
The *spirituali* movement in Scotland before the Reformation of 1560

D. W. B. SOMERSET

1. Introduction

The *spirituali* were members of the Church of Rome in Italy in the earlier sixteenth century who held Lutheran or semi-Lutheran views on the doctrine of justification by faith but who remained within the bounds of Romanism. The *spirituali* movement was a broad one, ranging from crypto-Protestants or Nicodemites,¹ at one extreme, to those who believed in the sacrifice of the mass and who were ready to persecute Protestants, at the other. The movement was strong in the 1530s and 1540s and included several cardinals such as Fregoso, Contarini, Sadoletto, Bembo, Seripando, Pole, and Morone. Twice (Pole in 1549 and Morone in 1565), a *spirituali* cardinal was almost elected as Pope. The *spirituali* movement was bitterly opposed by the *zelanti* in the Church of Rome; and the setting up of the Roman Inquisition in 1542 was partly aimed at the suppression of the *spirituali*. The foremost *zelanti* were Carafa, who was Pope Paul IV from 1555 to 1559, and Michele Ghislieri, who was Pope Pius V from 1566 to 1572.²

1. The term 'Nicodemite' was introduced by Calvin to describe those of Protestant beliefs in France and Italy in the 1540s who chose to remain in the Church of Rome to avoid persecution; see C. M. N. Eire, *War Against the Idols*, (Cambridge, 1986), p. 236. Similar conduct was found soon afterwards in Germany (following the Augsburg Interim of 1548) and in England (during the reign of Mary I, 1553-58). The term is now used generally to describe the same type of behaviour, whether among Protestants or Roman Catholics.

2. The literature on the *spirituali* movement is vast (with much of it in Italian). The natural starting place in English is Dermot Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter-Reformation* (Cambridge, 1972).

In 1552, John Hamilton, Archbishop of St Andrews and Primate of the Scottish Church, published a *Catechism* which expressed an essentially Lutheran view of faith, at variance with the canons of the Council of Trent published five years earlier.³ The *Catechism* was probably compiled by a committee on which the Dominican friar Richard Marshall and the Augustinian canon John Winram held prominent places. Had the *Catechism* been published in Italy, it would have been regarded as a *spirituali* document and would have brought Hamilton, Marshall, and Winram into trouble with the Inquisition. A reference to the *Catechism* in 1558/9 shows that it continued to be accepted as a standard of Roman Catholic orthodoxy in Scotland throughout the 1550s.⁴ Thus *spirituali* doctrine was orthodox in Scotland at a time when it was being vigorously suppressed in Italy.⁵

The prevalence of *spirituali* doctrine in Scotland in the 1550s is not a fact that has been generally recognised in Church histories of the period. The deviations of Hamilton's *Catechism* from Tridentine orthodoxy are frequently noted,⁶ but for some reason the *Catechism* is seldom or never identified as *spirituali*. James Cameron observes that the *Catechism's* 'theology was essentially that of Gropper's *Enchiridion*', and could be characterised as 'semi-Lutheran', but he does not take the further step of connecting the doctrine with that of the Italian *spirituali*.⁷ Nevertheless, that is the school to which it belongs – although we are not aware of any direct contact between Hamilton and the Italian *spirituali*.

2. Usefulness of the identification

This explicit identification of Hamilton's *Catechism* as *spirituali* by no means solves all the problems in Scottish Church history during the 1540s and 1550s, but it is of considerable help, as we shall see.

3. See T. G. Law (ed.), *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552* (Oxford, 1884), pp. xxxiii, xxxv-xxxvi.

4. D. Patrick (ed.), *The Statutes of the Scottish Church, 1225-1559* (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1907), p. 157.

5. For example, Cardinal Morone was imprisoned between May 1557 and August 1559, on the orders of Paul IV.

6. G. Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge, 1960), p. 35; I. B. Cowan, *The Scottish Reformation* (London, 1982), pp. 81-83; W. I. P. Hazlett, *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (London, 2003), pp. 147-8; A. Ryrie, *The Origins of the Scottish Reformation* (Manchester, 2006), p. 99.

7. J. K. Cameron, "Catholic Reform" in Germany and in the pre-1560 Church in Scotland', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society (RSCHS)*, Vol. 20:2 (1979), pp. 105-117 (p. 112).

The first reason for this is simply that it gives a third category into which religious people of the Reformation period can be placed. The straightforward division into Protestants and Roman Catholics is too crude, as is well known. Many people of Protestant sympathies remained in the Church of Rome for a long time (e.g. John Winram and John Erskine of Dun), while others were undoubtedly Roman Catholic and yet had certain Protestant leanings (e.g. Richard Marshall and Archbishop Hamilton). It is more accurate to think of the Protestant movement as comprising both overt Protestants and many of the *spirituali*, and the Roman Church as containing a *spirituali* faction which was out of sympathy with important aspects of the Tridentine position.

Secondly, the prevalence of *spirituali* doctrine in the Scottish Church from about 1547 onwards made Nicodemism far more attractive – or tempting – for Scottish Protestants than it would have been under Tridentine doctrine, because some of the most important Protestant beliefs were conceded already. In practice, Nicodemism in Scotland in the 1550s largely meant turning a blind eye to the mass; and many Scottish Protestants were content to do this, until Knox's visit shook them up in 1555.

Thirdly, the *spirituali* movement provided a continuous spectrum of religious belief – and thus a bridge – between Protestantism and Romanism. As we have mentioned, there were Italian *spirituali* who were Protestants in hiding, such as Peter Martyr Vermigli before 1542, or Pietro Carnesecchi who was eventually martyred in 1567; there were others such as Sadoletto who were opposed to the persecution of Protestants; and others again, such as Cardinal Pole, who eventually engaged in it. Within this range of opinion, it was possible to move from one position to another without drawing attention to oneself – for example, by changing one's views on transubstantiation, or purgatory, or the sacrifice of the mass, or the invocation of saints. Thus the prevalence of *spirituali* doctrine within Scottish Romanism provided a cover under which Protestantism could quietly flourish. Nicodemists could multiply without being noticed. This fact, together with the ease of Nicodemism, probably explains why overt Protestantism virtually disappeared in Scotland in the early 1550s, and then reappeared with surprising strength from 1556 onwards.⁸

Fourthly, the identifying of Hamilton's *Catechism* as *spirituali* shows the doctrinal isolation of the Scottish Church in the 1550s from the main

8. The apparent disappearance of Scottish Protestantism between 1551 and 1554 was noted by Thomas M'Crie as long ago as 1813, *Life of John Knox* (2 vols, Edinburgh, 1813), Vol. 1, p. 169.

stream of continental Romanism. Recent writers have stressed the contact between the pre-Reformation Scottish Church and currents of continental Roman Catholic thought, so the Scottish Church leaders must have been aware of the bitter opposition faced by the *spirituali*, especially in Italy. They knew that their own position was out on a limb, and yet they deliberately adopted it. English Romanism was also isolated during the reign of Mary I, but in a somewhat different way; and for political reasons there seems to have been little contact between the English and Scottish Churches. In both cases, however, the isolation from mainstream Romanism, and from the papacy, probably worked to the advantage of Protestantism.

Fifthly, the identification brings out the likelihood that there was a serious division within Scottish Romanism in the 1550s. The opposition to *spirituali* doctrine on the continent was presumably reflected in Scotland; and indeed we shall see that the split in the Church over the Pater Noster controversy of 1551–1552 was almost certainly along this fault-line. Such internal conflict can only have hindered the various reform programmes that were envisaged.

The purpose of this paper is to review the principal Scottish ecclesiastical events of the 1540s and 1550s and to see what light is shed on them by the identification of the doctrine of Hamilton's *Catechism* as *spirituali*. We proceed in a series of numbered paragraphs or short sections.

3. Survey

1. In the spring of 1529, Alexander Alane (Alesius) was imprisoned in the Augustinian priory in St Andrews because of his reluctance to condemn the Lutheran views of Patrick Hamilton. He was still prepared to say mass, however, and when he fled to the Continent he was associated with the reforming Roman Catholic bishop, Hermann von Weid of Cologne.⁹ Alesius' position at that time was thus the same as that soon afterwards to be held by the Italian *spirituali*. The Dominican friar John Craig, who was imprisoned (possibly in St Andrews) for suspected heresy in about 1534, is probably another example of an early Scottish *spirituali*.¹⁰

9. Like Alesius, von Weid subsequently became a Protestant. For Alesius, see his entry in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)* by G. Wiedermann with references given there. See also R. J. Dickie, 'Alexander Alesius: Scotland's first international Reformer', in *Scotland's Debt to Martin Luther* (Scottish Reformation Society), forthcoming.

10. T. G. Law (ed.), *A Shorte Summe of the Whole Catechisme by John Craig* (Edinburgh 1883), pp. v-lxi; D. W. B. Somerset, 'John Craig: the earlier years to 1560', *The Bulwark*, January-March 2018, pp. 3-9.

2. In the 1530s, the College of St Leonard in St Andrews became a centre of *spirituali* teaching.¹¹ John Knox records that ‘within schort space [of Patrick Hamilton’s death in 1527/8] many begane to call in doubt that which befor thei held for a certaine veritie, in so much that the Universitie of Sanctandrose, and Sanct Leonardis Colledge principallie, by the labouris of Maister Gawin Logy, and the [Augustinian] novises of the Abbay, by the suppriour, begane to smell somewhat of the veritie, and to espy the vanitie of the receaved superstition.’¹² David Calderwood says that ‘Mr. Gawin Logie instilled into his scholars the truthe secretlie, which they, in processe of time, spread through the whole countrie, whereupon did arise a proverbe, ‘Yee have drunken of Sanct Leonards well.’¹³ The ‘secret’ maintenance of ‘the truth’ was very typical of the *spirituali*.

3. John Hamilton (1512–1571), the future Archbishop, entered St Leonard’s College in St Andrews in 1528. It is not known how long he studied there, but it is reasonable to suppose that it was there that he first imbibed *spirituali* views.¹⁴ In 1541 he was sent to France by James V,¹⁵ where he seems to have become morally debauched,¹⁶ and on his return in 1543 he disappointed the overt Protestants by turning against them; but the publication of the *Catechism* in his name in 1552 suggests that he never entirely abandoned his semi-Lutheran convictions.¹⁷ His companion

11. For interesting details of the unrest in the University after the death of Patrick Hamilton, see A. I. Dunlop (ed.), *Acta Facultatis Artium Universitatis S. Andree, 1413–1588* (2 vols, Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1964), Vol. 1, pp. liii, lvii–lxi.

12. D. Laing (ed.), *Works of John Knox* (6 vols., Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1846–64), Vol. 1, p. 36; W. Croft Dickinson (ed.), *John Knox’s History of the Reformation in Scotland* (2 vols, London, 1949), Vol. 1, p. 14.

13. D. Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland* (8 vols., Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1842–49), Vol. 1, pp. 82–83.

14. Several writers, including Knox and George Buchanan, bear witness to Archbishop Hamilton’s early Protestant inclinations; see J. Herkless and R. K. Hannay, *The Archbishops of St Andrews* (5 vols, Edinburgh, 1907–1915), Vol. 5, pp. 8–9.

15. ‘And sum men sayis the bybill I Imbraist./For feir of that thay gart me fle to France’; see J. Cranstoun (ed.), *Satirical Poems of the Time of the Reformation* (2 vols., Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1891–3), Vol. 1, p. 195.

16. G. Buchanan, *The History of Scotland*, trans. J. Aikman (4 vols, Glasgow, 1827), Vol. 2, p. 329; Dickinson, *John Knox’s History*, Vol. 1, p. 59.

17. From a biblical point of view, Hamilton, along with several others of the *spirituali* such as Cardinal Pole, seem to be examples of those spoken of by Christ in Luke 11:24–26: ‘When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest;

in France, David Panter, later Bishop of Ross, also turned away from his early Protestantism, but seems to have retained some *spirituali* sentiments up until his death in 1558.¹⁸

4. There is nothing to connect Cardinal David Beaton (1494–1546) with the *spirituali*. His interest in theology was minimal but politically he was opposed to anything subversive or that favoured the English. By 1542, he was sheltering the English Dominican Richard Marshall – probably the principal author of Hamilton’s *Catechism*, and therefore a proponent of *spirituali* views – but Marshall was loyal to the papacy and to the Roman Church, and therefore Beaton was probably not inclined to enquire further. For Beaton, the great thing about Marshall was that he was obnoxious to Henry VIII.¹⁹

5. John Winram (1492–1582) was an Augustinian canon in St Andrews by 1527 and became the third prior by 1534 and the sub-prior in 1535. From 1538, when Lord James Stewart (c.1531–1570) became prior *in commendam*, Winram was the *de facto* leader of the priory. Winram came into *spirituali* views quite early. Traditionally, he has been identified with Knox’s *spirituali* ‘sub-prior’ in paragraph 2 above; but this has been challenged on the ground that Winram was not sub-prior between 1528 and 1535.²⁰ Against this it can be said that Winram was sub-prior for twenty-five years from 1535 to 1560, so Knox, writing in the 1560s, may well have used that designation for him anachronistically even before 1535. Furthermore, the man to whom Knox refers was the instructor of the novices, and this is not likely to have been the sub-prior, who was a busy man, especially when Patrick Hepburn (prior from 1526 to 1538) was absent.²¹ In any case, whether as teacher or taught, Winram probably ‘smelled somewhat of the verity’ by the early 1530s.

and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. And when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first.’

18. Dickinson, *John Knox’s History*, Vol. 1, p. 131.

19. M. H. B. Sanderson, *Cardinal of Scotland: David Beaton, c.1494–1546* (Edinburgh, 2001), p. 123.

20. L. J. Dunbar, *Reforming the Scottish Church: John Winram (c.1492–1582)* (Aldershot, 2002), p. 20. The sub-priors between 1528 and 1535 were James Wemyes and Alexander Young. Whatever the identification of Knox’s ‘supprior’, it is likely that Alexander Young also had *spirituali* leanings, given his close involvement with Gavin Logie; see Dunbar, *ibid.*; Dunlop, *Acta Facultatis Artium Universitatis S. Andree, 1413–1588*, Vol. 1, pp. xlviii–xlix.

21. M. Dilworth, ‘The Augustinian Chapter of St Andrews’, in D. McRoberts (ed.), *The*

Winram's *spirituali* views are confirmed by his sermon at George Wishart's trial in March 1546, which infuriated Cardinal Beaton. According to Pitscottie, Beaton told Winram: 'We know you and what you are seven years since', i.e. since Beaton became Archbishop in 1539.²² Winram regarded Wishart as innocent of the charges against him, and after his condemnation he wanted to administer the Lord's Supper to him in both kinds, but was forbidden to do so by Beaton.²³ After Beaton's death in May 1546, Winram became vicar-general of the vacant diocese, and during the course of this year he published a *Catechism* of which no copy survives.²⁴

In May 1547, or thereabouts, Winram was present when Knox preached his first sermon. Among other subjects, Knox proclaimed justification by faith alone in opposition to 'the doctrine of the Papists, which attributeth justification to the works of the law'. Under pressure from Archbishop Hamilton, Winram drew up ten articles against Knox which he was required to answer, but the doctrine of justification was not among them. In the ensuing debate, Winram made little resistance to Knox's views; and he was thereafter happy to acquiesce in a brief 'pulpit-sharing' arrangement with Knox in the parish church.²⁵ Winram was involved in the trials of both Adam Wallace in 1550 and Walter Milne in 1558; but he was one among many, and there is no reason to think that he approved either condemnation, though he may not have been brave enough to make much opposition.

Linda Dunbar makes the interesting suggestion that it was Winram's *Catechism* that Knox used with his pupils in the parish church of St Andrews in April 1547, on the ground that this was the only vernacular catechism available.²⁶ On reflection, however, this suggestion seems

Medieval Church of St Andrews (Glasgow, 1976), pp. 121-136 (pp. 130-31, 134). There were about twenty canons during the 1530s; Dunbar, *Reforming the Scottish Church*, p. 205.

22. Robert Lindesay of Pitscottie, *Historie and Cronicles of Scotland* (3 vols, Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1899-1911), Vol. 2, pp. 76-77.

23. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 77; Buchanan, *History of Scotland*, Vol. 2, p. 356 (1582 edn., f. 177v). For discussion, see Dunbar, *Reforming the Scottish Church*, pp. 22-24.

24. Dunbar, *Reforming the Scottish Church: John Winram*, pp. 24-5. Bishop John Bale gives the date of the *Catechism*, which he had apparently seen, as 1546.

25. Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, pp. 85, 87-90, 93.

26. Dunbar, *Reforming the Scottish Church*, pp. 24-25; Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 82. Calderwood records that Thomas Forret (d. 1538/9) wrote a catechism which

unlikely. Winram's *Catechism* was presumably a *spirituali* document – and certainly so if Knox was using it – but had Knox seen it, he would have known that there were differing views on justification in the Roman Church, which apparently he did not when he preached his first sermon. Furthermore, Knox had an abhorrence of all things Roman Catholic, and Hugh Watt's suggestion that Knox was using a Latin catechism of Luther (or possibly Calvin) seems more likely.²⁷

David McRoberts says with regard to Winram's extended ecclesiastical career: 'One would very much like to know what religious convictions he really held, if any'; and then likens him to Hermann von Wied who, according to Charles V, was 'neither a Protestant nor a Catholic but a proper heathen'.²⁸ In both cases, however, their views were simply those of the more Protestant-leaning *spirituali*, and both eventually made the transition to full-blown Protestantism.

6. John Erskine of Dun (1509–1590) was another who had early Protestant convictions – for example, his association with the martyr David Straiton in 1534, and his support for George Wishart in 1543–45 – and yet who remained in the Church of Rome until the late 1550s. Such conduct has puzzled some writers,²⁹ but the puzzle largely disappears once his position is recognised as similar to that of the Italian Nicodemites and *spirituali*.

7. Little is known of the early religious history of Lord James Stewart (1531–1570), illegitimate son of James V and later Regent Moray.³⁰ He occupied the prior's house in St Andrews from 1545, and his contact with his sub-prior John Winram, and the presence of John Spottiswoode (below) in his house, both suggest a *spirituali* position. A German Lutheran visitor to the priory of St Andrews in 1553, Marcus

had quite a wide circulation, but it is unlikely that Knox even knew of this; Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, Vol. 1, p. 127.

27. H. Watt, *John Knox in Controversy* (London, 1950), pp. 6–7.

28. McRoberts, *The Medieval Church of St Andrews*, p. 117 and note. For similar sentiments, see D. McRoberts (ed.), *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513–1625* (Glasgow, 1962), pp. xix–xx.

29. See, for example, the ODNB entry for Erskine of Dun; cf. F. D. Bardgett, *Scotland Reformed: The Reformation in Angus and the Mearns* (Edinburgh, 1989), pp. 22–24, 35.

30. For an interesting summary of what is known of the earlier life of Lord James, together with his intellectual interests, see D. W. Doughty, 'The Library of James Stewart, Earl of Moray, 1531–1570', *Innes Review*, Vol. 21 (1970), pp. 17–29.

Wagner, describes Lord James as jesting at the dinner table with Erskine of Dun.³¹ His first distinctly Protestant appearance was as a hearer of John Knox's in 1555.³²

Lord James is sometimes said to have been educated under George Buchanan from 1536 until 1539,³³ but in fact Buchanan's pupil was another illegitimate son of James V, also Lord James Stewart, who was the son of Elizabeth Shaw of Sauchie.³⁴ This boy was commendator of Kelso from 1534 and of Melrose from 1541, and died on 25th September 1557.³⁵ Buchanan apparently brought his pupil to Protestant or *spirituali* views because on 25th March 1551 a witness before the Paris Inquisition deponed that Robert Wauchope had told him that 'Buchanan had been tutor to the son of the Scottish king and that he had been the ruin of that youth.'³⁶

8. John Erskine's contemporary John Spottiswoode (1509/10–1585) attended Glasgow University, and went to England about 1540. There he was befriended by Archbishop Cranmer who brought him to 'knowledge of the truth'.³⁷ He returned to Scotland after James V's death in 1542 and 'stayed a long time' with the Earl of Glencairn, an early Protestant sympathizer. In 1548 he accepted James Sandilands of Calder's offer of the parsonage of Calder, living partly with Sandilands, who was preceptor of Torphichen (a hospital of St John of Jerusalem), and partly with Lord James Stewart in St Andrews.

Other members of Lord James' circle included Robert Colville of Cleish (c.1520–1560), who was the master of his household, and Patrick

31. J. H. Baxter (ed.), *Copiale Prioratus Sanctiandree* (Oxford, 1930), p. xxvi. Wagner was collecting material on behalf of Flacius Illyricus for the famous Church history, *The Magdeburg Centuries*, which commenced publication in 1559.

32. Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 121.

33. See, for example, the entry on Regent Moray in *ODNB*.

34. P. Hume Brown, *George Buchanan, Humanist and Reformer* (Edinburgh, 1890), p. 91; J. M. Aitken, *The Trial of George Buchanan before the Lisbon Inquisition* (Edinburgh, 1939), p. 122.

35. D. E. R. Watt and N. F. Shead, *Heads of Religious Houses in Scotland from Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries* (Scottish Record Society, Edinburgh, 2001), pp. 125-6, 154.

36. J. Durkan, 'Buchanan's Judaising practices', *Innes Review*, Vol. 15 (1964), pp. 186-7; I. D. McFarlane, *Buchanan* (London, 1981), p. 68. The Paris Inquisition had summoned witnesses at the request of the Lisbon Inquisition which was investigating Buchanan.

37. J. Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland* (3 vols, Spottiswoode Society, Edinburgh, 1847-51), Vol. 2, p. 336.

Cockburn (d. 1568), who may have been his teacher at St Andrews University in the 1540s. In July 1548 Colville, Cockburn, and Lord James accompanied the young Mary Queen of Scots to France;³⁸ and in September 1550, the three of them, together with James Sandilands and John Spottiswoode, returned to France in the entourage of Mary of Guise. Cockburn became a professor of Oriental Languages at the Sorbonne, and published two doctrinal works: *Oratio de utilitate et excellentia verbi Dei* (1551), dedicated to Archbishop Hamilton; and *De vulgari sacrae scripturae phrasi* (1552), dedicated to Lord James. The former work was translated into French by Jacques Vincent in 1553. Returning to St Andrews to teach, Cockburn published *In Dominicam orationem pia meditatio* in 1555. In summer 1558, Lord James, Colville, Spottiswoode, and Cockburn were again in France, when Mary Queen of Scots married the Dauphin; and Colville and Spottiswoode helped with the publication of a second, enlarged edition of Cockburn's *De vulgari sacrae scripturae phrasi* in July.³⁹ In 1561 he published part of a catechism: *In secundae partis catechismi (quae est de simbolo quod apostolicum vocant) enarrationem, de fide, et iustificatione, praefatio*.

Cockburn, Colville, and Spottiswoode all became Protestants at the Reformation. Cockburn debated with Ninian Winzet on prayers for the dead in Linlithgow in June 1559;⁴⁰ Colville was killed at the siege of Leith in May 1560; and Spottiswoode became the Superintendent of Lothian. There can be little doubt that Lord James' house in St Andrews formed a Nicodemite or *spirituali* 'nest' in the early 1550s. Indeed the whole priory inclined in this direction, and of the twenty-three canons known to have joined the priory in the 1550s, no fewer than nineteen found positions in the Reformed Church after 1560.⁴¹

38. Sir R. Cockburn and H. A. Cockburn, *The Records of the Cockburn Family* (Edinburgh, 1913), pp. 146-7.

39. J. Durkan and J. Kirk, *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577* (Glasgow, 1977), p. 212; entry on Patrick Cockburn in *ODNB*.

40. N. Winzet, *Velitatio in Georgium Buchananum* (Ingolstadt, 1582), p. 222; N. Winzet, *Certain Tractates*, ed. J. K. Hewison (2 vols, Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1888-90), Vol. 1, pp. xxvii-xxx. Presumably this was the same debate in which John Knox participated; see 'Addenda and Corrigenda', *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal (SRSJH)*, Vol. 7 (2017), p. 284. Cockburn went on to become minister of Haddington in 1562.

41. Dunbar, *Reforming the Scottish Church*, p. 34 and note. The canon Robert Achesoun, who disappears after 1555, is presumably the man who appears as Protestant minister in Ayr in 1557; see Ryrie, *The Origins of the Scottish Reformation*, pp. 120, 129.

9. John Hamilton was nominated to the see of St Andrews by the Pope in November 1547 but was not installed as archbishop until June 1549. A provincial synod was at once held in Linlithgow in August 1549 and continued in Edinburgh in November 1549. This enacted numerous decrees, several being taken directly from the Council of Trent. Four of the decrees condemned the keeping of concubines by churchmen, and these call into question the sincerity of the whole meeting, because of the sixty-odd men who were present in Edinburgh, nearly a quarter are known to have had illegitimate children.⁴² A few of these (including Hamilton) definitely continued their irregular conduct after 1549, and the likelihood is that all of them did.

Three of the decrees of 1549 related to the extirpation of heresies and the setting up of an inquisition. The main inquiry for the inquisitors of heretical pravity was to be against those who ‘rail against the sacraments themselves or against the ceremonies, rites, and observances received by the Church and used in the administration of the sacraments, and especially in the sacrifice of the mass, in baptism, confirmation, extreme unction, penance, and the other sacraments.’ They were also to question those who ‘reject [the] canonical decisions’ of General Councils.⁴³ Within two years, the compilers of Hamilton’s *Catechism* – most of whom were probably members of the 1549 synod – were to show scant regard for some of the canons of Trent. This inconsistency may indicate a shift in the balance of power in the Church during that time.

10. John Row (c.1526–1580) matriculated at St Leonard’s College, St Andrews, in 1544. After further studies in law, he practised as an advocate in the consistory court of St Andrews. About 1550 he went to Rome, and on 11th March 1555 he was appointed procurator for Archbishop Hamilton and his coadjutor, Gavin Hamilton. In 1559 he returned to Scotland as a papal nuncio, was converted to Protestantism through the instrumentality of Robert Colville of Cleish and John Knox, and was persuaded by Lord James Stewart not to return to Rome. This was probably in October 1559,⁴⁴ and thereafter he presumably joined John Winram, John Douglas, and John Spottiswoode in the safety of St Andrews for the next few months. The

42. Patrick, *Statutes*, pp. 85-8 compared with D. Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland* (London, 1910), pp. 546-569.

43. Patrick, *Statutes*, pp. 126-7.

44. D. W. B. Somerset, ‘John Row the Reformer and the Miracle at Loretto’, *SRSJH*, Vol. 6 (2016), pp. 1-21 (p. 11).

following summer, the four of them, with John Knox and John Willock, compiled the Scots Confession of 1560 and the First Book of Discipline.⁴⁵ Row's antecedents at St Leonard's, his appointment as procurator by Archbishop Hamilton, and his rapid rise to prominence in the Reformed Church, would all suggest a *spirituali* background; but, if so, Rome must have been an uncomfortable residence for him in the late 1550s.

John Row's contemporary Robert Pont (1524–1606) matriculated at St Leonard's College the same year as Row. Thereafter nothing is known of him until he reappears as a signatory to the Protestant band of July 1559 and as an elder on the St Andrews kirk session later in that year.⁴⁶ Again, a *spirituali* position during the 1550s is likely.

11. In 1550, Archbishop Hamilton embarked on a campaign of persecution against Protestantism. In the words of John Knox: '...Scotland had peace with the world. But yet would their bishops make war against God; for how soon that ever they got any quietness, they apprehended Adam Wallace, alias Fean, a simple man, without great learning, but one that was zealous in godliness and of an upright life.'⁴⁷ Adam Wallace was charged with rejecting the mass and was put to death on the Castlehill in Edinburgh. The other known victims of the campaign were George Winchester of Kinglassie, Fife and John Macbriar, a former Cistercian canon from Glenluce. Winchester had been the steward and baillie of the regality of St Andrews in 1544-5, but for some reason had been escheated (deprived of his property) in 1546. In 1550 he was summoned by Archbishop Hamilton and convicted of heresy *in absentia*. He fled abroad where he died, apparently before August 1555.⁴⁸ John Macbriar had left the Cistercians and was apprehended by Hamilton in the house

45. Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 343.

46. D. Hay Fleming (ed.), *Register of the Minister, Elders, and Deacons of the Christian Congregation of St. Andrews, 1559-1600* (2 vols, Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1889-90), Vol. 1, pp. 3, 8.

47. Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, pp. 113-4; see also Lord Herries, *Historical Memoirs* (Abbotsford Club, Edinburgh, 1836), p. 26.

48. G. Martine, *Reliquiae Divi Andreae* (St Andrews, 1797), p. 144; T. M'Crie, *Life of John Knox* (Edinburgh, 1855), pp. 80, 319; D. Hay Fleming, *Martyrs and Confessors of St. Andrews* (Cupar, 1887), pp. 190-93; W. Macfarlane, *Genealogical Collections* (2 vols, Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1900), Vol. 2, pp. 188-9; Durkan, 'Heresy in Scotland: the second phase, 1546-1558', *RSCHS*, Vol. 24:3 (1992), pp. 320-365 (p. 363); M. H. B. Sanderson, *Biographical List of Early Scottish Protestants* (Scottish Record Society, Edinburgh, 2010), p. 138.

of Andrew Stewart, Lord Ochiltree, sometime before 4th March 1549/50. He was imprisoned in Hamilton Castle, whence he was rescued by John Lockhart of Bar and others in May 1550. He subsequently fled to England.⁴⁹

Adam Wallace had been acting as tutor to John Cockburn of Ormiston, while Macbriar may have been chaplain to Lord Ochiltree, so it seems that the campaign was intended as a warning shot to prominent Protestant sympathisers. Whether there were other victims of the campaign is unknown. In a communication to the Court of Rome in September 1554, Hamilton refers the cases of Macbriar and Wallace as evidence of his zeal against Protestantism, which rather suggests that there had been no further prosecutions after 1550.⁵⁰

One case of persecution, however, which dates from 1551, is that of John Durie (d. 1600), a Benedictine monk at Dunfermline Abbey, and later the prominent Protestant and supporter of Andrew Melville. Durie became a monk in 1548,⁵¹ and according to Spottiswoode, after three years at the abbey, he was considered heretical, tried, and sentenced to being shut up between two walls until he died.⁵² His friends, however, secured his release with the help of the Governor (the second Earl of Arran).⁵³ The instigator of the persecution was his own cousin, George Durie, who was the abbot of Dunfermline and a first cousin of Cardinal David Beaton. The timing is interesting, because in 1547 and 1548 some of the Augustinian

49. R. Pitcairn (ed.), *Ancient Criminal Trials* (3 vols., Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1833), Vol. 1, p. 352*; R. K. Hannay (ed.), *Acts of the Lords of Council in Public Affairs, 1501–1554* (Edinburgh, 1932), p. 601; J. Durkan, 'Some local heretics', *Transactions of the Dumfries and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 3rd Series, Vol. 36 (1959), pp. 67–77 (pp. 74–75). Curiously, the same page of Pitcairn shows that Lockhart of Bar and Lord Ochiltree were themselves involved in a serious feud at that very time.

50. M'Crrie, *Life of Knox* (1855 edn.), p. 374; *Liber Officialis Sancti Andree* (Abbotsford Club, Edinburgh, 1845), pp. 164–8 (p. 167).

51. M. Dilworth, 'Monks and ministers after 1560', *RSCHS*, Vol. 18:3 (1974), pp. 201–221 (pp. 216, 219). John Durie is usually said to have been born c.1537, but, if so, he became a monk excessively young. He subsequently had a large family, with the second son Robert being born in 1555.

52. About the beginning of the nineteenth century, a skeleton was found standing upright in the ruins of Inchcolm Abbey; see Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland*, p. 76.

53. Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland*, Vol. 3, p. 83. Spottiswoode names John Durie's deliverer as 'that worthy nobleman, the Earl of Arran', apparently thinking of the third Earl (c.1532–1609), but he was out of the country between 1548 and autumn 1559.

canons of Inchcolm Abbey were staying in Dunfermline Abbey while their island was occupied successively by the English and the French.⁵⁴ It was these men of whom the martyr and former canon Thomas Forret stated in 1539: ‘he converted the younger channons, “but the old bottells...would not receive the new wine”’;⁵⁵ and perhaps it was from one of the younger canons staying in Dunfermline that Durie received the gospel. In any case, the whole incident would seem to have been local rather than part of a general campaign.

12. At this point, Scottish Protestantism seems to have entered a Nicodemite phase. Very little overt Protestantism is recorded between 1551 and 1555, and in January 1551/2 the Provincial Council reflected with thankfulness: ‘How many frightful heresies have, within the last few years, run riot in many diverse parts of this realm, but have now at last been checked by the providence of the All-good and Almighty God, the singular goodwill of princes, and the vigilance and zeal of prelates for the Catholic faith, and seem almost extinguished.’⁵⁶

In spite of the appointment of an inquisition by the 1549 Council, and the campaign of 1550, the *spirituali* ethos was not inquisitorial.⁵⁷ It was inclined to tolerance, provided that the role of the Church was respected and the doctrines of the Church, especially the mass, were not openly denied.⁵⁸ Scotland did not have the network of secret informers found in the Roman, Spanish, and Portuguese Inquisitions (and those that there were in Scotland were probably anti-*spirituali*). Archbishop Hamilton was mainly preoccupied with politics as long as his half-brother was Governor,

54. J. Hill Burton (ed.), *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, Vol. 1, 1545–1569* (Edinburgh, 1877), p. 80; D. E. Easson and A. Macdonald (eds.), *Charters of the Abbey of Inchcolm* (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1938), pp. xxxix–xl.

55. Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, Vol. 1, p. 127. Fifteen canons of Inchcolm are recorded in 1541, of whom five or six (John Flagear, Patrick and Thomas Ramsay, John Brown(?), John Brownhill, and Andrew Angus) found service in the Reformed Church after 1560; see Easson and Macdonald, *Charters of the Abbey of Inchcolm*, pp. 72–3; C. H. Haws, *Scottish Parish Clergy at the Reformation, 1540–1574* (Scottish Record Society, Edinburgh, 1972).

56. Patrick, *Statutes*, p. 143. One exception was the preaching of the Augustinian canon Robert Achesoun in Kelso in August 1553; see A. I. Cameron (ed.), *Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine, 1543–1560* (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1927), p. 368.

57. Herkless and Hannay, *The Archbishops of St Andrews*, Vol. 5, p. 55.

58. The 1549 statutes for the repression of heresy were directed ‘chiefly against those who inveigh against the sacrament of the Eucharist’; see Patrick, *Statutes*, p. 124.

so it was not difficult to be a Nicodemite Protestant in Scotland in the early 1550s. Hamilton suffered ill-health during this period, but otherwise, with the irresolute Governor so much under his control, he had every opportunity of persecuting Nicodemism had he wished.

13. The case of Robert Wedderburn presents some difficulties. The first part of his life seems to have moved in a Protestant direction. He was born about 1510, the youngest of the three well-known brothers from Dundee. He attended St Leonard's College, St Andrews from 1526 to 1530, and may have come under the influence of Gavin Logie and *spirituali* doctrine during that time. In the 1530s he went to Paris where he 'remained chiefly in company of these that were instructed in religion' such as James Sandilands of Calder.⁵⁹ Thereafter he visited eastern Europe, possibly calling on his former teacher, the reformer John Fethy, in Legnica in Silesia.⁶⁰ On his return to Scotland in summer 1546 he was involved in the burning of an effigy of Cardinal Beaton on board the ship. His brother John, who had to flee Scotland in 1546, was an open Protestant by this stage; while his brother James, who fled to Rouen and Dieppe in 1540, probably held either a *spirituali* or a Nicodemite position.⁶¹ In 1547, Robert became chamberlain to the Knights of St John at Torphichen, again in association with James Sandilands who was the preceptor. According to an addition in Calderwood, Wedderburn was one of the authors of the *Gude and Godlie Ballatis*: 'Mr Robert turned the tunes and tenour of many profane ballads into godlie songs and hymnes, which were called the Psalmes of Dundie. Thereby he stirred up the affections of many.'⁶² An edition of the *Gude and Godlie Ballatis* may well have been printed by John Scott in Dundee sometime before April 1547.⁶³

At this stage, however, Wedderburn's life seems to have lost its Protestant edge and turned more in a *spirituali* direction. In 1547, there was an anti-English reaction in Scotland, particularly after the disastrous battle of Pinkie in September, and Wedderburn seems to have shared in

59. Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, Vol. 1, p. 143.

60. Durkan, 'Heresy in Scotland: the second phase, 1546–1558', pp. 327, 331.

61. A. F. Mitchell (ed.), *A Compendious Book of Godly and Spiritual Songs: commonly known as 'The Gude and Godlie Ballatis'* (Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1897), p. xxiii; A. A. MacDonald (ed.), *The Gude and Godlie Ballatis* (Scottish Text Society, Woodbridge, 2015), p. 34.

62. Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, Vol. 8, p. 147; see also Vol. 1, p. 143.

63. *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, Vol. 1, 1545–1569, pp. 69–70.

this. His uncle was the vicar of Dundee, and the burning of his uncle's vicarage by the English after the battle may have contributed to the nephew's embitterment. Wedderburn is generally thought to have been the author of the violently anti-English, pro-French *Complaynt of Scotland* which was probably published about March 1549/50. One difficulty about this attribution – not strong enough to overturn it, but still a puzzle – is that at the time when the author of the *Complaynt* was warning about the dangerous 'abusions' in the Church,⁶⁴ Robert Wedderburn had a mistress or concubine, Isobell Lovell. Their two children were legitimated in 1552. In 1551, Wedderburn succeeded his uncle as vicar of Dundee, but he died in 1553 and was buried, for some unknown reason, in St Giles in Edinburgh.⁶⁵

Not surprisingly, some have found Wedderburn's authorship of the *Complaynt of Scotland* hard to reconcile with his earlier Protestant sympathies, and one recent writer tries to resolve the problem by denying that he had such sympathies: 'There is no reason to suppose that Robert Wedderburn...ever espoused Protestantism...Burial in such a prominent location [St Giles], and at such a date, would have been unthinkable for anyone tainted by heresy...The *Complaynt of Scotland* [was] a prose work suffused with pro-French sympathies, dedicated to the Queen Mother, Mary of Guise, and anything but crypto-Protestant.'⁶⁶ A more likely reconciliation, however, is that after 1547, Wedderburn regarded 'schism' in the Scottish Church as something to be avoided because it might endanger Scotland's independence from England, and he therefore sought an internal reform in the Church from a *spirituali* position.⁶⁷ His burial in St Giles in 1553 would be perfectly consistent with this.

Wedderburn's enduring reputation was as one inclined to Protestantism. John Johnston (c.1565–1611) praised him along with his brothers ('three equal in learning and in piety'),⁶⁸ while the gleanings of David Calderwood (1575–1650) have already been cited. Given the closeness of early Scottish Protestantism, there is every likelihood that the

64. A. M. Stewart (ed.), *The Complaynt of Scotland* (Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1979), pp. 124-7, fol. 124v-127v.

65. A. Maxwell, *Old Dundee prior to the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1891), p. 147; R. Adam, *Edinburgh Records: The Burgh Accounts* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1899), Vol. 2, pp. 6-8.

66. MacDonald, *The Gude and Godlie Ballatis*, p. 32.

67. Stewart, *The Complaynt of Scotland*, p. 127, fol. 127v-128r. See also Mitchell, *A Compendious Book of Godly and Spiritual Songs*, p. c note.

68. A. Maxwell, *History of Old Dundee* (Edinburgh, 1884), p. 69.

recollections recorded by Johnston and Calderwood were broadly correct. David Fergusson, for instance, who was active in the Dundee reformation in the 1550s, and who lived as a prominent Church of Scotland minister until 1598, must have known what Robert Wedderburn's position was.

14. One matter regarding Robert Wedderburn that calls for comment is his mistress, Isobell Lovell, and his illegitimate children. Archbishop Hamilton also had a long-term mistress, Lady Grisel Sempill, and so too did another probable *spirituali* Alexander Gordon, titular Bishop of Athens.⁶⁹ According to Marcus Wagner, Lord James Stewart seems to have had a mistress in 1553 (although he married someone else in 1562).⁷⁰ Another probable *spirituali*, the Dominican John Black, is described by Knox as having 'his harlot' in 1560, as though this too was a standing relationship.⁷¹ Another possible *spirituali* was William Gordon, Bishop of Aberdeen, and he too had a long-term mistress, Janet Knowles. Some of the Italian *spirituali*, such as Cardinal Contarini, certainly rejected clerical marriage,⁷² but the idea was favoured by others such as Cardinal Thomas Cajetan; and it may be that the Scottish *spirituali* movement would have allowed the practice, had it been possible.⁷³ Certainly Sir David Lyndsay argued for its introduction (see 'The Papyngo', lines 1055-56), and John Lesley, somewhat cynically, mentions the proposed enforcing of clerical celibacy in 1559 as a reason why 'many young abbots, priors, deans, and beneficed men' joined the Protestants.⁷⁴ It is likely, therefore, that Robert Wedderburn regarded Isobell Lovell as his *de facto* wife. There may also have been an antinomian streak in the practice of the Scottish *spirituali*. Being justified by faith (as they thought), they need not be overly strict in the observance of the Divine law. This common error is answered by the

69. See entry on Alexander Gordon in *ODNB*. Gordon's mistress was Barbara Logie, and he was said to have married her *per verba de presenti* in 1546. The marriage was publicly acknowledged in 1560.

70. McRoberts, *The Medieval Church of St Andrews*, p. 117.

71. Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 319.

72. E. G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini* (Berkeley, CA, 1993), p. 102.

73. The hope that the Church of Rome might make concessions on clerical celibacy remained open until 1566; J.W. O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Harvard, 2013), pp.252-3.

74. J. Lesley, *The History of Scotland* (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1830), p. 271. Lesley himself had three illegitimate daughters, but whether he had reformed his conduct by 1559 appears to be unknown; see Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland*, pp. 134-5; Macfarlane, *Genealogical Collections*, Vol. 2, pp. 4, 65, 445.

Apostle Paul in Rom. 6:1-2 and the verses following, where he emphasises the new spiritual obedience of the believer.

15. George Buchanan (1506–1582), the celebrated humanist, seems to have been somewhat pliable in his religious views, rather like Thomas Cranmer. He wrote his satirical poem against the Grey Friars, *Franciscanus et Fratres*, about 1537,⁷⁵ and was arrested, along with other suspected Lutherans, about January 1538/9. The instigator of his troubles was Margaret Erskine, Lady Lochleven, the mistress of James V and mother of Lord James Stewart (Regent Moray),⁷⁶ and the accusations against him were, probably, that he had been involved in some way in the wedding of the priest Thomas Cocklaw, that he had eaten flesh in Lent, and that he had adopted Lutheran views on free will and confession. He was detained in Linlithgow, but escaped – with the connivance of James V – and fled to England.⁷⁷

After six months in England, he went to France where he remained until 1547. There he seems to have reverted to a more Roman Catholic position. To the Lisbon Inquisition he claimed that he had taken advantage of a papal pardon in 1544, but no trace of this pardon has been found, and it may have been an invention.⁷⁸ In 1547, he moved to Portugal, and between August 1550 and January 1551/2, he was in the hands of the Lisbon Inquisition. He was eventually condemned for having rejected transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, prayer to the saints, and confession, and for having maintained justification by faith.⁷⁹ He abjured and was sent to a monastery ‘for further instruction’. His adoption of Protestantism after 1560 calls into question the sincerity of this abjuration. In any case, his statement on justification before the Lisbon Inquisition shows that he held a *spirituali* position: ‘On justification, I thought that you [the Roman Catholic Church] and the Lutherans made the same statement in different words, since the one party said that man was justified by faith and works, and the other party by faith acting through charity; and when the distinction was so small, I grieved that they did not agree on so important a matter.’⁸⁰

75. The surviving text of *Franciscanus et Fratres* attacks purgatory, papal bulls, and the mass, and supports vernacular translations of the Bible, but it dates from 1566, having been revised by Buchanan prior to publication; see McFarlane, *Buchanan*, p. 55.

76. Aitken, *Trial of George Buchanan*, p. 52.

77. Aitken, *Trial of George Buchanan*, pp. 59, 119, 123, 125.

78. Aitken, *Trial of George Buchanan*, p. 141.

79. McFarlane, *Buchanan*, p. 144.

80. Aitken, *Trial of George Buchanan*, pp. 17-19, 143-4.

16. Somewhat similar was the humanist Florence Wilson or Volusenus (died c.1551). Born near Elgin and educated at King's College, Aberdeen, under Hector Boece, he spent the years between 1526 and 1535 living partly in England and partly in Paris. In England, he was friendly with Thomas Cromwell and John Fisher. Late in 1535 he met the *spirituali* Jacopo Sadoletto, Bishop of Carpentras (near Avignon), where he acted as a schoolmaster for a while, before settling in Lyons. His work *Commentatio quaedam theologica* (1539) 'emphasizes points of belief common to Catholics and reformed', while his *De animi tranquillitate dialogus* (1543) is 'an eclectic and attractively written work, showing influences from both ends of the theological spectrum'.⁸¹ In it, he meets in a dream the Apostle Paul 'who convincingly shows him that, not by his own good works, but only by the grace of God, can man attain salvation.'⁸² He praises the Italian former *spirituali*, Peter Martyr Vermigli, Bernardino Ochino, and Paolo Lacizi, who the previous year had all fled from the Roman Inquisition and become Protestants.⁸³ In 1546, intending to return to his native land, he consulted Sadoletto as to what he should do about religion; and he received the advice, which he apparently took, that he should 'abide by the religion of his fathers'. It is clear that he, too, can be numbered with the *spirituali*.

17. Sir David Lyndsay of the Mount (1486–1555), the poet and Lyon King, was another person who would have come under suspicion as a member of the *spirituali*, had he lived in Italy. Lyndsay virtually identified himself with Knox and the Protestants in St Andrews Castle in 1547, but thereafter retired back into Nicodemism. Two twentieth-century discussions of Lyndsay's doctrine claim that his views on justification were non-Protestant, but the evidence that they adduce (which is the same in both cases) fails to prove this: there is nothing in the stanzas of his verse quoted which is inconsistent with Protestantism.⁸⁴ Alec Ryrie is more accurate when he says: '[Lyndsay's] views on justification strongly

81. Entry on Florence Wilson by John Durkan in *ODNB*.

82. P. Hume Brown, 'A forgotten Scottish scholar of the sixteenth century', *Scottish Historical Review*, Vol. 10 (1913), pp. 122-137 (p. 135).

83. David Irving, *Lives of Scottish Writers* (Edinburgh, 1841), p. 32.

84. Brother Kenneth, 'Sir David Lindsay, Reformer', *Innes Review*, Vol. 1 (1950), pp. 79-91 (p. 88); C. Edington, *Court and Culture in Renaissance Scotland: Sir David Lindsay of the Mount* (Amherst, 1994), pp. 176, 190, 224-5. Edington acknowledges, however, that the stanzas in question are 'not entirely in line' with the Tridentine doctrine of faith promulgated in 1547 and are 'arguably, slightly Protestant in tone' (p. 190).

emphasised the place of works, giving much less ground to evangelical ideas on this point than [Hamilton's] *Catechism* did.⁸⁵

As noticed in Section 12 above, it was dangerous to oppose the mass, so Lyndsay's near-silence on this subject may have been because he held a Roman Catholic position, or may simply have been a matter of caution.⁸⁶ His comments on other Roman practices such as indulgences, images, pilgrimages, and clerical celibacy show that it was safer to call these things into question.⁸⁷

18. The *spirituali* encountered strong opposition in Italy, and presumably there was opposition to the movement in Scotland too, although there is little direct record of this. One absentee Scot who must have condemned Hamilton's *spirituali* doctrine was Robert Wauchope (c.1500–1551).⁸⁸

Wauchope was born in Niddrie Marischal but was out of Scotland for most of his life after the mid-1520s. He was appointed Bishop of Armagh in 1539, and according to Alesius, was involved in the persecution of French Protestants in Paris in about 1540. In 1541 he was present at the Colloquies of Worms and of Ratisbon, although he had no sympathy with the idea of compromise with Protestants. He was friendly with several of the early Jesuits and his inclinations were towards a counter-reformation along Jesuit lines. In 1544 he published a Latin work 'The Conclusions regarding the Sacrifice of the Mass and Lay Communion'. He was present at the Council of Trent in 1545-7 and was on the committee which drew up the decrees on justification. His closeness to the Pope and his support of papal power caused resentment at the Council.⁸⁹ About the end of 1549 he came to Scotland on his way to Ireland, and he died in Paris in November 1551.

In November 1539, Wauchope secured a papal provision to the Premonstratensian abbacy of Dryburgh. This angered James V who had a

85. Ryrrie, *The Origins of the Scottish Reformation*, p. 106.

86. Edington, *Court and Culture in Renaissance Scotland*, p. 189.

87. Two of the questions or charges against Walter Milne, however, in 1558 were, 'What think you of priests' marriage?' and 'Thou speakest against pilgrimage and callest it a pilgrimage to whoredom'; so caution was still needed; see Knox, *Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 552-3. On the other hand, Milne's martyrdom came as a shock to many, so perhaps the prevailing view at that time had been that the day of caution was already past.

88. For the life of Robert Wauchope, see J. Durkan, 'Robert Wauchope, Archbishop of Armagh', *Innes Review*, Vol. 1 (1950), pp. 48-66; H. Jedin, 'The Blind "Doctor Scotus"', *J. Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 1 (1950), pp. 76-84; J. K. Farge, *Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology, 1500-1536* (Toronto, 1980), pp. 437-441.

89. Jedin, 'The Blind "Doctor Scotus"', p. 84.

different nominee, and Wauchope was declared a rebel and an outlaw. His friend John Greenlaw, who had carried the papal letters of appointment back to Scotland, was arrested. Wauchope was still pursuing his unsuccessful claim to Dryburgh as late as 1549. In 1544, Wauchope was involved in an unsuccessful dispute over the vacant bishopric of Dunkeld which the Governor Arran intended for his half-brother (later Archbishop Hamilton). The main rival claimant to Hamilton was Wauchope's friend Robert Crichton, who eventually secured the bishopric about 1554. Crichton was one of the three bishops who opposed the Confession of Faith in the Parliament of August 1560, and was the only bishop prepared to meet the papal envoy Nicholas de Gouda in 1562.⁹⁰ From their friendship with Wauchope, it seems likely that Greenlaw and Crichton shared his opposition to Hamilton's *spirituali* position. Greenlaw assisted the early Jesuit mission to Ireland of February-March 1541/2, which travelled via Edinburgh, and by this time he had already completed the 'Spiritual Exercises' of Ignatius Loyola.⁹¹ Greenlaw in turn was friendly with John Watson of Aberdeen whose re-constructed 'sermons' show no *spirituali* influence.⁹²

19. One development which probably increased the strength of the *spirituali* movement in Scotland was the re-structuring of St Mary's College in St Andrews under Archbishop Hamilton. Following the death of the previous Principal, Archibald Hay, the new principal from September 1547 was John Douglas who joined the reformers in 1559, while the second master was Richard Marshall (see below). It is probable that the new college was a centre of *spirituali* doctrine. The third and fourth masters were the Dominican John Black and William Skene.⁹³ William Skene, too, joined the reformers in 1559;⁹⁴ while Black remained a Roman Catholic, became the confessor of Mary Queen of Scots, and was murdered on the same night as David Rizzio in 1566. Black's position at

90. J. H. Pollen, *Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots, 1561–1567* (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1901), p. 148. For Robert Crichton, see M. Yellowlees, 'The ecclesiastical establishment of the diocese of Dunkeld at the Reformation', *Innes Review*, Vol. 36 (1985), pp. 74–85.

91. S. M. Holmes, *Sacred Signs in Reformation Scotland* (Oxford, 2015), p. 73.

92. G. Hill, 'The sermons of John Watson, Canon of Aberdeen', *Innes Review*, Vol. 15 (1964), pp. 3–34.

93. D. W. D. Shaw (ed.), *In Divers Manners: A St Mary's Miscellany* (St Andrews, 1990), p. 50.

94. Hay Fleming, *Register of the Minister, Elders, and Deacons of the Christian Congregation of St. Andrews, 1559–1600*, Vol. 1, p. 8.

St Mary's College makes it likely that he too held *spirituali* views, or at least acquiesced in them.

20. Disappointingly little is known of Richard Marshall.⁹⁵ In 1527, already a Dominican, he was a student at Oxford University. He became Prior of the Dominicans in Newcastle, and in 1536 he fled because he of his refusal to acknowledge Henry VIII as head of the Church of England.⁹⁶ By 1542 he was in Edinburgh, and in 1547 he received a licence to live outside the Dominican convent in order to study at St Andrews. He matriculated formally at the university in 1550. He is presumably the English Dominican who, with Andrew Abercrombie, visited Adam Wallace in prison in Edinburgh in that year, immediately before Wallace's martyrdom.⁹⁷ In 1558 he was appointed preacher to the abbey church of Dunfermline. The only indications of his doctrine are those provided by Hamilton's *Catechism* – of which he is usually understood to have been the principal author – and by the part that he played in the Pater Noster controversy. When and how he acquired his *spirituali* views is not known. It does not appear that he conformed to Protestantism at the Reformation of 1560.

21. In 1551, Marshall became involved in the so-called Pater Noster controversy.⁹⁸ It was a common Roman Catholic practice to recite the Pater Noster (Lord's Prayer) to saints and to images. Henry Balnaves mentions this as one of the abuses of Romanism in his treatise on Justification of 1548.⁹⁹ There was probably already disagreement on the propriety of this practice at the General Council of 1549, because the statutes of the Council leave space for an enactment 'Concerning the Lord's Prayer' which has not been recorded.¹⁰⁰ In 1551 (according to John Foxe, who presumably

95. See McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513–1625*, pp. 327-9 for what is known of Marshall.

96. A letter that Marshall wrote at the time is in Bede Jarrett, *The English Dominicans* (London, 1921), pp. 160-1.

97. Knox, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 548.

98. For the Pater Noster controversy, see S. R. Cattley, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe* (8 vols, London, 1837-41), Vol. 5, pp. 641-644; Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, Vol. 1, pp. 273-7; Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland*, Vol. 1, pp. 180-182. Foxe's account of the dispute was dismissed as an absurd tale by the nineteenth-century Episcopalian historians George Grub and Joseph Robertson (see Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland*, p. 142), but has been accepted since.

99. Knox, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 518.

100. Patrick, *Statutes*, p. 127.

got his information from John Winram), Marshall preached a sermon in St Andrews in which he condemned the reciting of the Pater Noster to the saints. His criticisms offended some of the university theologians, and also the Franciscans who had long been promoters of the practice, and on 1st November (All Hallows' day) the Franciscans put up one of their number, Andrew Cottis, to preach in defence of their position. Cottis made a fool of himself in his sermon, and a considerable controversy ensued.

The matter came up two months later at the General Council in January 1551/2; and according to Foxe:

They that were called churchmen, were found deuided and repugnant among them selues. For some Bishops with the Doctors and Friers, consented that the Pater noster shoulde be sayd to Saintes: but the Bishops of S. Andrewes, Caitness (Robert Stewart) and Atheins (Alexander Gordon), wyth other more learned men, refused vtterly to subscribe the same. Finallye, with consent of both the parties, commission was geuen by the holye Church, to Dane Iohn Wynrame, then Suppriour of S. Andrewes, to declare to the people how and after what maner they should pray the Lords prayer. Who accepting the commission, declared that it should be said to God, wyth some other restrictions whych are not necessary to be put in memory. And so by litle and litle, the brute and tumult ceased.¹⁰¹

The statutes of the Council of 1551/2 contain nothing relating to the controversy, but Hamilton's *Catechism*, which was published on 29th August 1552, quietly but firmly reiterates the position of Hamilton, Winram, and Marshall.¹⁰² At the same time, the *Catechism* has a lengthy appendix on prayer, 'Ane declaratioun schawand to quhem we suld pray, and for quhom', which defends prayer to the saints, prayer for the dead, and the doctrine of purgatory. Whether the Council knew the detailed contents of the *Catechism* when it approved it on 26th January 1551/2 cannot be said, but it seems likely that the appendix was a subsequent addition, drawn up as a peace-making exercise to reconcile the two parties.

101. See J. Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1583 edn.), p. 1298 (online at <https://www.johnfoxe.org>). One of the Scottish bishops, William Gordon of Aberdeen, commenced studies at Louvain in August 1551, and was in Paris in September 1552, so he may have been out of the country throughout the Pater Noster controversy; McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513–1625*, p. 324; C. Innes (ed.), *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis* (2 vols., Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1845), Vol. 1, pp. lx, 456.

102. See *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, pref. by A. F. Mitchell (Edinburgh, 1882), p. xxiv; W. Murison, *Sir David Lyndsay* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 118.

Sir David Lyndsay alludes to the Pater Noster dispute – with ‘mortal wars’ among the friars – in his *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* (lines 4617-20), dated to 1552. His further reference to the Pater Noster in his *Dialog betuix Experience and ane Courteour* (or *The Monarche*; lines 2279-2322), dated to 1554, suggests that the practice of reciting the prayer to the saints was continuing just as before, notwithstanding the decision in the controversy. A few hundred lines later (lines 2621-2634), he gives his own opinion on the subject, which very much coincides with that of the *Catechism*.¹⁰³

22. The significance of the Pater Noster controversy is that it brings to light a major division in the pre-Reformation Church of Scotland. The particular issue was a rather narrow one (though not unimportant), but the strong feelings that the controversy generated make it likely that broader issues were involved as well. The distinctions that were proposed suggest that the defenders of the practice of reciting the prayer to the saints realised that it could not strictly be justified:

For some of the popish Doctours affirmed that it shoulde be sayd to God formaliter, and to Sayntes, materialiter, Others vltimatè, & non vltimatè. Others sayde it shoulde be said to God principaliter, and to sayntes minus principaliter. Others, that it should be sayd to God primariè, and to saintes secundariè, Others that it should be sayd to God capiendo strictè, and to sayntes capiendo largè.¹⁰⁴

At the same time, the defenders felt that the criticisms of the practice were coming at a time when the Church needed to show unity in the face of Protestant condemnation of saint-worship; that they were coming from a quarter with dubious associations – the *spirituali*; and that the principle behind them – that of subjecting the accepted practice of the Church to arguments from human reason – was a dangerous one. It is likely, therefore, that the division in the Scottish Church followed the *spirituali/zelanti* fault-line. Mitchell mentions that the Pater Noster controversy was also found in England, Switzerland, and Germany, and a closer study of the whole subject might clarify what was happening in Scotland.¹⁰⁵ Foxe names

103. D. Laing (ed.), *Poetical Works of Sir David Lyndsay* (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1879), Vol. 2, p. 221; Vol. 3, pp. 27-28, 39.

104. Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1583 edn), p. 1298.

105. Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, p. xxiv, note. In Italy, the writings of the *spirituali* – most notably Cardinal Fregoso – had promoted inward and devotional prayer, as against mechanical recitation and repetition. The Inquisition was placing such works on the various Indexes of Prohibited Books from 1549 onwards; see G.

the two parties in the Scottish Church as ‘the Papists’ (those supporting the practice) and ‘the Christians’ (those opposing it), and gives the impression that ‘the Papists’ formed the substantial majority.

23. The earliest reference to the preparation of Hamilton’s *Catechism* is probably in a letter from the English exile Richard Smyth to Archbishop Cranmer, written from St Andrews on 14th February 1550/1.¹⁰⁶ Smyth was wishing to return to England, and he says to Cranmer that if he were to remain another quarter of a year in Scotland, he would be required ‘to write an answer to your grace’s book of the sacrament, and also a book of common places against all the doctrine set forth by the king’s majesty [Edward VI], which I cannot do with a good conscience.’¹⁰⁷ The ‘book of common places’ is probably what in due course became Hamilton’s *Catechism*. Smyth did write a reply to Cranmer on the sacrament entitled *A Confutation of a Certen Booke, Called a Defence of the True, and Catholike Doctrine of the Sacrament*; this was published in Paris (probably) and was undated, and though usually assigned to 1550 it probably came out in the early summer of 1551. Cranmer’s rejoinder was speedily published by September 1551.¹⁰⁸

Mitchell gives reasons for thinking that Smyth did in fact contribute to Hamilton’s *Catechism*,¹⁰⁹ while Durkan argues strongly that Richard Marshall was the principal author.¹¹⁰ Earlier writers had suggested John Winram as the author, while J. K. Cameron thought that it was a ‘product

Caravale, *Forbidden Prayer: Church Censorship and Devotional Literature in Renaissance Italy* (Routledge, 2016). It seems likely that Richard Marshall’s controversial sermon arose out of preparatory reading, possibly of such books, for work on the *Catechism*.

106. The dating of this letter is disputed, the author of Richard Smyth’s entry in *ODNB* placing it in February 1551/2, but the date that we have given seems more likely.

107. J. Strype, *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer* (3 vols, Oxford, 1848-54), Vol. 2, p. 168.

108. D. MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer* (Yale, 1996), p. 487.

109. John Gau, *The Richt Vay to the Kingdom of Heuine*, ed. A. F. Mitchell (Edinburgh, 1888), pp. xlviii-xlix. When the *Catechism* was published, Smyth sent copies down to England; see McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513–1625*, p. 301.

110. McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513–1625*, pp. 327-8. One reason for thinking that an English hand, such as Marshall’s, was involved in preparing a draft is that the Lord’s Prayer is said to be ‘in Inglis’ (as if by oversight), whereas two other places refer distinctly to ‘our Scottis speche’; see Law, *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552*, pp. 139, 157, 249; Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, p. xviii; McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513–1625*, p. 368. In general, the language of the *Catechism* is Scottish rather than English; see Patrick, *Statutes*, p. 144.

of the St Andrews theologians who enjoyed the patronage of the primate'.¹¹¹ Ryrie proposes that it was a committee production, with Marshall as its 'research editor'.¹¹² Probably all these suggestions are broadly correct, and indeed it seems likely that the eleven theologians incorporated at St Andrews University in 1551 were intended as a committee for the preparation of the *Catechism*, along with those already at the university such as Winram, John Douglas, and Marshall.¹¹³ The position assigned to Winram in the Pater Noster controversy suggests that he was the chairman of the committee.

A draft of the *Catechism* was presumably ready for the Provincial Council in January 1551/2, and the final version prepared by the summer of 1552. The Pater Noster controversy must have flared up in the middle of their work, and Foxe's account of the controversy makes it likely that the committee was not unanimous on the matter.¹¹⁴

24. Hamilton's *Catechism* was a remarkable theological production. From a Protestant perspective, it is a strange mixture of wholesome doctrine, deadly poison, and foolish error justified by spurious argument. From the various works that have been identified as sources for the *Catechism*, it can be seen that its authors were well versed in both the Roman Catholic and the Anglican theology of the day.¹¹⁵ They must have been familiar, in particular, with the canons and decrees of the first period of the Council of Trent (1545-47), and presumably also with those of the second period (May 1551–April 1552, the decrees being issued in October and November 1551). They did not regard themselves as being tightly bound by these decrees, however, and their theological position was very much their own. They expressed a *spirituali* view of faith; made little of the papacy,¹¹⁶ the sacrifice

111. Shaw, *In Divers Manners*, p. 47.

112. Ryrie, *The Origins of the Scottish Reformation*, p. 100.

113. The eleven theologians included Alexander Anderson (Aberdeen), John Watson (Aberdeen), William Cranston (Paris, Seton, and St Andrews), Richard Smyth, and John McQuhyn (Paisley).

114. We would suggest William Cranston, and possibly John Watson, as among the opponents of Marshall in the Pater Noster controversy.

115. Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, pp. xii-xiv, xxvi-xxxii; Law, *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552*, pp. xxxi, xxxvii.

116. For a discussion of the *Catechism*'s virtual silence on the papacy, see Law, *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552*, pp. xxxiii-xxxiv; Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation*, p. 45; McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513-1625*, pp. 66, 302, 368.

of the mass, or indulgences;¹¹⁷ and seem to have held to limited atonement;¹¹⁸ but they maintained purgatory, prayers for the dead, the use of images (especially of the Virgin Mary),¹¹⁹ the seven sacraments (along with a host of minute ceremonies), transubstantiation, communion in one kind,¹²⁰ the removal of original sin by baptism, and the sinlessness of concupiscence.¹²¹

In modern terms, the position of the *Catechism* was somewhat similar to very high Anglicanism or Lutheranism. Mitchell summarises its teaching thus:

The doctrine which is put throughout in the foreground is that of the authority of the external Church as represented in General Councils lawfully gathered, to determine all questions and controversies in religion, and the necessity of remaining in the communion of this external Church, having unbroken succession of bishops, in order to share in the benefits of the death and mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ.¹²²

25. The teaching of Hamilton's *Catechism* on the subject of faith does not quite violate any of the canons or decrees of the Council of Trent (1545-7), as far as one can see, but it manifestly belongs to that *spirituali* school that had been decisively rejected by the Council.¹²³ Those preparing the *Catechism* must have been well aware of this fact. The forceful Robert

117. References to indulgences in Scotland seem to become less common in the 1530s and 1540s. The hospital of the Magdalen Chapel was granted an indulgence sometime before 1547; see A. Pennecuik, *An Historical Account of the Blue Blanket* (Edinburgh, 1780), p. 52. We are grateful to Tom Turpie for discussion on this point.

118. Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, p. xxi; Law, *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552*, p. xxxv.

119. Law observes that the *Catechism* went beyond the Council of Trent in explicitly affirming the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary; *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552*, pp. xxxiii, xxxix.

120. Durkan thinks that, in rejecting communion in both kinds, the compilers of the *Catechism* were influenced by Robert Wauchope's 1544 publication mentioned above, McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513-1625*, p. 302, n. 155. They may, however, simply have been following Henry VIII's *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man* (1543); see C. Lloyd (ed.), *Formularies of Faith put forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII* (Oxford, 1856), pp. 265-6.

121. M'Crie lists some of the minute ceremonies, and gives a useful discussion of the teaching and methods of argument of the *Catechism*; see *Life of Knox* (1855 edn.), pp. 346-8.

122. Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, pp. vii, xv-xvi.

123. Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, p. xxii-xxiii; Law, *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552*, pp. xxxv-xxxvii, 126-130, 256.

Wauchope, who had a large hand in preparing the Tridentine decrees on justification, was in Scotland in January 1549/50,¹²⁴ and there is no doubt that, had he been among their number, the compilers of the *Catechism* would have been a deeply divided body. As it was, he did not remain in Scotland, and he died in Paris in November 1551 while the *Catechism* was still in preparation.

The compilers' disregard for Tridentine authority is not easy to account for. It is sometimes argued that the Pope had not yet ratified the decisions of the Council – and indeed Cardinal Morone used this defence before the Roman Inquisition in his *Apologia* of 1557, with limited success.¹²⁵ But it was one thing to have private doubts, as Morone, and another thing for the primate of a national Church to publish an official document with rival theology, as Hamilton was doing. Furthermore, in theory the Scots were supposed to be conciliarists, so that the decision of the Council of Trent should have been authoritative for them even without papal ratification. Two factors may have been relevant, however: one was that in late 1551, there was talk of Lutheran delegates coming to the Council of Trent, with a possible re-visiting of earlier decisions;¹²⁶ the other was that France had remained aloof from the Council of Trent thus far, and indeed the French king Henry II was at war with the Pope from September 1551 to April 1552. The French attitude to the Council may have prevailed in Scotland too.

26. One notable feature of Hamilton's *Catechism* is its reserve on the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass. It says little more on the subject than that the Eucharist 'is callit the sacrifice of the altar, because it is ane quick and special remembrance of the passioun of Christ... Now the passioun of Christ was the true sacrifice.'¹²⁷ This reticence is rather surprising because it was no part of the *spirituali* teaching to reject the sacrifice of the mass: it was maintained, for example by Cardinal Contarini in his short work written to quieten the theologically restless *accademici* of Modena

124. Wauchope sent a letter from Dunkeld on 7th January 1549-50; Jedin, 'The Blind "Doctor Scotus"', p. 83.

125. A. P. Robinson, *The Career of Cardinal Giovanni Morone (1509-1580)* (London, 2012), pp. 77, 83. The decrees of Trent were ratified by Pius IV in the bull *Benedictus Deus* on 26th January 1564.

126. See O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council*, pp. 154-5.

127. Law, *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552*, pp. xxxv, 203, 282-3; Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, p. xv.

in 1542.¹²⁸ Equally, Gropper's *Enchiridion* (1538), which was one of the sources used for the *Catechism*, has a section devoted to the sacrifice of the mass.¹²⁹ However, Henry VIII's *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man* (1543) has as little to say on the doctrine as the *Catechism* has, and this may have been the model that was followed.¹³⁰

Furthermore, as mentioned above, Robert Wauchope had written a work on the subject in 1544 entitled 'The Conclusions regarding the sacrifice of the mass and lay communion',¹³¹ while Richard Smyth had published his *Defence of the Sacrifice of the Masse* in 1546. Both these works must have been well known in Scotland. Indeed, Smyth had published very recently on the subject in his *Confutation* of Cranmer (mentioned above), written under persuasion from Archbishop Hamilton. For some reason, however, the *Catechism* drew back on this doctrine, and one is left wondering whether the printing of Smyth's *Confutation* in Paris rather than Scotland was an indication that Hamilton had not been pleased with Smyth's production. There is no reason to think that the *Catechism*'s reticence on this subject was in order to appease Protestants as it says plenty of things about the mass which would have had the opposite effect. It seems, then, that the *Catechism* simply represents the theology of its authors on this particular point.¹³² They were not prepared to deny the sacrifice of the mass but they did not give it any prominence.

In the same vein, the 'Godlie Exhortatioun' of 1559 was entirely silent on the sacrifice of mass,¹³³ and in the disputes on the mass around 1560, Alexander Anderson (probably one of the compilers of the *Catechism*) went beyond the position of the *Catechism* in denying that the mass was a

128. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, pp. 286-8.

129. *Enchiridion Christianae Institutionis* (Lugduni, 1544), p. 138ff.

130. J. A. Löwe, *Richard Smyth and the Language of Orthodoxy* (Leiden, 2003), p. 185. Curiously, several writers mistakenly assert that Henry VIII's *Necessary Doctrine* contains a separate section on the sacrifice of the mass: Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, p. xv; Law, *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552*, p. xxxiv; Ryrie, *The Origins of the Scottish Reformation*, p. 100.

131. R. Vauchop, *Conclusiones de sacrosancto Missae sacrificio, & communione laica* (Mainz, 1544).

132. Law gives various reasons for thinking that 'the theological characteristics' of the *Catechism* 'indicate the genuine mind of the authors', and that they wrote it 'without any special regard to their opponents', *The Catechism of John Hamilton, 1552*, p. xxx.

133. Patrick, *Statutes*, pp. 188-190.

propitiatory sacrifice.¹³⁴ On the other hand, Quintin Kennedy and Ninian Winzet both vigorously defended the sacrifice of the mass, with Kennedy's *Ane Compendius Tractive* (1558) drawing heavily on Richard Smyth's *Confutation* of 1551.¹³⁵ Thus the theology of Hamilton's *Catechism* was not universally received, even among the active defenders of Romanism in Scotland.

27. The Nicodemite period of Scottish Protestantism gradually came to an end from 1555 onwards. Knox mentions William Harlaw and John Willock as preaching before that time, and he himself visited Scotland in autumn 1555.¹³⁶ In the course of this visit, he argued against Nicodemism with John Erskine of Dun, William Maitland of Lethington, and others; he celebrated the Lord's Supper in the reformed manner; and he persuaded some of the nobility to enter into the 'Dun Band', 'refus[ing] all society with idolatry'.¹³⁷ In a letter of November 1555, Knox expressed to his mother-in-law his astonishment at the fervent thirst he found for the bread of life: 'Gif I had not sene it with my eyis in my awn contrey, I culd not have beleivit it.'¹³⁸

28. The puzzling letter of Cardinal Sermoneta to Pope Paul IV (Carafa), dated about 1556, highlights how little is known about the Scottish Church history of that period. Sermoneta commends to the Pope five Scottish bishops – James Beaton of Glasgow, Andrew Durie of Galloway, Patrick Hepburn of Moray, William Chisholm of Dunblane, and Robert Reid of Orkney – as 'most capable of executing' reform and as 'by far the most acceptable' to Mary of Guise.¹³⁹ As Ryrrie comments: '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.'¹⁴⁰ The same might also have been said of Chisholm of Dunblane.¹⁴¹ Presumably

134. Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, pp. 352-3.

135. Winzet, *Certain Tractates*, Vol. 1, pp. 88-9; C. H. Kuipers, *Quintin Kennedy (1520-1564): Two Eucharistic Tracts* (Nijmegen, 1964), p. 71.

136. Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 118.

137. See J. Stephen, 'The Dun Band 1556', *Bulwark*, July-September 2017, pp. 14-17; Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 122.

138. Knox, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 217.

139. Pollen, *Papal Negotiations*, p. 530.

140. Ryrrie, *The Origins of the Scottish Reformation*, p. 110.

141. Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland*, pp. 57-58; T. Slonosky, 'Burgh government and Reformation: Stirling, c.1530-1565', in J. McCallum (ed.), *Scotland's Long Reformation* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 49-68 (p. 62).

Sermoneta was ill-informed regarding the moral character of Durie, Hepburn, and Chisholm, but one would suppose that he was correct about the acceptability of these various bishops to the Queen Regent.

Of the other bishops, Robert Crichton of Dunkeld might have been expected on the list, as the only bishop courageous enough to meet de Gouda in 1562. However, he was at loggerheads with Mary of Guise until he finally secured the see of Dunkeld in 1554, and though relations improved thereafter, perhaps he was still somewhat out of favour with her in 1556.¹⁴² John Hepburn of Brechin was an old man and died in 1557. Archbishop Hamilton, Robert Stewart of Caithness, Alexander Gordon of the Isles, and David Panter of Ross, were perhaps acceptable neither to the Queen Regent (because of their Hamilton associations) nor to the Pope (because of their *spirituali* leanings). William Gordon of Aberdeen may have been omitted because of his moral character, or perhaps he too had *spirituali* inclinations.¹⁴³ With so little surviving information, it is difficult to be sure on several of these points, but one thing that does emerge is that Mary Guise was probably no supporter of *spirituali* doctrine.

29. The beginning, or resumption, of open Protestantism did not signal the immediate end of Nicodemite or *spirituali*-type Protestantism. In 1556, William Lauder published in Edinburgh a poem entitled *Ane compendious and breue Tractate, Concernynge ye Office and dewtie of Kyngis*. This presents a Protestant view of faith (lines 181-2), although Lauder remained in the Church of Rome at the time:

And, quhare faith is, thare is all grace
Thare is prosperitie, lufe, and peace.¹⁴⁴

After the Reformation, Lauder became minister of the united parishes of Forgandenny, Forteviot, and Muckarsie.

30. The case of John Sinclair, Dean of Restalrig and Bishop of Brechin from 1565, is important because it brings out the divisions within Scottish Romanism by 1558. Foxe's description of Sinclair's part in the death of Adam Wallace in 1550 makes it virtually certain that Sinclair

142. Yellowlees, 'The ecclesiastical establishment of the diocese of Dunkeld at the Reformation', pp. 75-76.

143. 'Some hopes he [William Gordon] gave at first of a virtuous man, but afterwards turned a very epicure'; Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland*, Vol. 1, p. 210.

144. W. Lauder, *Ane compendious and breue Tractate, Concernynge ye Office and dewtie of Kyngis*, ed. F. Hall (London, 1869), p. 8; Ryrie, *The Origins of the Scottish Reformation*, pp. 106-7.

originally had *spirituali* leanings: ‘Then was sent to him [i.e. Wallace] a worldly wise man, and not vngodly in the vnderstandyng of the truth, the Deane of Rosealrige, who gaue him Christiā consolation, amongst the which hee exhorted him to beleue the realtie of the Sacrament after the consecration.’¹⁴⁵ This is confirmed by Knox, who says that when Sinclair began to preach ‘in his kirk of Restalrig’ in 1558:

at the beginning [he] held himself so indifferent, that many had opinion of him that he was not far from the kingdom of God. But...when he understood that such as feared God began to have a good opinion of him, and that the Friars and others of that sect began to whisper... he appointed a sermon, in the which he promised to give his judgment upon all such heads as then were in controversy in the matters of religion. ... But that day he so handled himself, that after that no godly man did credit him; for not only gainsaid he the doctrine of Justification and of Prayer which before he had taught, but also he set up and maintained the Papistry to the uttermost prick; yea, Holy Water, Pilgrimage, Purgatory, and Pardons were of such virtue in his conceit, that without them, he looked not to be saved.¹⁴⁶

Knox’s mention of justification shows that by 1558 there was a backlash against *spirituali* doctrine, at least among leading Scottish Roman Catholic clergy in the vicinity of Edinburgh. Such a division in the Roman Church means that her reactions to Protestantism at this time – as they were recorded by Knox and others – are to be viewed, not as the coherent conduct of a united body, but as the erratic responses of one that was seriously divided.

31. An example of this probably appears in the martyrdom of Walter Milne, at the age of 82, in April 1558. Like the death of Adam Wallace in 1550, this was not part of a widespread persecution. The man chiefly responsible for Milne’s arrest was a career-ecclesiastic, Sir Hugh Curry. In 1538 Curry was a priest and notary public, and by 1547 he was the commendator of Strathfillan, near Crianlarich. He seems, however, to have lived in Edinburgh, being present at the Provincial Council of November 1549, and supervising the imprisonment of Adam Wallace in Edinburgh in 1550. By this time, he was also the Dean of Christianity (i.e. the Rural Dean) of Linlithgow. In December 1551, he exchanged his position at Strathfillan for a prebend at the Chapel Royal in Stirling, endowed by the parish of Crieff. This he retained until 1574. In 1552, he was still acting as

145. Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1570 edn), p. 1489.

146. Dickinson, *John Knox’s History*, Vol. 1, p. 131.

a notary public, and at some point, and certainly before June 1555, he also became rector of Eassie in Angus.¹⁴⁷

In the spring of 1557/8, Curry and another priest, sir George Strachan, arrested Milne in Dysart, Fife after watching him for a while. They knew that he had already been condemned to death years before under Cardinal Beaton. According to Pitscottie, he was married by the time of his condemnation under Cardinal Beaton, and this marriage formed part of the charge against him in 1558.¹⁴⁸ A large court was assembled including Archbishop Hamilton; the Bishops of Caithness, Moray, Dunkeld, and Dunblane; the Abbots of Couper, Lindores, Dunfermline, Balmerino, and Kilwinning; and John Douglas and John Winram; but according to Knox, it was Patrick Hepburn, Bishop of Moray, who was principally responsible for his execution: 'by his counsel alone was Walter Myln our brother put to death'.¹⁴⁹ Probably Hepburn pressed for the rigorous execution of the law, and those who were opposed could do nothing to resist in the circumstances. Knox says that the Queen Regent blamed Archbishop for the death, but Pitscottie confirms that Archbishop Hamilton was reluctant to proceed with the burning.¹⁵⁰ Foxe, probably on the authority of Winram, describes sir Hugh Curry as 'an ignoraunt minister and impe of Sathan';¹⁵¹ and the likelihood is that the anti-*spirituali* movement was making an example of Milne to attack both the Protestants and the laxity of the *spirituali*, perhaps especially on the matter of clerical celibacy.

32. Another example is provided by the Bishops' 'articles of reconciliation' which, according to Knox, were proffered to the Protestants in 1558, probably in the autumn or early winter:

147. J. Anderson (ed.), *Calendar of the Laing Charters, A.D. 854–1837* (Edinburgh, 1899), no. 428; Watt and Shead, *Heads of Religious Houses in Scotland from Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries*, p. 207; J. Beveridge (ed.), *The Protocol Books of Dominus Thomas Johnsoun, 1528–1578* (Scottish Record Society, Edinburgh, 1920), nos. 362, 375. In connection with Adam Wallace and Walter Milne, Foxe calls him sir Hew Terry or Turry, but Pitscottie gives his surname as Curry; see Pitscottie, *Historie and Cronicles*, Vol. 2, p. 130; Knox, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 551.

148. Pitscottie, *Historie and Cronicles*, Vol. 2, pp. 132–3. Foxe places Milne's marriage after his return to Scotland in the 1550s, but, given his age, the earlier date would seem more likely.

149. Pitscottie, *Historie and Cronicles*, Vol. 2, p. 130; Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 190.

150. Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 153; Pitscottie, *Historie and Cronicles*, Vol. 2, p. 134; Herkless and Hannay, *The Archbishops of St Andrews*, Vol. 5, p. 94.

151. Knox, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 548.

Thei and thare factioun began to draw certane Articles of reconciliation, 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.¹⁵²

It is very likely that these proposals were provisional and unilateral, emanating from Hamilton's *spirituali* wing of the Church; and there is no reason to think that the anti-*spirituali* party would have ratified – or stood to – any agreement that might have been reached.

33. While some of the Scottish clergy were reacting against Archbishop Hamilton's *spirituali* position, many of the nobility were embracing it. The articles proposed to the Queen Regent by 'some of the temporal lords and barons', which she transmitted to the Provincial Council of March 1558/9 by the Earl of Huntly, evidently came from supporters of Hamilton's views. They reflect a sacramental religion – 'there is nothing that can move men more to worship God, nor [i.e. than] to know the effect, cause, and strength of the sacraments of the Holy Kirk' – and they endorse Hamilton's *Catechism* which they require to be 'distinctly and plainly read' by all curates and vicars. To this, they want to add declarations in English on the sacraments of the mass, baptism, and marriage, to be read whenever these are administered; and common prayers in English, morning and evening 'upon Sondays and other Haly Dayis' after the mass.¹⁵³ Lesley says that the authors of the articles wanted mass in English as well, and characterises them as 'certane Barrounis with sundrie vtheris gentlemen' who had offered to the Queen Regent 'a scrow of requeist contening sum poyntes of thair schisme, inuentionis, and deuyses.'¹⁵⁴ His hostility may have sprung from anti-*spirituali* views (if he held such at the time), or it may have been retrospective when he was writing in 1578 because the barons (whose names, unfortunately, are not known) probably ended

152. Knox, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 306.

153. Patrick, *Statutes*, pp. 156. The request for English prayers was very similar to a request from the Protestants a few months earlier; see Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, pp. 137, 150.

154. Lesley, *The History of Scotland*, pp. 269-70; J. Leslie, *The Historie of Scotland*, trans. J. Dalrymple, ed. E. G. Cody and W. Murison (2 vols., Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1888-95), Vol. 2, p. 397.

up joining the Protestants. It is clear, however, that the position of these barons was *spirituali* rather than Protestant in March 1558/9.

34. The ‘counsel’ which the Dean and Chapter of Aberdeen gave to the Bishop, at his own request, in January 1558/9 again betrays traces of the division in the Church.¹⁵⁵ The ‘counsel’ called for the punishment of those who denied the sacrifice of the mass,¹⁵⁶ and stressed the need for an immediate end to clerical concubinage; and both these were points on which the *spirituali* had proved to be weak. The ‘counsel’ also called for the Bishop, William Gordon, not to be ‘our familiar with thame that ar suspect contrarius to the kirk...and that his lordship evaid the sammyn’. These suspected persons must have been Protestants – although it is difficult even to guess at their identity – and association with Protestants was usually an indication of *spirituali* sympathies. We are inclined, therefore, somewhat tentatively, to number William Gordon with the *spirituali*, and to regard his long-term mistress Janet Knowles in the same moral light as those of several others of the *spirituali*. Gordon seems to have been a learned man, but perhaps rather lazy and easy-going in character (although we very much doubt that he deserves the severe censures of Spottiswoode).¹⁵⁷

35. A similar slant can be seen at Archbishop Hamilton’s Provincial Synod in Edinburgh which started in March 1558/9. Again, there was a renewed demand for clerical celibacy and emphasis laid on the sacrifice of the mass.¹⁵⁸

Since Lord Hailes in 1769, Knox’s brief account of the Provincial Council has been criticised, especially for its statement that the Council enacted: ‘That if any were found in open adultery, for the first fault, he should lose the third of his benefice; for the second crime, the half; and for the third, the whole benefice’. No such act is found in the surviving record of the Council.¹⁵⁹ Knox goes on to say that Patrick Hepburn, Bishop

155. J. Stuart (ed.), *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club* (5 vols, Aberdeen, 1841–52), Vol. 4, pp. 57–59.

156. *ibid.*, p. 58. Ironically, Alexander Anderson was a signatory to this ‘counsel’. As we mentioned above, in January 1560/1, he unwittingly denied the sacrifice of the mass before the ‘Convention of Nobility’; but as he confessed to them, ‘he was better seen in philosophy than in theology’ (Dickinson, *John Knox’s History*, Vol. 1, p. 353).

157. Holmes, *Sacred Signs in Reformation Scotland*, pp. 65–7; Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland*, Vol. 1, p. 210.

158. Patrick, *Statutes*, pp. 163–4, 166–7, 175, 184–5.

159. Sir D. Dalrymple, *Annals of Scotland* (3 vols, Edinburgh, 1819), Vol. 3, pp. 260–62;

of Moray, and other prelates appealed against this alleged decision of the Council. Knox's account is confirmed by Pitscottie who represents Hepburn as saying: 'he wald nocht put away his hure noe mor nor the bischope of Sanctandros wald put his away ffor it was as lesum to him to haue ane hure as hie; and farder he wald preif it lesum to him, to call the popis bowis [bulls] that is writtin in the degreis [decrees], that he might haue ane hure in absence of his wyffe.'¹⁶⁰ Obviously both Knox and Pitscottie were getting their information second-hand, and the probable explanation for the omission of Knox's 'act' from the Council record is that Hepburn's intervention, or formal appeal, either sisted the passage of the act, or else caused it to be modified into the somewhat similar Statute 261.¹⁶¹ There seems no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the statement attributed to Hepburn; and his statement supports the view that there was a group in the Church, probably including the *spirituali*, who regarded their concubines as virtually lawful, and as virtually their wives.

Statute 265 of the Council forbade any churchman from maintaining 'in his household or company or in any kind of daily service any manner of persons suspected of heresy, who either scorn to attend the sacrifice of holy mass... or hold erroneous opinions contrary to the Catholic faith and the teachings of the orthodox fathers.'¹⁶² From what we have seen above (sections 8, 34), it is natural to think that this statute was aimed against Lord James Stewart and Bishop William Gordon of Aberdeen, among others.

Statute 276 of the Council can probably also be read as an attack on the laxity of the *spirituali*. The statute is based on the Thirty-Two Articles issued by the Theological Faculty of the University of Louvain in December 1544, at the request of Emperor Charles V, which were extensively used at the Council of Trent.¹⁶³ Commentaries on the articles by Ruard Tapper (1487–1559), Chancellor of Louvain University, Inquisitor-General of

J. Robertson, *Concilia Scotiae* (2 vols., Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1866), Vol. 1, pp. clxii-clxiii; A. Lang, *John Knox and the Reformation* (London, 1905), p. 100; Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 139n; McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513–1625*, p. 359.

160. Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, Vol. 1, p. 139; Pitscottie, *Historie and Cronicles*, Vol. 2, p. 141. Patrick Hepburn (c.1487–1573), it might be mentioned, was aged about 72 at this stage.

161. Patrick, *Statutes*, pp. 163-4.

162. *Ibid.*, p. 166.

163. H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, trans. E. Graf (2 vols., London, 1949-57), Vol. 1, pp. 406-7.

the Hapsburg Low Countries, and member of the Council of Trent, are known to have been in the hands of John Sinclair and others in Scotland.¹⁶⁴ Statute 276 adopts nine of the Louvain articles, some of them practically verbatim. The subjects covered are: tradition, the veneration of saints, the use of images, purgatory, transubstantiation, communion in one kind, the sacrifice of the mass, and the necessity of the priesthood.¹⁶⁵ Quite why these topics were chosen is not clear, but perhaps they were matters on which Hamilton's *Catechism* was felt to need further bolstering. The article on tradition quotes loosely from Article 25 of the Thirty-Two Articles: 'we must likewise observe what she [the holy Catholic Church] has ordered to be observed in respect of sound morals; *and it is heretical persistently to assert the contrary*'; with the words in italics being added by the 1558/9 Council, presumably with the *spirituali* in mind.

The impression left by the Council is that Archbishop Hamilton had lost control in the Church, and that in the face of rising Protestantism, the anti-*spirituali* party was becoming increasingly assertive. Doubtless, they were emboldened by the well-known and bitter opposition of Paul IV to the Italian *spirituali*. Tentatively, we would suggest James Beaton (Archbishop of Glasgow), Robert Crichton (Bishop of Dunkeld), George Durie (Abbot of Dunfermline), William Cranston,¹⁶⁶ and Quintin Kennedy as among the leaders of the anti-*spirituali* reaction.¹⁶⁷

164. Robert Reid (d. September 1558), Bishop of Orkney, had a copy of Tapper's *Declaratio* (1554) which comments on the first twenty-four of the Thirty-Two Articles. John Sinclair had at least the first volume of Tapper's considerably expanded *Explicatio* (2 vols, 1555-7), the two volumes of which together comment on the first twenty articles. See J. Durkan and A. Ross, *Early Scottish Libraries* (Glasgow, 1961), pp. 46, 63.

165. The articles in Statute 276, which are numbered from 1 to 8, correspond to Articles 25 & 26, 27, 29, 30, 14, 15, 16, and 17 of the Thirty-Two Articles; see Patrick, *Statutes*, pp. 173-5; R. Tapper, *Declaratio articulorum a veneranda facultate theologiae Louaniensis* (Lugdunum (Lyon), 1554), pp. 239, 253, 278, 287, 357-8.

166. For Cranston, see M. Dilworth, 'William Cranston (c.1510-1562): A Catholic protagonist', *Innes Review*, Vol. 55 (2004), pp. 44-51; M. J. Protheroe, 'William Cranston: *sedis apostolicae in regno Scotie protector*', *Innes Review*, Vol. 62 (2011), pp. 213-231. Cranston's religious views may have cost him the principalship of King's College, Aberdeen in 1547, and may have lain behind his opposition to John Rutherford at St Salvator's in 1557. He seems to have steered several students there towards Jesuitism; see M. Yellowlees, 'So Strange a Monster as a Jesuiste' (Isle of Colonsay, 2003), p. 37.

167. The departure of Richard Marshall from St Mary's College, St Andrews to Dunfermline Abbey on 29th May 1558 may indicate that he was retreating from an overtly *spirituali* position. The martyrdom of Walter Milne in St Andrews the previous month probably

36. The existence of a *spirituali* party in the Scottish Church necessitates a reconsideration of the reformation in Aberdeen in 1559-60. The author discussed the Aberdeen Reformation at some length in an earlier paper, but that was with what now appears to have been an excessively polarised model of the religious state of the country.¹⁶⁸ If Bishop William Gordon was not, in fact, a Tridentine Roman Catholic but belonged to the *spirituali*, was perhaps the same true of his nephew the Earl of Huntly, who was notoriously non-committal during the reformation struggle? What about the Provost, Thomas Menzies, who appeared as a Protestant in the early 1540s, relapsed into Romanism in the 1550s, joined the Congregation in October 1559, but then acted against them the following December and January? Perhaps a *spirituali* position would help to explain these perplexing oscillations. The main claim of the earlier paper was that Aberdeen almost certainly adopted Protestantism ‘democratically’ in November 1559 – and this claim is unaffected by the existence of a *spirituali* party in Aberdeen – but what is affected is the understanding of the circumstances surrounding this momentous step.

37. In recent work on St Andrews, Elizabeth Rhodes observes that the Roman Catholic practice of making donations for anniversary masses continued to be popular into the late 1550s, and infers that: ‘their popularity amongst the St Andrews burgesses and elite suggests that the influence of Reformed ideology was limited in the burgh in the years preceding 1559.’¹⁶⁹ This inference shows the weakness of the polarised Protestant/Roman Catholic view of pre-Reformation Scotland, against which the present paper is arguing. When the intermediate *spirituali* position is recognised, it becomes quite possible for certain Roman Catholic practices to retain their popularity *and* for certain Protestant doctrines to flourish. This seems to have been what was happening in St Andrews.

The strength of Protestantism in St Andrews in 1559 can be seen from the fact that on 18th May, one week after the destruction of the Perth friaries, the Observantine Franciscans in St Andrews decided to hand over ‘thar closter place and haill boundis tharof, with all that tharin is,

caused tensions at St Mary’s. See Shaw, *In Divers Manners*, p. 50; McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513–1625*, pp. 328-9.

168. D. W. B. Somerset, ‘The “Alteration of Religion” in Aberdeen in 1559: an ancient and persistent historical error’, *SRSJ*, Vol. 4 (2014), pp. 1-62.

169. E. Rhodes, ‘The Reformation in the Burgh of St Andrews: Property, Piety and Power’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of St Andrews, 2013), p. 50.

be themselves undisturbt' to the Burgh council.¹⁷⁰ Presumably this was a response to the reformation of the parish church in Cupar, ten miles away, a few days earlier.¹⁷¹ This was well before Lord James Stewart sided with the Congregation (on 29th or 30th May), and more than three weeks before Knox's arrival in St Andrews (11th June), and the town might have been supposed to have been in a state of peace; but evidently this was not the case. The Protestants were already sufficiently threatening for the friars to take this drastic precautionary step.

In a subsequent paper, Rhodes notes that:

One of the striking aspects of St Andrews' 1559 declaration of loyalty to the Congregation is the fact that so many of the names of the men who signed it are the same as those who are mentioned as playing key roles either as donors, administrators or clerics in the pre-Reformation church. For many citizens of St Andrews, it was evidently perfectly possible to be an active supporter of the Catholic Church throughout most of the 1550s, and then to join the Protestant Kirk in the summer of 1559.... Although the Reformation in St Andrews was effective, this should not be taken as evidence of previous disillusionment with Catholicism. Paradoxically, the success of St Andrews Protestant Kirk was rooted in the vitality of the Catholic Church during the 1550s.¹⁷²

Martin Luther's religious path shows, however, that increasing religious zeal can be accompanied by a growing *dissatisfaction* with the form of religion pursued. This may have been what was happening with the Holy Trinity chaplain, Walter Mar, whom Rhodes mentions, and with others too.¹⁷³ For those who were troubled about their religion, the burning of Walter Milne in April 1558 at the instigation of worldly clerics like Hugh Curry and Patrick Hepburn can only have made unreformed Romanism still less attractive to them. Knox's role when he did arrive was not so much to persuade determined Tridentine Roman Catholics to embrace Protestantism as to persuade those who were already either *spirituali* or full of doubts that they should forsake Romanism completely. There seems

170. W. Moir Bryce, *The Scottish Grey Friars* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1909), Vol. 1, p. 295; Vol. 2, p. 202.

171. Pitscottie, *Historie and Cronicles*, Vol. 2, p. 147.

172. E. Rhodes, 'Property and Piety: Donations to Holy Trinity Church, St Andrews', in McCallum, *Scotland's Long Reformation*, pp. 27-48 (pp. 42, 46).

173. *Ibid.*, pp. 42-44.

no reason to question Knox's statement to Anna Locke on 23rd June that the people of St Andrews had a 'thrist' for his preaching.¹⁷⁴

38. That the Protestant conflict with the *spirituali* in 1559 was chiefly over the sacraments also helps to explain what is otherwise perplexing: that the Scots Confession of August 1560 was nearly silent on the doctrine of justification but devoted several lengthy articles to baptism and the Lord's Supper.¹⁷⁵ Commenting on the Confession some months later, Archbishop Hamilton informed Knox that 'he could not deny but there was some reason... [for] a reformation of the doctrine of the Church'.¹⁷⁶ Presumably Hamilton was conceding that some of the doctrines and practices in his *Catechism* were not easy to defend, but the definition of faith was not among them.

39. The years 1559 and 1560 brought a separation among the Scottish *spirituali*. Some, such as John Winram and John Douglas, made the transition to Protestantism, while others drew back. It would be interesting to know more about the doctrine of those who remained in Romanism. Did they retain *spirituali* views or move towards Tridentinism? Is it broadly true that the ongoing *spirituali* remained in Scotland, like Archbishop Hamilton, whereas the anti-*spirituali*, such as James Beaton and Ninian Winzet, headed for the Continent? What was the doctrine of Mary Queen of Scots' chaplain René Benoît, and of Mary herself? What was the doctrine of the remnant in Aberdeen that was openly Roman Catholic after 1560, and what was that of the Nicodemite Roman Catholics who reluctantly professed Protestantism? It cannot necessarily be assumed that any of these were Tridentine.

40. In about 1660, the Roman Catholic missionary to Scotland, Prefect William Ballantine, giving an account of the religious history and circumstances of Scotland to his superiors in Rome, commended Hamilton's *Catechism* to them, and suggested reprinting it:

Shortly before this time he (Archbishop Hamilton) had summoned a provincial council in Edinburgh in which he had decreed many laws concerning the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline and attempted to

174. Knox, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 26; cf. Rhodes, 'Property and Piety: Donations to Holy Trinity Church, St Andrews', p. 28.

175. There are passing references to justification in Articles 15 and 25, whereas Articles 21-23 are wholly on the sacraments. See A. F. Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1900), pp. 111-114.

176. Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland*, Vol. 1, p. 372.

apply a remedy to so many evils; he published a *Catechism* too for the instruction of the people; it is the most suitable of all I have read. Only five or six copies, which I have myself collected are now extant. As it is written in a somewhat old-fashioned style, it would seem that a great contribution would be made to the conversion of the people if it were corrected and reprinted in a style more fashionable today; God willing, I shall transcribe it, and I shall do so all the more readily, because I can find no other catechism at all more comprehensive, more learned, or better arranged. The scripture texts certainly suit very well the proof of the articles of our faith with which it deals; nowhere else do I find all the ceremonies better or more tastefully explained, and at the end of each explanation of the articles of the faith there is a devout exhortation to the people urging them to lead a life in conformity with the precepts of the gospel therein set forth.¹⁷⁷

The *Catechism*'s language on faith does not seem to have jarred with Ballantine. Did he perhaps have Jansenist leanings?

4. Conclusions

We have seen that what in Italy was called *spirituali* doctrine was common in Scotland from the 1530s, and dominant in a certain sense from 1550 under Archbishop Hamilton. We want now to draw some conclusions.

1. It is a mistake to think of the Church of Rome as basically Tridentine in its doctrine, either before or during the Council of Trent. The Church was divided on several doctrines, and the Council of Trent represented the victory of a faction; and it was a while before that victory could be enforced.¹⁷⁸ Even Roman Catholic historians have been inclined to fall into this mistake,¹⁷⁹ which is far from helpful for a correct understanding of the period. James McMillan complained about a similarly blinkered mentality in the study of the Jesuit/Jansenist controversy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, where Jansenism was simply dismissed as heresy by Roman Catholic historians rather than considered on its own terms.¹⁸⁰

177. W. J. Anderson, 'Narratives of the Scottish Reformation III: Prefect Ballantine's Report, circa 1660, Part 1', *Innes Review*, Vol. 8 (1957), pp. 39-66 (p. 44).

178. Holmes and others date the final triumph of Tridentinism in England, Scotland, and France to 1580 or later; see Holmes, *Sacred Signs in Reformation Scotland*, p. 193.

179. See, for example, the discussions on Archbishop Hamilton's *Catechism* in McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513-1625*, pp. 64-6, 252-5.

180. J. F. McMillan, 'Scottish Catholics and the Jansenist controversy: the case re-opened', *Innes Review*, Vol. 32 (1981), pp. 22-33 (pp. 22-24, 30); *ibid.*, review of B. M. Halloran, *The Scots College, Paris, 1601-1792*, in *Innes Review*, Vol. 52 (2001), pp. 107-9.

2. The doctrine of Hamilton's *Catechism* may not have been universal in the Scottish Church in the 1550s, but it was certainly widespread; and it was as much to this doctrine as to Tridentine doctrine that Scottish Protestants were reacting after 1555.

3. Many writers talk about 'Catholic reform' in Scotland before 1560, but the term is imprecise. The 'Catholic reform' pursued by Archbishop Hamilton was very different from that of the *zelanti* or the Jesuits, and in some respects they were opposed to each other.¹⁸¹ So strongly did the *zelanti* Paul IV distrust the Catholicism of Mary I and the former *spirituali* Cardinal Reginald Pole in England that he was gratified to hear of their deaths.¹⁸² One would think that he had even more reason to dislike the form of religion promoted by Archbishop Hamilton. Thus, in discussing attempted Scottish 'Catholic reform', it is necessary to distinguish the proponents of *spirituali* reform from those seeking a Tridentine or Jesuit counter-reformation.

4. The Scottish *spirituali* movement seems to have been largely indigenous in origin. There may have been some borrowing from Cologne, and from the various other German sources mentioned by Mitchell,¹⁸³ but Archbishop Hamilton probably got his basic doctrine of faith from Alexander Logie, who got it from Patrick Hamilton, who got it from Luther. It is likely that *spirituali* doctrine – that is, a Lutheran view of faith combined with a Roman Catholic view of the mass – occurred wherever Lutheranism and pre-Tridentine Romanism confronted each other.¹⁸⁴ In the same way, Richard Marshall may have acquired his *spirituali* views after he came to Scotland, but it seems just as likely that he developed them in England. It would be interesting to identify other Englishmen with *spirituali* views at that time.

5. As we have mentioned, the *spirituali* doctrine and the resulting Nicodemism probably explains the relative absence of persecution, and of references to Protestantism, in the early 1550s in Scotland. It also sheds some light on why people like John Winram and John Douglas remained in the Church of Rome as long as they did, and why they so rapidly attained prominence in the Protestant Church.

181. This point was made long ago by Gordon Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation*, p. 35.

182. D. Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor* (London, 1991), p. 371.

183. Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, pp. ix-x.

184. For some evidence to support this statement, see Slonosky, 'Burgh government and Reformation: Stirling, c.1530–1565', p. 68.

6. The widespread embracing of *spirituali* doctrine, and the consequent Nicodemism, makes it difficult to estimate the number of Protestants in Scotland in the 1550s. There was a fashion some years ago to minimise that number as far as possible, but this overlooked the fact that the influence of Protestantism extended far beyond the number of its open professors. Protestantism in that period has to be weighed rather than counted.

7. Archbishop Hamilton's reforms are usually regarded as a failure, but this is not altogether accurate. They certainly failed to preserve Tridentine Romanism, but that is not what Hamilton was trying to do. In terms of clerical morality, education, and preaching, the impact of his reforms seems to have been limited, but in the promoting of an appetite for a more biblical form of religion in the vernacular, they seem to have been quite effective. The fact that Knox diverted the reforms into something even closer to the Bible does not take away from the achievement of Hamilton and his assistants such as Richard Marshall and John Winram. As James Cameron said: 'The ease with which the reformation was carried out in 1559-60 perhaps owed more to what had been happening within the Church in the previous decade than has hitherto been realised.'¹⁸⁵

8. While Archbishop Hamilton may have helped the Church towards *spirituali* doctrine, the transition to full-blown Protestantism had much to do with Knox. His visit in 1555 seems to have shaken the prevailing Nicodemism, and his return in May 1559 gave impetus to the rising Protestant movement. His hand is very evident in the Scots Confession of 1560. Without Knox, there might perhaps have been an English-style compromise reformation in Scotland, but he, under the Divine hand, was largely responsible for the form that it finally took in 1560.

9. This paper has elaborated on the outline hinted at by Alexander Mitchell in his 1882 preface, picked up by James Cameron in 1979, and developed at length by Alec Ryrie in his 2004 paper.¹⁸⁶ Consideration of the notion of *spirituali* doctrine has, we think, helped to sharpen the focus of the earlier work and has brought out more detail, especially of the tensions and divisions within Scottish Romanism in the 1550s.

185. J. K. Cameron, 'The Cologne Reformation and the Church of Scotland', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 30 (1979), pp. 39-64 (p. 64).

186. Mitchell, *The Catechism set forth by Archbishop Hamilton*, pp. viii-xix; Cameron, "'Catholic Reform" in Germany and in the pre-1560 Church in Scotland'; A. Ryrie, 'Reform without frontiers in the last years of Catholic Scotland', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 119 (2004), pp. 27-56.