

The Origins of the Three Maps of Fife Published by Blaeu in 1654

JEFFREY C STONE

A curious feature of Joan Blaeu's atlas of Scotland (1654), is that it includes several regional maps which duplicate the coverage of larger-scale maps. The reason for this might simply be that small-scale maps covering large areas in less detail were considered useful by the publisher since they show the relative location of places far apart. Alternatively, the duplication of coverage could have occurred if the atlas was compiled from drafts made by different cartographers. The latter possibility is relevant to the unresolved question of the authorship of some of the maps in the atlas.

The origins of the atlas were recently described in *Scottish Studies* (Stevenson 1982: 1). The critical feature was that because of the length of time involved in the production of the work, not all Timothy Pont's sixteenth-century manuscript drafts could be engraved by Blaeu. Through the good offices of Sir John Scot of Scotstarvit, some of Pont's manuscripts were returned to Scotland to be revised by Robert Gordon of Straloch, but the printed maps do not always indicate their individual origins.

The small-scale maps in the atlas which overlap larger-scale maps are *Extima Scotiae*, *Braid-Albin*, *Aebudae Insulae*, *Gallovidia* and *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. *Extima Scotiae* has been shown to be the work of Robert Gordon (Stone 1972: 25), drawing largely on the work of Timothy Pont: it was compiled at a relatively late date to make good a major deficiency in Blaeu's coverage of Scotland, by means of a single map of an extensive area, which is at a necessarily small scale. Hence, although overlap exists between *Extima Scotiae* and *Cathenesia*, *Strath-navernia*, *Southerlandia*, *Moravia* and also parts of *Aberdonia & Banfia* and *Skia*, there are extensive areas of northwest Scotland which are depicted only on *Extima Scotiae*. The inclusion of such a small-scale map is therefore understandable. The same is true of *Braid-Albin*, despite partial overlaps with *Moravia*, *Aberdonia & Banfia*, *Lorna*, *Mula*, *Aebudae Insulae . . . Minores*, *Skia* and *Extima Scotiae*. The fact that both *Aebudae Insulae* and *Gallovidia* together with the large-scale maps which they overlap are all credited to Pont by the engraver on the maps themselves, suggests that both large- and small-scale draft maps were all compiled by Pont. They were included because both Pont and Blaeu considered it useful to have large areas shown on single sheets. Thus it is possible to account for four out of the five small scale maps.¹

However, the reason has still to be sought for including the small-scale map of *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. This map, depicting the whole of Fife, overlaps with two larger-scale



Plate 1. The only extant Pont manuscript of any part of Fife, glued to one corner of a larger area of Fife drawn by Robert Gordon and showing the country south of the Firth of Tay between Elcho Castle and Balmerinoch. The map appears as no. 54B in Cash's (1907) list of manuscript maps by Robert and James Gordon. (Reproduced by courtesy of the Trustees of the National Library of Scotland.)

maps, each showing only a part of Fife. The single sheet of the whole of Fife adds nothing to the total landward area covered by the atlas. Moreover, there is a suggestion of unease in the publisher's mind in the index to the atlas: whereas the two large-scale maps are entitled *Fifae pars Occidentalis* and *Fifae pars Orientalis* on the maps themselves, in the index the titles are modified to their comparative forms, *Fifae pars Occidentaliior* and *Fifae pars Orientalior*. It is as though the publisher is justifying what might otherwise appear to be duplication, by referring to the maps as expressly showing the more westerly and more easterly parts, not simply the whole broken into two parts. The implication is that we are to be presented with something different from the single-sheet map. In this respect, it is noteworthy that *Fifae Vicecomitatus* is the only map in the atlas credited to James Gordon (Robert Gordon's son); but the two large-scale maps which it overlaps bear no author's name.

Another interesting difference between the small-scale and two large-scale maps of Fife is the fact that comparison of the relative accuracy of all the maps in the atlas shows that *Fifae Vicecomitatus* is the most accurate map in the atlas, whereas there are respectively twenty-one and thirty-three maps in the atlas which are more accurate than *Fifae pars Orientalis* and *Fifae pars Occidentalis* (Stone & Gemmell 1977: 9). If the three maps of Fife were all by the same cartographer then one might expect that they would be of the same order of accuracy.

The question of authorship of the three maps of Fife has been commented on in the past. Skelton (1970: 107) believed that all three maps were probably by James Gordon, as did Cash (1901: 408), although Cash drew attention to the significantly different locations of Sir John Scot's seat of Scotstarvit in relation to the town of Cupar, on the maps of Fife (Cash 1901: 407). Skelton and Cash did not state their reasons for believing that all three maps were by James Gordon. Both presumably considered that since James Gordon was the author of *Fifae Vicecomitatus* it was probable that the other two maps of Fife were by the same author. Moir (1973: 52) made the same assumption, as did this author (Stone 1970: 20). However, I have more recently suggested that a small and unrecognised map of northwest Fife by Pont might provide clues in resolving the questions of the authorship of the three maps of Fife and of the seeming duplication of coverage in the atlas (Stone 1973: 150).

The small Pont manuscript (Plate 1), which was erroneously listed by Cash (1907: 590) as item 54B of maps by Robert and James Gordon, shows an area stretching from the Firth of Tay between Elcho Castle and Balmerino Abbey, southwards some five kilometres into Fife as far as a line joining Wedersbie Hill, Mount Hill and Mountquhaine House. The map has a relatively high density of names but is quite legible and carries a variety of castle sketches, some of them quite large. A locational note on the southern boundary reads 'marching with the paresh/ of Coulesly' (Collessie), which, if it was intended as a guide in locating one small map in relation to another, perhaps implies that Pont's cartography extended beyond the extant map.

Map no. 54B was compared with all overlapping Gordon manuscripts and printed

maps to see if continuity could be established. Of the eight manuscripts by the Gordons which show all or a part of the surface area of no. 54B, nos. 2, 47 and 48 each have two place-names on the parts of the maps corresponding to the coverage of 54B, no. 41 has three names and no. 46 has only one. Since all these names appear on the three maps still to be examined, these five maps could be set aside. The remaining three Gordon manuscripts are nos. 6, 53 and 54A; two printed maps (Blaeu's *Fifae Vicecomitatus* and *Fifae pars Orientalis*) also show the area of Pont no. 54B.

There are sixty-seven names on the Pont manuscript map, which carries more detail than any of the comparable maps. For example, Robert Gordon no. 54A has twenty-five names in the relevant area, all of which also appear on the Pont map with the exception of one ('Aiton'). Robert Gordon no. 6 has twenty-two names, again all on the Pont map except for 'Aiton'. James Gordon no. 53 is a richer source and has fifty-four names in the comparable area, but thirteen of them are not to be found on Pont's map; and of these thirteen names, twelve appear on *Fifae Vicecomitatus* but only one ('Aiton') appears on *Fifae pars Orientalis*. Map no. 53 is a finely executed manuscript, in a finished state as though ready to be passed to the publisher for engraving. However, in the area of overlap with the small Pont map, another source must have been used. Moreover, since Blaeu's *Fifae Vicecomitatus* has identical names to map no. 53 in the area of the Pont map, it follows that part of the printed map derives from the same source. However, just as the names on Robert Gordon's two manuscripts maps (nos. 54A and 6) are closely comparable to the Pont manuscript, so too is the corresponding part of Blaeu's *Fifae pars Orientalis*. In fact, all the names on *Fifae pars Orientalis*, excepting 'Aiton', could have been derived from the Pont manuscript.

It is probable that Robert Gordon, if not James Gordon, was aware of the existence of the Pont manuscript, because it is attached to Robert Gordon's larger manuscript no. 54A and the two cannot have been joined together recently, since they were described, as they exist today, as items XII (2) and (3) in Gough's list of 1780 (Gough 1780: 593). Whereas there is no clear evidence of Pont's work being used in the compilation of *Fifae Vicecomitatus*, in the case of *Fifae pars Orientalis* the very close but not total similarity between Robert Gordon's manuscripts nos. 6, 54A, 54B and the printed map might suggest that Robert Gordon was the draughtsman of the pair of large-scale printed maps of Fife, using Pont sources with minor additions. The evidence is tenuous but is necessarily so because of the very small amount of extant mapping by Pont.

I am indebted to Dr David Stevenson for responding to my examination of the role of Robert Gordon in the preparation of the Blaeu atlas of Scotland (Stone 1981) by pointing out that the existing literature does not sufficiently explore the surviving records of church courts. Assembly records show that in August 1642 Scot desired the Assembly to request that James Gordon be given permission to do work on the ground for the map of Fife (Stevenson 1982: 4). This record challenges my suggestion that the three maps of Fife were compiled before 1642, a suggestion based on the evidence of Blaeu's letter to Scot of March 1642 listing the parts of Scotland for which he lacked

maps, but since he made no mention of Fife this seemed to point to his being already in possession of maps of Fife. The ecclesiastical record is consistent with the date of 1642 on James Gordon's extant manuscript map of Fife (no. 53). The fact that James Gordon did indeed visit Fife for the purpose of obtaining the data for his map is confirmed by the title of manuscript no. 52 which reads 'Keanrosse-shyre / described / Oct 25 / 1642 / Be Ja: Gordon at Keanrosse'.

The points which are raised by the firm new evidence of the late date of preparation of a map of Fife by James Gordon are several. Firstly, did James Gordon's work on the ground of 1642 indeed result in the engraving of *Fifae Vicecomitatus*, whose contents can consequently be precisely dated? Secondly, are there further differences in content between the small-scale and the two large-scale printed maps of Fife? If so, can comparison with extant manuscript maps beyond the very limited area of Pont no. 54B reveal anything more of the origins of *Fifae pars Occidentalis* and *Fifae pars Orientalis*? If the contents of the two larger-scale maps can be dated, then we may well have a more valuable source of information on the historical geography of Fife than was previously appreciated, in that the two large-scale printed maps and the small-scale map may show Fife at different dates. In an attempt to move towards an answer to these questions, careful comparison has been made between the contents of Robert Gordon's manuscript map of Fife, Blaeu's *Fife Vicecomitatus*, also his *Fifae pars Orientalis* and *Fifae pars Occidentalis*, as well as all other extant manuscripts maps by James and Robert Gordon covering Fife.

The first question as to the date of *Fifae Vicecomitatus* seems to be answered already on the face of it, without recourse to the manuscripts. After all, the engraved map is credited to James Gordon and the dedication refers to the illustrious 'IOANNI CRAVFORDIAE Comiti LYNSDALE, et PERBROTHIAE Baroni' being elected to high office in 1645; so the map could not have been engraved before 1645, although it may have been engraved later. This accords with the ecclesiastical record of James' visit to Fife in 1642, and with the confirmatory evidence of his extant manuscript of Kinross (no. 52). It also accords with the Latin address entitled 'Ioannes Blaeu Lectori Salutem' in the atlas itself, which talks of 'the most learned man James Gordon (who) had drawn while he was living with Tarvat a new map of Fife which he sent to me (Blaeu). . . . this fell into the hands of men of Dunkirk'.

Surprisingly, the content of the Kinross manuscript no. 52 does nothing to confirm the seemingly obvious origins of *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. It is an extremely legible map, in James' neat and characteristic hand, but it is a working draft bearing information for use elsewhere, as is shown by the four marginal inscriptions giving distances and directions to places adjacent but beyond the area of the map *e.g.* 'Neither Curch / has its spring 6 / myles NW oft / Keanrosse'. Admittedly there are no settlements named on the relevant part of *Fifae Vicecomitatus* which cannot be derived from manuscript no. 52. Indeed, the only place-name which is at all doubtful in that respect is the engraved 'Keanross- / Muire' which appears on the manuscript as 'THE MUIR'. The difference between

these two forms is not sufficient to disallow the possibility of the manuscript map as the source, except that the location of 'The Muir' is to the northwest of the Gelly Burn, whereas 'Keanross-Muir' is to the southeast. There are, however, other locations, *e.g.* of 'Cleish K.' and 'Pittendreich', which differ significantly between the two maps. Moreover, of the ninety-four places named on the manuscript, eight are not carried forward to the printed map.² Four of these names³ form a little cluster of adjacent settlements north of Loch Leven, in a part of the engraved map where there is a low settlement density. There is clearly a deficiency by omission in this very small part of the engraved map to the northwest of 'Bishops- / Muir' and south of present-day Glenfarg, where three of the four places named still exist on the ground today. Hence, while the contents of the Kinross manuscript no. 52 provides evidence of James Gordon at work on the ground, there is no clear evidence that the information on this particular map was the source of the corresponding area of *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. The contents of manuscript no. 52 offers no corroboration of the strong but circumstantial evidence for the origins of *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. A comparison of content results only in slight misgivings.

A much more comprehensive manuscript to compare with *Fifae Vicecomitatus* is no. 53, entitled 'FYFE. Shyre / MDCXLII / FIFA PRO- / vincia Noviter deline- / ta / Auctore Jacobo Gordono / Fo. R.G. a Strathloch'. This is a very detailed map in an advanced state of preparation, complete with embellishments, scale, border, compass rose, title and inset plans of the towns of Saint Andrews and Cupar. According to Gough (1780: 594), this map was engraved and is to be found amongst De Witt and Visscher's collection of maps; but this does not seem to be the case. It is the striking appearance of what must surely have been intended as a final draft for the engraver which gives rise to the question of why it has survived: had it been passed to the engraver as a final draft and used as such, it would be of no further use and therefore would not have been retained. Cash (1901: 405) explains its survival by reference to the correspondence dated 2 September 1645 between Robert Gordon and Sir John Scot, who was then visiting the low countries. Scot tells how Dunkirk privateers had seized the ship carrying James Gordon's draft map of Fife to Blaeu; Scot was trying to secure the return of the map but had little hope of succeeding; however, he compliments Robert Gordon on his advice to his son to retain a duplicate of the map, and asks that James be approached to draw another copy for dispatch to Amsterdam. Cash assumes that Scot did secure the return of the map and that the extant manuscript map is the duplicate which was originally retained in 1645.

The printed map differs from the extant manuscript in one obvious respect: the two town plans are missing. There are other, lesser, differences: the embellishments bear no resemblance; the division of the vertical borders into a scale of minutes of latitude has been added to the printed map; Gordon's key to the place-names has been removed, and the words 'THE / SCOTTISH / SEA' have not been carried forward to the printed map.

The detailed content of the two maps were examined for clues as to their relationship. Blaeu's *Fifae Vicecomitatus* has 1140 place names in total, six less than James Gordon's

manuscript (excluding the town plans and key). However, the difference between the two maps is slightly more than six names. There are twenty-three names on the printed map which do not occur on the manuscript.⁴ However, fourteen of these are not in Fife but on the adjacent shores of the Lothians and Angus, which are included on the printed map but not on the manuscript. Of the remaining nine, one is the name of a river which appears on both maps but is shown twice on the printed map. A further four names should occur at the edges or across the junctions of the several pieces of paper which were joined together to construct a single sheet large enough to take the manuscript map. The junctions are not exactly coincidental with the limits of the writing, suggesting that the map has come apart and been rejoined as some later date, with the possible loss of four names.⁵ This leaves four Fife names⁶ on *Fifae Vicecomitatus* which cannot have been derived from the manuscript, two of them immediately adjacent by Burntisland.

There are no less than twenty-nine names on the manuscript which are not on the printed map, but these tell us more about the process of engraving than about the sources of the engraver's information. The twenty-nine names include only three names beyond the bounds of Fife in this case, one in East Lothian and two in Perthshire,⁷ although it is noteworthy that the two Perthshire names which appear in physical isolation also appear in similar isolation on James Gordon's Kinross manuscript no. 52, tenuous evidence of a connection between manuscripts 52 and 53. Of the remaining twenty-six, all but three are physical features or else generic terms, rather than the names of particular places: they include coal pits, kirks, hills, lochs, rivers, burns, moors and a castle. Only three are the names of settlements, and in the case of two of these the name itself is not engraved on the printed map—only a small locational circle, which is Blaeu's nondescript settlement symbol, appears. In both cases it looks as though a named settlement may well have appeared on the draft from which the engraver was working, but because of the very high density of names in those two areas, the engraver did not have space to engrave the two names.⁸ The third settlement whose name is not repeated on the printed map is a settlement on the eastern shore of Kilconquhar Loch, named 'Lorheid' on the Gordon manuscript and 'Lonhead alias Kinocher' on the printed map. Clearly, Blaeu could not have derived his name directly from the Gordon manuscript, but they are one and the same place. Therefore all the settlements shown on the manuscript map are located, if not named, on the printed map. This implies an extremely close connection between the two. It further implies that settlement information has been very rigorously transferred from the original manuscript draft to the engraving, except that, because of the extremely high density of settlement names, and the premium on space in a map of a large area at a relatively small scale, some of what may have been conceived of as the less essential names of physical features and other categories of places have been omitted; the engraver also omitted two settlement names for lack of space.

At some time, the printed map acquired four additional names, including the *alias* of 'Kinocher', which is a phonetic version of Kilconquhar.⁹ One of these four, however,

may not necessitate an alternative source of information: Gordon's manuscript shows 'Pittedy', 'N. Pittedy' and 'S. Pittedy', whereas Blaeu shows an 'E. Pittedy' in addition, in very close proximity, north of Kinghorn. Although there are indeed four names known on the ground today, namely 'Piteadie', 'North Piteadie', 'Bankhead of Piteadie' and the ancient monument of 'Piteadie castle', the additional 'E. Pittedy' on *Fifae Vicecomitatus* must come under suspicion as an error of the engraver when copying one 'Pittedy' after another. Alternatively, since Pittedie was in the estates of Sir John Scot, perhaps it was he who made the addition at a late stage, after James Gordon had taken a copy of his original manuscript. No firm conclusions, therefore, can be drawn on the evidence of 'E. Pittedy' alone, but there remain the other three additional names on the printed map.

It is improbable that the engraver would trouble to refer to any additional sources when confronted with more than eleven hundred names. The presence of the four extra printed names suggests that the engraver might have been using a further draft in which James Gordon had inserted a couple of extra names near Burntisland, also the alternative name for his 'Lorheid', and perhaps 'E. Pittedy'. This suggestion would also help to account for the fact that the name 'Weems' becomes 'Weemstoun' and 'Eliot' becomes 'Ely' on the printed map. Such a draft either could have been a second draft prepared from manuscript no. 53 with additions by James Gordon after the loss of the copy sent to Amsterdam, or that very copy which was lost when it was seized by the men of Dunkirk as Sir John Scot relates. The latter is conceivable—and, as already mentioned, was the view held by Cash (1901: 405)—despite Sir John Scot's forebodings about the improbability of the success of his efforts to secure the return of the document. The address by Blaeu in introducing his atlas ('Lectori Salutem') says that when James Gordon's new map of Fife fell into the hands of men of Dunkirk, 'Tarvat did not fail to employ various devices to get round this obstacle, or to move every stone in Morini until he had won back this learned pledge from the sons of Neptune, as from the hands of the Laestrygonians'. Now we have the additional evidence from the comparison of the contents of the maps, in particular the additional names on *Fifae Vicecomitatus* which cannot derive from the extant manuscript where they are fewer in number. We may therefore propose that the printed map was prepared from an earlier draft, and the extant manuscript with fewer names was the copy which James Gordon retained. The printed map cannot be derived from a later copy of the extant manuscript, even though Scot sought a further copy in his letter of 1645, since the printed map contains more names than the extant manuscript. It seems likely, therefore, that the printed map is derived from the original draft which was seized by the Dunkirk privateers, but must have been recovered by Sir John Scot's efforts as is indicated in the introduction to the atlas.

The remaining fly in the ointment is the extant working map of Kinross (no. 52), the study of which has already been shown (p. 44) to provide little positive evidence that James Gordon's work on the ground was incorporated into *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. Indeed,

it shows that not all his work was so incorporated, since it contains information which is not on the printed map. Further investigation is necessary to prove that *Fifae Vicecomitatus*, although drafted c. 1645, shows Fife as recorded by James Gordon in 1642, and not a landscape recorded, as is much of the atlas, by Pont in the late sixteenth century. Comparison of content with every available relevant manuscript or printed map is required in the search for further clues.

The whole question of the origins of *Fifae Vicecomitatus* arises in the first instance from the existence in the same atlas of the unaccredited larger-scale maps of Fife. They have been shown to be planimetrically less accurate than *Fifae Vicecomitatus* (Stone & Gemmell 1977: 9), but their content remains to be assessed by comparison with the small-scale single-sheet coverage of Fife.

Between them, *Fifae pars Orientalis* and *Fifae pars Occidentalis* locate a total of 708 different names, that is 432 fewer than *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. *Fifae pars Orientalis* has 538 names, while *Fifae pars Occidentalis* has 315. There are 141 names common to both maps within the areas that overlap. Comparison between the names on the large and small scale maps cannot be done with absolute precision, however. It is often uncertain whether names on two different maps are intended to refer to the same place on the ground. This is partly due to small locational discrepancies, but also to renderings of names which differ to a greater or lesser degree. Some of the smaller places were presumably recorded phonetically, with the result that the name of the same place could be written down in different ways. Some of the curious discrepancies in spelling were possibly due also to mistakes made by the engraver. For example 'Burne turk' and 'Thomastoun' on *Fifae pars Orientalis* should probably be equated with 'Bankirk' and 'Thoma' on *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. I may have overlooked names which are common but contain greater superficial differences, and categorised them as different places; the substantial difference in content between the large and small scale maps should therefore be discounted slightly, but it is certainly great enough to imply that the maps have different sources. On *Fifae pars Orientalis* there are 175 names which are seemingly peculiar to it: they are not to be found on *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. *Fifae pars Occidentalis*, with a smaller total number of places located, has eighty-three names that are peculiar to it. Of the names common to both the large scale maps, fifty-nine seemingly do not occur on *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. There can be no doubt therefore about the independent origin of the two larger scale maps.

In passing, it is noteworthy that the two large-scale maps include four of the physical features shown on James Gordon's manuscript (no. 53) but not carried forward to *Fifae pars Vicecomitatus*. This confirms the validity of these names as recorded by Gordon, and that their subsequent exclusion does not imply that they were errors.

Given that the large scale printed maps of Fife are not from the same source as *Fifae Vicecomitatus*, it is possible that the drafts for those maps were received by Blaeu much earlier than 1645, the year the draft of the single sheet map of Fife probably reached Amsterdam. This would explain the absence of Fife from the list of counties requested

by Blaeu in his letter to Scot in 1642 (Moir & Skelton 1968: 155), although it does not itself explain why the Gordons went to such pains to provide Blaeu with a map of Fife. However, there is evidence to suggest that proofs of some maps were in the hands of Scot by 1641 (Moir 1973: 45), and if these included the two maps of Fife, Scot would have recognised the inaccuracies and omissions on the large scale maps since they depicted his home county: in particular, he would have been aware of the errors in the vicinity of his seat of Scotstarvit, near Cupar.

The evidence that Scot had access to proof copies is contained firstly in the well known letter to Gordon among the Straloch papers, dated 8 October 1641, from Charles I who was then in Scotland, in which the King speaks of having 'laily sein certane cairttis of divers schyres of this our ancient kingdome sent heir from Ansterdam To be correctit and helpeitt in the defectis thair of . . .' (Straloch Papers 1841: 11). The letter of 10 March 1642 from Blaeu to Scot confirms that these maps were proofs when it reads 'I have learnt from Master Wallace that, when the King was in Scotland, your Honour showed to his Majesty those proofs of maps which I had sent to you for correction. They were exceedingly imperfect . . .' (Moir & Skelton 1968: 155).

In 1641 Scot was pressing for the written descriptions which were to be prepared in every presbytery of the Church (Stevenson 1982: 3). Diligence was promised by the Kirkcaldy presbytery in January 1642, and in April 1642, the synod was urging the work on, at Scot's behest. In August 1642, however, the Assembly was addressed by Scot, not only on the subject of the written descriptions but also on the subject of sending James Gordon to map Fife. By the time the Assembly met in August 1642, Scot would have had time to appreciate the deficiencies of the proof maps of Fife, always assuming that these were among the proofs he received. It is unfortunate that none of these proofs seem to have survived.

If this were the true sequence of events it is, of course, curious that all three maps were eventually published. If the sight of the proofs of the two large scale maps so incensed Scot that James Gordon was put to the substantial trouble of replacing them, why didn't Scot ensure that only the improved map, and not the deficient maps, were published? After all, Scot was personally acquainted with Blaeu, who held him in high esteem (Cash 1901: 404-5). Presumably so much had been invested by Blaeu in the engraving of the two plates, that he was reluctant not to use them.

What were the sources of the two earlier maps of Fife and what date should be put on their contents? Are they based on the work of Pont or were they amended by Robert Gordon at a later date? As the very small map no. 54B is the only extant Pont manuscript of any part of Fife, a definitive answer seems improbable, but clues may emerge from examination of the several extant Gordon manuscripts.

There are eleven extant Gordon manuscripts which overlap all or some part of Fife as shown on the three printed maps. Of these, nos. 4 and 43 carry no place-names in the relevant area, while nos. 52 and 53 by James Gordon and no. 54B by Pont have been examined already. Map no. 2 is a small incomplete map of the whole of Scotland north

of Stirling, with only twenty-eight names in Fife, all of which can be found on other manuscripts, such as no. 53, so that it cannot be shown to have acted as a source for any of the printed maps of Fife. Map no. 48 is an unfinished map of part of the central Scotland with fifty-one names in Fife, mostly along the coast between Leven and Inverkeithing, but again there are no names which cannot be found on other manuscripts. Maps nos. 41, 46 and 47 are even less promising at first glance. They have only three, eight and thirty names respectively, in the relevant area. However, they all have one significant name, 'East Ferry', on the site of Tayport. East Ferry also appears on *Fifae pars Orientalis*, but not on any other printed or manuscript map. This points to the possibility that some of the extant manuscripts may be related to the same sources as the two large scale printed maps. Two manuscript maps remain.

Sheet no. 54 has the small Pont manuscript of northwest Fife (54B) affixed to one corner, but before the Pont map was glued to the sheet, a map of northeast Fife between Falkland and St Andrews (54A) was drawn on it by Robert Gordon. The Pont map is attached so that its names are at right angles to the alignment of Gordon's names. It was evidently not intended that the two maps should be read as one.

Robert Gordon locates seventy places on map 54A, twenty-two of which cannot be found on any other manuscript, which makes it a very unusual map. Moreover, these same twenty-two names are all to be found on *Fifae pars Orientalis* (three also appear on the area of overlap with *Fifae pars Occidentalis*), but not on *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. Indeed, all seventy names on map 54A are to be found, without exception, on the large scale printed maps. This strongly suggests that map 54A has the same source as at least a part of the large scale printed maps. This is confirmed by comparing the orientations of the rivers and streams which closely resembles *Fifae pars Orientalis* but are quite unlike *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. Similarly 'Swan Loch' and the great elongated 'myre' depicted in plausible locations in the extreme northeast of Fife are shown both on the printed large scale map and on map 54A, but not elsewhere.

As it is extremely unlikely that Robert Gordon did original work on the ground (Stone 1981: 21), the source he is most likely to have used is work by Timothy Pont. The attachment of a Pont manuscript (54B) to Gordon's map would seem a little more logical if Gordon's work was based on Pont. There is firmer evidence in the form of an endorsement on the reverse of the sheet, reading 'Fyffe imperfect M.T.P.' in Robert Gordon's hand, clearly indicating (Master) Timothy Pont's authorship. Admittedly this might be thought to refer to the small Pont original attached, but there is evidence to the contrary. A further entry on the front of the map, again in Robert Gordon's hand, reads 'ien est droit en cestui Table'. The Pont original seems to have been pasted over the first part of the entry, although it is so firmly stuck down that it is impossible to tell what, if anything, has been obscured: the obvious possibility is a letter 'R' at the start of the first word. The fact that the sheet was thus endorsed before the Pont original was affixed suggests that the subject of dissatisfaction is Gordon's draft map and not the Pont attachment. After all, Gordon's map is a somewhat rudimentary draft, perhaps

representing an early stage in copying or drafting, when its failings may have become apparent. There are other endorsements which confirm Gordon's doubts about his map. Along a river shown as flowing east from Falkland, there are the words 'There is no river betiuxt/ hellis and falkland', which is perfectly true. At the top left of the sheet there is a further entry reading, 'The part betiuxt Cluny and/ Balmerinoch is so contracted/ that it is altogether disproportionable/ to the rest of the mapp/ The toune of Abirnettie wants heer/ neither is ther place for the same.' Gordon had found fault with the map: hence the use of the word 'imperfect' on the reverse, which therefore refers to Gordon's map no. 54A and not to the Pont addition. Gordon's map is based on Pont, by his own admission.

We now have evidence that Robert Gordon had access to more work by Pont on Fife than has survived, but it was still only a fraction of the county and Gordon was far from happy with what he had. He scarcely seems likely to have prepared a draft for the engravers, since he was unfavourably disposed towards at least a part of Pont's work. Possibly, the engraving of the two large scale maps of Fife was carried out by Blaeu before any of Pont's manuscripts were returned to Scotland. The best of Pont's work on Fife would be selected by Blaeu for engraving, but thereafter lost, and the relatively indecipherable work returned to Scotland. Originally, the work returned would have included not only map 54B, but at least some work further to the east along the north coast of Fife, that is the area of map 54A. That original source is unfortunately lost. This proposed sequence of events is supported by Sir Robert Sibbald, in his history of Fife and Kinross, in which he acknowledges 'the unwearied diligence of Mr Timothy Pont, who after he had travelled over all the parts of North Britain, and the Isles belonging to it, made maps of them, and particularly these shires, some of which I have . . .' (Sibbald 1803:XII). Sibbald possessed some, but not all, of Pont's maps of Fife, which is understandable if not all Pont's maps of Fife had been returned to Scotland. Perhaps it was Sibbald who glued Pont's 54B to Gordon's 54A. Other Pont originals seen by Sibbald have been lost subsequently. The proposed sequence of events is further confirmed by the absence of a request for maps of Fife in Blaeu's letter of 1642 to Scot (Moir & Skelton 1968: 155): Blaeu had two maps already. If Scot received proofs of those maps by 1641, then they were not shown to Gordon, or he would not have set to work to produce a manuscript (no. 54A) so similar to the existing engravings. Exactly why he did draw the map is impossible to say. Many of the extant Gordon manuscripts have no obvious purpose but seem to be part of a larger collation exercise in which Gordon sometimes seems to have been in doubt as to what was required of him (Stone 1981: 21). As Dr Stevenson has shown (1882: 9), the work of the Gordons suffered from lack of clear priorities.

One relevant Gordon manuscript has still to be considered. Map no. 6 is a very large map of eastern Scotland with a great deal of detail in some areas including Fife, but with great gaps in other areas. It represents a massive task of compilation. Despite the relatively small scale, Gordon's use of very small lettering permits him to include 356

place-names in Fife. There is a tendency for a pair of names on the larger scale maps to appear as a single entry on map no. 6, *e.g.* 'N. Wrquhart' and 'O. Wrquhart' as 'Wrquhart', but if such differences are ignored, then 175 of the 356 names are also shown on *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. Some of these names also appear on one or other of the two large scale printed maps, but none appears in its printed form solely on the large scale maps. Hence, map no. 6 is derived from James Gordon's later observations of Fife. Robert Gordon was not inclined to use unverified Pont sources for Fife. It was therefore compiled after 1642, using the improved information by then available for Fife. This is further confirmation that Robert Gordon believed Pont's work to be imperfect, and it conforms with the proposed sequence of events.

It is tempting to wonder why Pont's work was of such a low standard in Fife, although not all the surface area on the two large scale printed maps is as unsatisfactory as the area of manuscript 54A—for example the area around Aberdour and Burntisland in the south of Fife has a higher density of place-names and they are better located. However, Pont's work in Fife is planimetrically much less accurate overall than the work of James Gordon. Also, there are some curious nomenclature errors, *e.g.* Camilla Loch, north of Burntisland is called 'L. Orr' on *Fifae pars Occidentalis*: in fact Loch Orr is the much larger loch to the northwest, as correctly shown on *Fifae Vicecomitatus*. That Pont did not achieve a consistent standard of accuracy is evident when comparing his maps (Stone & Gemmell 1977: 9), but, without the Pont manuscripts which were the sources for the printed maps, it is impossible to know how much error was introduced during engraving, particularly if the manuscripts were not very legible, or perhaps not in final draft. Nevertheless, the comparison which James Gordon's work permits is a salutary lesson when using other printed maps derived from Pont's fieldwork, not so much for planimetric accuracy which has already been established for each of his maps, but rather for comprehensiveness of content, which is much more difficult to test.

Answers to the initial questions about Blaeu's three maps of Fife can now be suggested. *Fifae Vicecomitatus* does indeed seem to be the result of a new and original survey of 1642 by James Gordon. There are certainly major differences in the content of that map and the corresponding content of *Fifae pars Occidentalis* and *Fifae pars Orientalis*: these latter two maps are probably the work of Pont, unamended by Robert Gordon. Settlement is less comprehensively depicted in the two earlier large-scale maps than in the later map; however, where an individual name appears in both sources, then this may be taken as evidence of the existence of that place both in the period 1584–96 (probably in the earliest part) and in 1642.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am very grateful to Dr David Stevenson for his criticism and advice.

NOTES

- 1 To these five, we may incidentally add the relatively large scale map of *Lorna*, whose authorship by Pont seems in contradiction to its position in the atlas between maps by Robert Gordon (Stone 1980: 28): it may have been printed at a different time from the other maps in the atlas but placed next to the map of *Braid-Albin* in the atlas because of its substantial overlap with the smaller scale map. The separate printing is suggested by the fact that it is printed on a different quality of paper from the other maps in some copies of the first edition of the atlas. The mystery of why *Lorna* is the one map in the atlas whose position does not primarily result from its date of receipt by the publisher, seems thus solved. I am indebted to Mr L. McLean for drawing my attention to the printing anomaly.
- 2 The eight names are Achmuir, B., Carsloch, Condon, Hilton of binnaga, Stunton, Blairhead, Blair of Forth and Collestone.
- 3 Stunton, Blairhead, Blair of forth and Collestone.
- 4 These are as follows: Lonhead alias Kinocher, Lumfinnans, E. Colwhally, Dundonnat, Castell of Brune ylland, Binhill, E. Pittedy, Wakmill, Levin fl., Arthurzeat, The Park, Pinkie, Dundelaw, Maynis, Dightie fl., Sclait-mills, Fort hill, Grange of mony futh, Ardestie, Kelly C., Ardbirlet, Brotock fl. and Arbroath.
- 5 These four names on the printed map but not on the manuscript are Lumfinnans, E. Colwhally, Dundonnat and Wakmill.
- 6 Kinocher, Castell of Brune ylland, Binhill and E. Pittedy.
- 7 Respectively: Loverock Law, Castell Campbell and Dobr.
- 8 The two settlement names are Ticshis and Blaiswith.
- 9 I am grateful for the advice of Daphne Hamilton.

REFERENCES

- CASH, C. G.
1901 'The first topographical survey of Scotland'. *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 17: 399-414.
- CASH, G. C.
1907 'Manuscript maps by Pont, the Gordons and Adair in the Advocates Library'. *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 23: 574-92.
- GOUGH, R.
1780 *British Topography* 2. London.
- MOIR, D. G.
1973 'A history of Scottish maps' in *The Early Maps of Scotland to 1850* by a Committee of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society, Edinburgh. Pp. 1-156.
- MOIR, D. G. & SKELTON, R. A.
1968 'New light on the first atlas of Scotland'. *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 84: 149-59.
- SKELTON, R. A.
1970 *County Atlases of the British Isles 1579-1860*. London.
- STEVENSON, D.
1982 'Cartography and the Kirk: aspects of the making of the first atlas of Scotland'. *Scottish Studies* 26: 1-12.
- STONE, J. C.
1970 'The preparation of the Blaeu maps of Scotland: a further assessment'. *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 86: 16-24.
1972 'Origins and sources of the Blaeu atlas of Scotland with particular reference to Extima Scotiae'. *Imago Mundi* 26: 17-20.
1973 'Manuscript maps of north-east Scotland by Timothy Pont'. *Northern Scotland* 1: 143-50.

- 1980 'The Blaeu atlas of Scotland'. *The Map Collector* 10: 25-30.
- 1981 'Robert Gordon of Straloch: cartographer or chorographer?' *Northern Scotland* 4: 7-22.
- STONE, J. C. and GEMMELL, A. M. D. G.
1977 'An experiment in the comparative analysis of distortion on historical maps'.
Cartographic Journal 14: 7-11.
- STRALOCH PAPERS
1841 *Miscellany of the Spalding Club* 1. Aberdeen.

