there, not in the popular reading.

The National Library of Scotland has a wealth of material relating to Robert Louis Stevenson. There is space here to mention only a few sources of direct relevance. The cover photograph, showing Robert Louis Stevenson in 1880, is from the Gorrie collection of photographs (NLS, GRH.9. [3292]). The Library has a copy of the 1880 Deacon Brodie or, The double life: a melodrama, founded on facts, in four acts and ten tableaux (NLS, F.S.d.20) which bears Henley’s name and address on the title-page, and alterations to the text by W.E. Henley and (probably) Stevenson. The play is also in the 1908 New York Bigelow–Scott edition of Stevenson’s Works (NLS, NC.1173.14). S.G. Hulme Beaman’s dramatic images are to be found in The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde (NLS, X.187.c). The 8-volumes of Stevenson’s Letters, edited by Bradford Booth and Ernest Meheux (NLS, Lit.529.S) are an invaluable source of information.

Note on sources
In tracing the Scottish ethnobotanical tradition concerning the Caremyle or Heath Pea, a crucial and richly rewarding focus of my research has been the relevant holdings of Rare Books and Manuscripts in the National Library of Scotland.

The characters in this piece of detection are Dr James Fraser (1645–1731), Sir Robert Sibbald (1641–1722) and the Rev. Robert Wodrow (1679–1734). Fraser was the mystery of the three: after extensive investigation, I have been able to ascertain the identity of the James Fraser who was in correspondence with Wodrow, setting the scene for the London-based experimentation upon Caremyle. In an age when medicine and botany were inextricably linked, Sibbald was an outstanding authority on medico-botanical matters. The Rev. Robert Wodrow figures in this investigation only insofar as he kept up (and carefully preserved) a prolonged correspondence with the otherwise elusive Fraser over their common interests, bibliophily and historical scholarship.

Sir Robert Sibbald was co-founder of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh; co-founder of the Botanic Gardens in that city; and Geographer Royal for Scotland. He was an avid writer and publisher, both in scholarly Latin and in English. The National Library of Scotland has a fine collection of Sibbald’s abundant and meticulous works on medico-botanical matters, which complements its unrivalled archive of his manuscripts. In closely-written journals may be found his observations on the Heath Pea: Sibbald described the popular claims for the pea-sized tubers of the plant – that their ingestion can eliminate hunger (for an unspecified, yet protracted, length of time) as well as enhancing well-being and endurance.

In both his scholarly and his popular writings, Sibbald gave more space and attention to Caremyle than any other plant in Scotland. A practical pocket-sized handbook for the populace, titled Provision for the Poor in Time of Dearth & Scarcity (1699, with a second edition in 1703) by ‘R.S., Doctor of Medicine’ (Sibbald), names plants that are usable from the wild and from the garden. Caremyle (or Karemyle) is the plant above all others that Sibbald recommends ‘in time of dearth and scarcity’. He notes:

The Historian Dion in The Life of Severus, where he treateth of the Ancient Britains [Britons] writeth of them, that they endured much Hunger and Cold, & fed in the Woods upon the Barks and Roots of Trees, and upon all occasions, they had a sort of Meat, of which, if they took but the bigness of a Bean, they neither Hunger or Thirst. Our Highlanders… to preserve them from Hunger and Thirst, make much use of the Knobs upon the Roots of the Karemyle, which is Orobus silvaticus nostras perennis… [literally: our perennial Wood Vetch], of our learned Dr Morison… The round Knobs have the taste of Liquorice. They keep it in their Mouths the bigness of a Bean or Pea; they infuse it too in the Water they Drink, and they make a Drink of the Decoction of the Knobs of it; in the strength of this they can Travel and Toil.

A lengthy entry dated 6 January 1685 in a notebook of Sibbald’s provides a vivid narrative. The title-page of the notebook reads:

Ane Essay Relating to the Natural History of Scotland by way of Supplement to the Prodromus Naturali History[.]ae Scot[i]ae published anno 1684, digested in Common Places and containing the Authors observations upon these things and the transcripts of the Letters of those … who corresponded wt. [with] him about ym. [them] and the Relations of other Curious Gentlemen about such of yu. [you] as concern[?] Scotland & the Isles, and Waters y[er]to [thereto]…

It is clear that Sibbald was working towards a second edition of the Prodromus (the forerunner of the Natural History of Scotland, and the second title for the published Scotia Illustrata). The relevant section is headed ‘Of Plants theire Vertues & Uses.'
Vertue of ye Karemyle or AStraGalus SylVaticus Thali' and is Sibbald's copy of a letter, dated 6 January, 1685, to him from Fraser:

I have made the experiment on my self with your AstraGalus which more properly is wild Liquorish, then Wood Pease, for it has the savour, flavour and produces the same effects that the Common [Liquorice] does. I took the quantity ['of ye Karemyle' added in margin] of a Hazel Nutt on Monday Morning, and the like quantity on Tuesday Morning[...]. On Wednesday I had but a little Bitt, and from Sunday till Wednesday 3 aclock did not eat any sort of food, or taste any sort of Drink, only one tea Cup full of Small Beer too see what taste it gave the Liquor I drank when it was in my mouth, which I found to be the very same with the common Liquorice...

On this occasion he fasted for about sixty-six hours, during which time he felt well, though he had no desire to eat or drink, and 'sat up every night to one or two in the morning, reading or writing'. His notebook entry continues:

The King [Charles II], Duke & Dutchess, Prince and Princess, and all the court, were surprized at the nature of the plant, and desyred me to gett some more on’t to make further experiments on others. My Lord Braid Albin [Breadalbane], Sir William Bruce and several Gentlemen of our Country now at Court have testifi'd to the effects usually ascribed to these roots, which in the North they call Knappers. ... if families can be Kept or Seamen at Sea Dyeted wt. [with] such food, which would much save charges of the country physician.

In his memoir of his life, Sibbald recalled he had given copies of Scotia Illustrata to King Charles II, to the Duke of York and to various members of court. As the above extract demonstrates, prominent members of the court at Westminster were involved in testing Caremyle, and their findings were relayed to Sibbald by a James Fraser, who was evidently the initiator and organiser of the experiments.

I pursued a number of research paths to establish the identity of this ‘James Fraser’. In brief, from registers of the reformed church I discovered he was a son of the manse at Petty, Inverness-shire. Examination of the register of Aberdeen graduates established that our man graduated as Master of Arts from King’s College, Aberdeen, in 1664, and as Doctor of Laws in 1725. In London he was ‘Secretary and Register of Chelsea College’, effectively Secretary of the Chelsea Royal Hospital for its first forty years, from its foundation in 1689. This hospital, founded by Charles II, was intended to look after retired soldiers and seamen – the so-called Chelsea Pensioners. Historians of the Chelsea Royal Hospital consider the post to have been a leisurely sinecure, which would have combined readily with Fraser’s primary occupation – as a bookdealer (as described by his contemporaries, and referred to in Dean’s 1952 History of the Chelsea Royal Hospital).

‘Catalogue Fraser’, as he was called, frequented book auctions and coffee-houses, where his learning and helpfulness were much admired. A rapid study of the prolific correspondents in the London of the Restoration period, centred on the Fellows of the Royal Society (previous owners of Chelsea College), tells us that Fraser had contact with John Aubrey, Edward Chamberlayne, John Evelyn, Robert Hooke, John Locke, Samuel Pepys and Hans Sloane. Fraser’s most abundant extant correspondence is, however, with the Glasgow-based cleric, antiquary and museum curator Robert Wodrow. This correspondence, extending from 1718 to 1730, is largely in the National Library of Scotland.

Fraser’s fondness for accruing money earned him the sneer of ‘usurer’ from the Restoration poet and libertine John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, evidently for mortgaging the inheritance of his friend the royal favourite, Nell Gwyn. ‘Pretty, witty Nell’ is traditionally credited with influencing Charles II in the foundation of the Chelsea Royal Hospital; Chelsea pensioners still toast her memory.

However, Fraser was a generous benefactor of his alma mater, King’s College in Aberdeen: he gave £200 towards rebuilding the college, with £50 annually for life from rents and £220 towards two college burships. He also gave the burgh of Inverness ‘1000 merkes’ towards equipping its ‘Kirk Session Library’. These documents, lodged with the beneficiaries, do not cover grants mentioned in letters to Wodrow: these include grants to charity schools in Scotland, to the charity school in Hall, Germany, and to the Christian mission at Curmandel (Coromandel), East India.

Dr Burns, cited by Wodrow’s biographer, commented on the power Fraser held in London society. Presumably this observation refers partly to Fraser’s influence through his role as Chief Libencer for the Company of...
Caremyle experiments have regretfully led to no research reports – at least in no archives under his name and in no Transactions or Proceedings of the Royal Society. However, I have traced around 200 later writers who have broadly endorsed, or repeated, what Sibbald and Fraser wrote regarding its widespread traditional folk use in Scotland, especially in the north. Apparently the knappers (tubers) were collected against times of food shortage and a few sufficed to replace all other food and drink without loss of energy.

The usual source for these reports is travellers’ accounts dating from the late-seventeenth century to the mid-nineteenth century. Their initial awareness of Caremyle most likely came from its mention in Sibbald’s Scotia Illustrata (NLS, Ao.2; NLS, Ferg.211); Sibbald’s observations were later much-quoted, including by John Ray (1627–1705) ‘the father of British botany’; in Historia Plantarum he mentioned that Caremyle was to be found in the Scottish mountains (rather than in ‘our mountains’, as Sibbald had put it).

As my research continues, I am still unearthing information about James Fraser, hoping to discover more about his collaborative experiments with Caremyle. One most exciting recent outcome is that it appears that he held the post of Royal Librarian to Charles II.

I was alerted to the possibility by a reference in James Roy Pickard’s A History of King’s College Library, Aberdeen, until 1860 (1987, vol II, ch IV) (NLS, HP2.87.1946); Pickard cites a letter in which Fraser writes that he is to be ‘shortly in the possession of the Library at St James [Palace at Whitehall]’.

Pickard also cites Professor John Ker’s funeral oration and elegy for Fraser (Fraserseides, 1732); that Fraser was made Royal Librarian by James II (not Charles II), and the standard text on royal libraries, Edward Edwards’ Libraries and Founders of Libraries (NLS, K.R.22.b) (1864) has absolutely nothing to report for the period of the reign of Charles II. Professor Ronald Hutton, the most recent biographer of Charles II, put it.”}

The focus of my research is now moving on from the National Library of Scotland to private archives in northern Scotland, notably those of Brodie of Brodie, and to lesser lights of the Royal Society c. 1700. Pharmacological evaluation of the tubers is now arranged.

In conclusion, I note that a correspondent to the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society (1691–93, vol 17, 824–26), one Tancred Robinson of Northampton-shire, writing about Tubera terrae or Truffles, observed that Caremyle, is likewise suited to being dug for by specially trained dogs. The scent is strong and attractive.

The hunt is on.

---

**Note on sources**

The National Library of Scotland’s manuscript holdings by or relating to Sir Robert Sibbald are extensive; these are detailed, as are the Wodrow Papers, in the Library’s catalogues of manuscripts. The notebook, in the hand of Sir Robert Sibbald, is headed ‘An Essay relating to the Natural History of Scotland by way of supplement to the Prodromus Naturalis Histor[i]ae Scot[i]ae published anno 1684’ (NLS. Adv. MS.33.5.19). Largely comprising discourses on natural history and scientific and medical phenomena found in Scotland, it includes (pp.243–44) the reference to James Fraser mentioned above. The Library also has a sketchbook by Sibbald containing three depictions of Caremyle (NLS, Adv. MS. 6.1.14). Among the many books by Sibbald to be found in the Library is his magnificent Scotia Illustrata, 1684, (NLS, Ao.2; NLS, Ferg.211). The Memoirs of Sir Robert Sibbald 1641–1722 (NLS, X.183.f) edited by Francis Hett gives an overview of his life and achievements. The Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh has an important collection of Sibbald material.
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29 October 2000
The Library’s summer exhibition, Scotland’s Pages, ends. The last chance to see Mary Queen of Scots’ last letter, Blind Harry’s ‘Wallace’, the order for the Massacre of Glencoe and other Library treasures charting almost one thousand years of history.
Open Monday-Saturday 10.00-17.00; Sunday 14:00-17.00 at the Library’s George IV Bridge Building

November 2000
The National Library of Scotland Elizabeth Soutra Bookbinding Award 2000 is announced. Now in its eighth year, the competition aims to encourage the practice and development of craft binding skills with individual expression and originality. The winning entries join the Library’s collection of fine bindings.

John Higgert’s The Murthly Hours: Devotion, Literacy and Luxury in Paris, England and the Gaelic West is published by The British Library and the University of Toronto Press, in association with the National Library of Scotland. The book examines the text and illumination of the Murthly Hours, one of the Library’s finest treasures, and traces its history from the thirteenth century to the present. It will be on sale in the Library Shop (tel. 0131-226 4531 ext 2204) from November. A complete digital facsimile of the manuscript will also be available on the Library’s website at www.nls.uk.

30 November 2000

December 2000
The Library’s newsletter, Quarrò, is published. Contact Jackie Cromarty, Deputy Head of Public Programmes (details below) to be added to the mailing list to receive a regular update of news about the National Library of Scotland.

January 2001
The winner of the Robert Louis Stevenson Award is announced. The Award, which was instituted in 1994 to commemorate the centenary of the death of RLS, is jointly funded and administered by the Library and the Scottish Arts Council. It allows writers to spend March and April at the Hotel Chevillon International Arts Centre in Grez-sur-Loing near Fontainebleau, France. To have time away from their usual environment and preoccupations has proved to be of great assistance to the recipients. Previous winners of the award have been Ian Stephen (1995), Angus Dunn (1996), Dilys Rose (1997), Hugh Macpherson (1998), Chris Dolan (1999) and Maggie Graham (2000).

In the next Folio
(Spring 2001)

Kevin Halliwell of the Collection Development Division takes a journey through the National Library of Scotland’s collection of emigrant’s guides to North America. The emigrant’s guide is a bibliographical sub-genre whose content varies from the passionate declaration and utopian description, to the cold presentation of statistics and the soberest of advice. Beginning as a personal expression, usually based on first-hand experience, of enticement and discouragement to emigrate, its numbers growing and decreasing according to the vagaries of colonisation, it at times became a government document and political tool in the building of empire.

Alison Lumsden, a research fellow with the Edinburgh University Press Edinburgh Edition of the Waverley Novels discusses how the National Library of Scotland’s holdings of Scott novel manuscripts and other material – including Ballantyne correspondence, Constable Letter books and Cadell’s diaries – offer insight into Scott’s working methods and the publishing history of his novels. The Edinburgh Edition provides for the first time authoritative texts of the Waverley Novels, restoring ‘what Scott originally wrote and intended his public to read’.

Priscilla Bawcutt outlines the challenges she faced in editing the poems of William Dunbar (c. 1460–1513). In the National Library of Scotland she consulted the Bannatyne Manuscript, the Asloan Manuscript and the Chapman and Myllar prints as well as ‘a wealth of secondary material on Scottish history, literature, language, law, heraldry archaeology and many other topics’, the exploration of which helped to elucidate Dunbar’s topical allusions. The scholarship and cultural significance of her work was honoured in 1999 with the accolade of Scottish Researcher of the Year.

Robin Smith of the Library’s Manuscript Division discusses the development of the Muriel Spark Archive, one of the largest collections of a contemporary writer’s personal papers held in the National Library of Scotland. Giving an overview of the extraodinary range and quantity of everyday ephemera it contains, Robin Smith considers the archive in the light of passages from Muriel Spark’s published writing. The Muriel Spark Archive represents a feast of domestic, personal and literary material for researchers and literary biographers.