

Reform without Frontiers in the Last Years of Catholic Scotland

The summer of 1549 was a good time to be a Scottish Catholic. During the political turmoil and devastating warfare of the previous seven years, heresy had made alarming progress. Even in the last years of James V, the old kirk's position had been less than secure. The king's conspicuous loyalty to Rome was perhaps as much a technique to prise taxes out of the kirk as it was a statement of religious loyalties.¹ After James' death in late 1542, the earl of Arran, as regent, flirted briefly but openly with evangelical ideas. Within months he had changed direction, as the failure of his pro-English diplomacy made a pro-English religious policy untenable. However, during the war which followed, the English openly attempted to underpin their Scottish conquests by spreading their heresies. The scale of the military assault meant that the Scottish authorities had little attention to devote to the problem of heresy, and the damage which war inflicted on the physical patrimony of the old kirk had serious consequences for a religious tradition in which the material and the visible were so central to piety. The scale of actual evangelical allegiance is notoriously difficult to assess, but it is clear that during this period a significant minority of the lairds and nobles who made up the political nation came to be associated with novel religious ideas. The most spectacular consequence of this was the assassination of Cardinal Beaton by a group of Fife lairds in 1546 – although they were motivated by more than reforming zeal. Perhaps more significant was the regent's inability to remove the assassins from St. Andrews castle until French help arrived a year later: a powerful symbol of the helplessness of the Scottish crown in the face of war and religious upheaval.

Yet by the middle of 1549, it was clear that French intervention had turned the war against the invader.² The young queen herself was safely in France and betrothed to the dauphin. The regency government was still nominally headed by Arran, but real power was passing to the French queen mother, Mary of Guise. Most importantly, from the kirkmen's point of view, there was at last a new archbishop of St. Andrews and primate of Scotland, John Hamilton. He was the regent's illegitimate half-brother, and was notoriously unchaste; but he was no timeserver and took his ecclesiastical responsibilities seriously. He had been nominated to the see almost as soon as Beaton was killed, but only took full possession in June 1549. One of his first acts was to summon a general provincial council of the Scottish church, the first of four such councils that would meet over the following decade. The council of 1556 has left no records, and was probably a brief affair concerned with enforcement and implementation,³ but those of 1549, 1552 and 1559 were ambitious, reforming synods enacting imaginative and far-reaching legislation. They were also explicitly aimed at combating the problem of heresy.⁴

With hindsight, this reforming effort lies under the shadow of the religious revolution of 1559-60 which terminated it. To study the reform movement of the 1550s, therefore, is in one sense to study a failure. There are two common, and not wholly incompatible, explanations given for that failure. These are, first, that reform ran out of time, and second, that it was insufficiently radical. The first argument is that Catholic reform was the tortoise to Protestantism's hare, but that the race was a sprint rather than a marathon. The late Cardinal Winning suggested, optimistically, that another ten years would have been enough.⁵ The second argument is a little more profound, and suggests that the reform effort was doomed from the beginning because it did not bite deep enough. James Kirk dismisses the programme as one of 'half-hearted tinkering' which did not begin to address the kirk's 'fundamental problems'. Others have made similar points, albeit with less scorn.⁶ Little was done, they

argue, about education of the clergy, particularly the parish clergy. More significantly, this line of criticism suggests that the councils were neither able nor wholly willing to tackle the financial roots of the kirk's woes. The Scottish crown and nobility had already managed a de facto secularization of a great deal of ecclesiastical property. Rather than take the troublesome route of schism and religious upheaval, Scotland's magnates had long employed the simpler expedients of appropriations and lay commendatorships, which allowed lands to remain nominally ecclesiastical while placing them firmly under lay control. In addition, the bishops, abbots and priors themselves were almost all drawn from the leading noble families. The siphoning of wealth away from parish ministry was, this argument suggests, the kirk's most pressing problem. However, it was a problem which the landed elites would not allow a provincial council to address, even if a council composed of nobly born bishops, abbots and priors showed any inclination to do so. In other words, the accepted view of these councils is the journalists' cliché: too little, too late.

In most of its essentials, this view had been formed within a century of the Reformation. The Protestants who wrote the great narratives of the Scottish Reformation treated the councils as flotsam swept aside by a providential tide. Indeed, for the most part they were beneath their notice. Neither George Buchanan's history nor the chronicle known as the *Diurnal of Remarkable Occurents* mentions the councils at all. John Knox's history only mentions the last council, and that briefly and contemptuously. His brief and partial summary of it dwells chiefly on its acts against clerical concubinage; it also mentions that 'thare was much ado for cappes, schavin crounes, tippetis, long gounes, and such other trifilles'.⁷ This last phrase was later borrowed by David Calderwood. Calderwood also used a story taken from John Foxe about arguments over the use of the Paternoster in 1551; the account mentions a 'principal Councell' at Edinburgh, which may be the provincial council of 1552.⁸ Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie's somewhat confused account again noticed only the

final council, at which he described the bishops condemning heretics and hypocritically fulminating against clerical concubinage.⁹ Scottish Catholics, unsurprisingly, remembered these events somewhat differently. Writing in the 1570s, Bishop Leslie claimed that in 1552,

quhen the heretickis trublet the Catholik religioun, quha of the Clergie war prudent and wyse, cunning, and chaste in bodie, appoyntet in the counsell halden in the Shirrefdome of Lythgwe ... that heresie suld be depriuet, curst, and excommunicat, that quhat euir be the fatharis was confirmet in the counsel of Trent under pape Paul iij ... heir suld be declairet, set out publiklie, and sinceirlie reteinet.

However, this superficially more accurate account also has its problems. Leslie's credibility is undermined by his conflation of the 1549 council, held in Linlithgow, with that of 1552, held in Edinburgh. More significantly, as we shall see, his determination to map a papal and Tridentine agenda back onto the councils is seriously misleading. His account of the 1559 council is fuller and more circumstantial, but here too his polemical purpose colours his description. That council was, he claims, the immediate cause of the Reformation crisis, for its effective imposition of discipline and orthodoxy drove the corrupt and loose-living clergy into the arms of the Protestants:

not samekle for conscience caus, or ony way to serue thair conscience, as to satisfie thair affectione and lust of thair flesche, quhen tha held vp commoun huiris, in the name of wyfes.¹⁰

It is a morally satisfying narrative, but too clearly reflects the needs of the 1570s rather than the realities of the 1550s.¹¹

This article will argue that these approaches do not do justice to the movement for Catholic reform in 1550s Scotland. It is true that it was a movement which had very little time in which to make an impact, and it is true that some of the most intractable problems

were scarcely affected by the reform measures that were enacted. Yet the urgency of the problem, and its difficulty, were perfectly obvious at the time. The article will argue that even the scanty evidence which remains indicates that the Catholic reformers developed an imaginative and effective approach which took account of the difficulties of their situation. It will suggest that the approach which they took might have stood an excellent chance of halting the spread of heresy; and will consider why it was that they nevertheless failed.

It is a truth universally acknowledged that a church with a heresy problem must be in want of discipline. This is not only a historians' truism; it was believed by most contemporaries.

When Robert Wedderburn, the reform-minded Catholic author of the Complaynt of Scotland, turned his attention to the clergy, he informed them that 'the abusione and the sinister ministratiōne of thy office is the special cause of the scisma and of diuers sectis that trublis al cristianite'.¹² Evangelical reformers were happy to agree, since for them the indiscipline and abuses of the old kirk were signs of the bankruptcy of its doctrine, and attacks on clerical corruption made good copy. However, if ecclesiastical corruption did foster heresy, the causal connection was neither simple nor inevitable. John Knox's History of the Reformation has left us with an unusually clear example of this, in his account of David Stratoun of Lauriston. Stratoun owned a fishing boat, and in the early 1530s he fell into a dispute with the vicar of Ecclesgreig over the teinds owing on his fish. When the vicar tried to collect them, Stratoun refused, having 'a haterent against the pride and avaritiousnes of the preastis'. He said, 'Yf thei wald haif teynd of that which he servandis wane in the sea, it war but reassoun, that thei should come and receave it whare hie gatt the stock' and explained that he had

thrown every tenth fish he had caught overboard. The vicar, understandably, was not satisfied, and Stratoun was excommunicated for non-payment. He was subsequently heard to have denounced the excommunication, and was duly delated for heresy. Now while Knox clearly enjoyed (and embellished) this tale, he was quite clear that Stratoun was no reformer at this point. He was, indeed, ‘ane man verry stubburne, and one that dispysed all reading, (cheaflye of those thingis that war godly)’, and was distinguished only by his hatred of the clergy. Knox tells us that it was only after his delation for heresy that he fell in with certain godly lairds, who led him to reading the scriptures in the vernacular, and thus to a dramatic conversion; it was for these new convictions that he was burned outside Edinburgh in August 1534.¹³ Knox’s highly stylized account may not be particularly credible, but the paradigm he suggests is clear. Stratoun’s aggressive anticlericalism did not make him an evangelical. It was only when the kirk’s response to his anticlericalism pushed him into evangelical company that he was converted.

Contempt for clerical abuses might be widespread, but this would not automatically foster heresy; any more than a well-disciplined church could be guaranteed immunity from evangelical ideas. Abuses and corruption were the concerns of Catholic reformers, not of Protestants. The Protestants’ programme was more far-reaching, and at its heart was doctrine, not discipline. Perceived abuses might indeed contribute towards the spread of heresy, but not in a straightforward way. Stratoun’s case shows us one important route: routine squabbles over money, land or clerical behaviour might drive those with merely anticlerical views to make common cause with genuine heretics. More seriously, corruption and indiscipline might prevent the kirk from mounting an effective counter-attack against heresy. A kirk without an active preaching ministry, or a kirk whose reputation was so tarnished that its preachers were not respected, would have difficulty in resisting the spread of evangelicalism. These, it seems, were the kinds of concerns which dominated Scotland’s reforming provincial

councils. Renewed discipline, it appears, was being imposed less as an end in itself than in an attempt to limber up to resist heresy.

Two major strands of reform stand out. First, there was an effort to restore the dignity and distinctiveness of the priesthood. The 1549 council insisted on clerical celibacy, and put in place some shrewdly designed mechanisms to enforce it. The 1559 council revisited the question with renewed vigour, creating a system of named inspectors empowered to search out and examine all clergy suspected of unchastity, regardless of status or seniority. The 1549 council also reaffirmed the traditional requirements that clergy should refrain from secular occupations; that they should be appropriately dressed, clean-shaven and tonsured; and that they should keep sober households and austere tables. The purpose of such reforms, the legislation insisted, was both to deflect mockery of the clergy and to ensure ‘that they as clergymen may be distinguishable from laymen’. Similarly, the need carefully to examine prospective ordinands was re-emphasized. The 1559 council reiterated many of these points, creating tighter and more detailed mechanisms for their enforcement. In addition, some of the worst financial flashpoints between the clergy and laity were reformed. In other words, the reformers were aiming to disarm the most common criticisms of the clergy, and to reassert the distinct and austere status of the clerical estate. This was essential if the message which those clergy preached was to be heard. As a statute of the 1549 council put it, clergy who are seen to be corrupt in life and morals at the same time as they are correcting the morals of others are the cause of ‘the greatest scandal to the laity, and the largest proportion of the heresy’.¹⁴

Yet well-disciplined clergy were no more than a prerequisite for effective reform. Fittingly, the second major strand of reform was concerned with equipping and mobilizing these newly respectable clergy to preach. The 1549 council incorporated into its legislation a part of the decree ‘for the repression of heresies and the edification of Christians in the words

of evangelical doctrine' already passed by the Council of Trent: making the Scottish church the first in Christendom formally to adopt any of the Tridentine decrees. The section in question was that requiring the maintenance of lectureships in theology at cathedrals and collegiate churches, affirming the priority of preaching and granting bishops sweeping powers to control heretical preachers. The council also reaffirmed the traditional requirement that all parishes receive four sermons a year, and obliged rectors, whether resident or absent, to provide for these. It ordered that such preaching be centred on Scripture and on the exposition of basic Christian doctrine. Monasteries and cathedrals were to become centres of preaching, with several specified monasteries required to send men to the universities to study theology. The need to enforce these ambitious requirements headed the legislation of the 1552 council, which put additional mechanisms in place to do so. The 1559 council again reinforced these demands. It also added a list of specified controversial doctrines which were to be defended, and envisaged the publication of a series of 'short declarations' defending the Catholic doctrine of the sacraments. Throughout, it is clear that the reformers had at least one eye on the problem of heresy. The 1549 council understood confuting heresy to be one of a preacher's principal responsibilities, although it warned preachers of the dangers of introducing their audiences to heresies by indiscreet refutations of them. The 1552 assembly even celebrated the achievements of preachers in extinguishing heresy – as it turned out, prematurely.¹⁵

The Catholic reformers of the 1550s recognized that discipline was not enough. It was a means to an end, a necessary but not sufficient condition for regaining the ground lost to heresy. The actual battle had to be centred on the preacher. After all, if the heretics' criticisms were at root doctrinal, not disciplinary, the defence against them also had to be doctrinal. The need to fight on both of these fronts was of course recognized by the Council of Trent, which pursued disciplinary and structural reform side by side with doctrinal definition. Strictly,

however, this two-pronged approach was not open to Scotland's Catholic reformers. General councils such as that at Trent were different in kind from provincial councils; the latter had no authority to pronounce on doctrinal matters, but were restricted to reforming and enforcing discipline. Yet doctrine was the key battleground; and inevitably the Catholic reformers were drawn to fight there, whether or not they had the formal authority to do so.

The impact of the provincial councils' legislation is almost impossible to gauge. Scraps of records tell us that some parishes and dioceses put some of the decrees into effect.¹⁶ Some burghs also made considerable efforts to restore and advance the old kirk in the 1550s, not least through the slow but vital process of repairing war damage.¹⁷ Archbishop Hamilton himself is said to have embarked on a preaching tour of Fife immediately after the 1559 council.¹⁸ However, the paucity of evidence is severe. Even the councils' decrees themselves only survive by chance, in a single copy in the Glasgow diocesan archives. Later Protestants had little interest in preserving the records of the popish church. Yet there is one reform, arguably the centrepiece of the reform programme, which was certainly put into effect, and which crossed explicitly from disciplinary into doctrinal territory. This was the famous vernacular catechism, whose commissioning was the main business of the 1552 council. It is a substantial doctrinal and devotional formulary, closely modelled on other, similar documents which had been produced in Germany and England in the previous fifteen years.¹⁹ Its two hundred folios lead the reader through discussions of the ten commandments, the Apostles' Creed, the seven sacraments and of prayer. It was, the council decreed, to be circulated to the clergy alone, 'as much for the instruction of themselves as of the Christian

people committed to their care'. It was not to be lent to the laity, except perhaps a few folk of exceptional gravity and piety; but every Sunday and holy day, for half an hour, every curate was to read from the catechism to his people. Swingeing fines were imposed for clergy who failed to do so.²⁰ How far this order was observed is impossible to know; it may be significant that the 1559 council reiterated and reinforced many of the decrees of the earlier councils so as to improve their compliance, but made no mention of failure to use the catechism. It is certainly possible that the catechism was used very widely. We do not know how many copies were printed, but a single full-size print run of some 1300 copies would have provided easily enough for every parish in Scotland to have one. Their distribution might have taken some time but need not have been unduly difficult, and the cost had apparently already been met by Archbishop Hamilton. It was probably the most easily implemented, cost-effective and far-reaching reform that the councils introduced. Like the official homilies which English churches had been using for five years,²¹ the catechism bypassed the sloth or incompetence of the parish clergy to broadcast officially approved doctrine directly to the people.

As is well known, however, that doctrine is distinctly peculiar to modern eyes. The papacy is only explicitly mentioned once, at the beginning of the preface, where Archbishop Hamilton is noted as being a legate of the 'seit Apostolyck'.²² Elsewhere, the power of the keys is said to have been given to the apostles collectively.²³ The catechism's declared yardstick of authority is:

the wordis of halye scripture, trew expositioun of ye auld and catholyk doctouris,
and ... the decisious and determinatiouns of general counsallis, lauchfully gaderit
in the halye spreit.²⁴

There are repeated references to the unique authority of lawful general councils, or to the collective authority of the church as a whole. Yet the authors clearly see Scripture itself as the central authority, and bend over backwards to use it. The book is a tissue of Biblical

quotation, with texts always given first in Latin and then in Scots. The most striking example of this is the attempt to ground the perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary on the text of Luke 1:34. This was a doctrine which most magisterial Protestants were unwilling to abandon, yet it was normally agreed that the doctrine could not be proved from scripture. It therefore became a standard (and effective) Catholic argument for the validity of extra-scriptural authority – an argument which the catechism appears to contradict.²⁵

This is more than mere biblicism, however. The catechism's discussion of the Eucharist appears to go out of its way to respect evangelical sensibilities. Although several names for the sacrament are listed, the word 'Mass' is not mentioned, at least not in the section which discusses the sacrament itself. The benefits which the sacrament bestows are discussed but its efficacy as a sacrifice is not mentioned.²⁶ Likewise, when discussing justification and the role of faith, it is at the least an appropriation of evangelical language to describe baptism as leaving the believer

cled with the rychteousnes of Iesus Christ. ... His halynes, his rychteousnes, his meiknes, his mercy, and cheritie is communicat and geuin to vs, ... that we may cleth our self with his rychteousnes, & repute it as our awin.²⁷

Elsewhere, the catechism insists on the importance of putting one's trust for salvation exclusively in God's grace, rather than presuming on one's own free will or good deeds. And when discussing faith, the authors distinguish between what they call a dead, general faith – what we might call a historical faith – and a special, living faith, which consists of trust in God's mercy and which 'is the faith yat iustifeis a christin man'. Indeed, they insist that 'this faith is alwayis ionit with hoip and cheritie, and werkis throw lufe' – apparently accepting the evangelical argument that faith and charity are inseparable, which was amongst the heresies for which Patrick Hamilton had been condemned.²⁸ This apparent willingness to follow evangelical patterns of thought has alarmed Catholic historians.²⁹ These are the most striking

examples, but there are a number of other significant silences or flirtations with evangelical ideas. Although the use of images in worship is of course permitted, the text draws attention to the dangers of falling into idolatry through giving godly honour to an image.³⁰ Moreover, despite long discussions of the sacrament of matrimony and the commandment not to commit adultery, no mention is made of clerical celibacy.

Many of these oddities are familiar to scholars, and many scholars have concluded that the catechism was crippled by them. Alexander Mitchell suggested that by dallying with evangelical ideas the reformers were playing with fire.³¹ More recently, Maurice Taylor and Ian Cowan have both held that its value for teaching the faith was ‘seriously impaired’ by its apparent crypto-evangelicalism. But this hardly explains why such an ambiguous text was used.³² One possible strand of explanation, to which Cowan is inclined, suggests that the catechism’s ambiguities reflect foreign rather than Scottish concerns. It is certainly true that it is a document which needs to be seen in an international context. Indeed, the man normally named as the catechism’s author is Richard Marshall, an English Dominican friar who participated in the 1549 council (the only one for which a list of members survives).³³ It is suggested that Marshall was hoping to use the catechism to appeal to moderate reformers in England. Another of the English Catholic exiles in St. Andrews, Richard Smith, may well have wanted to use the catechism to appeal to the English; in 1552 he sent copies of the book to an English agent in Berwick called Sir Nicholas Strelly.³⁴ Yet an attempt to dismiss the catechism as an English cuckoo in the Scottish nest will not do. Smith may have wanted to create something reminiscent of Henry VIII’s Reformation, but it seems clear that his correspondence with Strelly was a private initiative in which his chief concern was his fruitless attempt to negotiate his own safe return to England. And Marshall was hardly likely to wish to implement a Henrician Reformation in Scotland: he had fled England in 1536 because he was unwilling to accept the Royal Supremacy.

Even if Marshall wanted to pursue such a programme, it seems doubtful whether he can actually be called the text's author. The evidence for his role comes from his friend John Douglas, provost of St. Mary's College, who in 1571 seems to have referred to the text as 'frier marchels Catechismes'.³⁵ Yet the text itself is a fluent, idiomatic Scots of a kind that Marshall would have been most unlikely to have written.³⁶ More importantly, the catechism itself refers to its authors in the plural and describes itself as having been 'compilit'.³⁷ Marshall was probably not so much its author as its research editor. This seems particularly likely given the eclectic mixture of pre-existing sources on which the catechism drew. As Alexander Mitchell first demonstrated, these included several clearly unorthodox texts: not only the King's Book, Henry VIII's relatively conservative formulary issued in 1543, but also, apparently, Luther's greater catechism and the early Scottish Lutheran tract, John Gau's The Richt Vay to the Kingdom of Heuine. Indeed, the compilers seem to have consulted an even wider range of texts, extending even to work by John Hooper, the most faithful disciple of the Zürich theologians amongst Edward VI's bishops. The most important sources, however, were catechisms and formularies produced by several Catholic reformers in Germany, in particular the Enchiridion of Johann Gropper, the Catholic reformer from Cologne. Many of the most striking oddities of the Scottish catechism, such as its silence regarding the pope and its omission of the word 'transubstantiation', have parallels in the English and particularly in the Cologne sources. Clare Kellar has recently pointed out that many of the catechism's source texts were themselves compiled from an eclectic range of sources. Such borrowing across (indistinct) confessional lines was almost common practice in the 1540s and 1550s. Yet neither the other texts nor the Scottish catechism itself were simply assembled with scissors and paste. None of the catechism's several sources was absorbed uncritically, nor can its whiff of evangelicalism be blamed wholly on them. The sections on the Eucharist in the Cologne Enchiridion and the English King's Book both include

discussions of the sacrifice of the Mass; the omission of such a discussion from the Scottish catechism can only have been deliberate.³⁸ The various source texts, especially Gropper's, may have provided raw materials, but deliberate choices were made regarding their selection and use. Similarly, the editors chose not to use other, perhaps more obvious sources. The early Tridentine decrees were known to Scotland's Catholic reformers, who used them liberally to bolster the provincial councils' legislation. The Tridentine decree on justification would have been an obvious source for the catechism to draw on, despite its lack of formal authority; the compilers' decision to take their consideration of justification in a very different direction looks pointed. These evangelical leanings, which have been so obvious to every subsequent reader, surely did not escape the attention of the archbishop in whose name the catechism was issued; still less, that of his staff. It seems perverse to conclude that the studied silences and careful ambiguities of this centrepiece of the Catholic reform programme were anything other than deliberate Scottish policy.

This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the catechism's ambiguities have echoes elsewhere. The provincial councils themselves were far from enthusiastic about papal authority. The few references to the papacy in their decrees see it essentially as an administrative entity – indeed, usually, as an administrative menace, which, by granting inappropriate exemptions, hinders bishops' ability to control their dioceses.³⁹ The 1549 council denounced various heresies, including the denial of the authority of general councils, but made no mention of the papacy.⁴⁰ Likewise, the 1559 council's description of ecclesiastical authority closely followed the Louvain declaratio, but omitted the Louvain doctors' reference to Petrine authority.⁴¹ The 'short declarations' on the sacraments authorized by that council were probably also intended to take a non-confrontational approach to their sensitive subject-matter. The only one of these texts that has survived, on the Eucharist, affirms the Real Presence but makes no mention of the Mass as a sacrifice.

Instead, its account of the benefits which the sacrament bestows concentrates on the faith and love it kindles within the believer. It also warns against ungodly clergy who minister the sacrament irreverently.⁴² The impression is one of latter-day Erasmianism – a kirk which was at least as keen to repent of its own faults as it was to confute those of its opponents.

The most striking echoes come in the single piece of vernacular Catholic printed propaganda which survives from 1550s Scotland. Quintin Kennedy, the abbot of Crossraguell, was the brother of the Protestant earl of Cassillis and a cousin of the Protestant earl of Argyll. He was also a Catholic reformer. He was present at the 1549 council,⁴³ and in 1558, he published a book entitled Ane compendius Tractiue ... declaring the nerrest, and onlie way, to establishe the conscience of ane christiane man. It was dedicated to his nephew, Gilbert Kennedy, son of the earl of Cassillis, who was to succeed to the title before the year was out. Kennedy claims that the book arose out of religious controversies between himself and his nephew, and so, appropriately enough, its subject is authority: the knotty question of whether bare Scripture is authoritative, or whether it needs the Church to interpret it. Kennedy comes down emphatically on the side of ecclesiastical authority, and mounts a powerful argument. Yet once again, he seems oddly respectful of evangelical sensibilities. The papacy is mentioned only once, when he characterizes Protestants as asking, ‘Hes nocht Christ bocht us als deir as older Bischof, Abbot, Prior, or Pape?’ Elsewhere he asserts the perpetuity of the office of apostle, but makes little distinction between the apostles. Although he once refers to St. Peter, in passing, as ‘the cheiff Apostole’, his account of the Council of Jerusalem unproblematically gives St. James the senior role. His assertion of ecclesiastical authority is uncompromising, but again, it is attached to general councils. And while he insists that such councils ‘assuritlie hes never errit’, even this assertion was moderated. Although he claims to be upholding the authority of all councils, the only such councils to which he explicitly refers to are those up to the council of Chalcedon, that is, those whose

authority magisterial Protestants recognized. Moreover, even his doctrine of the general council seems peculiar. Ultimate authority, he is clear, rests with the church as a whole, the ‘universale Congregatioun unit togidder in ane faith be Baptyme’; general councils are ‘ane speciale member’ of the whole, empowered by virtue of their office and learning to speak for the rest. As such, he says, councils have ‘the samyn denominatioun, strenth, and effect, representand the universale Kirk, as gyf al the rest of the membris had concurrir thairwith’.⁴⁴ This sounds more like the General Assembly than a general council; and the impression is reinforced by his careful use throughout of the loaded word congregation to describe the universal church.

There are other hints of accommodation to a Protestant agenda. Kennedy admits, and deplores, the fact that sometimes those who oppose abuses and unscriptural innovations in the kirk are denounced as heretics, and describes this as an evil equal and opposite to actual heresy. He assumes unproblematically that the age of miracles ceased with the apostles, so agreeing with Protestant orthodoxy but opposing most Catholic tradition. His discussion of vernacular Scripture is carefully open-ended; he warns of its dangers, but also sees arguments in its favour and refuses to pronounce definitively on the matter. In other words, he adopts something akin to an old-fashioned humanist view; an impression reinforced by his praise for Erasmus.⁴⁵ He is vigorous in his denunciations of corruption and abuses within the kirk, focusing his attention on the ways in which noble and lairdly families treated benefices as their personal fiefdoms. It is an attack whose force is only slightly diminished by coming from a blood relative of two of Scotland’s leading nobles who had inherited benefices from his brother.

None of the other items put into print by Scotland’s Catholic reformers in this period survive, but what little we know of them suggests that they may have followed a similar line. Knox famously referred to a document, printed in 1559, which became known as the ‘Twa-

Penny Faith' (or, perhaps, the Threepenny Faith). This is often taken to refer to the 'short declaration' on the sacrament, but this seems unlikely. That declaration would have been overpriced at two, let alone at three pence.⁴⁶ Moreover, it was produced for the clergy, to be read to the people, and was specifically on the sacrament, whereas the 'Twa-Penny Faith' seems to have had both a wider market and a wider purpose. This, at least, is the implication of Knox's claim that it was set forth so that the bishops 'mycht geve some schaw to the People that thei mynded Reformatioun'; this can perhaps be linked to Lindsay of Pitscottie's claim that the 1559 council set forth in print a document which discussed the doctrine of the Mass but also purgatory and prayer to saints.⁴⁷ It seems more likely that Knox and Pitscottie were referring to another, lost tract, and that its promise of reform reflected the moderate tone of the catechism and of Kennedy's treatise. The case of John Winram is more tantalising. Winram, the subprior of St. Andrews, seems to have been one of the more 'advanced' of the Catholic reformers; in 1560 he was to join the Protestants, who held him in sufficiently high regard that he promptly became superintendent of Fife.⁴⁸ At some point before 1559 he published a catechetical sermon in the vernacular, now lost.⁴⁹ This was once thought to have been the official 1552 catechism; it may have been a source for it. However, it is no more than a guess that this text tended in the same doctrinal direction.

A few other fragments of evidence do suggest that that direction was shared at least a little more widely. John Knox's History relates how, in late 1557 or early 1558, the old earl of Argyll, Quintin Kennedy's cousin, took an evangelical preacher named John Douglas into his household. By March 1558 the matter had come to Archbishop Hamilton's ears. His letter to the earl was cautious, as one might expect, but this seems to be more than mere discretion. When pointing out the error of Douglas' doctrine, he suggests that his ideas 'ar many yearis past condempned be Generall Counsallis and the haille estate of Christiane people' – again suggesting a quasi-conciliarist stance. In addition, he offered to provide Argyll with an

orthodox preacher who could instruct him. Argyll clearly felt that this offer was a mere rhetorical device, and he rejected it with heavy irony; yet it is fully consistent with the priority which the Catholic reformers had given to preaching.⁵⁰ Knox also provided rather more direct testimony to the reformers' willingness to make some compromises. He described how a petition for reformation put to the bishops by the Lords of the Congregation in about 1558 was not simply rejected outright. The bishops offered to hold a public disputation; the Congregation, on Knox's account, believed this proposal to be a sham and sank it by imposing impossible conditions, but it is an offer congruent with what we have already seen of the Scottish hierarchy's approach. Even when this offer was rejected, Knox adds, the bishops

began to draw certane Articles of reconciliatioun, promissing unto us, yf we wold admitt the Messe, to stand in hir formare reverence and estimatioun, grant Purgatorie after this lyiff, confesse Prayer to Sanctes and for the dead, and suffer thame to enjoye thare customed renttis, possession, and honour, that then thei wold grant unto us to pray and baptize in the vulgar tounge, so that it war done secreatlie, and nott in the open assemblie.⁵¹

Knox's account is our only evidence for this rather dubious episode, and we may be sure that he has presented the old kirk's position in the worst possible light; but even so, the terms of the offer as he records it are certainly reminiscent of the kind of approach which the Catholic reformers had been pursuing for some ten years.

A further echo of this style of reformism can be found in a still more unlikely source: John Row's History of the Kirk of Scotland. Row's brief treatment of the pre-Reformation kirk is of strictly limited value. Much of it is taken up with a tale of a dispute in Perth, in which a godly craftsman used an unspecified book of Sir David Lindsay's to bring the light of the Gospel to all the children of the town and, eventually, to the master of the grammar

school. The story is as stylized as it is implausible. Yet one detail jars, and it is a detail which Row, whose father became minister of Perth immediately after the Reformation, might conceivably have picked up from local tradition. The villain of Row's story is a friar who was preaching 'invectives aganis thir new preachers'. Yet the denouement is not the expulsion of this servant of Antichrist from the town, nor his conversion, nor even his gruesomely providential death. Rather, the friar is persuaded to change tack, and preaches a sermon in which he accepts that the old kirk should shoulder some responsibility for the spread of heresy:

If we had done our duetie in calling faithfullie, and made yow, God's people, to know God's trueth, as we should have done, thir new teachers had not done as they doe; for what shall poor sillie sheep doe that are poyndit in a fold where there is no meat, but break the dyke and go to their meat where they may have it?⁵²

It may be that, buried in this story, there is a genuine memory of the non-confrontational and self-critical approach taken by some preachers during the last years of Catholic Scotland.

Our records of the doctrinal agenda pursued by Scottish Catholic reformers in the 1550s are scanty, but there is enough here to discern a pattern. They appear to have taken a public approach which was candid to the point of flagellation in its assessment of the kirk's abuses and corruption. They professed a remarkable degree of indifference towards the papacy, taking instead a view of ecclesiastical authority which was conciliarist with biblicist undertones. They would not depart materially from Catholic orthodoxy on issues such as the sacraments, justification and ceremonial, but they were certainly willing to flirt with evangelical ideas and language regarding those subjects. Yet for all this, they gave no quarter to what they regarded as heresy. The 1549 council provided at some length for the appointment of inquisitors against heresy; the 1552 council warned that those who questioned the contents of the catechism should be denounced by their curates as heretics.⁵³ The

catechism itself denounced ‘herityckis, quhilk stifly haldis false opinions aganis the trew faith of haly kirk’; it insisted that those who deny the Real Presence of Christ in the sacrament were guilty of ‘gret heresy’, and likewise denounced those who opposed prayer to saints.⁵⁴ Quintin Kennedy’s appropriations of evangelical language included the claim that the evangelicals themselves belonged to ‘the Kirk malingnant’. He denounced Luther, Oecolampadius, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Bucer, Bullinger and Calvin at some length, along with all those who would meddle in the doctrine of justification or defame ‘the ineffable misterie of the blyssit sacrament of the Altare’. And he worried that if the simple saw that heretical preaching went unpunished they would come to believe it.⁵⁵ And for all its discretion, Hamilton’s letter to Argyll in 1558 contains unmistakable threats.⁵⁶ The effort for Catholic reform which took place under his supervision may have flirted with modish doctrines, but it did not drift into crypto-Protestantism. The determination of the reformers to remain true to their principles cannot be doubted; although the prudence of their approach perhaps can.

By their nature, none of our sources state why Scotland’s Catholic reformers took this stance. It may have been a matter of conscience or of policy; the reformers may have believed that their doctrines were correct, or that they were useful. More likely, both considerations pointed in the same direction.

Scottish Catholics were not alone in taking a non-confrontational approach towards evangelical ideas in the mid-sixteenth century. A recent although problematic survey has suggested that many English Catholics of this period took a similarly biblicist, humanist

stance, with a similar indifference to Rome.⁵⁷ If this is the case, it may be that the English exiles among the senior theologians at the university in St. Andrews brought such ideas with them. Even if such direct influences are discounted, the Scottish reformers clearly felt that some of the ideas which the English invaders had disseminated in the 1540s could be reclaimed for orthodoxy, rather than simply being opposed.⁵⁸ It is more certain that St. Andrews was impressed by aspects of the evangelical Catholic reform programme which Archbishop Hermann von Wied had pursued in Cologne. Von Wied's Enchiridion Christianae Institutionis was one of the sources for the 1552 catechism and had an agenda strikingly similar to that of the Scottish Catholic reformers; it is known to have been circulating in Scottish academic circles.⁵⁹

As James Cameron has demonstrated, the influence of the Cologne reformers went beyond the catechism to underpin the reform of the universities themselves.⁶⁰ One of the criticisms which has been levelled at the reforming provincial councils is their comparative inattention to the problem of clerical education.⁶¹ This is not quite fair – the 1549 council did require that monks be educated in theology so as to be able to preach, and demanded that bishops should examine all their curates for their competence;⁶² but in any case, this was a matter which was better resolved in the universities than in synods. St. Mary's college at St. Andrews, formally founded in 1538, remained essentially a paper institution under Cardinal Beaton; and the university as a whole suffered during the English invasions of the 1540s, especially when the occupation of the castle in 1546-47 brought war to its doorstep. Archbishop Hamilton set about restoring his university with some vigour. He secured a papal refoundation of St. Mary's and began building work there. Most importantly, in 1554 he established a new constitution for the college, closely modelled on von Wied's plans for the foundation of a school of divinity in Bonn. St. Mary's was now clearly the theological establishment which it has remained ever since, and, in Cameron's words, a 'vehicle of

Catholic Reformation'. Yet although intended principally as a seminary, the education which Hamilton envisaged clergy receiving at St. Mary's was thoroughly grounded in humanist principles. Indeed, in this period the Scottish universities seem finally to have embraced humanism. Greek and Hebrew began to be taught at Aberdeen in the 1550s. Hamilton, who himself had a passably distinguished humanist background, made some efforts find staff for his refounded college amongst the distinguished Scottish scholars on the continent.⁶³ The new dean of the Faculty of Arts was David Guild, whose readiness to indulge in theological speculation had seemed heretical a decade earlier; his successor in 1557, John Douglas, was not only a product of several distinguished European universities but also, unprecedentedly, a layman.⁶⁴ Hamilton's commitment to reform, and his willingness to use sources of questionable orthodoxy such as von Wied's work, was more than mere propaganda.

The sense that a vanguard of modishly educated Catholic reformers was being established in the universities by 1550 is reinforced by John Foxe's story of the disputes in St. Andrews in 1551-52 over the Paternoster. Foxe's contemptuous account invites scepticism, but beneath his scorn the events he describes are plausible enough, especially if, as recently argued, his source was one of the participants, John Winram.⁶⁵ Sir David Lindsay's apparent references to these disputes lend credence to the account.⁶⁶ The question at issue was whether the Paternoster might legitimately be addressed to saints, or only to God. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Richard Marshall, who we already know as an editor or compiler of the 1552 catechism, took the latter view, and it was apparently his uncompromising statement of this position which sparked the dispute. Foxe claimed that it provoked 'a dangerous schisme in the Church of Scotland', but it is fairly clear from his account that the schism was confined to the city, and largely to the university, of St. Andrews. The issue seems to have been won by the reformers, after being debated at the 1552 council, where Archbishop Hamilton gave them his full support. The catechism itself makes

no specific mention of the issue, but does nothing to imply that the prayer may be said to anyone other than God.⁶⁷ For our purposes, the significance of this episode lies in its demonstration that the reformist party in the kirk, and in particular in the universities, were acting at least in part from conviction – sufficiently so that they were willing publicly to denounce the doctrine preached by other Catholics. Moreover, their apparent victory suggests that they did indeed succeed in dominating the kirk during this period; as well as underlining Hamilton's personal commitment to their cause.

This reforming party's convictions and approaches arose not only from continental models, but also from pre-existing Scottish traditions. In his attention to his university, Hamilton was following the pattern laid down by his predecessors at St. Andrews, who had founded St. Leonard's and St. Mary's colleges earlier in the century, as well as the illustrious example of Bishop William Elphinstone, who had founded the University of Aberdeen in 1495. Even Cardinal Beaton had made a contribution, using his legatine powers to confirm the status of St. Leonard's college in 1545, and doing so explicitly so that the college might oppose heresy and protect the faith.⁶⁸ Several of Hamilton's contemporaries had also anticipated his emphasis on the role of preaching. In 1547 a preaching canon was appointed to the cathedral in Aberdeen, and explicitly charged to preach across the diocese.⁶⁹ When Bishop Reid of Orkney refounded his cathedral in 1544, regular cycles of lectures and sermons were built into its life – a reform which, although inevitably limited, does not deserve the scorn with which historians have treated it.⁷⁰ Such reforms may not have built up parish ministry, but the creation of cadres of high-quality itinerant preachers was a shrewd and pragmatic policy, which elsewhere in Europe met with considerable success. As Winning has demonstrated, the lost legislation from Cardinal Beaton's provincial council of 1546 had tackled the reform of preaching and instruction more generally.⁷¹ Few had acted on this –

unsurprisingly, in the midst of war – but principles had been laid down which Hamilton, in his more peaceful times, was able to follow.

A more important inheritance, however, was Scotland's lively conciliarist tradition. Many of the Catholic reformers had links with Paris, the last stronghold of conciliarist thought; these included John Douglas, the provost of St. Mary's, as well as Quintin Kennedy. Moreover, in John Mair, St. Andrews itself had perhaps the most distinguished of the last generation of European conciliar theorists. Mair died in 1550, and was too infirm to attend the 1549 provincial council, but he was represented there by his proctor, establishing at least a symbolic link.⁷² The impact of this inheritance is difficult to measure, but as J. H. Burns has argued, it surely means that conciliarist ideas were 'part of the mental equipment of educated Scots'. Moreover, we know that conciliarist texts were circulating in Scotland.⁷³ Martin Balfour, the provost of St. Salvator's college, St. Andrews, owned a copy of the 1535 Paris edition of the acts of the general councils known as the Conciliorum Quatuor Generalium, whose second volume includes the acts of the Councils of Constance and Basel, but neglects the papal council at Florence and the more recent Fifth Lateran Council. Two other Scots are also known to have owned copies.⁷⁴ Henry Sinclair, dean of Glasgow and latterly bishop of Ross, owned a volume containing the acts of the Council of Constance bound with William of Montserrat's commentary on the so-called Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges in which the French crown had acknowledged conciliar supremacy over the Pope.⁷⁵ This influence was paralleled by the Scottish crown's burgeoning interest in the imagery and rhetoric of empire, again borrowed from French sources but boosted by Henry VIII's use of it. Although its principal purpose was to counter English pretensions, this imagery also gave a theoretical backbone to the longstanding royal concern about papal interference in Scottish affairs.⁷⁶ The kings of Scots were as jumpy as any late medieval monarchs about the influence of the

papacy within their realm, especially where their own somewhat fragile powers of patronage were concerned.⁷⁷

Before the late 1540s, however, such anti-papal words and actions were balanced by the conspicuous loyalty which Scotland, once the papacy's 'special daughter', could rouse herself to show. Parliamentary legislation of 1532 boasted of how the kings of Scots had long been 'maist obedient sonn^{is} to our haly faderis þe papis of rome and þe auctorite apostolik w^tout any maner of smot violacioun or defectioun', and the anti-heresy legislation of 1541 included an order 'that na maner of persoun Argvn nor Impung þe papis autorie vnder þe pane of deid'.⁷⁸ Some Scottish Catholics did maintain such conspicuous loyalty to the pope during the 1540s and 1550s;⁷⁹ and those Scots who remained Catholic after 1560 were (perhaps inevitably) far more explicit about their loyalty to Rome. In other words, the Catholic reformers were not simply expressing the general will of the kirk; and we would be unwise to accept their sudden silence about the papacy, or their other controversial stances, at face value.

It is not to question the integrity of the Catholic reformers to point out that all the evidence for their doctrinally ambiguous approach derives from propaganda. Archbishop Hamilton and his circle do appear to have held conciliarist, Erasmian views, but their pursuit of them was part of a deliberate campaign against heresy. They appear to have been hoping to present their faith in a light which was as inoffensive as possible to those who were dissatisfied with the old kirk, so as to persuade them to stay on board. This rather obvious possibility has been met with scepticism from most scholars,⁸⁰ principally on the twin grounds that the reformers

were not going far enough to forge a doctrinal compromise with Protestantism, and that Scottish Protestants had no interest in such compromises. However, as Michael Lynch has persuasively argued, even in the late 1550s committed Protestantism remained very much a minority stance.⁸¹ Dissatisfaction with the old kirk extended well beyond Protestantism per se. Erasmian-style reformism was very much in fashion at James V's court; many who had no real humanist education nevertheless aligned themselves with humanist criticisms of the kirk.⁸² Like David Stratoun, in the 1530s court Erasmians such as George Buchanan were pushed by the kirk into a category – heresy – where they had little wish to be. After James' death, the most prominent representative of this pattern of thought in Scottish public life was Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, the Lyon king of arms. Lindsay's work is both subtle and well known, and this is not the place for a detailed analysis of his views.⁸³ The Tragedie of the Cardinal, written in 1547, did not condone Cardinal Beaton's assassination, but it did not stint in its criticism of Beaton. His religious criticisms were more detailed and far-reaching in his most famous work, Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, first performed in the form we know in 1552; and in his last composition, Ane Dialoge of Experience and ane Courtier, usually known as The Monarche. Since the late 1520s Lindsay had been denouncing clerical abuses and immorality, and pressing for Erasmian reform centred around preaching and education. By this period, however, his criticisms were becoming more systematic, and were also deliberately being aimed at a wider audience than his earlier, courtly poems. The later works include a number of detailed prescriptions for reform. On many issues, such as the reform of mortuary dues, this paralleled legislation actually passed by the provincial councils. However, he also ventured onto doctrinal ground of a kind that we are by now familiar with. His approach to the papacy was hostile and contemptuous, but he was apparently never willing to discard it or to deny that it could be reformed. He referred to the papacy as a manifestation of the forces of Antichrist, but (except in one early poem of doubtful

attribution) only as one antichrist amongst many. When proposing major ecclesiastical changes in the Thrie Estaitis, he made only the swiftest and most contemptuous reference to the need to secure papal approval, and envisaged the ideal Christian king as being virtually free of papal oversight. In The Monarchie, he embarked on a lengthy and vitriolic attack on the degeneracy of the court of Rome, and denounced the papacy for defending its doctrines ‘be flammand fyre’; yet he continued to see the papacy itself as having been instituted by Christ. He had less to say about the Bible, but he clearly saw it as having a central role in the life of the church and came close to endorsing vernacular scripture. Other flirtations with reformist ideas include his attacks on indulgences and pilgrimages; his unease about the use of images; and, most radically, his outspoken advocacy of clerical marriage. Yet his exploration of controversial ideas had clear limits. Although he argued for the use of prayers in the vernacular, he also accepted prayer to saints. His view of justification strongly emphasized the place of works, giving much less ground to evangelical ideas on this point than the catechism did. He had almost nothing to say about the sacraments, which may mean that he saw them as unimportant, but cannot surely be taken to mean that he disagreed with traditional doctrine or practice in this regard.⁸⁴

Lindsay’s works were popular, but we cannot know how many of his readers came to share his views. However, it is at least clear that some other Scots took a similar line. The Revised Short-Title Catalogue lists only six vernacular texts printed in Scotland during the period 1549-60.⁸⁵ Two of these are the official publications of the reform effort, the 1552 catechism and the 1559 ‘short declaration’; a third is Kennedy’s treatise. Another official publication, a description of the queen’s marriage to Dauphin Francis in 1558, survives only in a fragment. The fifth is the first edition of Lindsay’s The Monarchie. The last of these vernacular imprints is a short verse treatise by a playwright named William Lauder, published in Edinburgh in 1556, and entitled Ane compendious and breue Tractate, Concernynge ye

Office and dewtie of Kyngis. Although he was later a Protestant minister, in 1556 Lauder clearly saw himself as a Catholic and remained rooted in traditional religion. The final page of the book bears a thoroughly traditional woodcut of Christ in glory displaying the Five Wounds. It is possible that this was placed there by the printer, John Scot, against Lauder's will. However, Lauder's repeated claim that his book is written for the edification of 'all Catholyke kyngis and Prencis' is clear enough, as is his unproblematic acceptance of the validity of canon law.⁸⁶ Yet his Catholicism was of a strikingly biblicist and reformist kind. His central requirement for his righteous king is: 'first cause zour prechours, all and od / Trewlie sett furth, the wourd of God.' And in case there can be any doubt of the evangelical flavour of this demand, he spells out a king's responsibility to open Scripture to his people in terms which imply not only that Scripture's authority is final, but that is its own interpreter.

Itt suld nocht be hid, nor obscurit
It suld nocht wreistit be, nor wryit
Nor vnto prophane thyngs applyit
Itt suld be prechit, to all dois seik it
Itt nother suld be paird, nor ekit
Saif Scripture, with Scripture, ze expone
Conforme vnto, the trewtwiche stone
Quhilk is the auld, and new Testament
Quhilk suld be taucht, most deligent.

This aspiration is matched with a warning, clearly aimed at the foot-draggers amongst the clergy:

Wo be to thame, that dois knaw
Gods wourd, syne dois the contrar schaw
In Pulpet, or in preching place

Speking, aganis godds wourd of grace.

This is followed by a full discussion of the principles on which a king should choose his ‘Pastores’: these people are also referred to as ‘Gostlie Mynistaris’, but never as priests or bishops. He emphasizes their role as preachers to the exclusion of all else; there is no mention of any sacramental ministry. Many of his requirements match the disciplinary aspirations of any reformer (although he makes no mention of clerical celibacy). More intriguing is his extended comparison between such a preacher and a shepherd, in which he not only emphasizes the true preacher’s commitment to his flock but claims that such a preacher is the ‘trew successour’ of St. Peter. None of this could be called heretical (although his suggestion that ‘all grace, ... prosperitie, lufe and peace’ depends simply on faith is at least unguarded). Yet his scripturalism, emphasis on a preaching ministry, scepticism towards the clergy and apparent lack of interest in much of the traditional framework of Catholicism suggests that he favoured reform of the kirk in many of the same ways that Lindsay did. It also suggests that he would have been thoroughly in sympathy with the more provocative aspects of the reform programme pursued under Hamilton’s oversight.⁸⁷

Not all of the vernacular imprints produced for the Scottish market were actually printed in Scotland, of course. Indeed, the best-known vernacular text from this period was printed in Paris: Robert Wedderburn’s Complaynt of Scotland, written in 1549-50. The Complaynt is relatively uninterested in ecclesiastical matters, being essentially war propaganda; although its emphasis on the regeneration of the Scottish commonwealth is one which both Lindsay and Lauder share. As part of this, Wedderburn did turn his attention briefly to the ecclesiastical estate, and condemned clerical corruption in unforgiving but wholly orthodox terms. However, he also argued that heresy should be fought by persuasion and virtuous example, not by persecution, which he claimed was counterproductive. And again, there are hints of a less than traditional attitude towards authority. Priests, he argued,

should take up arms and fight the English like everyone else. He dismissed the idea that they are not allowed to do so, citing Biblical examples of warlike priests and claiming that those who disagreed with him ‘ar mair obedient to the canon lau nor thai ar to goddis lau’. It was in this context that he made his only reference to the papacy; he denied that only the pope had the authority to licence clergy to fight. Again, when the papacy impinges on Scottish Catholic consciousness, it seems to do so as an administrative inconvenience.⁸⁸

Lindsay, Lauder and Wedderburn’s testimony suggests that the eirenic approach taken by Scotland’s Catholic reformers may not have been as quixotic as it appears.⁸⁹ A significant proportion both of educated layfolk and of clergy in 1550s Scotland seem to have been persuaded that matters in the old kirk could not go on as before. James Kirk has noted that many of those who eventually arrived at Protestant convictions after 1560 had previously had Erasmian and Catholic-reformist inclinations.⁹⁰ But this journey was not predestined, and an attempt by the old kirk to appeal to those with such inclinations might have stood a good chance of arresting the process. These were views which were widely held, even having some purchase on convinced Protestants; Glenn Burgess has recently pointed out the extent to which Knox’s ecclesiology was coloured by conciliarist ideas.⁹¹ Perhaps the most striking evidence of the breadth of support for such reform comes from the petition addressed to the 1559 provincial council by a group – unfortunately anonymous – of ‘temporall Lordis and Barronis’. This proposed a series of reforms which were thoroughly in tune with the approach which the earlier councils had already taken. It urged that the priority given to preaching should be redoubled; it also emphasized the value of the catechism, insisting that ordinaries should ensure that all curates were capable of using it correctly. The idea for the ‘short declarations’ on the sacraments also seems to have originated from this petition, which calls for a ‘godlie and fruitfull declaration set forth in the Inglis tounge’ to be read to the people before they receive communion. And most famously, the petition also suggested that

vernacular prayers be said after Mass each Sunday in every parish church.⁹² This last demand was apparently too much for the clergy gathered in council, and nothing came of it; it was, after all, a reform which had been demanded most recently by the Lords of the Congregation,⁹³ and the council's business was reform, not capitulation. Apparently because of this clause, Bishop Leslie later anathematized the petitioners, claiming that 'certane Barrounis with sundrie vtheris gentlemen' had put forward a 'requeist conteining sum poyntes of thair schisme, inuentionis, and deuyses'.⁹⁴ Yet this seems unjust. If the authors had been crypto-Protestants, they would scarcely have urged stern punishments for irreverence towards the Mass, for iconoclasm and 'for deforming or innovating the louable ceremonies and rites ... usit in Haly Kirk'.⁹⁵ It seems more likely that the petition represents a body of lay opinion largely in tune with the official reform effort.

The message which the Catholic reformers were spreading was a persuasive one. It would not have appealed to convinced Protestants, nor, apparently, was it meant to. But the compromises, the shifting emphases, and the evangelical mood music of this programme seem to have been closely aligned with the concerns of a significant number of educated Scots as well as with the convictions of the reformers themselves. In pursuing such a course, the reformers were appealing to those who looked for an inclusive, generous reform both of discipline and of doctrine, who were opposed to heresy but not deaf to it; the 'floating voters' of a religiously unsettled country. It was a risky approach but not, perhaps, a foolhardy one. The potential constituency seems to have been a large and influential one. Moreover, it is noticeable how many of the leading figures in the Catholic reform effort came, in 1559-60, to throw their lot in with the Protestants.⁹⁶ If (as the admittedly fragmentary evidence suggests) those reformers were trying to persuade their people that Scottish Catholicism could be rejuvenated, it may be that many of them were also trying to persuade themselves.

It is possible to argue that the approach which Scotland's Catholic reformers adopted was a wise one; but it is unmistakable that they failed. Religious revolution came anyway. Indeed, it is likely that the reform programme as it was implemented actually accelerated rather than retarding the spread of heresy. If this is so, however, it perhaps does not reflect a fundamental error of judgement by the reformers as much as it does the incomplete and unbalanced implementation of their programme. As we have seen, almost all of the documents which testify to that programme, official and unofficial, include the requirement that the laws against heresy should be maintained and enforced. This was an essential ingredient of the reform effort. If a greater area of doctrinal freedom was being implicitly opened up, it was vital to provide clear and effective boundaries to that area. No moment is more dangerous for a much-criticized regime or institution than the point at which it begins to heed those criticisms and to reform itself. Opponents will naturally tend to interpret any concessions made to them as a sign of weakness, and think that if they have been given an inch they may be able to take a mile. If reform is to be perceived as an act of strength, rather than of weakness, it must be accompanied by intensified repression of those outside the new settlement. If one is going to speak softly, one has to carry a big stick. If the reformers wished to persuade waverers to rejoin the old kirk, they needed not only to appeal to them directly, but also to do all they could to stifle the contrary arguments of their Protestant opponents. In particular, the Protestant leadership had to be silenced, whether by arrest, exile or execution. It appears, from their repeatedly stated intentions, that Scotland's Catholic reformers understood this.

However, the matter was out of their hands. The kirk could pursue reform on its own initiative; for repression, the active co-operation of the secular power was needed. While the

duke of Châtelherault, Archbishop Hamilton's half-brother, remained governor, the reformers retained a degree of support from the crown. The archbishop was able to use his position as treasurer to purchase books needed for the reform effort in the governor's name.⁹⁷ The reformers also received some parliamentary support. In February 1552, while the provincial council was still in session, parliament enacted several statutes against religious offenders. The act against blasphemous oaths must surely have remained merely aspirational, for all the careful sliding scale of fines it imposed; yet the act against those who 'makis perterbatioun in the Kirk the tyme of deuine seruice' was precisely the kind of support from the state which the reformers needed. More significantly, perhaps, the same parliament's act imposing a system of censorship for printed books was essential if the process of reform was to be controlled.⁹⁸ Yet little was done to enforce these laws, even while Châtelherault remained nominal head of the government. When he was finally supplanted by Mary of Guise in 1554, political support for the Catholic reform effort seems to have ceased altogether. One of Guise's first acts as regent was to remove Archbishop Hamilton from the post of treasurer and replace him with the Protestant earl of Cassillis. In so far as she took an interest in ecclesiastical matters, it seems that she was concerned to undercut the primate, rather than to support him. During the long wrangle between Hamilton and the papacy over the bishopric of Dunkeld, the Guise interest consistently backed Hamilton's opponent Robert Crichton, and in 1554 the archbishop was forced to concede.⁹⁹ Virtually the only evidence for Guise's interest in reform comes from a letter written by Cardinal Sermoneta to Pope Paul IV in or around 1556. Sermoneta summarizes what he has been told about the plight of the Scottish church, and provides his suggestions for reform; throughout, he emphasizes that his interest is in supporting the child queen, Mary, but the views he ascribes to her can be taken as representing those of her mother. His first priority, indeed, is to give his support to the crown's wish to tax the clergy more heavily, a request which he supports. He also suggests

various other expedients by which the pope could empower or compel the Scottish bishops to put their houses in order. At no point does he even hint that a substantial reform effort is already under way. Instead, he insists that nothing can be done without ‘upright and honest prelates’, and he names five such, whom he claims are ‘most capable of executing the above reforms, and who are by far the most acceptable to the same most serene sovereign lady’. The five are the archbishop of Glasgow and the bishops of Orkney, Moray, Dunblane and Galloway. It is a peculiar list. While Archbishop Beaton and Reid of Orkney deserved the confidence which Sermoneta had been led to place in them, Hepburn of Moray and Durie of Galloway were in no way model bishops. More remarkable than the inclusions, however, are the omissions. Astonishingly, no mention is made of the primate of Scotland, who had committed himself so publicly to the reform programme. Sermoneta also omitted the two prelates who had accompanied Archbishop Hamilton in supporting the reformers during the dispute over the Paternoster in 1552: Robert Stewart of Caithness and Alexander Gordon, then titular bishop of Athens, but since 1554 bishop of the Isles. William Gordon of Aberdeen, another active reformer, is also missing from this list.¹⁰⁰ Mary of Guise could perhaps never have been expected to be warm towards a Hamilton, given the dynastic threat which the family represented, but through bypassing the archbishop in this manner, she was potentially sabotaging the entire reform effort.

The most obvious sign of this, however, was her regime’s persistent unwillingness to countenance any significant prosecution of heresy. Parliament was silent on the issue after 1554, excepting one 1555 statute against those who broke the Lenten fast.¹⁰¹ Not a single heresy execution took place between 1550 and 1558, and there is precious little evidence of other efforts to enforce the heresy laws during this period. In 1556 Guise even revoked the forfeitures of Cardinal Beaton’s assassins. In 1558, one heretic, Walter Myln, was indeed executed – significantly, a mere four days after Queen Mary had married the dauphin in

France. Yet even then, if Knox is to be believed, the queen regent distanced herself from the act, attributing it to Archbishop Hamilton's cruelty and assuring the Protestants that she herself was innocent.¹⁰² It is hard to see what more she could have done to undermine Hamilton and to leave the Catholic reformers' flank exposed. Her policy made sense in its own, somewhat narrow terms. Guise's politics were dynastically driven; her consistent aim was to secure her daughter's throne and a stable succession through the French marriage and through the alliance and eventual union of the crowns which the marriage promised. In the pursuit of these aims she was unwilling to alienate Scottish Protestants. While the young queen's marriage, and question of the grant of the crown matrimonial to the dauphin, were both in the balance, Guise felt she could not afford to make enemies. The temptation to turn a blind eye to heresy became all the stronger after 1553-54, when England both returned to forthright Catholicism and was drawn into the Habsburgs' sphere. However, with hindsight, the events of 1558-60 suggest that ignoring or appeasing the threat of Protestantism through the 1550s was unwise.

In the face of Mary of Guise's refusal to permit the enforcement of the heresy laws, Catholic reform was crippled. Two events in particular stand out. First, no attempt was made to curb the activities of Sir David Lindsay. Lindsay never quite ventured into open heresy, and in any case his position as Lyon king of arms gave him a peculiar immunity.¹⁰³ Yet his works were inflammatory, and his advocacy of clerical marriage and description of the papacy as antichrist went well beyond the official reform programme. The 1549 council expressed alarm about heretical and anticlerical books, plays and poems.¹⁰⁴ However, the surviving version of Lindsay's Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis was performed at least twice, the second performance being at Edinburgh in the presence of the queen mother herself. Lindsay's other late work, The Monarche, was printed in St. Andrews by Hamilton's own printer. It may be that The Monarche was condemned around the time of the 1559 council,

but if so this was far too late.¹⁰⁵ Secondly, in 1555-56 John Knox visited Scotland, touring Edinburgh, Ayrshire and Angus. His visit was doubtless not as critical in accelerating the growth of Scottish Protestantism as he himself believed, yet his evangelistic efforts were certainly aimed at exactly the same waverers whom Hamilton's reform programme was trying to lure back. His activities were no secret, and in 1556 he was summoned to Edinburgh to answer heresy charges. Yet he escaped to the Continent, almost certainly because the queen mother intervened to protect him.¹⁰⁶ This was folly of the highest order. It was clear enough even then that Knox was an extremely dangerous man. If such men could be allowed to come and go freely, Scottish Catholicism was no longer able to defend itself. The Catholic reformers may have avoided 'a damaging association with brutal Roman repression' – although Knox and others did their best to make this association anyway – but we are perhaps too ready to forget the dangers of an excessively permissive policy.¹⁰⁷ While the Catholic reform programme flirted with evangelical ideas, the absence of any sustained effort to enforce limits to that flirtation left the kirk exposed to the seductions of the new religion without the defences of the old. Mary of Guise has frequently been credited with considerable political judgement, and she was indeed an able political tactician.¹⁰⁸ However, she should perhaps also be credited with a hand in the destruction of Scottish Catholicism.

By the mid-1560s, Catholic reform of the kind which Archbishop Hamilton appears to have attempted in the 1550s was no longer possible. The Council of Trent had laid out a far more conservative vision of Catholicism which, while not monolithic, had no place for doctrinal experimentation on this scale. With hindsight, the reforming project which the 1552 catechism represents appears at best eccentric, at worst a Trojan horse for Protestantism. The perspective of the 1550s was very different. It was unclear if the Council of Trent would ever be recalled – indeed, in the second half of the decade, Paul IV's open hostility to the Council made it seem most improbable. At its most recent sessions, in 1551-52, doctrinal

reconciliation (if not actual compromise) was certainly on the agenda, sufficiently so that Protestant delegates had briefly attended. The German Interims were recent enough to think that compromise of a kind remained possible, especially if imposed by a strong hand. In the end, Charles V was unable to provide that hand in the Empire; if Mary of Guise was able to provide it in Scotland, she was unwilling to do so. Yet the hope that a settlement which included an element of compromise might be imposed was not altogether vain, nor did it disappear. Henry VIII had briefly achieved something of this kind in England. In France, the idea of a pacification in which royal power compelled Catholic and Protestant to coexist within a single system survived from the failure of hopes for a more substantive compromise at the Colloquy of Poissy through to the final imposition and enforcement of just such a pacification in 1598. Like their counterparts in Germany, Catholics in 1550s Scotland were playing a dangerous game. Unlike their counterparts in Germany, they were unambiguously defeated. Without the full-hearted support of the temporal power, they were unable to confine their reforms within acceptable limits. Yet the eclipse of this face of reform should not blind us to the existence, in Scotland as elsewhere, of the other Catholic Reformation that might have been.

¹ Jamie Cameron, *James V: the personal rule 1528-42* (East Linton, 1998), pp. 289-91.

² Marcus Merriman, *The rough wooings: Mary Queen of Scots 1542-1551* (East Linton, 2000), pp. 340-6.

³ Thomas Winning, 'Church councils in sixteenth-century Scotland', *Essays on the Scottish Reformation*, ed. David McRoberts (Glasgow, 1962), pp. 332-58 at 334, 357.

⁴ *Statutes of the Scottish Church 1225-1559*, ed. David Patrick (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1907), pp. 150, 161.

⁵ Winning, 'Church councils', pp. 335, 357.

⁶ James Kirk, *Patterns of reform: continuity and change in the Reformation kirk* (Edinburgh, 1989), p. xii; I. B. Cowan, *The Scottish Reformation* (London, 1982), p. 87; Gordon Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge, 1960), p. 35; Jenny Wormald, *Court, kirk and community: Scotland 1470-1625* (Edinburgh, 1981), pp. 93-4.

⁷ John Knox, *The works of John Knox*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1854-95), I p. 291-2.

⁸ John Foxe, *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall in the church* (London, 1583: RSTC 11225), p. 1274; David Calderwood, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. Thomas Thomson (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842), I pp. 273-7, 438.

⁹ Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie, *The Historie and Cronicles of Scotland*, ed. Æ. J. G. Mackay (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1899-1911), II pp. 141-3.

¹⁰ John Leslie, *The Historie of Scotland*, trans. James Dalrymple, ed. E. G. Cody and William Murison (Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1895), II pp. 345-6, 400. Cf. John Leslie, *De origine moribus, et rebus gestis Scotorum* (Rome, 1578), pp. 516, 547.

¹¹ A similar argument was put in 1959 by the Catholic historian Brother Kenneth, who argued that the councils failed because the ‘very reforms that they proposed alienated those whose interests were affected and prevented the reforms from taking effect’. Brother Kenneth, ‘The popular literature of the Scottish Reformation’, *Essays*, ed. McRoberts, pp. 169-84 at 178-9.

¹² Robert Wedderburn, *The Complaynt of Scotland*, ed. A. M. Stewart (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society 4th series xi, 1979), p. 126.

¹³ Knox, *Works*, I pp. 58-60. It is John Foxe’s briefer and less polemical account which names Stratoun’s opponent as the vicar of Ecclesgreig: *Actes and monuments*, p. 982.

¹⁴ *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 89-94, 110-12, 124, 163-7, 176-77, 185-6.

¹⁵ *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 98-103, 104-09, 126-7, 136, 147, 173-6.

¹⁶ For example, in January 1559 the dean and chapter of Aberdeen produced, at the bishop’s request, a document on the implementation of the conciliar legislation; and nine days after the conclusion of the 1559 council, Archbishop Beaton of Glasgow issued detailed instructions to at least one of his rural deans for implementation of twelve key reforms, headed by the requirement that regular preaching should be organized throughout the deanery within four months. *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis*, vol. I (Edinburgh: Spalding Club, 1845), pp. lx-lxiv; *Selections from the records of the regality of Melrose, vol. 3: 1547-1706*, ed. Charles S. Romane (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society 2nd series xiii, 1917), pp. 167-87, esp. 168-9. See also Cowan, *Scottish Reformation*, p. 87.

¹⁷ Michael Lynch, *Edinburgh and the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1981), p. 30; Alexander Maxwell, *Old Dundee Prior to the Reformation* (Edinburgh and Dundee, 1891), pp. 124-31.

¹⁸ Lindsay of Pitcottie, *Chronicle*, II p. 142.

¹⁹ The best account of its complex genealogy remains that of Alexander Mitchell in his edition, *The catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton printed at Saint Andrews* (Edinburgh, 1882), pp. iii - xxxii.&

²⁰ *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 144-7.

²¹ Which are a possible source for the catechism, although the evidence here is ambiguous at best. *Catechism*, ed. Mitchell, pp. xiv, xxvi.

²² *The Catechisme, That is to say, ane commone and catholik instructioun of the christin people ... set furth be ye maist reuerent father in God Iohne Aschbischop of sanct Androus* (St. Andrews, 1552: RSTC 12731), preface fo. 1^r.

²³ *The Catechisme*, fo. 119^r.

²⁴ *The Catechisme*, preface fo. 2^r.

²⁵ *The Catechisme*, fo. 100^r. Cf. Peter Marshall, 'The debate over "unwritten verities" in early Reformation England', *Protestant history and identity in sixteenth century Europe*, ed. Bruce Gordon (Aldershot, 1996), I pp. 60-77 at pp. 65-6.

²⁶ *The Catechisme*, fos. 139^r - 148^v. Strangely, the term 'Mass' is used, and the doctrine of the sacrifice implied, in passing references elsewhere in the text: for example, fos. 35^r, 93^v, 199^r, 200^r. Mitchell suggested that these were last-minute insertions by an editor aiming to stiffen the spine of an otherwise alarmingly ambiguous text: *Catechism*, ed. Mitchell, p. xvi.

²⁷ *The Catechisme*, fo. 128^v.

²⁸ *The Catechisme*, fos. 83^v - 84^r; *Catechism*, ed. Mitchell, pp. xxii-xxiii.

²⁹ Maurice Taylor, 'The conflicting doctrines of the Scottish Reformation', *Essays*, ed. McRoberts, pp. 245-73 at pp. 252-4.

³⁰ *The Catechisme*, fos. 7^v, 23^v.

³¹ *Catechism*, ed. Mitchell, pp. xvi-xvii.

³² Taylor, 'Conflicting doctrines', pp. 253-55; Cowan, *Scottish Reformation*, pp. 82-83.

³³ This identification was first made by John Durkan, 'The cultural background in sixteenth-century Scotland', *Essays*, ed. McRoberts, pp. 274-331 at p. 327; and has been adopted unproblematically, for example by Cowan, *Scottish Reformation*, p. 82. Cf. *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, p. 86.

³⁴ *A Collection of State Papers ... 1542 to 1570*, ed. Samuel Haynes (London, 1740), pp. 130-1.

³⁵ Durkan, 'Cultural background', p. 327.

³⁶ Mitchell described the catechism as 'one of the most important specimens of our ancient Scottish speech while yet unvulgarized and uncorrupted by English and French modes of spelling'. *Catechism*, ed. Mitchell, p. xix.

³⁷ *The Catechisme*, fo. 206^r.

³⁸ *Catechism*, ed. Mitchell, pp. ix-xv, xxvi-xxxii; John Gau, *The Richt Vay to the Kingdom of Heuine*, ed. A. F. Mitchell (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society xii, 1888), pp. xlvi-xlvii; *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*, ed. James Balfour Paul (Edinburgh, 1913), X p. 50; Clare Kellar, "'To enrich with Gospel truth the neighbour realm": religious reform in England and Scotland, 1534-61' (University of Oxford D.Phil, 1999), pp. 128-9.

³⁹ *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, e.g., pp. 90, 94, 165, 176-7.

⁴⁰ *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 126-27.

⁴¹ *Catechism*, ed. Mitchell, p. xv n.1.

⁴² *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 188-90.

⁴³ *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, p. 86.

⁴⁴ Quintin Kennedy, 'Ane compendius tractiue by Mr. Quintin Kennedy, abbot of Crossraguell', *The miscellany of the Wodrow Society*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh, 1844), I pp. 95-174 at pp. 101-03, 106, 115-6, 125, 133, 150.

⁴⁵ Kennedy, 'Compendious tractiue', pp. 121, 143.

⁴⁶ William James Anderson, 'Some documents of the Scottish Reformation', *Essays*, ed. McRoberts, pp. 359-70 at p. 360.

⁴⁷ Knox, *Works*, I p. 291; Lindsay of Pitscottie, *Chronicle*, II pp. 141-2.

⁴⁸ On Winram, see Linda Dunbar's biography, forthcoming in the Ashgate series *St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History*.

⁴⁹ John Bale, *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae posterior pars* (Basel, 1559), p. 224.

⁵⁰ Knox, *Works*, I pp. 276-9, 288.

⁵¹ Knox, *Works*, I p. 306.

⁵² John Row, *The history of the kirk of Scotland*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842), pp. 7-9.

⁵³ *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 122-7, 147.

⁵⁴ *The Catechisme*, fos. 18^r, 143^v.

⁵⁵ Kennedy, 'Compendious tractiue', pp. 114, 125, 133, 150-1, 157-9.

⁵⁶ Knox, *Works*, I pp. 277-8.

⁵⁷ Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford 2000).

⁵⁸ Kellar, ““To enrich with Gospel truth the neighbour realm””, pp. 140-1.

⁵⁹ John Durkan and Anthony Ross, *Early Scottish Libraries* (Glasgow, 1961), pp. 73, 93, 139, 148.

⁶⁰ James K. Cameron, ‘The Cologne Reformation and the Church of Scotland’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xxx (1979), 39-64 at 41-2; James K. Cameron, ““Catholic Reform” in Germany and the pre-1560 Church in Scotland’, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, xx (1979), 105-117 at 105-07, 112-15.

⁶¹ Cowan, *Scottish Reformation*, p. 87; Winning, ‘Church councils’, p. 340.

⁶² *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 106-07, 110-1.

⁶³ Ronald G. Cant, *The University of St. Andrews: a short history* (Edinburgh & London, 1970), pp. 34-7; James K. Cameron, ‘St. Mary's College 1547-1574 - the second foundation: the principalship of John Douglas’, in D. W. D. Shaw (ed), *In Divers Manners: a St. Mary's Miscellany* (St. Andrews 1990), p. 43-48; Cameron, ““Catholic Reform””, 114; Durkan, ‘Cultural background’, p. 292; James K. Cameron, ‘Humanism and Religious Life’, *Humanism in Renaissance Scotland*, ed. John MacQueen (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 165-6.

⁶⁴ *Acta Facultatis Artium Universitatis Sanctiandree 1413-1588*, ed. Annie I. Dunlop (Edinburgh: Scottish Historical Society 3rd series liv, 1964), pp. lxiii-lxvi; John Herkless and Robert K. Hannay, *The College of St. Leonard: being documents with translation, notes and historical introductions* (Edinburgh, 1905), pp. 220-2; Cameron, ‘Humanism and Religious Life’, p. 166.

⁶⁵ Thomas Freeman, ““The reik of Maister Patrik Hammyltoun”: John Foxe, John Winram and the martyrs of the Scottish Reformation’, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, xxvii (1996), 43-60, esp. 55.

⁶⁶ David Lindsay, ‘Ane dialog betuix Experience and ane Courteour’, *The Works of Sir David Lindsay*, ed. J. H. Murray (London: Early English Text Society old series xi et seq., 1865-71), lines 2624-31; idem., ‘Ane satyre of the Thrie Estaitis’, *Works*, line 4604.

⁶⁷ Foxe, *Actes and monuments*, p. 1274; *The Catechisme*, fo. 175^v ff.

⁶⁸ Herkless and Hannay, *The College of St. Leonard*, p. 187.

⁶⁹ *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis*, p. lix.

⁷⁰ Kirk, *Patterns*, pp. 26-7; Donaldson, *Scottish Reformation*, p. 34.

⁷¹ Winning, ‘Church councils’, p. 336.

⁷² *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, p. 87.

⁷³ J. H. Burns, ‘The conciliarist tradition in Scotland’, *Scottish Historical Review* xlii (1963), 89-104 at 89, 100.

⁷⁴ *Conciliorum quatuor Generalium Niceni, Constantinopolitani, Epheseni, & Calcedonensis [Tomus secundus Conciliorum generalium]* (Paris, 1535); Durkan and Ross, *Libraries*, p. 74. The 1549 provincial council had happily cited the Council of Basel as an authority: *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 89-90; cf. *Melrose Regality Records*, p. 187.

⁷⁵ Durkan and Ross, *Libraries*, p. 50, quoted in Kirk, *Patterns*, p. 63.

⁷⁶ Roger Mason, ‘This realm of Scotland is an Empire? Imperial ideas and iconography in early Renaissance Scotland’, *Church, Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Early Renaissance Scotland*, ed. Barbara E. Crawford (Edinburgh, 1999), pp. 74-81.

⁷⁷ See, for example, *The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland* (1814), II p. 306, 377-8; cf. John Durkan, ‘Robert Wauchope’, *Innes Review*, i (1950), 48-65 at 50-1, 61.

⁷⁸ *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, II pp. 335, 370.

⁷⁹ Winning, 'Church councils', p. 336.

⁸⁰ For example, Taylor, 'Conflicting doctrines', p. 254; Kenneth, 'Popular literature', p. 179; Cowan, *Scottish Reformation*, p. 83. Margaret Sanderson, by contrast, agrees that these texts 'moderate and middle-of-the-way' approach reflects an 'intention to contain rather than confront the threat' of heresy. Sanderson, *Ayrshire and the Reformation: people and culture 1490-1600* (East Linton, 1997), p. 75.

⁸¹ Lynch, *Edinburgh and the Reformation*, pp. 74, 81.

⁸² Cameron, 'Humanism and Religious Life'.

⁸³ For which see Carol Edington, *Court and Culture in Renaissance Scotland: Sir David Lindsay of the Mount* (Amherst, MA, 1994), whose argument I follow closely here.

⁸⁴ See, for example, Lindsay, 'Ane dialog betuix Experience and ane Courteour', lines 490-9, 538-684, 2613-84, 4375-4400, 4639-58, 4743-4973, 5690-4; idem., 'Ane satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', lines 1091-2, 1144-51, 2037-2287, 2723-44; cf. Edington, *Court and Culture*, esp. pp. 170, 195.

⁸⁵ We can presume that there were other, lost publications, if only from the statute against printers of 1552. However, for what it is worth, that statute's statement that 'thair is diuers Prentaris in this Realme that daylie and continuallie prentis bukis concerning the faith ballatis sangis blasphematiounis rymes alsweill of Kirkmen as temporall' implies that many of these lost imprints were at least as sharp in their criticism of the old kirk as was Lindsay. *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, II. pp. 488-9.

⁸⁶ William Lauder, *Ane compendious and breue tractate, concernyng ye office and dewtie of kyngis* (Edinburgh, 1556: RSTC 15314), sigs. A1^v, C2^v, C3^v - 4^v; *DNB*. There seems to be no evidence for the *DNB*'s assertion that he was probably ordained.

⁸⁷ Lauder, *Breue tractate*, sigs. B1^r - B4^r.

⁸⁸ *The Complaynt of Scotland*, pp. 127-30. The book seems to have caught the eye of the Catholic reformers; at any rate, within a year of its publication Wedderburn was appointed vicar of Dundee by the reforming abbot of Lindores. Maxwell, *Old Dundee*, p. 147.

⁸⁹ A point made by one of the first editors of the 1552 catechism, Thomas Law: *The Catechism of John Hamilton, Archbishop of St. Andrews*, ed. Thomas Graves Law (Oxford, 1884), p. xii.

⁹⁰ Kirk, *Patterns*, p. 43.

⁹¹ Glenn Burgess, 'Scottish or British? Politics and political thought in Scotland, c. 1500 - 1707', *The Historical Journal*, xli (1998), 579-90 at 583-4.

⁹² *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 156-60.

⁹³ Knox, *Works*, I p. 275.

⁹⁴ Leslie, *Historie*, II p. 397; cf. Leslie, *De origine moribus, et rebus gestis Scotorum*, p. 546.

⁹⁵ *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, pp. 159-60.

⁹⁶ As James Cameron has observed: Cameron, 'The Cologne Reformation', 64.

⁹⁷ *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer*, X p. 50.

⁹⁸ *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, II pp. 485, 488-9.

⁹⁹ Michael Yellowlees, 'The ecclesiastical establishment of the diocese of Dunkeld at the Reformation', *Innes Review* xxxvi (1985), 74-85 at 75-6.

¹⁰⁰ *Papal negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots*, ed. J. H. Pollen (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1901), pp. 528-30; Foxe, *Actes and monuments*, p. 1274; Cowan, *Scottish Reformation*, p. 87; Sanderson, *Ayrshire and the Reformation*, p. 73.

¹⁰¹ *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, II. p. 493.

¹⁰² Knox, *Works*, I pp. 308-09.

¹⁰³ As Edington argues: *Court and Culture*, p. 41.

¹⁰⁴ *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, p. 127.

¹⁰⁵ Lindsay of Pitscottie records this detail, and dates it to a provincial council in December 1558; there is no record of it in the statutes of the 1559 council. *Chronicle*, II p. 141.

¹⁰⁶ J. H. Burns, 'The political background of the Reformation, 1513-1625', *Essays*, ed. McRoberts, pp. 1-38 at p. 14.

¹⁰⁷ Kellar, "'To enrich with Gospel truth the neighbour realm'", p. 146.

¹⁰⁸ For example, Jenny Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots: a study in failure* (London, 1988), p. 84.