

**JOHN SPOTTISWOODE, JACOBAN ARCHBISHOP AND STATESMAN.**

Thesis  
3466

**Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy of the University of Stirling.**

**A.S.Wayne Pearce.**

**Department of History.  
October 1998.**

~~0/100~~

## CONTENTS.

Abstract.....	ii.
Declaration.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv.
Introduction.....	1.
I. John Spottiswoode, 1565-1603.....	6.
II. Archbishop Spottiswoode and the re-establishment of erastian episcopacy.....	45.
Part I.	
III. Archbishop Spottiswoode and the re-establishment of erastian episcopacy.....	85.
Part II.	
IV. Archbishop Spottiswoode in Glasgow and its environs.....	117.
V. Archbishop Spottiswoode and Roman Catholic recusancy.....	152.
Part I.	
VI. Archbishop Spottiswoode and Roman Catholic recusancy.....	186.
Part II.	
VII. Archbishop Spottiswoode in St Andrews and its environs, 1615-1625.....	226.
VIII. Archbishop Spottiswoode and the five articles of Perth.....	264.
Part I.	
IX. Archbishop Spottiswoode and the five articles of Perth.....	301.
Part II.	
Conclusion.....	335.
Bibliography.....	341.

## **ABSTRACT.**

This main aim of this thesis is to conclusively demonstrate that John Spottiswoode was one of the most important churchman in early modern Scotland. He was, it will be shown, the most authoritative and impressive of Scotland's post-Reformation bishops. Spottiswoode was the principal ecclesiastic in James VI's reconstruction of an episcopal church in Scotland after 1603 when he was appointed Archbishop of Glasgow. This was followed by his prestigious translation to the metropolitan see of St Andrews in 1615 from where he presided over those controversial liturgical reforms of the succeeding years of the Jacobean era. Moreover, as a prominent member of the Scottish government he was heavily involved in secular politics and administration throughout the absentee kingship of James VI and that of his son, Charles I. This study, however, will confine itself to charting the archbishop's ecclesiastical and political ascendancy and involvement within the Scottish Jacobean church and state. Although Spottiswoode was without question a loyal supporter of the crown, it will be shown that he was no sycophant. Therefore, it is necessary to provide an analysis of the qualities and characteristics that made Spottiswoode such an influential figure and beneficiary of royal largesse between 1603 and 1625. Through focusing on the activities and objectives of Archbishop Spottiswoode throughout the reign of James VI, this thesis also aims to challenge the popular notion that the Church of Scotland functioned efficiently and harmoniously throughout the reign of "rex pacificus". Furthermore, the idea that an absolutist state existed in Scotland after the regal union will be exposed as fanciful.

**DECLARATION.**

I hereby declare that this thesis has been composed by myself, and that the work which it embodies has been done by myself and has not been included in another thesis.

Signed: 

September 1998.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

I first of all wish to extend my sincere appreciation and gratitude to Professor Keith Brown for his pertinent advice, encouragement and support over the duration of this thesis. I also wish to express my heartfelt thanks to the Department of History, especially to Dr Ian Hutchison, Professor George Peden and the office staff, for both proffering material and practical assistance and for making my post-graduate years at Stirling such a pleasurable and stimulating experience. I furthermore want to extend a special thank-you to Dr Alison Peden for graciously translating two of John Spottiswoode's Latin correspondence to the French humanist scholar Isaac Casaubon. Lastly, an extra-special thank-you to Margaret and Duncan for their loving support over the last four years.

## INTRODUCTION.

It has been written that with the notable exceptions of William Cowper, the Bishop of Galloway, and Patrick Forbes, the Bishop of Aberdeen, that the Jacobean episcopate was a somewhat obscure and apparently uninspiring group.<sup>1</sup> However, it is the principal intention, or goal, of this thesis to conclusively demonstrate that such a claim cannot be levelled against John Spottiswoode, who after 1603 emerged as one, if not the, most important ecclesiastical figure in early modern Scotland. Spottiswoode, firstly as Archbishop of Glasgow between 1603 and 1615 and subsequently of St Andrews, was not simply by far the most authoritative and impressive figure to appear on the Scottish Jacobean ecclesiastical stage after the regal union, he was also much more pro-active in the secular affairs of the kingdom than he has been given credit for to date. There can be no debate that King James was the architect and driving force behind the reconstruction of the Scottish episcopate. His conviction that it was his God given right to rule over the church as well as the state compelled him to establish constitutional and doctrinal alterations in the Church of Scotland. Of course, such an ideological underpinning should not blind the reader to the very palpable political reasons the king entertained for re-establishing an episcopal church in Scotland. James VI, without question, sought to establish a British church on the anglican template. Thus the king regarded the re-establishment of the episcopate in Scotland as the precursor to the construction of a British hierarchy. On a purely Scottish level, he was assured that bishops would function as an effective bulwark to the crown, providing him with control over a church that, although autonomous, had not hesitated to audaciously chastise and criticise the sovereign and his government over a range of personal and policy issues. Crucially, King

---

<sup>1</sup>J.Wormald. No Bishop, no King: The Scottish Jacobean Episcopate, 1600-1625 in *Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique: Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae VIII*. (ed). E.Vogler. (Louvain, 1987). pp.259-267. I wish to express my gratitude to Dr Alan MacDonald for drawing my attention to this essay.

James calculated that an erastian episcopacy would provide greater control over parliament and other key Scottish secular institutions through the representation of servile and fawning bishops. Finally, the embellishment of bishops with political, legal and social authority and status was evidently designed to strengthen and extend the crown's authority and influence within the localities. While Spottiswoode, as the king's principal ecclesiastic north of the border, was a passionate advocate of the theory of the divine right of kings, he was no slavish sycophant. Indeed, more often than not Spottiswoode was working to a peculiarly Scottish agenda which at times clashed with that of his royal master.

To date, historiography has produced either a superficial analysis of the archbishop's career that fails to measure up to contemporary academic standards, or has focussed on one particular aspect of Spottiswoode public life.<sup>2</sup> The main aim of this thesis is to chart and analyse afresh Archbishop Spottiswoode's meteoric ascendancy within both the Jacobean church and the state. Moreover, since he was one of the principal protagonists in the struggle to re-establish and procure conformity to bishops, his role in the ecclesiological revolution, and the reasons why he acted as he did need to be sought. After his translation to the metropolitan see of St Andrews in 1615 he uneasily presided over the king's untimely and highly controversial alterations in divine worship which manifest themselves in the infamous five articles of Perth in 1618. Thus it is also necessary to assess Spottiswoode's view of the new measures and identify the part he

---

<sup>2</sup>See R. Wodrow. Collections on the Life of Mr John Spottiswoode in J.F.S.Gordon. *Scotichronicon*. Vol.I. (Glasgow, 1867). pp.360-578. J.Perry. *John Spottiswoode, Archbishop and Chancellor*. (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1954). J.Cooper. Archbishop Spottiswoode, 1565-1639 in *Transactions of the Glasgow Archaeological Society*. New Series 7. (1924). pp.79-104. A.I.Dunlop. John Spottiswoode, 1565-1639 in (ed). R.S.Wright. *Fathers of the Kirk*. (1960). pp.48-61. J.Kirk. The King's Bishop: Archbishop Spottiswoode and the See of Glasgow in *Patterns of Reform: Continuity and Change in the Reformation Church*. (1989). pp.426-448. M.Lee Jnr. Archbishop Spottiswoode as Historian in *The Journal of British Studies*. Vol.13. (1973-4). pp.138-150. A.L.Birchler. Archbishop John Spottiswoode: Chancellor of Scotland, 1635-1638 in *Church History*. Vol.39. (1970). pp.317-326.

played in their implementation and enforcement. Additionally, in order to proffer an accurate appraisal of his archiepiscopal authority, it will be essential to gauge his status and influence within, firstly, the archiepiscopal diocese of Glasgow and later St Andrews. Within a broadly chronological discussion of Spottiswoode's career a number of key themes evolve.

His role in the re-imposition of erastian episcopacy and the emasculation of both clerical and secular opposition was crucial. Related to this is an identification and assessment of the impact that the archbishop's acquisition of temporal political and legal authority had at the centre of the Scottish body politic. Away from the centre of power in the Jacobean state, it is necessary to analyse Spottiswoode's establishment of archiepiscopal authority within the respective dioceses of Glasgow and St Andrews. One particular issue close to Spottiswoode's heart, was how he deployed the episcopate to tackle the perennial problem of Roman Catholic recusancy. Special emphasis is accorded to his endeavour against jesuit and secular priests operative in his diocese between 1603 and 1615, with particular attention given to the capture, trial and subsequent execution of Scotland's one and only post-Reformation Roman Catholic martyr, John Ogilvie. Moreover, Spottiswoode's role in the ignominious political fall of the crypto-Roman Catholic secretary of state and president of the court of session, James Elphinstone, first lord Balmerino, needs to be scrutinised. After Spottiswoode's prestigious promotion to the metropolitan see in 1615, he continued to pursue the issue for the remainder of King James's reign and into that of his son. Spottiswoode and his clerical colleagues encountered an even greater problem in enforcing conformity to the established faith among the social elites within their own localities, where an underlying commitment to kith and kin transcended loyalty to the Scottish church and state. These problems were compounded by the inconsistent, indifferent, and all too ambiguous policies emanating from the royal court. One particularly intransigent case was that of Scotland's most

powerful Roman Catholic adherent, George Gordon, first marquis of Huntly. However, an even greater obstacle faced Spottiswoode in the period after his translation to St Andrews, and considerable prominence is given to determining the archbishop's view of and part in the ratification and enforcement of the five articles of Perth.

Through focusing on Archbishop Spottiswoode's embroilment in the ecclesiastical and secular political affairs of the Scottish Jacobean church and state, at the centre and in the localities, between 1603 and 1625, this thesis also challenges the historiographical consensus that has promoted the notion that the Church of Scotland, notwithstanding the vociferous opposition of a small minority of "extremists", was functioning harmoniously prior to the disruptions wrought on the church by Charles I and Archbishop William Laud of Canterbury. Just as Fielding's persuasive study of Peterborough diocese between 1603 and 1642 contradicted the widely held view that James's reign was a time of tranquillity in English ecclesiastical affairs, so a close look at Spottiswoode's involvement within his dioceses - especially in St Andrews, has revealed that there existed significant discord within the Church of Scotland prior to the imposition of the five articles.<sup>3</sup> Unlike in England, arminianism was not a factor in the tangible acrimony and divisions which beset the Scottish church. Instead, resistance to the royal supremacy and the rule of bishops was the root cause of the dissension. Moreover, turning to the temporal sphere, the suggestion that James VI had firmly created an absolutist state in Scotland by the early seventeenth-century needs to be challenged and rebuffed.<sup>4</sup> For although Spottiswoode and others engaged in the government of the kingdom worked diligently and effectively to legislate and ratify royal

---

<sup>3</sup>See J.Fielding. Arminianism in the Localities: Peterborough Diocese, 1603-1642 in (ed).K.Fincham. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. (1993). pp.93-113.

<sup>4</sup>See J.Goodare. The nobility and the absolutist state in Scotland, 1584-1638 in *History*. Vol.LXXVIII. (1993). pp.161-182. The Emergence of the Absolutist State, a paper given to *The Association of Scottish Historical Studies* annual conference at Perth in May 1996. pp.12-23.

policy, it is also evident that the Jacobean state required the consent and support of the localities in order to implement and enforce these injunctions. However, before turning the spotlight on John Spottiswoode as Jacobean archbishop and statesman, it is necessary to evaluate the familial factors, his upbringing and education, and early clerical experience and performance as minister of Mid-Calder, in laying the foundations for his subsequent high profile role in the Scotland of James VI and I.

## JOHN SPOTTISWOODE, 1565-1603

### CHAPTER ONE.

John Spottiswoode was born in the parish of Greenbank,<sup>1</sup> in the barony of Calder, Mid-Lothian, in 1565, (precise date unknown) into a family with a long and distinguished record of service to both church and state. It has been written that at his birth a woman attendant taking him in her arms prophetically expostulated that "ye may all well rejoice in the birth of this child, for he will become the prop and pillar of this Church, and the main and chief instrument in the defending of it".<sup>2</sup> Whether the above statement has any bearing of truth or is simply apocryphal is unimportant. However, there can be little doubt that Spottiswoode ascended to a position after 1603 where he became "the prop and pillar" of the reconstructed Jacobean church and its main ecclesiastical protagonist. Spottiswoode himself relates in his *History of the Church of Scotland*, that his father was "a sonne of the house of Spottiswoode in the Mers, within the Barony of Gordon, of which Surname it seems his first progenitors were by armes they have in common with the Gordons".<sup>3</sup> While there has been some confusion as to the genealogical origins of the house of Spottiwoode, and much debate over the inclusion of the boars head on their heraldic coat of arms, there can be no debating their antiquity.<sup>4</sup> A "Robert de Spotteswod del Counte de Berewyk" was listed as adhering to the cause of Edward I in 1296, while William de Spottiswod is recorded, in the capacity of a notary-public, as verifying the proceedings against the Knights Templar at the Abbey of Holyrood, in December 1309.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See *The Statistical Account of Scotland 1791-1799*. (ed). Sir J.Sinclair. Vol.II. The Lothians. pp.86-106. Spottiswoode was probably born in Greenbank House, situated a short distance south of Calder. The house which appears to have been a substantial property with a few acres of land attached to it was in the possession of Spottiswoode's father, the superintendent of Lothian and Tweeddale. p.102.

<sup>2</sup>J.F.S.Gordon. *Scotichronichon*. 3 Vols. (1867). Vol.I. p.362.

<sup>3</sup>J.Spottiswoode. *History of the Church of Scotland*. (1655). p.344.

<sup>4</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. 2 Volumes. (Edinburgh, 1844). Vol.I. p.5. Sir George Mackenzie argued that the Spottiswoodes were descended from the Gordons, of whom one married the heritrix of Spottiswoode, upon which account they bear the boar's head on the chevron. Others have conjectured that the boars head was carried as a sign of vassalage to the Gordons, who were their feudal superiors.

<sup>5</sup>See preface to *The Spottiswoode Family*, *ibid.* p.xi.

In addition, in the fourteenth century, John Spottyswod, Laird of that Ilk, is identified as witnessing a charter between Alexander Lindsay of Ormiston and Alexander de Cockburn which received confirmation by King David II; while a century later, one John Spottswode is listed on three separate occasions as a witness to transactions in the Chartulary of Melrose.<sup>6</sup> Finally, Spottiswoode's grandfather, William of that Ilk, was killed alongside King James IV at the battle of Flodden in 1513, leaving an orphaned son (Spottiswoode's father) of four years of age.<sup>7</sup> His father (also called John) emerged as a prominent and respected reformer in the nascent Reformed Church of Scotland, and was superintendent of Lothian and Tweeddale from March 1561. He undoubtedly had a decisive influence upon the prospective vocation of his eldest son, and accordingly, it will pay dividends to briefly outline his career and assess both the direct and indirect bearing it had upon the future archbishop.

John Spottiswoode (1510-1585) was incorporated at the University of Glasgow, *servus domini rectoris*, on 27 June 1534,<sup>8</sup> and while there is no extant record of his graduation, there is no reason to question his son's assertion that he attained the degree of Master of Arts.<sup>9</sup> If, as seems probable, he graduated in 1536, there is a high probability that he was the *Joannem Spottiswod* appointed as one of four deputies to the university rector, James Houston, on the Feast of Crispin and Crispinian, in October 1537.<sup>10</sup> However, while it was his intention to further study divinity, he "was diverted from following the same, by the persecutions he saw used against those they called hereticks".<sup>11</sup> The tightening of the inquisitorial screw by the church authorities in 1538, under the direction of Cardinal

---

<sup>6</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. p.xi.

<sup>7</sup>*Spottiswoode. History*. p.344.

<sup>8</sup>(Ed). C.Innes. *Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis*. 4 Vols. (Glasgow, 1854). Vol.II. pp.159-160. See also K.Hewat. *Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation*. (1920). pp.281,304.

<sup>9</sup>*Spottiswoode. History*. p.344.

<sup>10</sup>*Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis*. Vol.II. p.162.

<sup>11</sup>*Spottiswoode. History*. p.344.



David Beaton, directly impacted on Glasgow, where against the better judgement of the incumbent archbishop, Gavin Dunbar, Jerome Russell a Franciscan friar, and Thomas Kennedy of Ayr, "who passed not eighteen years of age, [and] one of excellent engine in Scottish poesy", were interrogated and subsequently sent to the stake for expounding heterodox opinions.<sup>12</sup> It is apparent that Spottiswoode must have entertained Protestant convictions at this point, since he appears to have felt sufficiently threatened by the suppression of heterodoxy that he sought refuge in England, where he came under the influence of Archbishop Cranmer, and was "by his means brought to the knowledge of the truth" and admitted to holy orders.<sup>13</sup> King Henry VIII's England proved a natural haven for Scottish Protestants in the 1530s and 1540s,<sup>14</sup> and Spottiswoode remained there until early 1543 when he returned to Scotland with the former Scottish prisoners taken at the battle of Solway Moss on 24th November 1542.<sup>15</sup> From this juncture he was and remained a conspicuous adherent of the Protestant/Anglophile faction in Scottish politics, and was a prime beneficiary of the patronage this accorded.

On his return to Scotland, he took up residence with the zealous Protestant nobleman, Alexander Cunningham, fourth earl of Glencairn and was subsequently appointed *regens pedagogit* back at Glasgow University in October 1543.<sup>16</sup> However, the pro-English and reforming policies of James Hamilton, second earl of Arran, who was appointed Regent on King James V's death in December 1542, were abandoned when he defected to the Francophile/conservative faction led by Cardinal Beaton and the queen mother, Mary of

---

<sup>12</sup>J.Knox. *History of the Reformation in Scotland*. (ed) W.C.Dickinson. 2 Vols. (1949). Vol.I. p.27. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.67.

<sup>13</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.344. Hewat. *Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation*. p.282.

<sup>14</sup>See J.Kirk. The Religion of Early Scottish Protestants, in *Humanism and Reform: The Church in Europe, England and Scotland 1400-1643*. (ed) J.Kirk. (Ecclesiastical History Society, 1991). p.379.

<sup>15</sup>*Collections upon the lives of the reformers and most eminent ministers of the Church of Scotland*. (ed). W.J.Duncan. 2 Vols. (Maitland Club, 1834-48). Vol.I. p.73. Hewat. *Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation*. pp.282-283.

<sup>16</sup>*Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis*. Vol.II. p.167.

Guise. This precipitated a reversion to the anti-reformist position postulated by both church and state prior to 1543,<sup>17</sup> and it has to be surmised that in such an environment, Spottiswoode found it expedient to terminate his educational posting. In 1544, he was employed by Matthew Stewart, fourth earl of Lennox, in negotiations with Henry VIII, concerning the marriage proposals between Lennox and Lady Margaret Douglas, the English king's niece.<sup>18</sup> He remained with Lennox in England until 1547 when he returned and was presented to the parsonage of Calder-Comitis (Mid-Calder) by Sir James Sandilands of Calder,<sup>19</sup> with the likely consent and encouragement of his sons, John Sandilands and Sir James Sandilands of Torphichin, Lord St John, whom Spottiswoode accompanied to France in September 1550.<sup>20</sup> This seigneurial family had a long and distinguished pedigree of support and commitment to the Reformed cause, and it is as a testimonial to this fact that John Knox chose to reside at Calder House for a period on his preaching mission to his native country in 1555.<sup>21</sup> Their dispersal of patronage to Spottiswoode was clearly indicative of his own commitment to Protestantism.

The rationale behind the trip to France in 1550, was an attempt by Mary of Guise and the French crown to persuade or compel the principal Scottish peers (and others) who were committed, or had leanings, to an English alliance and Protestantism, to switch their allegiances in favour of the "Auld Alliance" and the Roman Catholic church. Lucrative inducements in the form of French pensions were offered to Glencairn, Marischal, Cassillis, Maxwell, Fleming, Lord James and Lord St. John.<sup>22</sup> And while they appear to

---

<sup>17</sup>See J.Goodare's essay "Scotland" in *The Reformation in National Context*. (ed). B.Scribner *et al.* (1994). p.95.

<sup>18</sup>Hewat. *Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation*. pp.284-285.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.* pp.285-286.

<sup>20</sup>*Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland*. 7 Vols. (Edinburgh, 1908-1966). Vol.IV. No.882.

<sup>21</sup>Knox. *History*. Vol.I. p.121.

<sup>22</sup>Alexander Cunningham, fifth earl of Glencairn; William Keith, third earl Marischal; Gilbert Kennedy, third earl of Cassillis; Sir John Maxwell of Terregles; James Fleming, fourth baron Fleming; Lord James and Lord St. John all, with the exception of Cassillis and Fleming who mysteriously died while returning from France in 1558, supported the Reformation of 1559-60.

have accepted the financial enticements, these did not extinguish their commitment and resolve to reform the Scottish church both morally and doctrinally. It might have been on the above sojourn to France that Spottiswoode first made the acquaintance and forged close links with Lord James Stewart, (later earl of Moray) commendator of the priory of St. Andrews and holder of the lands of Tantallon in East Lothian. He was the illegitimate son of King James V, and therefore the half-brother of Mary, Queen of Scots. Furthermore, Lord James played a significant part in the establishment of the Reformation in 1559-60, and was subsequently appointed Regent in 1567 after the deposition of Queen Mary; he held this position until he was assassinated in January 1570.<sup>23</sup>

From this point until the establishment of the Scottish Reformed Church, Spottiswoode had no fixed abode, living for periods with Sir James Sandilands at Calder and at other times with Lord James, whom he might have tutored. Spottiswoode accompanied Lord James to France in 1558 to witness the marriage contract between the French Dauphin and Queen Mary.<sup>24</sup> However, it seems significant that while in France he used his time constructively on behalf of the Reformed cause in Scotland. For he along with Robert Colville of Cleish negotiated a contract on 14 May with the Parisian master printer, Jean Cavalier, for two hundred copies of Patrick Cockburn's "*De vulgari Sacrae Scripturae phrasi*", with the proviso that more copies could be printed on demand.<sup>25</sup> While the above publication is clearly not overtly Protestant, it does, nevertheless, seem telling that on the eve of the Scottish Reformation, those seeking root and branch reform should be placing an order for a considerable quantity of Scripture in the vernacular language. Furthermore, it is worth noting that until the accession of England's Queen Elizabeth in November 1558, Scotland's dynastic and political connection with France would have

---

<sup>23</sup>See M.Lee Jnr. *James Stewart, Earl of Moray*. (1953).

<sup>24</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.344. *Collections upon the lives of the reformers and most eminent ministers of the Church of Scotland*. Vol.I. p.74.

<sup>25</sup>J.Durkan and J.Kirk. *The University of Glasgow 1451-1577*. (1977). p.212.

enabled and compelled the Scottish reformers to develop close links with the French Protestants, who were at the height of their influence, and who apparently entertained a sense of imminent victory for the Reformed Church in France in the late 1550s.<sup>26</sup> Thus, it should come as no surprise that the desacralising, deritualising, and demythologising Calvinistic programme enunciated in the French "Confession" and "Discipline" of 1559 had stark parallels with the Scottish programme produced the following year.<sup>27</sup>

Spottiswoode, whom one of the few vociferous defenders of Roman Catholicism in Scotland, Quentin Kennedy described as "learnit in the mysteries of the New Testament",<sup>28</sup> played a prominent part in the establishment of Protestantism as the official state religion in the 1560s. In 1560, he along with Knox, Row, Winram, Willock and Douglas (all called John) was commissioned by the Scottish Protestant political community to formulate both the doctrinal and organisational blueprints for the Reformed Church of Scotland, known as the *Confession of Faith* and (first) *Book of Discipline* respectively.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, he was nominated superintendent of Lothian (and Tweeddale) in July 1560 and admitted to the office the following March, while retaining his pastoral charge at Calder.<sup>30</sup> While he was clearly a highly articulate and competent ecclesiastic, his appointment as superintendent, was as much a recognition of his Protestant pedigree and his aristocratic connections, whose continued acquiescence and support was essential for the church's consolidation, expansion and general well-being. However, while

---

<sup>26</sup>See M.Greengrass's contribution on France in *The Reformation in National Context*. p.56.

<sup>27</sup>See *ibid.* p.56. A.L.Drummond. *The Kirk and the Continent*. (1956). pp.12-13.

<sup>28</sup>See Kennedy's Compendious Reasonyng in *The Works of John Knox*. (ed).D.Laing. 6 Vols. (1846-1864). Vol. VI. p.167.

<sup>29</sup>Knox. *History*. Vol.I. p.343. D.Calderwood. *History of the Kirk of Scotland*. 8 Vols. (Wodrow Society, 1842-49). Vol.II. pp.41-42.

<sup>30</sup>For the duties and responsibilities appertaining to the office of superintendent see J.Kirk. *Patterns of Reform: Continuity and Change in the Reformation Kirk*. (1989). pp.154-231. G.Donaldson. *The Scottish Reformation*. (1960). pp.102-129. See also pp.226-228 for a mandate to John Spottiswoode as superintendent of Lothian and a circular letter sent by Spottiswoode. See Knox. *History*. Vol.II. pp.273-276 for Spottiswoode's election to the office of superintendent.

Spottiswoode was most suited to the charge, he nevertheless, considered the appointment a heavy burden to bear, and a considerable barrier to an effective parish ministry - as did his parishioners who petitioned the general assembly in 1562 for his release from the above office.<sup>31</sup> Spottiswoode made repeated requests to the general assembly to be relieved of the superintendency, however, these were all to no avail, since "the profit of many kirks was to be preferred to the profit of one particular".<sup>32</sup>

Although never appointed as moderator, Spottiswoode was a regular attender of general assemblies and was consistently chosen by the church to confer with the queen and her government on ecclesiastical issues.<sup>33</sup> On the birth of Prince James in June 1566, he was commissioned by the church to offer its congratulations to Queen Mary on the birth of her son, and to petition the queen that the prince might be baptised in the Reformed manner; a request that was refused. However, a little over a year later, on 29 July 1567, Spottiswoode officiated at King James VI's coronation at Stirling, where he, along with the superintendent of Angus and the Bishop of Orkney, placed the crown on the young king's head.<sup>34</sup> As might have been expected, in the ensuing protracted civil war fought between the adherents of the king and queen's respective sides, Spottiswoode was a firm supporter of the king's party which eventually emerged triumphant with the help of English military aid in May 1573.<sup>35</sup> Indeed Hewat's contention that he became a bitter and scathing critic of the queen on account of her apparent complicity in the murder of her husband, Lord Darnley, the son of Matthew Stewart, earl of Lennox, his former

---

<sup>31</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.II. p.245.

<sup>32</sup>*The Booke of the Universall Kirk, Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland*. 3 Vols. (Edinburgh, 1839). Vol.I. p.18.

<sup>33</sup>A glance at Dickinson's index to Knox's *History* demonstrates his worth to the church in negotiations with the state. Vol.II. p.489.

<sup>34</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.II. p.384.

<sup>35</sup>See I.B.Cowan. *The Marian Civil War, 1567-1573*, in N.Macdougall (ed). *Scotland and War AD79-1918*. (1991). pp.95-112. Hewat. *Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation*. pp.291-292.

patron rings true.<sup>36</sup> In a letter penned shortly after Mary's escape from Lochleven, Spottiswoode referred to that "wicked woman, whose iniquity known and lawfully convict deserved more than ten deaths".<sup>37</sup>

It was probably a highly significant factor in determining his son's future episcopal orientation, that Spottiswoode was one of the church representatives at the Convention of Leith in January 1572, which found it expedient to accept episcopal nominations to vacant bishoprics in an attempt to halt the secularisation of ecclesiastical land and property.<sup>38</sup> Indeed, Spottiswoode was assigned a conspicuous role in the subsequent examination and consecration of the archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow, and the bishops of Dunkeld and Ross.<sup>39</sup> Certainly, Archbishop Spottiswoode claimed that some two years before his death, his father had been deeply troubled by the "disorders raised in the Church through the confused parity, which men laboured to introduce".<sup>40</sup> This was more than likely a personal reaction to the political and ecclesiastical upheaval precipitated by the rise and fall of the Ruthven Regime and the subsequent ascendancy of the arch-conservative James Stewart, earl of Arran.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, if his son's retrospective account is accurate, then the superintendent most likely approved of the Black Acts of May 1584 which established episcopacy and confirmed "the royall power and authoritie over all statis, alsweil spirituall as temporal".<sup>42</sup> Indeed, it should not be overlooked that he was initiated into the Protestant fold by the archetypal erastian, Archbishop Cranmer.

---

<sup>36</sup>Hewat. *Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation*. pp.291-296.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.* p.293.

<sup>38</sup>See Spottiswoode. *History*. p.258. I.B.Cowan. *The Scottish Reformation: Church and Society in sixteenth-century Scotland*. (1982). pp.122-123,130-131. Kirk. *Patterns of Reform*. pp.349-352.

<sup>39</sup>RPSS. Vol.VI. See entries 1473-4 for the consecration of James Douglas to the archbishopric of St Andrews; 1572 and 1672 for James Paton to the bishopric of Dunkeld; 2175 and 2810 for James Boyd to the archbishopric of Glasgow. Vol.III. For the election and conformation of Alexander Hepburn, the bishop of Ross.

<sup>40</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.344.

<sup>41</sup>The Ruthven Regime held power from August 1582 until June 1583. It was immediately superseded by that of James Stewart, earl of Arran's ascendancy which lasted through to November 1585.

<sup>42</sup>*The Booke of the Universall Kirk*. (ed). A.Peterkin. (1839). p.369.

Furthermore, it might be indicative of the above statement that Spottiswoode took no part in the compilation of the *Second Book of Discipline* of 1578, although there is no record of him registering his dissent at its approval and implementation.<sup>43</sup>

The archbishop's eulogy of his father that he "was a man well esteemed for his piety and wisdom, loving, and beloved of all persons; charitable to the poor, and careful above all things to give no man offence",<sup>44</sup> seems on reflection to be a reasonably accurate appraisal of the reformer's character and personality. However, as shown above, he could on occasion exhibit an acerbic tone and was somewhat despondent in relation to his impecunious situation during the early years of the Reformed Church of Scotland. Nevertheless, his son's interpretation would appear to find indirect confirmation in a letter issued under the privy seal presenting the superintendent to the parsonage and vicarage of Lothermacus and Mordington in the Merse, on 11 April 1581. This was evidently a reward for his distinguished service to the Scottish Church - and no doubt as reimbursement for the long periods when he had not received the stipend allocated to him.<sup>45</sup> In this letter it is stated

that our soverane lord being informit of the qualificatioun,  
literature, maneris and guid conversatioun of his lovit  
orator Mr. Johne Spottiswode, minister, and of his eirnest  
effection to travell and exerce himself diligentlie to the  
charge and office of ministrie within the kirk of God, lyke  
as he hes been ane minister and usit the said office and cure  
thir dyverse yeiris bygane....<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup>See J.Kirk. *Second Book of Discipline*. (1980).

<sup>44</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.344.

<sup>45</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.III. p.332. He once again appealed to the assembly to be discharged from the office of superintendent. And one of the principal reasons for doing so was that he had received no stipend for the previous two years.

<sup>46</sup>RPSS. Vol.VIII. pp.34-35.

To what extent these qualities were transmitted to his eldest son will be made apparent at a later stage. However, it is appropriate to conclude that his father's influence, career, reputation, and aristocratic and ecclesiastical connections provided his son with an ideal model for emulation, and were the principal determinants in moulding him for a role in the Reformed Church of Scotland and gaining him his first ministerial charge at Calder.

John Spottiswoode married Beatrix Crichton, the daughter of Patrick Crichton of Lugton and Gilmerton (by Dalkeith). Little is known of her save that she was "a grave Matron",<sup>47</sup> "remarkable for her pious and intelligent character".<sup>48</sup> She was appointed chief executor of her husband's will and must also have possessed considerable wealth in her own right, since in June 1584 she purchased a feu for the lands of Falhouse, in the barony of Torphichin and the sheriffdom of Linlithgow, from James Cochran of Bradshaw for the not insubstantial sum of 3400 merks. This she did with the understanding that she was liable to pay an annual feu duty of £10, which was to be doubled on the entry of every heir.<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, she appears to have continued to exert a particular influence on her eldest son's life after he became a cleric as is evidenced in the formal requirement of her consent to a land transaction on 12 July 1590 between John (Spottiswoode) and his wife, Rachel Lindsay, in favour of George Ferry, portioner of the town of Restalrig and its surrounding environs, of the lands of "Awdeweill" in the barony of Calder and the sheriffdom of Edinburgh.<sup>50</sup> In addition to John, his parents had a daughter, Rachel, who later married James Tennant of Linhouse, and another daughter, Judith, who apparently died prior to 1593. In addition they had a son William who

---

<sup>47</sup>*A Breefe Memoriall of Dr James Spottiswood.* (ed) Sir A.Boswell. (1811). p.1.

<sup>48</sup>Spottiswoode. *History.* (ed) M.Napier and M.Russell. 3 Vols. (Edinburgh, 1847-51). This quote is taken from the "Life of the Author" prefixed to the *History.* Vol.I. p.xxxi. All subsequent references taken from the "Life" are from this source.

<sup>49</sup>Scottish Record Office. *Register of the Commissariat of Edinburgh, Register of Testaments.* CC8/8/20, and *Inventory of Torphin Writs,* bundle IV. f.32.

<sup>50</sup>SRO. *Calendar of Charters 1587-1591.* Vol.XIII. 2875-3147. RH6/3073..



appears to have died at an early age, and another son James, who was born at Calder, 7 September 1567.<sup>51</sup> As with the archbishop's father, it will pay dividends in offering a brief narrative of this younger brother's life since it affords some interesting parallels with John Spottiswoode's own, but also because they might have reciprocally helped advance each other's careers.

James Spottiswoode was educated in his father's house under the tutorage of William Strange, minister of Kirkliston, and later of Irvine.<sup>52</sup> He completed his initial education by spells at both Edinburgh and Linlithgow grammar schools, and subsequently followed in his father's and brother's footsteps by matriculating at the University of Glasgow while "scarce past twelve yeares of Age": he graduated Master of Arts in August 1583.<sup>53</sup> After graduating, he returned to Calder and assisted his father until the latter's death in December 1585. The author of *A Breefe Memoriall* claims that shortly before his death, his aged father had advised him to travel to France (for what purpose is undisclosed, although, most probably to study law) but he was unable to comply because a pension granted to the superintendent from the abbacy of Deer, from which the costs of the trip were to have been met, had been revoked.<sup>54</sup> Thus, James "waited on Court still hopeinge for recompence, and to this purpose entered in the King's Service" in 1588.<sup>55</sup> In October 1589 he accompanied James VI as gentleman-usher on his journey to Denmark to fetch

---

<sup>51</sup>Hewat. *Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation*. p.301. *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae*. (ed). H.Scott. 8 Vols. (Edinburgh, 1915-1950). Vol.I. p.176.

<sup>52</sup>See *FES*. Vol.I. p.212. Strange was minister of Kirkliston from May 1569 until his translation to Irvine in 1584.

<sup>53</sup>*A Breefe Memoriall*. p.1.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid*. p.2. *RPSS*. Vol.VIII. p.250. On 23 October 1583, a gift of a pension out of the abbacy of Deer to John Spottiswoode and his son James of seven chalders, five bolls, two and two thirds pecks of meal, four and two thirds bolls of wheat and £45, 9s, 6d. This was confirmed, "after the late revocation" on the 26 November 1583. p.262. The pension was likely revoked as a result of the Act of Annexation of 1587 when the temporalities of all benefices formerly belonging to the church were transferred to the crown to do with them as it thought fit. Alternatively, it might have been part of the general revocation issued by the king on attaining the age of twenty-one that same year.

<sup>55</sup>*A Breefe Memoriall*. p.2.

home his bride, the soon to be Queen Anne. And on 27 December 1591, he won the king's eternal gratitude for averting a raid against James's person at Holyroodhouse, by the ubiquitous Francis Stewart, fifth earl of Bothwell.<sup>56</sup> Spottiswoode appears to have remained at court in an administrative capacity until 1598, when he was sent as secretary on the embassy to the king of Denmark and the German princes.<sup>57</sup> While it is pure conjecture, it is worth hypothesising that James Spottiswoode may have acted in the role of negotiator *vis-à-vis* his brother and the king in the late 1590s and early 1600s, when John apparently switched allegiances from the presbyterian to the episcopal camp. Likewise, he may have drawn Ludovic Stewart, second duke of Lennox's attention to his brother, who was chosen to accompany the duke to France in 1601. On James VI's accession to the English throne in April 1603, he was instructed to attend on the Queen and act as her distributor of alms.<sup>58</sup> Moreover, soon after arriving in England he was informed by archbishop Whitgift

that he had taken especiall notice of him and his good affection to the Clergie of England, by some Speaches he had [made] one daye at Hampton Court att dinner with Mr Gallawaye,<sup>59</sup>

and persuaded to enter into holy orders in the Church of England. On 24 November 1603, letters of naturalisation on his behalf passed the great seal and he was presented to the rectory of Wells, Norfolk.<sup>60</sup> Having identified and discerned the archbishop's family background, it is now thought appropriate to outline and analyse his early life.

---

<sup>56</sup>*A Breefe Memoriall.* p.2.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.* p.3.

<sup>58</sup>*Ibid.* p.3. The author may have been confusing James with John Spottiswoode, who was sent to Scotland to accompany Queen Anne on her journey south and act as her official almoner in 1603.

<sup>59</sup>*Ibid.* pp.3-4. The Mr Galloway referred to was most likely Patrick Galloway, the king's Scottish chaplain.

<sup>60</sup>*Dictionary of National Biography.* Vol.XVIII. p.818.

There is no extant record appertaining to John Spottiswoode's childhood. Nevertheless, it is worth outlining the general type of education he would have received and assess how this would have prepared him for a ministerial position in the post-Reformation Church of Scotland. While it cannot be stated with absolute certainty, it is probably safe to surmise that John, like his younger brother James, received his initial educational instruction in his father's house under the tutorage of the cleric, William Strange. Here he would have been introduced to passages from the Bible and the metrical Psalms, learned Calvin's Catechism, and the rudiments of Latin and English grammar.<sup>61</sup> Furthermore, he doubtless imbibed a considerable quantity of religious instruction directly from his father, when resident at Calder. Indeed, the superintendent, as one of the compilers of the *Book of Discipline*, appreciated only too clearly the necessity for special emphasis to be given to Biblical indoctrination for "the advancement of Christ's glorie... [and] the continuance of his benefits to the generation following."<sup>62</sup> This is evidenced in the disproportionate amount of space dedicated to education in the *Book*, and especially the heavy emphasis placed on religious instruction.<sup>63</sup> In a wider context, the programme closely paralleled that which was being effected on the Continent under the guidance of Andre Gouvea, Jean Sturm and Claude Baduel.<sup>64</sup> After an initial period of instruction he presumably proceeded to Edinburgh and/or Linlithgow grammar school/s where an introduction to the arts; logic, rhetoric, and the tongues (namely Latin and Greek), prepared him for entry to university.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup>See J.Melville. *Autobiography and Diary of Mr James Melvill*. (ed). R.Pitcairn. (Edinburgh, 1842). pp.16-19 for an excellent illustration of a contemporary curriculum for one of a similar social status.

<sup>62</sup>*The First Book of Discipline*. (ed). J.K.Cameron. (1972). p.130.

<sup>63</sup>Somewhere in the region of two-thirds of the *Book* is dedicated to religious instruction and education. This of course is hardly surprising given the immense task facing the reformers of converting the nation to Protestantism.

<sup>64</sup>*FBD*. (ed). Cameron. p.130n.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid*. See Head V, Of the necessity of schools. p.130.

John Spottiswoode matriculated at the University of Glasgow at the early, although not uncommon, age of twelve or thirteen<sup>66</sup> While there is no extant record of his matriculation, it most likely took place on either 1 October 1577 or 1578, for the customary length of the Master of Arts degree course was three and a half years, and he attained this distinction in August 1581 at the age of sixteen<sup>67</sup> It should come as no surprise that the superintendent of Lothian chose to send his son/s to University of Glasgow, as opposed to St. Andrews or Aberdeen Although he likely harboured feelings of loyalty to his *alma mater*, it is more significant that Glasgow University was in the vanguard of educational innovation and attainment from the mid-1570s and thus proved a magnetic attraction for would be clergymen This was due to the reputation and reinvigorating work of Andrew Melville, who had returned to Scotland from Geneva, where he had taught the humanities in the city's college, to accept the principalship of the university in November 1574<sup>68</sup> Melville, who had been a graduate of St Mary's College, St. Andrews and had furthered his study by spells at Paris, Poitiers and finally Geneva, was an outstanding humanist scholar whose arrival clearly raised the aspirations and expectations of the Scottish Protestant community whose educational agenda of 1560 had as yet failed to fully materialise Melville introduced and taught Hebrew, Chaldean, and the Syrian languages in the humanist fashion, lectured on theology, gave weekly sermons, and reduced the traditional emphasis given to philosophy in the curriculum by reforming the arts course on a Ramist model<sup>69</sup> The renewed vibrancy of the university during this period is accentuated by the increased number of students matriculating after

---

<sup>66</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p xxxii

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid* p xxxii Gordon *Scotichronicon* p 362

<sup>68</sup>See J Durkan and J Kirk *The University of Glasgow 1451-1577* Chapter 14, Andrew Melville and the Nova Erectio pp 262-292 T M'Crie *The Life of Andrew Melville* 2 Vols (1819) Vol I. pp 58-96 J Kirk Melvillian Reform in the Scottish Universities in (ed) A A MacDonald et al *The Renaissance in Scotland Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture* (1994) pp 276-300.

<sup>69</sup>J Durkan Education The Laying of Fresh Foundations in *Humanism in Renaissance Scotland* (ed) J Macqueen (1994) T.M'Crie *The Life of Andrew Melville* Vol I pp 23-24,72

Melville's arrival. Melville's nephew James (also Melville), who was appointed a regent at the university in 1575 and who later taught Spottiswoode,<sup>70</sup> stated that Melville's

learning and peanfulnes was mikle admired, sa that the nam  
of that Collage within twa yeirs was noble throwout all the  
land, and in uther cuntreys also Sic as haid passed ther  
course in St Androis cam in nomber ther, and entered  
schollars again under ordour and discipline, sa that the  
Collage was sa frequent as the roumes war nocht able to  
receave them. [He concludes], I dar say ther was na place  
in Europe comparable to Glasgow for guid letters, during  
these yeirs for a plentiful and guid chepe mercat of all  
kynd of langages, artes, and sciences <sup>71</sup>

While Melville may well have indulged in a spot of hyperbole, the above statement does appear to be essentially accurate. This development has its antecedents in John Mair's arrival at Glasgow University from Paris in 1518, when his appointment as principal attracted the largest inflow of students since the university's foundation in 1451.<sup>72</sup> Notwithstanding the obvious point that there were unquestionably major ideological, theological, and methodological differences between Melville and Mair, they were nevertheless, both products of the European Renaissance tradition.

While Spottiswoode has left no autobiographical record, it is possible to construct an accurate account of the type of regime he would have encountered at Glasgow, and the range of subjects he would have studied for the attainment of the Master's degree. The *Nova Erectio* (or New Foundation) of 1577, a royal charter conveyed to the university granting possession of the parsonage and vicarage of Govan, formally established the constitution and programme of education to be followed by the principal and the three

---

<sup>70</sup>Durkan and Kirk *The University of Glasgow 1451-1577*. In a letter to his nephew Andrew Melville described Spottiswoode as "your scholar" p 378. Taken from Edinburgh University Library. MS Dc 6 45. Melvini Epistolae f 29.

<sup>71</sup>Melville *Autobiography and Diary*. p50

<sup>72</sup>Durkan and Kirk *The University of Glasgow 1451-1577* p 206

regents of the college.<sup>73</sup> The traditional system of regenting, whereby each regent taught the complete curriculum to the same class of students, was replaced by more specialised teaching, to the effect that each regent was assigned to specialise and teach in a particular field. Thus, the first regent, Blaise Laurie, was to confine himself to the teaching of the principles of rhetoric with the aid of the most approved authors, give instruction in the Greek language, and equip the students with the appropriate writing and declamatory skills so that they might gain a proficiency in both classical and contemporary languages and prepare them for receiving instruction in philosophy. The second, James Melville, was to concentrate on dialectics and logic, and with the use of authors such as Cicero, Plato, and Aristotle, tutor the students in moral philosophy and politics. In addition, the second regent was to teach the elements of arithmetic and geometry. Finally, Peter Blackburn, the third regent, was to teach physiology, the observation of nature, geography, astronomy and chronology, as well as history.<sup>74</sup> In addition to the above subjects, special emphasis was accorded to religious instruction which was retained and evinced in the principal's role as teacher of theology and Christian doctrine, the biblical languages, and as the chief expositor of Holy Scripture.<sup>75</sup> By November 1580, Andrew and James Melville left Glasgow to carry on their reforming work at St Mary's College, St Andrews.<sup>76</sup> They were replaced by Thomas Smeaton as principal and Patrick Melville as regent. Smeaton, whom Spottiswoode later described as "a man learned in the languages, and well seen in ancient Fathers, the reading of whose works he did ever seriously recommend to the youth",<sup>77</sup> was a former Jesuit whom Melville had converted to Protestantism while at Geneva in 1572. Patrick Melville was a kinsman of Andrew and

---

<sup>73</sup>The charter is given in full by Durkan and Kirk in *The University of Glasgow 1451-1577*. pp 439-447.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid* p 444 J D Mackie *The University of Glasgow 1451-1951* (1954) p 68.

<sup>75</sup>The Nova Erectio in Durkan and Kirk's *The University of Glasgow 1451-1577*. p 442.

<sup>76</sup>Melville *Autobiography and Diary* p 84

<sup>77</sup>Spottiswoode. *History* p 336

James Melville, who had graduated from Glasgow in 1578 <sup>78</sup> This change of personnel did not facilitate any departure from the above programme of educational instruction

On matriculating, Spottiswoode would have officially subscribed to the *Confession of Faith* and the principles laid down in Calvin's *Catechism*. Additionally, he would have sworn to abide by the rules and constitution of the university and obey the principal and regents, as well as others placed in authority <sup>79</sup> Once incorporated in the college, he would have experienced three and a half years of rigorous, demanding and disciplined academic life. The day began at 5 00a m. with classes starting at six and finishing sometime after 5 00p m, with intervals for prayer and meals. On Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays disputations, which were a regular daily feature, were held in the evening to make room for games <sup>80</sup> The pervading ethos of what was an essentially insular university environment was clearly akin to the monastic ideal of pre-Reformation times, with its rigid and systematic programme of instruction and observances. Moreover, the students' free time was closely supervised by the regents. Examinations were held on the 7th October for new entrants and those proceeding to their second and final years, and at the end of August for those completing the Master's course, all examinations were oral rather than written <sup>81</sup> To proceed in the above, a certificate of good conduct and educational progress from each student's particular regent, in addition to a specified payment was mandatory.

John Spottiswoode's earliest biographer, Bishop Duppa noted that at university the future archbishop exhibited "a pregnant wit, great spirit, and a good memory" <sup>82</sup> It needs

---

<sup>78</sup>Durkan and Kirk *The University of Glasgow 1451-1577* p 303.

<sup>79</sup>Mackie *The University of Glasgow 1451-1951*. p 75.

<sup>80</sup>*Ibid* p 76

<sup>81</sup>*Ibid* p 86

<sup>82</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p xxxii

to be acknowledged that without corroboratory evidence this assertion must remain hearsay. Nevertheless, since he did attain a Master's degree, he must have shown the necessary aptitude, confidence, intelligence and virtuous characteristics throughout the three and a half years he spent in the college, to fully meet the university's stringent moral and educational standards. Moreover, the education he received at Glasgow clearly prepared him for his subsequent career as a minister, archbishop, politician, judge, historian and polemicist. It has been hypothesised that Protestantism is a peculiar blending of humanism and scholasticism, and this was assuredly confirmed in the curriculum devised, principally by Melville, for Glasgow.<sup>83</sup> For while the humanist emphasis on philology and rationalism were prominent features in the academic programme, the style of argumentation and the adherence to a set of rigidly defined doctrine were all too characteristic of the scholastic past. Furthermore, these twin aspects were later manifestly discernible in Archbishop Spottiswoode's attachment to the Erasmian belief that church government was adiaphorous, while at the same time advancing and supporting the introduction of a more systematic Calvinistic *Confession of Faith* in 1616.<sup>84</sup> Whether or not this apparent paradox is attributable to the education he received at Glasgow cannot be ascertained, although it would appear most likely.

Before turning to Spottiswoode's early ministry, it might very well prove productive to identify and record some of the names of those students whom Spottiswoode would have encountered and possibly forged lasting links with while at Glasgow. For although it is probably overstepping the mark to suggest that contained within the graduation lists between 1578 (when the lists begin) and 1583, that there was the embryo of a future pro-episcopal party, it might, nevertheless, be significant that a not inconsiderable

---

<sup>83</sup>See J K Cameron *Humanism and Religious Life in Renaissance Scotland*. (ed). J Macqueen p 171

<sup>84</sup>This issue will be discussed in a later chapter



proportion of graduates from this period ended up in episcopal orders after the union of the crowns in 1603. Thus, in addition to John and James Spottiswoode, Andrew Knox after serving as minister of Paisley was elevated to the bishopric of the Isles in 1605, as well as Raphoe in Ireland from 1611,<sup>85</sup> George Montgomery, after spending a considerable time in England where he was awarded the deanery of Norwich, subsequently acted as a privy councillor in Ireland and was elevated to the episcopate there in June 1605,<sup>86</sup> James Hegait became archdeacon of Clogher in July 1609, and subsequently bishop of Kilfenoragh,<sup>87</sup> and finally, John Blackburn after spells as grammar schoolmaster and dean of faculty at Glasgow, became archdeacon of Down in Ireland in June 1606.<sup>88</sup> Another former student who graduated in the same year as Spottiswoode, Gideon Murray, received a knighthood in 1605 and served on the privy council along with the archbishop. Murray became lord high treasurer in 1613.<sup>89</sup>

After graduating in August 1581, Spottiswoode appears to have returned to Calder to assist his aged father in his pastoral duties and responsibilities, probably with a view to succeeding to the charge once having gained the necessary experience and having met with the church's thorough exegetical and doctrinal standards. In all likelihood the confirmation of a gift on 30 November 1581, dated 16 January 1578, by Robert Stewart, Bishop of Caithness and commendator of the priory of St. Andrews, of a pension of £40 yearly for life from the parsonage of Portmook and the parsonage and church of Linlithgow to "John Spottiswod, eldest lauffull sone to Mr Johnne Spottiswod, persoun of Calder" is suggestive that the archbishop was earmarked for an ecclesiastical career from an early age.<sup>90</sup> Although there is no surviving confirmatory evidence, the above

---

<sup>85</sup>Kirk *Patterns of Reform* pp 485-486.

<sup>86</sup>*Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae* 4 Vols (ed) H Cotton (Dublin, 1847-50) Vol III pp 78,117

<sup>87</sup>*Ibid* p 91

<sup>88</sup>*Ibid* p 203.

<sup>89</sup>*DNB* Vol XIII. pp 1261-1262.

<sup>90</sup>*Register of Presentations to Benefices &c* Vol II 1578-1587 CH4/1/2 RPSS Vol VIII AD

grant would further suggest that the Lennox patronage connection was not severed on the death of Spottiswoode's father. In light of his subsequent indefatigable support for erastian episcopacy, it is somewhat ironic that Spottiswoode should have entered upon an ecclesiastical career in August 1581, for in this same month the first thirteen presbyteries were erected "to be exemplars to the rest"<sup>91</sup> Calder was an integral component of Linlithgow presbytery which was one of the above thirteen<sup>92</sup>

The restating and redefining of earlier ideals in the *Second Book of Discipline* of 1578 and the subsequent creation of the presbytery were the Scottish church's response to state/episcopal encroachments throughout the 1570s, and reflected its commitment to the Calvinist doctrinal assertion of the two kingdoms theory and parity between ministers<sup>93</sup> This renewed emphasis on an autonomous ecclesiastical jurisdiction and conciliar church government, rather than entrusting the oversight of the church to individuals, is indicative of the church's only too apparent fear of backsliding to the pre-1560 situation, when episcopal nominations reflected the diplomatic, financial and domestic interests of the controlling faction of the state<sup>94</sup> Indeed, Spottiswoode must have been well aware of the ecclesiastical disruption and wrangle which ensued after the contested crown nomination of Robert Montgomery to the archbishopric of Glasgow in October 1581 For this matter was thoroughly investigated and strenuously opposed by the synod of Lothian which comprised Spottiswoode's own presbytery of Linlithgow in addition to those of Stirling, Edinburgh and Dalkeith<sup>95</sup> Montgomery was subsequently deposed and excommunicated

---

1581-1584 f 89

<sup>91</sup>Calderwood *History* Vol III p 523 *BUK* pp 214-218 The first thirteen presbyteries erected were. Edinburgh, Dundee, St Andrews, Perth, Stirling, Glasgow, Ayr, Irvine, Haddington, Dunbar, Chirnside, Linlithgow and Dunfermline

<sup>92</sup>The editor of the *Fasts* has mistakenly placed both East and Mid-Calder in the presbytery of Edinburgh See Vol 1 pp 174-176 These parish kirks, however, were without doubt an integral part of the presbytery of Linlithgow See *BUK* pp 217, 310, 341

<sup>93</sup>*Stirling Presbytery Records* (ed) J Kirk (Scottish History Society, 1981). See introduction pp ix-xiii .

<sup>94</sup>D G Mullan *Episcopacy in Scotland The History of an Idea, 1560-1638* (1986) p 2

<sup>95</sup>*Stirling Presbytery Records 1581-1587* (ed) Kirk p xvi By the end of the 1580s, the synod of Lothian

by the general assembly in June 1582. Although, in response, the privy council issued a proclamation declaring the assembly's decree null and void, Montgomery finally resigned the archbishopric in 1587, and was later readmitted by the church to a ministerial charge.<sup>96</sup>

Turning to the presbytery, it provided the final cog in a coherent series of concentric church courts, the kirk session, presbytery, synod and general assembly. Its creation was clearly designed to sound the death-knell to anyone still harbouring ambitions of reviving episcopacy. Since the extent of its jurisdiction included the examination and ordination of expectants, the oversight and visitation of the parishes within the bounds of its jurisdiction, and importantly, the right to impose the ultimate ecclesiastical censure "the fearful sentence of excommunication", it effectively usurped the functions and authority appertaining to bishops of old, and made them superfluous.<sup>97</sup> Although statutory ratification, and thus, official state recognition of presbyterianism was withheld until 1592, apart from the hiatus from May 1584 (with the proscription of presbyteries in the Black Acts) to June 1586, their authority and jurisdiction was generally recognised by the temporal powers.<sup>98</sup> However, it should be noted that titular bishops contentiously continued to represent the ecclesiastical estate, and vote as such, in parliament without the church's consent.

---

consisted of the presbyteries of Linlithgow, Edinburgh, Dalkeith, Haddington, Dunbar and Peebles. See *The Records of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, 1589-1596, 1640-1649* (ed) J Kirk (Stair Society, 1977) p x

<sup>96</sup>*Stirling Presbytery Records* (ed) Kirk pp xvi-xviii

<sup>97</sup>For a detailed exposition of the presbytery's authority and jurisdiction see *Stirling Presbytery Records 1581-1587* (ed) Kirk pp xv-xlv and W R.Foster *The Church Before the Covenants The Church of Scotland 1596-1638* (1975) pp 85-110.

<sup>98</sup>*Stirling Presbytery Records*. (ed) Kirk p xviii.

In 1583, at the age of eighteen, Spottiswoode was officially deemed qualified to assist his father as minister at Calder <sup>99</sup> He remained in the charge after his father's death, and in addition was advanced to the near-by incumbency of Calder-Cleres on 19 July 1594 he demitted this charge two years later to make way for John Brown who was presented to the vicarage by King James on 31 January 1596 <sup>100</sup> However, without the confirmatory evidence which surviving kirk session and presbytery records could have provided, it is clearly difficult to construct a wholly tangible picture of Spottiswoode's pastoral competency as minister of Calder Nevertheless, the inclusion of his name in extant synod and general assembly registers is illuminative Indeed, the very fact that he was consistently chosen and commissioned by the Linlithgow presbytery to act and vote as its representative in synod and assembly meetings is a good indication of his high standing amongst his fellow brethren who comprised the presbytery However, it must be noted that inclusions of John Spottiswoode in the synod and assembly registers may not all refer to the future archbishop, since there was another John Spottiswoode, who as a commissioner of the presbytery of Edinburgh was active during this same period <sup>101</sup>

The extant synod of Lothian and Tweeddale records, which are the earliest in existence, cover the years from 1589 to 1596, and demonstrate as will be shown, that Spottiswoode was not without his difficulties with regard to enforcing church discipline and imposing ecclesiastical enactments. It may even be suggested that he was negligent in, or at least indifferent to, the enforcement of the fourth commandment <sup>102</sup> Nevertheless, a more plausible explanation would suggest that the vitally important cooperation and active

---

<sup>99</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p xxxii.

<sup>100</sup>*Registrum Secreti Sigilli* Vol LXVI 1593-1594 *FES* Vol I. pp 174, 176.

<sup>101</sup>*FES* Vol I. John Spottiswoode, younger son of David Spottiswoode of that ilk, minister of Longformacus until translated to Crammond in 1585, and then to Newthorn by warrant of King James in 1599 A letter from Robert Bowes to Lord Burghley demonstrates that he was actively involved in ecclesiastical affairs throughout this period See *Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland, 1547-1603.* (ed) J Bain et al 13 Vols (Edinburgh, 1898-1969) Vol XII p.476

<sup>102</sup>Kirk *Patterns of Reform* p 434

support of those exercising secular jurisdictions was not fully forthcoming. Thus, on 17 September 1589, in response to a complaint made to the synod against Spottiswoode "for not causing tak ordour with the keiperis of merket in Calder upon the Sabboth day", and in which he acknowledged that "thair was sum cordnyneris of Linlythgow quha reparit thair", the synod commanded him to seek the assistance of Sir James Sandilands and terminate this only too apparent abomination.<sup>103</sup> However, this injunction had to be repeated the following year (7 October 1590) and again in October 1593, when the Linlithgow presbytery was instructed to investigate the claim that a market was still being kept on the Sabbath, "and if efter tryell it beis fund to caus the same to be removit conforme to sindrie ordinances maid in diveris utheris assembleis".<sup>104</sup> Of course this problem was not specific to Calder or to those churches within the bounds of the Linlithgow presbytery. As Graham has conclusively demonstrated, such disciplinary problems were widely encountered throughout Scotland.<sup>105</sup> A general proclamation issued by the synod in October 1594 called for action to be taken against those who were absent from the

heiring of the Word and catechising of thame bot giving thame selfis sum to handie labour and workin thairon as on the remnant dayis of the oulk, sum to gamming, playing, passing to tavernis and ale houssis and swar wilfullie remaning from the kirk.<sup>106</sup>

Nevertheless it is worth noting that in comparative terms there can be no doubt that Scotland fared much better at Sabbath enforcement than its southern neighbour during this same period.<sup>107</sup> Therefore the problem should not be exaggerated. In addition to the question of strict Sabbath observance, on 7 October 1590, the synod registered its

---

<sup>103</sup>*The Records of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, 1589-1596, 1640-1649* (ed) Kirk p 14

<sup>104</sup>*Ibid* p 20.

<sup>105</sup>M.F.Graham *The Uses of Reform: Godly Discipline and Popular Behaviour in Scotland and Beyond, 1560-1610* (1996)

<sup>106</sup>*Ibid*. p 75.

<sup>107</sup>See J.Guy. *Tudor England* (1992) p 295.

concern at having discovered that an unspecified number of ministers within the Linlithgow presbytery were failing to keep the exercise and catechise on a Sunday afternoon <sup>108</sup> In response, it was decreed that in keeping with the injunctions of the general assembly, each presbytery was to obtain and subscribe to the principals and regulations formulated in second *Book of Discipline* and ensure that the exercise and catechising was rigorously kept on the Sunday afternoon <sup>109</sup> Subsequently, a commission was established to ensure the presbytery met these requirements In April 1591, in response to a claim made by Spottiswoode and Peter Hamilton, the minister of Linlithgow, "that be ressoun of the greit boundis and largenes of thair parochin they culd haif na auditour on the Saboth day efternone", the synod instructed them "to devyde thair parochinis in partis and every Saboth day efternone to caus everie part to resort".<sup>110</sup> While it is apparent that the Linlithgow presbytery made progress in alleviating this deficiency, it was not until 9 October 1595 that the synod finally certified that the presbytery was

fund efter tryell that thair exerceis is weill keipit; that thair doctrine or catechising is observit everie Sabaoth efternone [and] that thair sessiouns ar ordinarie keipit <sup>111</sup>

In spite of these minor difficulties which beset Spottiswoode and the churches within the jurisdictional bounds of the Linlithgow presbytery, it is evident from what follows that he continued to play a conspicuous part in the proceedings of the higher echelons of the church Indeed, the very fact that he was elected moderator of the synod in October 1594, and was continually commissioned on mundane matters like scrutinising presbytery registers, enforcing synod injunctions and diffusing potentially damaging disputes within the locality by the synod, suggests that he was a talented administrator and skilled

---

<sup>108</sup>*The Records of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, 1589-1596, 1640-1649.* (ed). Kirk. p 20.

<sup>109</sup>*Ibid* p 21

<sup>110</sup>*Ibid* p 24

<sup>111</sup>*Ibid* p 98

negotiator.<sup>112</sup> His appointment by the general assembly the previous year on a commission to ensure that the University of Aberdeen was complying with the standards established by the church in its educational programme, was an endorsement of his high standing within the Church of Scotland.<sup>113</sup> This was further confirmed by the prominent position accredited to him, by both the synod and assembly, in negotiations between church and state, and in their efforts to extirpate Roman Catholic recusancy, which was perennially high on the church's agenda. Thus, after the treasonous Counter-Reformation activities of the Roman Catholic nobility which ended in their ignominious retreat at the Bridge of Dee, in April 1589, Spottiswoode was appointed as one of the commissioners of assembly, who appeared before the king to crave that James take retributive action against "the erles, lords, barons, freeholders, that were at the said insurrectioun, and speciall traffiquers and counsellors to the said noblemen".<sup>114</sup> Although mere conjecture, the discovery of Roman Catholic plots and conspiracies, either real or fabricated, around the time of the Armada scare in 1588 and culminating in the episode of the Spanish blanks in 1592 likely made a lasting impact on the young minister of Calder.<sup>115</sup> Moreover, although again speculative, Spottiswoode as a member of the Linlithgow presbytery must have been involved in the court's perennial endeavour to have the intractable recusant Alexander, seventh lord Livingston and his wife, the daughter of another indefatigable Roman Catholic, the earl of Errol, conform to the established religion.<sup>116</sup> In May 1601 he, along with James Law, was instructed to wait upon and proselytise William Douglas, tenth earl of Angus; although he was unable to comply "because he was directit be his Majestie to awaite upon the Duke of Lennox in his

---

<sup>112</sup>*The Records of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, 1589-1596.* pp.22, 46, 74, 84, 92.

<sup>113</sup>*BUK.* Vol.III.p.811.

<sup>114</sup>Calderwood. *History.* Vol.V. pp.110-111. *BUK.* Vol.II. p.777.

<sup>115</sup>See F.Shearman, "The Spanish Blanks" in *The Innes Review.* (1952). pp.81-103.

<sup>116</sup>See *Scottish Historical Review.* Vol.III. (October, 1905). pp.20-23. *The Scot's Peerage.* Vol.III. pp.443-445.

ambassadrie to France".<sup>117</sup> Furthermore, he was appointed by the general assembly on visitations to Galloway in 1596 and Clydesdale in 1601 and 1602, for the planting of churches, which clearly had as one of its prime objectives the rooting out of the vestiges of Roman Catholic worship and faith, and preventing and counter-acting Jesuit activity.<sup>118</sup> Does the fact that Spottiswoode played an increasingly leading role in ecclesiastical affairs from 1586 onwards demonstrate that he was a committed presbyterian? And if this assertion can be substantiated, for what reasons, and at what point, did he abandon his former beliefs?

The available evidence, although inconclusive, tends to indicate that Spottiswoode was indeed an adherent of the more zealous presbyterian party within the church up until the turn of the century. In 1586 at the tender age of twenty-one, he was one of the church's commissioners who remained resolutely opposed to the king's demand that the sentence of excommunication be lifted against Patrick Adamson, the archbishop of St. Andrews.<sup>119</sup> Adamson, who had argued that the king ought to be "the chief governor in the Kirk, ruling it by bishops, conform to antiquite and maist flurissing estate of the Christian Kirk under the best Emperor Constantine",<sup>120</sup> was the principal ecclesiastical proponent of erastian episcopacy, and one of the leading architects behind the Black Acts. However, it is unclear whether Spottiswoode opposed an annulment of Adamson's excommunication for this reason, since the archbishop had unilaterally committed a plethora of transgressions which were anathema to the church. Thus, as well as being actively engaged in the re-establishment of episcopacy and the suppression of presbyterianism, among other things, he used the English marriage ceremony, and married George Gordon, sixth earl of Huntly, the most powerful Roman Catholic

---

<sup>117</sup>*BUK*. Vol.III. p.981.

<sup>118</sup>*Ibid.* pp.863, 973, 981.

<sup>119</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.IV. p.383.

<sup>120</sup>Melville. *Autobiography and Diary*. p.120.



magnate in the kingdom and an overt opponent of Protestantism, which was wholly inexpedient to say the least.<sup>121</sup> Indeed, it is telling that having failed to reconcile the church and Adamson, King James himself was quick to sacrifice his archbishop in the interests of political and ecclesiastical expediency. Spottiswoode, writing retrospectively in his *History*, speculated that while James was intent on re-establishing the church hierarchy he had astutely calculated

that by yielding to the Church's advise in this particular, he hoped to winne them in end to those things which served for his peace and their own quietnesse, or, which I rather believe that he did only temporize not seeing another way how to come by his ends, and was content to keep them in any tolerable terms, till he should find himself of power sufficient to redresse these confusions.<sup>122</sup>

In 1586, Spottiswoode was also assigned the task of re-establishing the Linlithgow presbytery.<sup>123</sup> However, while this is clearly suggestive that he possessed the necessary presbyterian credentials, it cannot be taken as incontrovertible proof. And while the various appointments on ecclesiastical commissions noted above, during the period when the presbyterians were in the ascendancy, purports to confirm the implication that he was indeed a committed presbyterian, there is clearly a need for caution. However, proceeding on the assumption that he was a firm believer in the ecclesiology adumbrated in the *Second Book of Discipline*, the answer to his conversion to erastian episcopacy lies in the years between 1596 and 1600. For it was during this crucial period that the hard-line presbyterians lost their predominance in the church and the preconditions for the re-establishment of episcopacy were secured. Furthermore, by the end of this period there can be no doubt that Spottiswoode was siding with those who were in favour of, or acquiescent to, the restitution of a church hierarchy.

---

<sup>121</sup>Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. p.73.

<sup>122</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.347.

<sup>123</sup>Kirk. *Patterns of Reform*. p.435.

It needs to be understood that the re-establishment of (erastian) episcopacy was to all intents and purposes foisted upon the Church of Scotland by a king who believed that "the rewling of the Kirk Weill is na small part of the King's office", and that "paritie amangs the Ministers can nocht agrie with a Monarchie".<sup>124</sup> James VI's conviction that it was his divine right to rule over both church and state was readily affirmed in the *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* which he wrote and had published during these years.<sup>125</sup> However, it should be noted that the king was not a sudden convert to this notion, since he had, from the early 1580s, envisaged an episcopate directly answerable to his person and dependent on him for its standing and authority.<sup>126</sup> Nevertheless, both internal and external ecclesiastical and political developments had militated against the consolidation and perpetuation of episcopacy and enabled the presbyterians to retain their ascendancy in church affairs until James regained the initiative after the suppression of a riot in Edinburgh on the 17 December 1596. The origins of the riot are somewhat obscure. Was it a spontaneous reaction by the ministers and people of Edinburgh against what they perceived to be an imminent Catholic *coup d'etat*? Or was it principally orchestrated by courtiers for both political and financial reasons as a means to topple the Octavians? - the eight man committee in charge of the king's revenues.<sup>127</sup> Whatever its origins, James by cleverly exploiting the incident, turned out to be its chief beneficiary. The king chose to blame the ministers, and by threatening Edinburgh with displacement from its position as the country's capital, he effectively brought it to heel and secured for himself the right to appoint ministers of his own choice

---

<sup>124</sup>Melville. *Autobiography and Diary*. p.444.

<sup>125</sup>(ed)J.P.Sommerville. *King James VI and I. Political Writings*. (1994). *Basilikon Doron*. pp.1-61. See especially pp.25-27. *Trew Law of Free Monarchies*. pp.62-84.

<sup>126</sup>While it is not possible to ascertain the exact timing of the king's developed aversion to the ideological foundations of presbyterianism - namely an autonomous ecclesiastical jurisdiction and ministerial equality, he was unexpectedly wholeheartedly in favour of the Black Acts which bolstered his lofty views of kingship.

<sup>127</sup>M.Lee Jnr. King James's Popish Chancellor in *The Renaissance and Reformation in Scotland*. (ed). I.B.Cowan and D.Shaw. (1983). pp.174-175.

in the capital and other strategically important towns.<sup>128</sup> James Melville, the presbyterian minister and diarist (and former teacher of Spottiswoode) recognised the magnitude of the king's triumph when he lamented "the very Sioun of our Jerusaleme overthrawn and put at undir",<sup>129</sup> while Spottiswoode, writing retrospectively, confirmed the importance both episcopalians and presbyterians later attached to this event as the major turning point in their respective fortunes, when he wrote that "by this tumult was the King's authority in matters ecclesiastical so far advanced, as he received little or no opposition thereafter".<sup>130</sup> While Spottiswoode exaggerated the extent of James's power over the church after this one particular incident, the king was nevertheless in the driving seat from this point onwards.

While it has never been authenticated, and later remarks attributed to Spottiswoode apparently refute or contradict the claim, Archibald Simson, the presbyterian minister and polemicist, later claimed that Spottiswoode had been won over to the king's side shortly before the infamous riot, and was surreptitiously passing on information that had been communicated in private meetings of the ministry in Edinburgh.<sup>131</sup> Indeed, the fact that his brother James was working in some undisclosed administrative capacity in the king's household could have provided Spottiswoode with an ideal channel for clandestinely divulging ecclesiastical intelligence. However, without further proof the claim must remain spurious and regarded as a piece of presbyterian propaganda designed to discredit the archbishop's reputation. Indeed, if correct, Simson's allegation tends to suggest that King James VI was Machiavelli's quintessential *Prince*, who masterminded the riot, or at

---

<sup>128</sup>J. Wormald. *Court, Kirk and Community: Scotland 1470-1625*. (1981). p.129.

<sup>129</sup>Melville. *Autobiography and Diary*. p.523.

<sup>130</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.432.

<sup>131</sup>Gordon. *Scotichronicon*. p.367. It should be noted that Simson made the claim after he was prosecuted by Spottiswoode in the high commission for the minister of Dalkeith's non-conformity to the five articles of Perth. See final chapter. This claim was repeated by William Scot in his *A Apologetical Narration of the State and Government of the Kirk of Scotland since the Reformation*. (Wodrow Society, 1846). p.72.

least manufactured a situation which would inevitably lead to conflict of a sort, and brought down his own government in order to smash the presbyterian stranglehold over the capital. While it has to be recognised that James was a dissembler and a highly astute political operator, the claim should be dismissed as fanciful. A more tenable solution to the question of Spottiswoode's conversion, if indeed he had to be persuaded of the merits of erastian episcopacy, lies in his gradual acceptance of the king's option for the practical reason that only with the support of the crown could the church extirpate recusancy, establish the constant platt, and extend and consolidate its position in the peripheral regions of the country. Thus, Spottiswoode was first and foremost a pragmatist, who saw in the king's scheme the opportunity to secure for the church the coercive power necessary to achieve these things. The promotion of an erastian ecclesiastical policy underpinned by the notion of the divine right of kings was a natural adjunct to this position. This conclusion is to a great extent attested to by the fact that Spottiswoode at no time advocated or supported *jure divino* episcopacy, at a time when this assertion was increasingly resonated by staunch anglicans with arminian leanings south of the border.<sup>132</sup>

At the general assembly of March 1597 the king successfully persuaded the assembled to establish a commission to confer between the church and himself on certain key matters which included: the provision of ministers for Edinburgh, St. Andrews, Dundee and the king's and the prince's houses; the planting of churches throughout the country; the constant platt, and "generally to give thair advyce to his Majestie in all affaires concernyng the weill of the Kirk, the intertainment of peace and obedience to his Majestie within this realme".<sup>133</sup> David Calderwood, the presbyterian divine, later rightly

---

<sup>132</sup>See J.P.Sommerville. The Royal Supremacy and Episcopacy *Jure Divino*, 1603-1640 in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. Vol.34. No.4. (October, 1983). pp. 548-558. N.Tyacke. *Anti-Calvinists. The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640*. (1987). pp.9-38, 58-60.

<sup>133</sup>*BUK*. (ed). Peterkin. p.461.

concluded, that the institution of a regular commission to deal between the church and the king was "the very needle which drew in the thread of bishops".<sup>134</sup> For while it is clear that James was in the driving seat by this juncture, the establishment of the commission, which only required seven acquiescent or apathetic commissioners of the king's choosing to create a quorum, provided the king with the ideal vehicle for setting the agenda in ecclesiastical affairs.

If there were still any doubts regarding the king's real intentions, clarification was given in December 1597, when the commissioners whom "his Hienes had assistit" petitioned parliament that

sik pastoures and ministers within the samin [kirk], as at any time his Majesty sall please to provide to the office, place, title, and dignity of ane bishop, abbot or uther prelate, sall at all time hereafter have vote in parliament,.....[and] that all and quhatsumever bishopricks presently vaikand in his Hieness hands, quhilks as zit are undisponed to ony person, or quhilks sall happen by at any time hereafter to vaik sall be only disponed to his Majesty to actual preachers and ministers in the Kirk.<sup>135</sup>

Parliament remitted the question of clerical parliamentary representation to the next general assembly which duly met at Dundee in March 1598. At this assembly, after a lengthy debate, which metaphorically speaking rent the church asunder, it was concluded by a slim majority that it was "nessessar and expedient for the weill of the Kirk that the Ministry as Third Estate... have vote in Parliament".<sup>136</sup> However, while the king had scored a notable victory in persuading a narrow majority in the assembly to abandon its long standing commitment to the Calvinist dichotomy between church and state, he had been forced to resort to personal lobbying at the assembly to sway the debate in his

---

<sup>134</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.V. p.644.

<sup>135</sup>*BUK*. p.601.

<sup>136</sup>*Ibid*. p.474.

favour.<sup>137</sup> Furthermore, at this point, the church remained collectively dedicated to the retention of a presbyterian polity, and opposed to the reimposition of the episcopate. This was confirmed by the Montrose assembly of 1600 which took care to formulate a number of preconditions designed to safeguard the Church of Scotland's liberty in spiritual matters and dispel any notion that it was prepared to sanction the re-establishment of the hierarchy. Thus, Alexander Hume, who had attended the assembly as a representative of the Stirling presbytery later recalled that

in the King's presence it was concluded, by pluralitie of vottes, that the saidis precheris sould be stylit Commissionaris of the Kirk, or General Assemblie; and that thei sould demitt thair office *annuatim* and be elected of new. [He continues that] the Prince was displeasit with the conclusion, and wald not admitt precheris upon his Parliament upon such conditiones: Quhairfoir the Assemblie wes forced eyther to condiscend that thair brethrene foursaid sould contenow in that office, and injoye thair livings *ad vitam siue ad culpum* or ellis have no vote in Parliament at all.<sup>138</sup>

However, James was not to be deterred from implementing his episcopal programme, and simply adopted an alternative strategy. At a convention of commissioners held at Holyroodhouse in October 1600, the king appointed three bishops by letters patent: David Lindsay (Spottiswoode's father-in-law) for Ross, Peter Blackburn for Aberdeen, and George Gladstones for Caithness.<sup>139</sup>

While it is not possible to pinpoint the exact timing of Spottiswoode's conversion to erastian episcopacy, there can be little doubt that by March 1600 he had nailed his

---

<sup>137</sup>M.Lee Jnr. James VI and the Revival of Episcopacy in Scotland, 1596-1600 in *Church History*. No.43. (1974). pp.50-54. Lee shows how the king was forced to revert to personal lobbying, attending the assembly in person and conducting interviews with ministers, both individually and collectively to sway the debate in his favour.

<sup>138</sup>A.Hume. Ane Afold Admonitioun to the Ministrie of Scotland in *The Miscellany of the Wodrow Society*. Vol.I. (1844). pp.571-572

<sup>139</sup>Melville. *Autobiography and Diary*. pp.488-489. J.Row. *Historie of the Kirk of Scotland from this year 1558 to August 1637*. (ed). D.Laing. (Wodrow Society, 1842). p.204.

colours firmly to the royal standard. As late as June 1599, according to Calderwood, who had evidently disregarded or was unaware of Simson's claim, Spottiswoode was still a staunch adherent of the presbyterian camp. Calderwood's *raison d'etre* for this claim comes from a dispute between David Lindsay, who passionately believed that opposition to the crown was intrinsically wrong and the principal source of much discord in church and state, and Robert Bruce and John Davidson who were tenacious advocates of the two kingdoms theory. During this heated debate Spottiswoode apparently turned to his father-in-law and exclaimed "lett us not seeke worldlie ease with the losse of the libertie of Christ's kingdom",<sup>140</sup> a clear indication that at this point he possessed serious misgivings about any erosion of the church's authority. Nevertheless, caution must be exercised in simply accepting Calderwood's assertion at face value, since the *Minutes of the Synod of Lothian* from which the claim emanates are no longer extant. Furthermore, in the fierce historiographical battle fought out between the respective proponents of episcopacy and presbyterianism in the 1620s and 1630s, to capture the moral and historical high ground, Spottiswoode as primate of Scotland, was a key target for Calderwood's scathing pen. Thus, in an age when character assassination was an all too common political ploy, it cannot be ruled out that Calderwood's assertion may indeed have been a fictitious attempt to tarnish Spottiswoode as a changeling who abandoned his commitment to those ecclesiastical regulations and principals enshrined in the *Second Book of Discipline* for reasons more attuned to personal aggrandisement than a responsible assessment of the situation. Another more concrete reason for calling into question Calderwood's allegation is that Spottiswoode had had no qualms about accepting the king's offer of a pension from the subdeanery of Glasgow on 12 April 1599.<sup>141</sup> Whether or not, prior to the turn of the century, Spottiswoode was siding with

---

<sup>140</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.V. pp.737-738.

<sup>141</sup>*FES*. Vol.I. p.176. There is nevertheless some reason to question whether Spottiswoode was the recipient of the said pension since in the Register of Presentations to Benefices, CH4/1/3, the name of the recipient is missing from the right hand corner of the document and elsewhere he was referred to as John

the king in the paramount issue of where ultimate authority lay in the national church is essentially unanswerable. However, by the Montrose assembly of March 1600 he was acting as secretary for the erastian side in a debate on this fundamental question.<sup>142</sup> Furthermore, in addition to being chosen as a regular commissioner from this juncture, he was nominated as a minister to the prince's house in May 1601,<sup>143</sup> and, more significantly, he was called upon to act as chaplain to the duke of Lennox in his diplomatic mission to France in July 1601<sup>144</sup> - an indisputable testimonial to his negotiating and administrative talent.

While Spottiswoode later claimed in his *History* that the purpose of the trip was "for confirming the old amity and friendship, than for any business else",<sup>145</sup> the principal reason behind the embassy was unquestionably to ensure that Henry IV acknowledged and was agreeable to King James VI's succession to the English throne. The party, which also included the privy councillors Sir Thomas Erskine and Sir William Livingston of Kilsyth, entered Paris in early August to be met by James Beaton, the aged diplomat and Roman Catholic Archbishop of Glasgow, and a considerable procession of Scottish exiles.<sup>146</sup> Calderwood satirically wrote that while in Paris Spottiswoode "made no scruple to goe to see a masse celebrated, and goe so neere, that it behoved him to discover his head and kneele".<sup>147</sup> While it is likely that he witnessed the celebration of the Mass, in light of his lifelong aversion to Roman Catholicism, it is most improbable that he was an active participant. The party were warmly received by the French king at St. Germain, and soon accompanied him to Fontainebleau where the French queen gave birth

---

Bell, minister of Calder.

<sup>142</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VI. p.2.

<sup>143</sup>*BUK*. Vol.III. p.969.

<sup>144</sup>*Ibid*. p.981. Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.465-466.

<sup>145</sup>*Ibid*. p.465.

<sup>146</sup>*Ibid*. p.465.

<sup>147</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VI. p136.



on 17 September. After concluding the embassy, and while Lennox was visiting his mother, madame D'Aubigny, an interesting incident occurred which supports the view that the rationale behind the trip was an attempt to ensure that Henry did not make waves for James over the English succession issue. Spottiswoode later related that the French king on receiving intelligence from England that Queen Elizabeth had taken seriously ill swiftly made for Calais on the pretence that military affairs in Flanders necessitated this sudden action. However,

whatsoever the businesse was no man doubted but that he had an eye upon the succession of England; and if he could have found a faction, would have foisted in another Bastard of Normandy, which oftentimes in a merriment and gallantry he spared not to utter.<sup>148</sup>

Nevertheless, it is inconceivable that King James and his Scottish subjects perceived France to be a real obstacle in the succession question, since there was no support in England to turn the country into a satellite of their traditional enemy, France. Indeed, in 1603, after returning from London, the Duc de Sully told Henry IV that "the English hate us, and with a hatred so strong and so widespread that one is tempted to number it among the natural dispositions of this people".<sup>149</sup>

From extant correspondence between Spottiswoode and Isaac Casaubon, the widely respected French classical scholar who was sub-librarian of the royal library in Paris, it is quite evident that Spottiswoode almost met with a premature death on his return from France. Spottiswoode secured his passage to England on board an English merchant vessel which set sail from Dieppe on the afternoon of 3 November 1601. At the outset weather conditions were favourable and it was intimated to him that he could expect to disembark around midnight. However, as he dramatically explained to Casaubon

---

<sup>148</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.466.

<sup>149</sup>J.Hale. *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance*. (1993). p.57.

towards evening a sudden and awful storm assailed us. With the south wind endlessly blowing, the sea raged so that huge waves were stirred up, and the ship seemed now to be lifted up to the stars, now sent down to the smoke of Tartarus. We were terrified, and asked the captain to take us back to the harbour from which we had set out, or to put us down on the nearest land. He refused. For he said, if we sail to land, we shall certainly be shipwrecked. There were heavy clouds, not like on a moonless night, but like a closed place with the light out. So there was a greater disturbance. However, lest any hope of safety remain, about midnight, a gust of wind first tore off the sail, then the mast fell into the sea; the rudder was steered in vain, the helmsman began openly to profess that he could no longer steer the ship. In this way we were tossed about by waves and wind the whole night. What was left to us but to pray and beseech and from the depths of our hearts to send up sighings to heaven...<sup>150</sup>

Fortunately by daylight the storm had abated slightly allowing the ship to limp back to the French port of Boulogne. The following day Spottiswoode undeterred made for Calais, caught another ship and proceeded to cross the Channel which to his undoubted relief was safely traversed in one night. On his arrival he made straight for the royal court at London. Although Spottiswoode made no mention of whether Lennox and the others sent on the embassy were with him on his fateful crossing to England, it is apparent from his *History* that they rendezvoused in London prior to their audience with Queen Elizabeth.

Spottiswoode informed Casaubon that they were “graciously received” by the queen. However, while the future archbishop categorically denied that they went home via the English court with the prime objective of securing official recognition of King James’s right to succeed to the English throne, his letter to the Frenchman effectively refuted his

---

<sup>150</sup>The British Library. *Burney MSS 366*. f.196r.

later claim.<sup>151</sup> Nevertheless, as Spottiswoode explained, discretion and expediency dictated an alternative course of action. The “legate”, by whom Spottiswoode was probably referring to Lennox, “refrained because he realised that the time was not really suitable. For he knew that this question would be unwelcome to the queen, for she thinks that having designated a successor once and for all her affairs will no longer be secure.”<sup>152</sup> As a good will measure they were keen to offer military assistance, on James's behalf, to help quell the Irish resurgents who with Spanish aid had been a thorn in the flesh of English imperialistic ambitions in the north of Ireland. Elizabeth accepted their generous offer and asked for two thousand conscripts.<sup>153</sup> By February 1602, when Spottiswoode penned his letter to Casaubon, he could report that the English under the highly competent command of Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, had secured a “wonderful victory over the Spanish which had descended there”. He satisfactorily recalled how Mountjoy’s tactical genius had confounded and smashed the Spanish forces and forced the leader of the Irish resurgents Hugh O’Neill, earl of Tyrone, and his men to flee for their lives.<sup>154</sup> After spending around a month politicking and enjoying English hospitality, Spottiswoode and company returned to Scotland to be debriefed both in public and in private by the king. In light of Casaubon’s future employment at King James’s court in 1610 after the assassination of his royal patron, it is worth recording that it would appear from Spottiswoode’s letter that it was he who first drew the king’s attention to the Frenchman’s works. “I greeted the king courteously in your name”, Spottiswoode wrote, “and spoke much of your affection and respect towards him, insofar as it seemed [good] to make a declaration of benevolence.”<sup>155</sup> Spottiswoode intimated

---

<sup>151</sup>See Spottiswoode. *History*. p.466.

<sup>152</sup>BL. *Burney MSS. 366*. f.196v.

<sup>153</sup>*Ibid.* f.196v. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.466.

<sup>154</sup>Burney MSS 366. f.196v-197r. Spottiswoode refers to Mountjoy as “Mongius” in his correspondence. See J.Guy. *Tudor England*. pp.366-368. J.O.Ranelagh. *A Short History of Ireland*. (1995). pp.52-53. for further detail on Mountjoy’s successful campaign.

<sup>155</sup>*Burney MSS. 366*. f.196v.

that the king had been greatly impressed by his writings, although, not unexpectedly, he was equally or more interested in developments at the French court and within the French church. Indeed, Spottiswoode ended his communique by strongly hinting to Casaubon that it might be in his interest to keep the king informed of developments in France. Interestingly Spottiswoode also promised to send the Frenchman a portrait of George Buchanan, which he had evidently requested when the pair had met in France, along with a biography of the famed Scottish humanist scholar. Spottiswoode noted that he intended to add a narrative of the life and death of Robert Rollock whom he described as a man “worthy of immortality”.<sup>156</sup>

Spottiswoode wrote again to Casaubon in January 1603. He apologised for the lengthy interlude and asked the Frenchman not to ascribe this to “negligence or forgetfulness”. Of particular interest Spottiswoode pointed out that “I have often discussed your books with Melvinus, who promised me a writing which I am waiting for day after day”.<sup>157</sup> He continued,

this delay is not due to disdain or aversion to you, but a certain inborn laziness about writing. And now, wicked men execute business to such an extent that the mind cannot attend to thought. Certainly his misfortunes do not lack ready intelligence, his crosses and bitter woes, which, would that you did not experience them...

“Our affairs”, Spottiswoode assured him, “thanks be to God, are without danger: with the king alive and well, all things promise to prosper for us”. Although Spottiswoode was evidently still on speaking terms with Andrew Melville, the above comment might suggest that relations between the two parties in the church were markedly strained by this point. Again Spottiswoode’s interest in and knowledge of political events on the

---

<sup>156</sup>*Burney MSS.366. f.197r.*

<sup>157</sup>*Ibid. f.198r.*

Continent provides an impression that by this juncture he was included amongst the close circle of confidantes surrounding the king. He informed Casaubon of how the Scottish court were kept up to date on French affairs through informants in Boulogne. He ended his letter by passing on the compliments of Peter Young, whom Spottiswoode described as “learned man, who once directed the education of the king with Buchanan, and now is a councillor to him”. Young had read Casaubon’s work on Strabo and believed he had some material in his possession which would be of particular interest to the classicist. Likewise Spottiswoode conveyed the greetings of Patrick Sharp, “a theologian from Glasgow, a learned and very cultured man”.<sup>158</sup> He closed with a somewhat conventional profession of love and loyalty to Casaubon. However without further surviving correspondence between the pair it cannot be ascertained whether Spottiswoode remained true to his word in the years which lay ahead.

With hindsight, King James need not have worried over whether he would gain the English crown without a fight for he achieved his longstanding ambition of succeeding to the English throne smoothly and peacefully in April 1603. Spottiswoode had clearly made a favourable impression on his social superiors and secular mentors - especially the king, for he was included in his retinue which went south in April.<sup>159</sup> While at Burleigh House, news reached James that Archbishop Beaton had died. Spottiswoode was immediately appointed as Beaton's successor, and was instructed to return to Scotland to escort Queen Anne to London as her official almoner. He was installed in the archbishopric of Glasgow in July.<sup>160</sup> Having ascertained Spottiswoode’s familial, educational and clerical background it is now necessary to focus on his career as Jacobean archbishop and statesman.

---

<sup>158</sup>*Ibid.* f.198r.

<sup>159</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. Vol.I. p.xxxiii.

<sup>160</sup>*Ibid.* p.477.

# ARCHBISHOP SPOTTISWOODE AND THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF ERASTIAN EPISCOPACY.<sup>1</sup> PART I.

## CHAPTER TWO.

The years covering John Spottiswoode's tenure as Archbishop of Glasgow (1603-1615) witnessed a prodigious alteration in both church and state, the seismic reverberations of which were felt the length and breadth of Scotland and further afield. The root cause of this momentous political and ecclesiological change, or at a minimum the catalyst which aided and abetted the process, was the regal union and the subsequent relocation of King James and his court in England. The king's eagerness to effectuate greater political, ecclesiastical, legal, economic and cultural integration and assimilation between his inherited and native kingdoms,<sup>2</sup> coupled with his determination to ensure that Scotland remained responsive and compliant to royal dictates in his protracted absence, brought to the fore individuals whose particular forte was in administration and the management of men. Spottiswoode's meteoric ascent in both church and state during the aforementioned period is testimony to the fact that he was unquestionably one such individual. Indeed, the archbishop commands the attention of all observers of the immediate post-regal union period as the only ecclesiastic in Scotland with the ability and resources at his disposal to exercise tangible political power amongst a coterie of Scottish Jacobean politicians. It is necessary here then to chart his meteoric rise and the means by which it was effected.

Since Spottiswoode's acquired authority derived directly from the crown and his archiepiscopal office, it is essential to denote the *raison d'être* for the indomitable reimposition of erastian episcopacy, determine the archbishop's role in weeding out

---

<sup>1</sup>Some of the material covered in the following four chapters concerning Spottiswoode while Archbishop of Glasgow is also discussed in The king's Bishop: Archbishop Spottiswoode and the See of Glasgow. In Kirk. *Patterns of Reform*. pp.426-448.

<sup>2</sup>See (eds) B.Galloway and B.P.Levack. *The Jacobean Union 1604*. (Scottish History Society, 1985). B.Galloway. *The Union of England and Scotland 1603-1608*. (1986). B.P.Levack. *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union 1603-1707*. (1987).

opponents of the ecclesiological metamorphoses and in nurturing the fledgling episcopal edifice, and then turn to Spottiswoode's impact and capacity in the secular affairs of the kingdom. Firstly, however, it is necessary to gauge the impact the regal union had on the Scottish church, or more importantly on the perceptions of churchmen, and determine Spottiswoode's function and position on this most crucial of questions.

Before taking leave of Scotland in April 1603, James VI gave an assurance to the assembled in St. Giles church Edinburgh that he had no intention of altering the status quo in either the Scottish church or the state.<sup>3</sup> However once peaceably ensconced on the English throne he exerted a considerable amount of both time and energy in an attempt to forge a new British state and identity in order to preserve and enhance his dynastic inheritance.<sup>4</sup> While endemic Anglo-Scottish hostility, centring on English chauvinism and xenophobia and Scottish fears of provincialisation, rendered him impotent in his labours to beget a uniform British state,<sup>5</sup> the immediate impact and the legacy it left behind in Scotland paradoxically both helped and hindered Spottiswoode and others charged with the implementation of an erastian episcopal settlement in the Scottish church.

Although guarantees had been given by the crown that it had no intention of re-structuring the organisational apparatus of the church, the choice of Spottiswoode, along with the bishops of Ross and Caithness among the nominees of the Scottish crown and parliament in July 1604 to "confer, treat and consult vpon a perfyte Vnioun of the Realmes of Scotland and England",<sup>6</sup> evidently sent presbyterian alarm

---

<sup>3</sup>Melville. *Autobiography and Diary of James Melvill*. p.554.

<sup>4</sup>Levack. *The Formation of the British State*. pp.3-5. On the methods adopted by the crown to procure a union of the two kingdoms see also (ed). R.A.Mason. *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*. (1994)

<sup>5</sup>See J.Wormald. *The Creation of Britain: Multiple Kingdoms or Core and Colonies?* in *Transactions of the Royal History Society*. 6th series, no.2. (1992). pp.175-194.

<sup>6</sup>*Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*. Vol.IV, 1593-1625. pp.263-264. Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.480-481.

bells ringing. Indeed, while there is no evidence to suggest that Spottiswoode or his fellow episcopalians sought to incorporate the Scottish church into *Ecclesia Anglicana*,<sup>7</sup> presbyterians had not unjustifiably reasoned otherwise. After all rumours circulating around the confines of the court at this time that the king was seriously considering appointing Richard Bancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, as Primate of Great Britain can only have compounded Scottish fears.<sup>8</sup> It is as a manifestation of the widespread apprehension within the kirk that Spottiswoode and James Law were "charged for their indirect dealing to overthrow the discipline of the Kirk,"<sup>9</sup> by the synod of Lothian, meeting at Tranent on 15 August. Although they apparently protested their innocence, "they were urged to subscribe the *Confession of Faith* of new, with the rest of their brethrein". Moreover, presbyterian hopes that King James would undertake to expunge what they saw as "the gross corruptions" of the anglican church had been effectively extirpated after the Hampton Court Conference of January 1604.<sup>10</sup> Here James, fulfilling the role of a self-styled British Solomon, had sought to fashion an accord between a vociferous puritan minority who were passionately inclined to a more chaste Calvinistic expression of Christianity and the anglican establishment who found merit and succour in the *via media*.<sup>11</sup> Although as Spottiswoode relates, James at the outset instructed all present

that his meaning was not to make any innovation of the government established, which he knew was approved of God, but to hear and examine the complaints that were made, and remove the occasions thereof,

---

<sup>7</sup>This is not to argue that individuals like William Cowper, the Bishop of Galloway, Patrick Galloway, John Gordon, John Russell and James Maxwell did not produce pro-union works in the apocalyptic genre lauding over King James as the new Constantine or King David who as ruler of the new 'Imperial Britain' would defeat the forces of the anti-Christ and re-establish the Kingdom of Christ on earth. See A.H. Williamson. *Scottish National Consciousness in the age of James VI*. (1979). pp.38, 41-42, 91-93, 102-103.

<sup>8</sup>*Calendar of State Papers: Venice. 1603-7.* p.201.

<sup>9</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol. VI. pp.268-269.

<sup>10</sup>*Original Letters on Ecclesiastical Affairs in Scotland*. (Bannatyne Club, 1851). See Patrick Galloway to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, 10/2/04, pp.3-8. Melville, *Diary*. pp.554-555.

<sup>11</sup>See K.Fincham and P.Lake. The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I in *Journal of British Studies* 24. (April, 1985). pp.171-177. R.Lockyer. *James VI & I*. (1998). pp.105-110. A.G.Dickens. *The English Reformation*. (1964). p.314. L.F.Solt. *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509-1640*. (1990). pp.134-138.



the mask of honest broker which the king chose to portray - at least to Scottish onlookers,<sup>12</sup> was discarded after a few days deliberations to reveal a vehemently anti-presbyterian persona.<sup>13</sup> It was here that James uttered his infamous "no Bishop, no King" aphorism and inveighed against presbyterianism arguing that it "agreeth with a Monarchy, as God, and the Devill".<sup>14</sup> While Spottiswoode in his account of the proceedings omits to mention these particular monarchical exclamations, he nonetheless includes a quotation of the king's which in all likelihood expresses the archbishop's own thoughts with regards to his intransigent Scottish ministerial opponents. For the archbishop recorded James's view that neither the wearing of the surplice or the symbolical making of the cross during the sacrament of baptism would

diminish the credit of Ministers that have formerly disallowed the same; for that is just the Scottish Argument, when any thing was concluded, that sorted not with their humour, the only reason why they would not obey, was, that it stood not with their credit to yield, having been so long of a contrary opinion.<sup>15</sup>

Additionally, as if to confirm his contempt for English puritanism, the king revealingly informed Lord Henry Howard on 17 January that "[w]e have kept such a revel with the Puritans here these two days as was never heard the like, where I have peppered them as soundly as ye have done the Papists".<sup>16</sup> Indeed, he explicitly stated that their efforts to persuade him to address their objections to certain practices in the Church of England only succeeded in turning the king "more earnestly against them." King James repeated the above mentioned anti-presbyterian sentiments before the English parliament on 19 March.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Patrick Galloway witnessed the proceedings, there is every likelihood that other Scots were in attendance, although there is no extant evidence which supports this conjecture.

<sup>13</sup>See Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. pp.90-91, 93-94.

<sup>14</sup>Both quotations taken from W.Barlow, *The summe and substance of the conference at Hampton Court*. January 14, 1604. (London, 1604). pp.36 & 79. Quoted in Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. p.90.

<sup>15</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.479.

<sup>16</sup>(ed) G.P.V.Akrigg. *Letters of King James VI & I*. (1984). p.221.

<sup>17</sup>Solt. *Church and State*. p.139.

The contemporary presbyterian historiographer, John Row, must have spoken for a significant number of disaffected presbyterian ministers and laymen when he expressed the view that the king had opted to stand "for the maintenance of Prelaticall government, and all the rabble of Popish ceremonies and rites depending thereon."<sup>18</sup> It should have come as no surprise then that in April 1604, the commissioners of the provincial synods collectively concluded that

because the realmes could not be united without the unione of the Kirk; neither could the Kirkis be united in discipline, the ane being Episcopall and the uther Presbyteriall, unles that the ane sould surrender and cede to the uther.<sup>19</sup>

Those same commissioners most probably concluded, since King James had left no-one in any doubt as to which national system of church government he strongly favoured, that episcopacy was to be imposed on Scotland in the interests of the king's dynastic and stately ambitions. In response, the ministers subsequently successfully supplicated the Scottish parliament to uphold "the present rycht professione of the Doctrine, Discipline, and Governement of the Kirk..."<sup>20</sup> Thus the widely held view among doctrinaire presbyterians that these institutions were scripturally ordained and not adiaphoristic made any episcopal additions retrogressive measures which had to be opposed.<sup>21</sup> Moreover since presbyterians increasingly equated erastian episcopacy as synonymous with anglicanism, they readily assumed the role of being the defenders of Scottish national identity.<sup>22</sup> Two examples should suffice to demonstrate this point adequately. Firstly, after the privy council initiated punitive procedures against a

---

<sup>18</sup>Row. *Historie*. p.220.

<sup>19</sup>Melville. *Diary*. p.555.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.* p.557-559.

<sup>21</sup>This was after all the fundamental rationale for their professed Calvinistic system of Church government. For proof that doctrinaire presbyterians were consistent on this point see *Ibid.* p.559. Enunciated in the Protestation penned by Patrick Simson in 1606 in Calderwood, *History*. Vol.VI. p.489. J.Davidson. D.Bancrofts Rashnes in Rayling Against the Chvrch of Scotland [1590], in *The Miscellany of the Wodrow Society*. (1844). p.505. A.Hume. Ane Afold Admonitioun to the Ministrie of Scotland [1609], in *Ibid.* pp.569-570. For the definitive statement on the presbyterian position see (ed) J.Kirk. *Second Book of Discipline*.

<sup>22</sup>In spite of the fact that prominent presbyterians like Andrew Melville favoured legislative union between the kingdoms. See T.McCrie. *Life of Andrew Melville*. Vol.II. p.193.

number of ministers for holding an unauthorised assembly at Aberdeen in July 1605, the government was

openly condemned by divers preachers; and to make them more odious, it was every where given out that the suppressing of Assemblies and present discipline with the introduction of the rites of England, were the matters intended to be established....<sup>23</sup>

Similarly, Alexander Hume, a minister within the presbytery of Stirling, writing in 1609 offered the accusation to those who had acquiesced in the introduction of erastian episcopacy that "ye appeir to conforme yourselves to the Disciplin of our nychtbour countrey of England."<sup>24</sup>

Because alterations and innovations made in both worship and the structure of the Scottish church during Spottiswoode's tenure at Glasgow were seen by many as covert attempts to anglicise the kirk, it has to be conjectured that the archbishop's task of implementing an episcopal agenda was especially arduous during its initial phase - and indeed may have sowed the seeds for future confrontation? However, although the king may very well have believed that his piecemeal transformation of the organisation and ceremonial practices of the Church of Scotland would eventually lead to a harmonious amalgamation of the two national churches - since religion was probably the sole dynamic capable of producing the type of "hearts and minds" conversion of his respective subjects King James desired to foment, Spottiswoode like the overwhelming majority of the king's subjects at no time gave the impression that he personally was an enthusiastic supporter of an incorporating union between the kingdoms and/or their respective churches. Spottiswoode regarded himself, first and foremost, as a Scottish archbishop, not as a potential member of a British ecclesiastical hierarchy. Interestingly, nevertheless, he does appear to have accepted the prophetic inevitability of the union as is evidenced by his recalling in his *History* that Thomas Lermouth,

---

<sup>23</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.487-488.

<sup>24</sup>A.Hume. Ane Afold Admonitioun in *The Miscellany*. p.570.

commonly called Thomas the Rymer, may justly be admired, having foretold so many ages before the union of the kingdomes of England and Scotland, in the ninth degree of the Bruces blood, with the succession of Bruce himselfe to the Crown being yet a childe,...<sup>25</sup>

Nevertheless, the archbishop, who certainly gave the impression of being a committed proponent of the 'imperial vision', writing retrospectively chose to blame English prevarication for the failure of James's scheme. For in spite of the fact that the king had been compelled into swallowing a generous measure of realpolitik in concluding that the creation of a British state could only happen by adopting a gradualist approach, the English parliament understanding the teleological implications and intentions of the crown's pro-union legislation effectively scuppered James's ambitions in 1607. Hence, although the crown had pledged not to undertake any alterations to either country's "fundamentall laws" and national integrity, Spottiswoode noted that

the Parliament of England, either disliking the union, as fearing some prejudice by it to their Estate, or upon some other hidden cause, did touch no more the business, and so that good work tending to the advantage of both Kingdomes was left and quite deserted.<sup>26</sup>

The abandonment of radical constitutional and institutional change, however, did not signal the consummation of Anglo-Scottish episcopal cooperation and mutual support, or for that matter fully terminate Scottish apprehension at what was clearly perceived as creeping anglicisation.

In January 1606 Spottiswoode, James Law, the Bishop of Orkney and Sir Alexander Straiton, the laird of Lauriston, had formed a delegation from the Scottish church which took a keen interest in the crown's appointments to the authoritative

---

<sup>25</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.47.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.* p.505.

English sees of York and Durham.<sup>27</sup> Likewise in June 1606 the Archbishop of Canterbury, willingly solicited King James's beneficence on behalf of George Gladstones, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, Andrew Lamb, Patrick Lindsay and James Nicholson, having been informed by Lindsay that the king was intent on granting the abbey of Arbroath to the earl of Montrose. Bancroft wrote,

[i]t semeth that your Majestie is about to assure the  
Abbay of Arbrothe vnto a certayne Noble man, which I  
cold have wisshed with all my harte might have beene  
annexed to some of your Majesties poere  
Bisshoprickes, the nature of those kinde of livinges  
considered.<sup>28</sup>

He went on to beseech James to grant pensions out of the abbatial revenues to Lamb and Lindsey and take preventative steps to ensure the bishopric of St. Andrews was dilapidated no further. It is also apparent that Spottiswoode himself conversed with the English metropolitan, Bancroft, and greatly admired his predecessor John Whitgift, who had died shortly after the Hampton Court Conference, whom he described as "one of the great glories of the English church".<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, English ecclesiastics and theologians were assigned a prominent propagandising part in Scotland during the formative years of 1608 and 1610 where they extolled the virtues of erastian episcopacy.<sup>30</sup> While Archbishop Spottiswoode appears to have welcomed the assistance given by English divines, he nevertheless took care to guarantee and defend the independence and jurisdictional autonomy of the Church of Scotland.

Although an unstinting supporter of episcopacy and the divine right of kings, Spottiswoode indirectly cautioned the king in 1610 in reply to his summons south to receive episcopal consecration at the hands of English bishops that

---

<sup>27</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. p.36.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.* Archbishop of Canterbury to King James, 26/6/06. pp.54-55. While in the short term, the archbishop's supplication appears to have deterred the king from turning the abbey of Arbroath into a temporal lordship, the king did just that two years later when he granted the abbey to James, second marquis of Hamilton. See J.Nicols. *The Progresses of King James the First*. Vol.III. (1828). p.385.

<sup>29</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.479.

<sup>30</sup>See Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. pp.102-103.

they were willing to obey his Majesty's desire and only feared that the Church of Scotland, because of old usurptions, might take this for a sort of subjection to the Church of England.<sup>31</sup>

Having given due consideration to the archbishop's concern, the king ensured that the archbishops of Canterbury and York were excluded from the act of consecrating Spottiswoode, Andrew Lamb and Gavin Hamilton, the bishops of Brechin and Galloway respectively. Instead the English bishops of London, Ely, Rochester and Worcester performed the service.<sup>32</sup> This was designed and certainly helped to allay Scottish episcopal fears that the inclusion of either of the archbishops of Canterbury or York might have left the Scottish church open to the resurrection of the highly dubious and contentious medieval English claim to jurisdictional supremacy over the Church of Scotland.<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless, David Calderwood, the most notable contemporary presbyterian historiographer and polemicist, although writing at a later date, surely captured a commonly held sentiment at the time of the consecrations when he noted that the "bishops in Scotland would not be content to be consecrated by the English bishops, not in tyme of Poprie."<sup>34</sup> This sentiment most likely struck a resonant note in Scotland since again presbyterians could when they wished tap into an extensive reservoir of latent anti-English feeling. By propagating the notion that the crown and episcopate were intent on anglicising the kirk to prepare the way for its incorporation into the Church of England, the presbyterian dissidents were determined to keep the issue of further reform of the church in the public spotlight.

Spottiswoode as might be expected gives every indication that he was deeply grieved by endemic Anglo-Scottish antipathies. During the early months of 1612, the archbishop mentions that there were "diverse unhappy quarrels betwixt the Scottish

---

<sup>31</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.514. The subject of the English consecrations will be returned to later in this chapter.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.* p.514. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.150.

<sup>33</sup>See J.A.Duke. *History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation*. (1937). p.80 and especially the sub-chapter headed "The Struggle for the Independence of the Church A.D. 1153-1286. pp.89-97.

<sup>34</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.150.

and English at Court, which was like to have produced very bad effects".<sup>35</sup> That the deferential ambience of the king's court had little effect on dissipating the mutual antagonisms and prejudices of those closest to the king is a good indication of how ineffectual James VI's efforts to engender a new spirit of entente cordiale between his subject peoples had been in general. As a corollary, it is possibly symptomatic of Scottish anglophobia that the privy council granted Thomas Finlison a monopoly on  
25 October 1611

of imprinting the Book of King Robert the Bruce, the Book of Sir William Wallace, and the Book of the Seavin Seages [by the Scots vernacular poet John Rolland], printed of befor bot now out of print lang since.<sup>36</sup>

On 11 July 1614 Spottiswoode wrote to John Murray of Lochmaben, the principal member of the king's bedchamber, through whom communiqués meant for the king himself were generally channelled, informing him of an inflammatory anti-English sermon given by Patrick Galloway in the "Little Kirk" in the capital the previous day. The fact that Galloway as a former royal chaplain who had been appointed minister of Edinburgh in 1607 and was a member of the the court of high commission should dare expostulate such an incendiary text appears to have greatly disturbed Spottiswoode. Galloway's sermon had focused on Daniel 11:5<sup>37</sup> and was a riposte to a speech made in the English parliament which characterised the king as an Epicurean who had foolishly lavished excessive preferment on his young Scottish favourite, Sir Robert Ker, whom he had created earl of Somerset the previous November.<sup>38</sup> Galloway's words are worth quoting at length since they reflect the views of someone inside the

---

<sup>35</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.517. See N.Cuddy. Anglo-Scottish Union and the Court of James I, 1603-1625. In *Transactions of the Royal History Society*. No.39. (1989).pp.107-124.

<sup>36</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.IX. p.277.

<sup>37</sup>And the king of the south shall be strong, and one of his princes; and he shall be strong above him, and have dominion; his dominion shall be a great dominion.

Daniel 11:5 (A.V.)

<sup>38</sup>For Ker's (Carr's) rapid ascendancy and the political response to it see D.H.Willson. *King James VI & I*. (1956). pp.333-356. See also N.Cuddy, Anglo-Scottish Union and the Court of James I, 1603-1625. pp107-124.

Scottish ecclesiastical establishment While Galloway himself appears to have been a reluctant conformist to episcopacy, as the following excerpt included by the archbishop makes clear, he was and remained contemptuous towards English religious practice which he implied was being imposed on the Church of Scotland He told the assembled

we wer a pleasant land before his goin thither, and a  
Churche we had that in beawtie schynit above al the  
churches in the world neyther heresie nor errour, nor  
schism in it, and wold to God we had continued so!  
Amongest tham qhat found he? Heresies mantenit in  
thair schules, blotis in thair Churche service, schisms  
and divisionis <sup>39</sup>

Spottiswoode remarked, "[q]hat his Maiestie wil think of the speechis, I know not, but, in my mynd, thai wer not pulpit speechis "<sup>40</sup> It is worth noting that the archbishop did not condemn outright the actual views expressed by the minister, although whether or not he actually agreed with their content is more difficult to adduce Nevertheless, it is more than likely that he was sympathetic to the sentiments contained therein. It was probably for this reason that he intimated to Murray that "[i]t is not nedful that any know be qhom the informatioun is gifin, my self wes not in town. The Bischope of Galloway wes ane hearer, and tellis me this muche."<sup>41</sup> Of course while Spottiswoode's strong sense of duty compelled him to inform the requisite authorities of Galloway's unrestrained outburst - presumably before someone else did, he evidently sought to avoid jeopardising his standing within the kirk by appearing to victimise Galloway for stating publicly what probably the overwhelming majority of the Scottish clergy thought in private. Galloway had after all not only defended the Scottish church but also the king's honour Although the issue appears to have been swept under the carpet, a supercilious King James ignored the depth of

---

<sup>39</sup>*OLEAS* pp 353-354

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid* p 354

<sup>41</sup>*Ibid* p 354



feeling within Scotland and continued apace with his anglicising agenda for the Scottish church.

Having demonstrated the impact the regal union had upon opinion within and outwith the Scottish church, it is now necessary to turn to Archbishop Spottiswoode's involvement in the establishment of the episcopate. Before moving on to his role in the parliaments and general assemblies which legislated for the ecclesiological transformation, it is essential to denote the methodology deployed by the king, Spottiswoode and others in overcoming and suppressing opposition to erastian episcopacy. This is of crucial importance for it helped engender an atmosphere of subservience to the crown and the episcopate both within and outwith the church in addition to elevating Spottiswoode's own status in both the church and the state.

Although, as shown in the previous chapter, the process of establishing episcopacy was advancing steadily prior to the regal union, the seminal years of 1605 and 1606 proved vital for its advocates. This was so for two principal reasons. Firstly, it was during these two years that the influence of the most vociferous proponents of presbyterianism within the church was to all intents and purposes emasculated after they were isolated and/or removed from the scene. Although opposition to bishops and the royal supremacy remained strong, active resistance became less overtly confrontational. Secondly, while there was believed to have been widespread sympathy and tacit support for presbyterianism amongst members of the nobility and burgesses, loyalty to the crown, political expediency, financial gain and individual alarm at the potential economic, political and social consequences of openly defying the royal will, essentially abrogated them of any compulsion to unite in defence of the religious watchmen of the presbyterian citadel. This, it can be argued, left the overwhelming majority of ministers little choice but to capitulate and accept the establishment of bishops as something of a *fait accompli*. As will be demonstrated,

what aristocratic opposition to bishops there was within the Scottish government, Spottiswoode proved highly effective at combating and nullifying

While it is not possible to quantitatively gauge the extent of disaffection within the church with any real precision, it appears to have been relatively widespread and increasingly adversarial. King James's withdrawal of his earlier consent in essence prohibiting the church to hold a general assembly in August 1604 "quhen all the Estaites of the realme, and every frieholder, wer zealous and cairfull for thair rychtis and possessiones"<sup>42</sup> incited elements within the ministry to adopt a much more belligerent attitude towards the king's bishops and his widely perceived anglicising policy.<sup>43</sup> On 22 March 1605 Spottiswoode despatched a disturbing letter from Edinburgh to the king informing him of the

daylie invectivis maid against Bischopis, that state, and  
ws directlie qho haif interprysit that service, and  
nothing is left vndone that can work a disgrace or  
contempe to this worke with the peple. Nether laws of  
Assemblies nor intimatioun of your Maiesties  
displesure, nor our innocent and vpricht procedingis,  
can worke ws peace at thair handis<sup>44</sup>

The archbishop went on to urge the king to order the commissioners of the church to initiate remedial action. However, anticipating the commissioners ineffectualness in this matter, Spottiswoode advised James "failzeing thair dewties, to the Counsel to sie to it, for the example will do much hurte, if in the beginning thir thingis be not repressit."<sup>45</sup> He ended his letter by notifying James that he had presumed to take upon himself to instruct the laird of Lauriston, the king's commissioner in ecclesiastical affairs, to convene the commissioners of the church on 10 April and

---

<sup>42</sup>Melville *Diary* p 604

<sup>43</sup>It is worth noting that the presbytery of Haddington implicitly accused Spottiswoode of dereliction of duty by intimating that the archbishop had failed to present a petition sent by the synod of Lothian and Tweeddale on 17 October 1604 to the king requesting a general assembly be held. King James denied that he had received their supplication. T McCrie. *The Life of Andrew Melville*. Vol II. pp 199-200n

<sup>44</sup>*OLEAS* p 16

<sup>45</sup>*Ibid* p 17.

requested a list of instructions be forwarded to the lord president, James Elphinstone, first lord Balmerino, to pre-empt any vacillation in this business. It is worth noting the way in which Spottiswoode, even at this early stage, appears to play a commanding role behind the scenes. He advised and urged the king to act to suppress dissent, plus he took it upon himself to instruct the king's commissioner while remaining aloof from the actual proceedings. Whether or not this was a deliberate strategy adopted by the archbishop to deflect criticism from himself and the other bishops is difficult to determine, but it is nevertheless a tactic he appears to choose often as will become apparent. The fact that these tirades against the bishops were being broadcast in the midst of the Scottish government and administration ensured that their message would be radiated out into the localities and must surely have been a damaging rebuff to the king's authority and his episcopal agenda. Nevertheless, it was the opposition particularly from the presbyteries of Fife and Aberdeen which compelled King James to take decisive retributive action.

The definitive event which paved the way for the establishment of a authoritative state episcopate was the ruthless demonstration of state power used against a number of ministers who had met without royal warrant to form an assembly at Aberdeen in July 1605.<sup>46</sup> As might be expected due to conflicting accounts and testimonies the most intriguing aspects of the whole affair must remain largely conjectural. These relate to Spottiswoode's personal role and objectives and the alleged involvement of Alexander Seton, first earl of Dunfermline. However before considering these particulars it is necessary to provide a brief synopsis of the episode.

On 20 June 1605 the privy council, in which Spottiswoode was present,<sup>47</sup> having taken cognisance of the king's earlier notification and instructions<sup>48</sup> issued a warning

---

<sup>46</sup>For further details and conflicting contemporary accounts see Spottiswoode *History*, pp 486-490, 495-496. Melville *Diary* pp 570-616. Row *History* pp 227-230. Calderwood *History*, Vol VI, pp 279-c 452. J Forbes *Certaine Records touching the Estate of the Church of Scotland in Scot. Apologetical Narration* pp 343-558.

<sup>47</sup>*RPCS* Vol VII, p 62. Spottiswoode's inauguration into the privy council took place on 30 May

to the phalanx of presbyterian ministers intent on assembling in Aberdeen the following month that

yf you proceed to the halding of this Assemblie without his Majesteis approbatioun and allowance, that his Heynes will very hardlie digeist that mater, and will accompt the same as a contempt tuicheing his Majestie in a heich degrie <sup>49</sup>

However, a number of ministers<sup>50</sup> irreverently opted to ignore the government's veiled threat and instituted a general assembly on 2 July <sup>51</sup> In an attempt to justify and legitimise their conduct they argued that they had

lauchfullie assembled not upoun ony privat appointment of oure awne, bot upoun the lauchfull warrand of Godis Worde, the lawis of this land, custome of the Kirk, and speciall directioun of his Majesties commissioner, the Laird of Laurieston, Mr Patrick Galloway, moderator of the last General Assembly, with consent of the remanent commissioners thairof .<sup>52</sup>

Although the divines dispersed on the same day in response to a proclamation issued by the king's commissioner to that effect, they only complied after appointing another assembly to be held in September. Whether these ministers had wilfully resolved to challenge the king's authority - which seems most likely, had misinterpreted the advice and commands given them by the government and the laird of Lauriston, or were the victims of an elaborate conspiracy in which Lauriston acted in the guise of an *agent provocateur* cannot now be determined with certainty, however, the upshot of these

---

1605. See *Ibid* pp xxii and 51.

<sup>48</sup>See *RPCS* Vol VII. p 468

<sup>49</sup>*RPCS* Vol VII p 471.

<sup>50</sup>For the names of the dissidents see Spottiswoode *History* p 487. There seems to be some confusion as to the numbers involved Spottiswoode states that only thirteen originally convened the assembly to be joined "after two or three days seven or eight more " Melville in his *Diary* records the names of sixteen ministers present on 2 July Melville. *Diary* p 575 Nineteen are recorded as present in Calderwood *History* Vol VI. p 440. See also V. Wells *The Origins of Covenanting Thought and Resistance c 1580-1638* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Stirling, 1997) Table 5 Wells has shown that 16 ministers were admonished, 5 confined and 16 were finally banished in connection with the Aberdeen assembly

<sup>51</sup>According to Row "tempestuous weather" and wrongly dated instructions to convene on the the 5th of the month prevented greater numbers from attending *History* p 227. See also Melville, *Diary*. p 571

<sup>52</sup>*RPCS* Vol VII p 471.

proceedings left a king demanding retribution. The most likely scenario, as will be shown, was that the ministers had received a surreptitious nod from the crypto-Catholic Dunfermline and possibly Balmerino who both opposed the re-establishment of the episcopate for political and economic reasons and appear to have been intent on obstructing its progress.<sup>53</sup>

King James, aghast at the obduracy of the ministers, wrote to Balmerino, the secretary of state, on 19 July to express his incredulity that

in making mentioun of the discharge of their dewtie  
thay nominat God, Kirk, and thair conscience, bot the  
mentioun of ony dewtie to us, thair Prince and  
Soverane is omitted, as yf nouthur Natur nor the Worde  
of God had evir directit obedyence of subjectis to thair  
native princes .<sup>54</sup>

Possibly bearing in mind Spottiswoode's earlier advice about stifling dissent at its outset, the king informed Balmerino that it was

ane greate deale better that ane unnecessarie member be  
cutt af then that be the gangrene and corruptioun of it  
the hail body sould be endangerit, we will rather mak  
choise to caus proceid with rigour and extremitie  
aganes some of thir, according to the qualitie of thair  
cryme. .<sup>55</sup>

Of those originally involved it seems that *circa* seven ministers must have expressed deep remorse for their behaviour, sought the king's mercy, and received a pardon having been admonished, fourteen remained unrepentant. The previous day (18 July) Spottiswoode had been in the privy council which had deliberated on the evidence presented to it anent the proceedings in Aberdeen, presumably by Lauriston, and denounced the ministers rebels and put them to the horn.<sup>56</sup> A week later the archbishop was once again present when the council issued a proclamation prohibiting

---

<sup>53</sup>See chapter on Roman Catholic recusancy for details on Dunfermline's and Balmerino's religious affiliations and Spottiswoode's involvement in Balmerino's downfall

<sup>54</sup>*RPCS* Vol VII. p 474

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid* p 475

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid* pp 82-3.

the intended holding of an assembly in Aberdeen in September. Moreover, the government ordered all burgh and rural authorities to ensure that the message was disseminated throughout their localities and instructed the respective magistracies to take the necessary precautions to ensure the prohibition was not violated. On that same day John Forbes was committed to be held in ward to be followed the day after by John Welsh.<sup>57</sup> Likewise the four commissioners who had represented Fife at Aberdeen, Robert Durie, Andrew Duncan, John Sharp and Alexander Strachan were soon to be incarcerated. Their numbers were swelled to fourteen by late October.

Although not entirely corroborated by reference to the privy council sederunts,<sup>58</sup> James Melville, the zealous presbyterian minister and diarist, intriguingly pointed out, in conjunction with the council's indictment against Forbes, Welsh *et al* that the Counsel was

conveinit in the morneing, betuixt sex and sevin a clock,  
and so lyk that of the Scribes and Pharisies that  
condemit Christ, consisting of a few Court Lordis and  
some Ministeres [bishops], to schaw the oppositioune  
of the Nobilitie, quha conveineing at the ordinaire houre  
of Coucel, reassounit honnestlie for the Britherine of  
the Assemblie of Aberdeen.<sup>59</sup>

If true, the episode is demonstrative of how divisive the issue had become within the privy council. This apparent aristocratic opposition also goes a long way to explaining why it was that the government struggled to later secure a conviction against six of the ministers who were tried the following January.<sup>60</sup> Indeed, as if to confirm the

---

<sup>57</sup>Spottiswoode refers to Forbes and Welsh as the "chief leaders of this stir." *History* p 487

<sup>58</sup>Melville does not specify which day, although he is likely referring to 26 July when the council committed Welsh to ward and indicted the commissioners of Fife to compeir before them. On this date only Montrose, Dunfermline, Balmerino, Spottiswoode, Lauriston and the Bishop of Aberdeen were present. See *RPCS* p 104. For the sederunts of those present in council (33 & 28 on the respective days) which issued the earlier proclamation against the ministers and their proceedings, and the indictment against Forbes see pp 81 & 93.

<sup>59</sup>Melville *Diary* p 575 Calderwood. *History* Vol VI p 286.

<sup>60</sup>This is not to suggest that all Scottish noble opponents of erastian episcopacy were committed to presbyterianism out of a pious respect for its doctrine and forms of worship. Presbyteranism it would seem complimented the decentralised political and institutional structure of Scotland, and thus there developed a symbiotic relationship between elements within the nobility and the doctrinaire presbyterians. *Jure divino* presbyterians anathematised episcopacy *per se*, while many noble

underlying antagonism between members of the nobility and the bishops on the council, by 15 March 1606, the Archbishop of St. Andrews and the bishops of Galloway and Caithness felt impelled to confess to King James that

thir jealousies betuyx us and the Counsallours have bein  
verie prejudiciall to your Hienes service, and furnisheid  
mater to the seditius bothe in the Kirk and Policie <sup>61</sup>

Additionally, it inadvertently puts flesh on the bones of John Forbes's accusation against Spottiswoode that he identified the ancient nobility as the most formidable obstacle to the revival of erastian episcopacy. Moreover, it is worth noting that Forbes claimed that the archbishop had later astutely calculated that it was politically expedient to initiate a campaign against Dunfermline and Balmerino because they were regarded as parvenus within particular aristocratic circles <sup>62</sup> While it needs to be acknowledged that neither the chancellor or secretary came from parvenu families, such claims and innuendoes were probably indicative of the professional jealousies and political factionalism at the heart of the Scottish government. In October the privy council made a final appeal to the confined ministers to acknowledge their fault and accept the royal supremacy. This only resulted in an adamant rebuttal and a counter-claim circulated in the *declinator* in which the clergymen denied the competence of the king and his government to adjudicate in this matter which they resolutely claimed was the preserve of ecclesiastical judicatories <sup>63</sup>

---

opponents deeply resented the erastian nature of these bishops who competed for governmental offices, rights of patronage, finance etc - in addition to challenging/damaging the quasi-confederal political structure itself. An analogy with the Protestant nobility of France in the proceeding century is illuminative.

<sup>61</sup>OLEAS. Vol I pp 45-46.

<sup>62</sup>See *Ibid.* p 34. M Lee Jnr *Government By Pen Scotland under James VI & I* (1980). pp 53-54. Interestingly Calderwood might well be parodying the views of the ancient nobility when he refers to chancellor Seton, secretary Elphinston, advocate Hamilton and the comptroller, Sir David Murray as the king's "new sworne creatures" *History* Vol VI, p 367

<sup>63</sup>*Ibid* pp 615-6. All fourteen ministers appended their signatures to the document in question. Spottiswoode. *History*. p 489

Although Spottiswoode appears to have originally advocated and supported a punitive approach, by 26 December 1605, he anxiously acquainted King James with the

grit prejudice that is done to our Kirk affairs be this deterring of the Ministers in ward, the burthen thereof being cast upon us, of purpose to make your Majesties designe in the erecting of Bishops the more hatit, and other discontented spirits serving them with this as a ground to worke some unquietnes in the State <sup>64</sup>

Although the archbishop conceded that while at court he had previously conferred and agreed with James that an arbitrary approach was the most appropriate course of action to take against the recalcitrant ministers, he now had deep reservations. He pointed out that while he believed

that half merit a more hard dealing, yet as matters are now handled, and the people disposed, any man sees it shall not go for your Majesties honour and contentment. <sup>65</sup>

Furthermore, the archbishop was most likely gravely concerned that he himself had been singled out by the vehemently scathing pen of John Welsh as the principal architect of the Presbyterian nemesis <sup>66</sup> Welsh writing to Sir William Livingston of Kilsyth from his confinement in the stronghold of Blackness Castle commented

[a]s for that instrument Spotswood, we are sure the Lord will never bless that man, but a malediction lies upon him, and shall accompany all his doings.. here I denounce the wrath of an everlasting God against him, which assuredly shall fall except it be prevented. Sir, Dagon shall not stand before the ark of the Lord; and these names of blasphemy that he wears of Lord Bishop and Archbishop will have a fearful end.. he has helped to cut Sampson's hair, and to expose him to mocking; but the Lord will not be mocked he shall be cast away as a stone out of a sling, his name shall rot, and a

---

<sup>64</sup>OLEAS. Vol I p 24.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid* p 24

<sup>66</sup>Welsh had written to Sir William Livingston of Kilsyth who was part of the clientage network of Ludovic, Duke of Lennox. See next chapter - Spottiswoode in Glasgow and its environs which demonstrates that the archbishop had a close working relationship with Kilsyth. It is highly probable that Kilsyth would have revealed the contents of Welsh's letter to Spottiswoode



malediction shall fall upon his posterity after he is  
gone <sup>67</sup>

Although such an epistolary assault taken in isolation would unlikely have perturbed and deterred the archbishop from implementing punitive policies, Spottiswoode was, and remained, sensitive to invectives against himself and his fellow bishops which sought to denigrate the episcopal office and its holder. Nevertheless, he was probably apprehensive as to the potential political and ecclesiastical fallout from having been labelled the main advocate of the hugely unpopular treatment being perpetrated against the defiant ministers, and so Welsh's attack just might have struck a raw nerve.

Spottiswoode continued his letter by petitioning the king

to supersede that business, and renew onlie your  
Maiesties first commandementis, that so many as stand  
obstinatlie at the defence of thair proceedingis, may by  
sentence of Counsel, be exylit your Maiesties countrey,  
and otheris that wil acknowledge thair erroris, may be  
confynit within thair parochis during your Hienes gud  
plesure <sup>68</sup>

He informatively concluded his letter by firmly advising King James to command George Hume, the earl of Dunbar's, presence in council to ensure that such instructions proved efficacious. Indeed, he went as far as to suggest that without the dominant and commanding presence of the earl, who happened to possess the joint Scottish governmental offices of lord high treasurer, comptroller and collector, as well as a seat on the English privy council, that

your Maiestie sal never see it concluded. This, and  
many other thingis, Sir, ar done of mere policie to  
disapoint your Maiesties affairis in the Parliament,  
speciallie that concerne our Estait "<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup>This quotation from *Select Biographies*. 2 Vols. (Ed) W K Tweedie (Edinburgh, 1845-47). Vol I. p 27 Cited from Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland* p 114 For original source see *Wodrow MSS*. Quarto XVIII. No 4

<sup>68</sup>*OLEAS* Vol I p 24

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid* p 25.

Since Spottiswoode had been residing with Dunbar at Newcastle when he penned the letter to the king, it can probably be assumed that the earl was privy to and wholly agreeable with its content. Importantly, the king responded positively to his archbishop's advice, and a trial was set for 10 January 1606. The fact that it was Spottiswoode himself, with the likely connivance of Dunbar, who insisted that the lord treasurer be present at the trial clearly repudiates the suggestion put forward by Maurice Lee Jr that Dunbar later initiated the campaign against Dunfermline and Balmerino out of resentment at being indirectly lumbered with the unpopular trial of the ministers by them.<sup>70</sup>

Although Spottiswoode's presence went unrecorded at the trial of Forbes, Welsh, Duncan, Durie, Strachan and Sharp held at Linlithgow Palace, he might well have been amongst the un-named representatives of the privy council present at the trial - although he could equally have reasoned it expedient to distance himself from the proceedings. Revealingly both the king's chief prosecutor, Sir Thomas Hamilton, the lord advocate, and contemporary prebyterian historiographers fully credited King James with initiating the assize. Its significance lies not in the inevitable conviction of the accused, but in the difficulty of its attainment. As the archbishop had astutely warned, had Dunbar not been present at the trial the crown and the advocates of erastian episcopacy would almost certainly have suffered a setback. For at stake was the question of the royal supremacy in and over the church. While every effort was made to persuade the accused ministers to retract their earlier position iterated in the *declinator*, all attempts were repelled. Moreover, because "the matter was thought to be of sua gryt importance concerneing the hail Kirk",<sup>71</sup> presbyterian supporters and sympathisers unsuccessfully implored the council to grant them permission and time to communicate and seek the collective response of individual presbyteries.

---

<sup>70</sup>Lee Jr *Government By Pen* p 53

<sup>71</sup>Melville *Diary* p 620. See also Calderwood *History* Vol VI, p 376

According to Row, Dunbar "was honoured as a great prince and ruler in this kingdom"<sup>72</sup> However, it was his political acumen and guile which secured for the king a conviction. For as Sir Thomas Hamilton intimated, Dunbar brought with him to Linlithgow "a very great number of honourable barons and gentlemen of good rank and worth of his kindred and friendship..,"<sup>73</sup> some of whom were placed on the jury This is largely verified by James Melville who recorded that the jury members were strangers to the presbyterian party, some of whose identity only subsequently came to light.

[F]or sum of thame wer debosched horneris, as wes the Laird of Craigihall utheris knawin Papistis, as Mark Swintoun and [of] Innerkeithing, and sume had suitis at Court, the Lairds of Caridine and Polwart, utheris mein men, easlie conducit or terrified.<sup>74</sup>

Nevertheless, Hamilton had to concede to James that it was only "after long and difficult, and most contentious travelling, they are convicted by assize of that treasonable declination"<sup>75</sup> Indeed, notwithstanding both Dunbar's and Hamilton's pleas, cajoling, threats, intimidation and jury rigging, the jury took over six hours to reach a guilty verdict, and then only by a slim majority of three.<sup>76</sup> It is worth noting that three members of the king's government registered their dissent at the guilty verdict, namely John Erskine, second earl of Mar, a former Ruthven Raider and presbyterian sympathiser, who had travelled north with Dunbar for the trial, John Preston, the collector, and John Bothwell, commendator of Holyroodhouse.<sup>77</sup> Nevertheless, the

---

<sup>72</sup>Row *History* p 229

<sup>73</sup>*State Papers and Miscellaneous Correspondence of Thomas, Earl of Melros.* (Abbotsford Club, 1837). p 11

<sup>74</sup>Melville *Diary*. p 623. The full assize comprised -voted guilty. Sir John Hume of Northberwick, Sir George Hume of Broxmouth, Sir John Forester of Carden, Mark Swinton of Inverkeithing, Harry Stewart of Craigihall, George Hume of Deans, James Gibb, younger of Carden, Alexander Hume of Rentown and Sir Patrick Hume of Polwart. Those who found the accused innocent were sir John Livingstone of Dunipace, sir Archibald Stirling of Keir, Gavin Hume of Johnsleuch, Robert Livingstone of Westquarter, Thomas Livingstone of Pantown and James Shaw of Sauchie. Calderwood *History* Vol VI, p 391

<sup>75</sup>*Melrose Papers* p 11

<sup>76</sup>Nine members of the jury found the ministers guilty of treason while six innocent of the charge.

<sup>77</sup>Melville *Diary* p 622 Although it is purely speculative, since it is likely that at least three of those who voted against a conviction lived within the geographical area under the overarching remit of the earl of Mar, it does seem plausible that he also might have endeavoured to rig the jury in his

end justified the means for King James had achieved what he had set out to, that is to re-establish the fundamental principle enshrined in the Black Acts of May 1584, namely that the royal supremacy extended to the church as well as the state. It is no coincidence that in the month following the trial, King James directed the provincial synods to convene for the sole task of reflecting over five articles apparently prepared and proposed by the king himself. Articles two and five respectively asked the synods to sanction

[t]hat Bishoppis shall have full jurisdiction over the Ministeris, under his Majesty [and] [t]hat the King be acknowledged supreme ruler of the Kirk under Christ, and that from him the power of Ministeris assembling and spiritual meetings do lawfully flow<sup>78</sup>

Although the king's proposals appear to have been met with a firm rebuttal, they provided a clear statement of intent. On 13 February, the privy council, with direct reference to the "wicked and licentious public and private speeches and utterances calumnies" which had accompanied the passing of the Black Acts, issued a proclamation calling on all local authorities to arrest and incarcerate any minister who dared exploit the pulpit as a political tool for propaganda purposes against the king's person or his royal policy.<sup>79</sup> Although the king rescinded his initial insistence that the remaining eight warded ministers be also tried in response to a petition from the privy council, it is surely to miss the point to suggest that the king backed off from trying the remaining ministers for fear that opposition was too great to guarantee a conviction.<sup>80</sup> He had after all established a fundamental point and could now demonstrate his magnanimity by a show of leniency. The six convicted ministers were not banished to the Continent until October. However, between their conviction and banishment they remained centre stage in a drama which threatened to prematurely end the political career of the chancellor.

---

and the indicted ministers interests

<sup>78</sup>Melville. *Diary* p 627

<sup>79</sup>*RPCS* Vol VII pp 179-181

<sup>80</sup>McCrie *The Life of Andrew Melville* Vol II p 207. The remaining eight ministers were banished to the Highlands, Western Isles, Orkney and Shetland

While Spottiswoode appears to have suspected Dunfermline of duplicitousness in the affair at Aberdeen after witnessing a particularly acrimonious dispute between the chancellor and John Forbes on 25 July 1605, and rumours abounded to that effect before the trial, it was not until February 1606 that the archbishop's suspicions seem to have been confirmed.<sup>81</sup> According to Forbes, it was Spottiswoode who first brought the matter to the king's attention. Moreover, the archbishop apparently implicated the lord president, Balmerino, who appears to have been later exonerated of any involvement in the affair.<sup>82</sup> Nevertheless, the claim that the earl of Dunbar and John, Lord Fleming<sup>83</sup> swiftly sought Balmerino's, as well as the chancellor's, removal from office suggests he was at least privy to Dunfermline's surreptitious meetings with Forbes and Welsh prior to the Aberdeen assembly. King James responded to Spottiswoode's allegations by commanding an official inquiry be established to determine whether or not there was any substantial basis for the claim presented.

Although the ministers tentatively confirmed that Dunfermline had, indeed, given them the go ahead and his backing to convene at Aberdeen in a jointly signed statement on 27 February, Forbes and Welsh did not compare before the privy council until 24 May,<sup>84</sup> prompting Dunfermline to write to James the following day. Dunfermline, aware of the king's penchant for the classics, ingeniously likened his present predicament to that of Marcus Scaurus who had been accused by one Quintus Varius of betraying the Roman Republic. Varius had been subsequently condemned "as a calumniator and a liar..." and Scaurus acknowledged as a man of "undoubted

---

<sup>81</sup> See Forbes's letter to Robert Bruce of 16 July 1606 in Calderwood *History* Vol VI. pp 552-553

<sup>82</sup> *RPCS* Vol VII pp 493-494n

<sup>83</sup> Lord Fleming had been recommended to the king by Dunbar for royal service. See *Royal Letters and Instructions and other documents from the archive of the Earl of Wigton MDXX-MDCL*. (Matland Club, 1840) Furthermore he was and remained one of the key secular figures involved in the implementation of the crown's ecclesiastical policy. Eg, see *Ibid* pp 37-38 & 39. See *OLEAS*, p 34, for instructions from King James anent the erection of bishops on 13 January 1606. Fleming was rewarded for his service by being created earl of Wigton in March 1606.

<sup>84</sup> The likely cause of the delay was that Dunbar had been incapacitated by ill health for seven weeks and had not expected to travel until April at the earliest. See Dunbar's letter of 16 March 1606. Scottish Record Office *GD124/15*.

vertew and honestie " Dunfermline decried Forbes's statement as a "manifest lye" and asked King James "whilk of thir twa is maist worthie of credit", a condemned traitor, who along with the other convicted ministers refused to acknowledge the illegality of their previous activities, or his majesty's chancellor who

be his publict letters, dischargit and contramandit the said Assemblie, [and] hes sensyne condemned the said Assemblie as a seditious and unlawfull deid, and all the pertakers and mantenars of the same as mutinous and seditious personnes <sup>85</sup>

Although it is unknown how the king responded to this particular letter, it does seem that the support and confidence in the chancellor conveyed to the king by members within his Scottish privy council helped his case immeasurably Furthermore, the chancellor received the influential support of Prince Henry and Robert Cecil, the earl of Salisbury, who

employed their credit to the uttermost till they obtaned of his Majestie that whether the mater was proved or not, the chancellor sould be continued in his Majestie's favour and in his office <sup>86</sup>

On 14 June the council, whose notion of justice evidently failed to transcend the parameters set by their social class, cautioned the king as to the

dangerous consequence, gif ane man in Maister John Forbes his caice sould be hard to bring in question, the fame and fortune of ane nobilman of sick birth, rank, and autoritie vnder your maiestie as your heyne's chancellor "87

They then went on to parody Dunfermline's earlier profession of his irreproachable management of the whole episode This in spite of the fact that the previous day the council had questioned the presbyterian ministers Walter Balcanquhal, James Balfour and Robert Cathart who had all been cited by Forbes as witnesses to the transactions

---

<sup>85</sup>*RPCS* Vol VII. pp 494-495n

<sup>86</sup>Calderwood *History* Vol VI, p 554. Lee Jr also states that Dunfermline enjoyed the backing of Queen Anne See *Government By Pen* p 55

<sup>87</sup>*Melrose Papers* pp 13-14.

between himself and Dunfermline<sup>88</sup> Although Spottiswoode failed to record Cathcart's appearance before the council, he, nevertheless, pointed out in his *History* that although Balfour unfortunately developed selective amnesia, Balcanquhal confirmed that Dunfermline had indeed met them privately and "commended them for maintaining the liberty of the Church..."<sup>89</sup> According to the archbishop, Dunfermline had promised to assist the presbyterian ministers in obstructing and opposing the re-establishment of episcopacy which they not unrightly took to be a go ahead for the Aberdeen assembly However, while the chancellor was willing to concede as much before the privy council that he had indeed been "intreated by them to oppose the restitution of Bishops temporalities,"<sup>90</sup> he clearly denied giving them his support or consent At the end of this sordid affair the king determined

[t]hat none of the two deserved credit, and that he saw the Ministers would betray Religion rather than submit themselves to government And that the Chancellor would betray the King for the malice he carried to the Bishops "<sup>91</sup>

Although Lee has reasoned that Dunfermline's involvement with the ministers was motivated by a genuine desire to avoid an acrimonious confrontation with the resentful presbyterians,<sup>92</sup> he has more convincingly conceded elsewhere that there was a great deal of political calculation in his attitude towards the presbyterians whom he regarded as a bulwark against the reintroduction of the unfettered power of bishops Moreover, his personal dislike and concern at Spottiswoode's apparent political ambition compelled him to seek an alliance with his enemy's enemies<sup>93</sup> While the archbishop certainly appears to have reciprocated a feeling of mistrust towards

---

<sup>88</sup>*Melrose Papers* p 13 It is worth noting that Balcanquhal along with Robert Pont had registered their dissatisfaction at the guilty verdict shortly after it was pronounced against the ministers at the mercat cross of the capital. See Melville *Diary* p 624.

<sup>89</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 496 Forbes stated the Cathcart was privy to a private conversation between Welsh and Dunfermline on the same issue. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VI p 555.

<sup>90</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 495.

<sup>91</sup>*Ibid* p 496.

<sup>92</sup>See Lee Jr King James's Popish Chancellor in *The Renaissance and Reformation in Scotland* (ed) I B Cowan & D Shaw. (1983). pp 177-178.

<sup>93</sup>Lee Jr *Government By Pen* pp 47-48

Dunfermline on account of his Roman Catholic leanings, it was the chancellor's caballing against the reinstatement of the political and economic powers of the episcopate which focused Spottiswoode's indignation on him. The suggestion offered by Forbes that Spottiswoode was angling for the chancellorship must be dismissed out of hand at such an early stage in his career, and at a time when erastian episcopacy had yet to be established. Even if the archbishop had entertained hopes (which seems doubtful) that in the future bishops might aspire to the highest secular offices in the kingdom, he was too much of a political realist to think that Scotland was ready in 1605-6 for a return to the days when prominent ecclesiastics rose to commanding positions in the state. As Spottiswoode himself noted, the timely assault on Dunfermline was crucially significant for the proponents of episcopacy for by "this contest always the Chancellor was made more tractable in the restitution of Bishops temporalities, which he had strongly resisted unto that time"<sup>94</sup> Nevertheless, as will be demonstrated, Dunfermline's support and sympathy for the presbyterians, as well as for his co-religionists, appears to have continued in a tacit manner, although he was extra vigilant not to endanger his political career by any show of defiance towards royal policy. It is also likely that this example served as a strong deterrent to other governmental officials and/or aristocrats who might have contemplated intriguing against the reimposition of erastian bishops.

Thus in July 1606, the Scottish Parliament, in which Spottiswoode as one of the lords of the articles was instrumental in scrutinising and preparing legislation, passed two salient Acts without opposition. The first was the *Act anent the kingis maiesties prerogative* which acknowledged

his maiesties souerane authoritie princelie power royall prerogative and privilege of his Crowne Over all estaittis persones and causs' quhatsumevir within his said kingdome<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 496

<sup>95</sup>*Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1844-1875) 12 Vols Vol IV. p 281.



The second was the *Act Anent the restitutioun of the estate of Bischoppis* which restored the episcopate

to thair ancient and accustomed honour digniteis  
prerogatiues privilegis levingis landis teyndis rentis  
thriddis and Estaitt As the samyn wes in the reformit  
kirk maist ample and frie at onytyme befor the act of  
annexatioun <sup>96</sup>

Spottiswoode later highlighted the importance of this second piece of legislation, for although it did nothing to raise the episcopate's spiritual authority in the church, it repealed the earlier Act of Annexation of 1587 which had appropriated episcopal temporalities to the crown. Although the Act failed to entirely eradicate the pecuniary problems specific to the episcopate,<sup>97</sup> it nevertheless provided an enhanced economic foundation on which to underpin the bishops' political, social and ecclesiastical status within the kingdom. The archbishop himself later noted that this was essential since "it was seen that the Bishops were disabled to attend their service in the Church and State by the want thereof."<sup>98</sup> Prospective aristocratic opposition to the repeal of the Act of Annexation was forestalled by the crown astutely proffering the erection of former monastic lands into temporal lordships <sup>99</sup>

Spottiswoode had given notice of these changes when he opened the parliament with the customary exhortation in which he "directed the greatest part of his speeches against the established discipline "<sup>100</sup> He consequently endured the wrath of a number of ministers who had been commissioned by their respective presbyteries to petition the parliament against any alterations to the church's constitution or doctrine. All attempts to have the archbishop censured, however, were dismissed by the

---

<sup>96</sup>APS Vol IV pp 281-2

<sup>97</sup>See Chapter three Spottiswoode in Glasgow and its environs where this issue is addressed with specific reference to the archbishop

<sup>98</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 496

<sup>99</sup>A I Macinnes *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641*. (1991) p 4 Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland* p 107.

<sup>100</sup>Calderwood *History* Vol.VI. p 493

commissioners of the general assembly Nevertheless, the fact that a *Protestation* prepared by Patrick Simson, the minister of Stirling, and subscribed to by an additional forty-one ministers representing their various presbyteries was submitted to the parliament provided an amply timed warning that a significant number of presbyterians were determined to fight the re-establishment of diocesan episcopacy tooth and nail. It will pay dividends to outline specific aspects of the *Protestation* for therein was the kernel of presbyterian dogma which Spottiswoode and his fellow episcopalians were determined to countermand It sought to portray bishops as "the ground of great ydlenesse, grosse ignorance, unsufferable pride, pitillesse tyrannie, and shamlesse ambitioun in the kirk of God."<sup>101</sup> Indeed, to the presbyterians it was "that antichristian hierarchie, which clame up upon the steppes of the pre-eminence of bishops, untill that Man of Sinne came furth", indicating that the erection of bishops was the first step on a retrogressive pilgrimage which would ultimately lead back to Rome. Fundamentally, for doctrinaire presbyterians

the bishoprie which [was] sought to be created [was] against the Word of God, the ancient canons and fathers of the Kirk, the moderne most godlie and learned divines, and the doctrine and constitutions of the Kirk of Scotland <sup>102</sup>

Although it has to be doubted that the king, or Spottiswoode for that matter, seriously thought that divine right presbyterians would be susceptible to an intensive course of episcopal proselytisation, the decision by King James to re-enact the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 but this time with Scottish ecclesiastics centre stage was in part an attempt to debunk the central tenets of presbyterianism.

Nevertheless, the principal rationale behind the conference was the conceived need to remove from Scotland the most fervent and influential critics of the crown's ecclesiastical policy who had been actively stoking the fires of presbyterian resistance.

---

<sup>101</sup>The *Protestation* is contained in Calderwood *History*. Vol VI pp 485-491.

<sup>102</sup>*Ibid* p.489

King James sent missives summoning Andrew Melville, James Melville, James Balfour, William Scot, John Carmichael, Robert Wallace, Adam Colt and William Watson to appear before him at Hampton Court on 15 September. So as a start could be made

with yourselves, and suche others of your brethrein as we have knowne to be of good learning, judgement, and experience, and commanded likewise to be heere at that same tyme, to treat with you in maters concerning the peace of our said Church of Scotland <sup>103</sup>

Of course the king was not inviting Andrew Melville and company to the court to engage in a debate amongst equals in the likelihood that a compromise could be thrashed out which would satisfy all the participants. Instead the king expected complete capitulation. As was implicit in the summons, the ministers were chosen for their fervid opposition to the crown's ecclesiastical policy and for their continued lobbying on behalf of their incarcerated brethren. The king spelt it out in no uncertain fashion that

if anie turbulent spirits be not recalled to their duetie, but persist maliciouslie in unduetifull contempt of us, it may then be worthilie judged, that the severitie which by their obstinacie we may be forced to use, sall rather be violentlie extorted against our nature, for their amendement, than willinglie inflicted for their overthrow <sup>104</sup>

There can be little doubt that the two most formidable adversaries of the episcopal party in Scotland were Andrew and James Melville. They had been actively absorbed in a propaganda campaign against episcopacy and the treatment meted out to the defiant ministers who had dared to assemble at Aberdeen.<sup>105</sup> Archbishop Gladstones

---

<sup>103</sup>Calderwood *History* Vol VI pp 478-479. See also specific letter sent to William Scot in *OLEAS* pp 49-50. The episcopal party included both archbishops, James Law, bishop of Orkney, James Nicholson, Robert Howy, Patrick Sharp and Andrew Lamb.

<sup>104</sup>Calderwood. *History* Vol. VI p 479.

<sup>105</sup>See James Melville's Appollogie for the Prissouneris of Chryst Presentlie in Blacknes. In *Melville Diary* pp 593-612. Both the Melville's set forth an accompanying document to the *Protestation* in which they sought to iterate the reasons why bishops should not be re-established in Scotland. See Calderwood *History* Vol VI, pp 500-534. See also McCrie *The Life of Andrew*

of St Andrews in a letter most likely written to the king at the end of May or early June 1606 stated that Andrew Melville "hathe begun to rais new stormes with his Aeolick blastis . "<sup>106</sup> It is worth noting that in this letter Gladstane indirectly acknowledged Spottiswoode's primacy in matters affecting the church when he wrote

I will nocht empesche your Majestie with the repititioun  
of these instructiounis anent the commoun service,  
committing the samine to your Majesties royall  
sollicitude, and to my Lord of Glasgow his  
sufficiencie.<sup>107</sup>

Although it does not appear that Spottiswoode had a hand in the the king's decision to summon the eight leading presbyterians to court, and he played an inconspicuous part in the subsequent proceedings at Hampton Court, he along with his episcopal colleagues were the main beneficiaries of its outcome.

The conference officially got under way on 20 September, however, any pretence that the presbyterians would be accorded the opportunity to dispute with the representatives of the episcopalian party was immediately abandoned.<sup>108</sup> Since Spottiswoode's involvement appears to have been minimal it is sufficient to point out that the ministers were subjected to periodic bouts of political and theological indoctrination English bishops cited texts which purported to "prove out of the Scriptures and Fathers the supremacy of Bishops above Presbyters .. the King's supremacy in cause Ecclesiastical", and other suchlike antitheses of presbyterianism <sup>109</sup> This it has to be surmised was designed to further antagonise and gall the ministers into providing the king with a further pretext for their confining and banishment King James after all knew well that these particular churchmen would

---

*Melville* Vol II pp 210-11.

<sup>106</sup>*OLEAS* pp 53-54

<sup>107</sup>*Ibid* p 54.

<sup>108</sup>For a full exposition of the proceedings at Hampton Court see. *OLEAS*. pp 59-67; *Spottiswoode History*. pp 497-500, *Calderwood History* Vol VI, pp c559-599; *Melville Diary*. pp c.653-c683.

See also McCrie. *The Life of Andrew Melville*. Vol II, pp 221-c247 and Mullan *Episcopacy in Scotland* pp 98-102. The only involvement the Scottish proponents of episcopacy appear to have played was in condemning the ministers who had met without warrant at Aberdeen

<sup>109</sup>*Spottiswoode. History* p 497

never sacrifice their presbyterian convictions on the high altar of anglican apologetics Furthermore, from the outset it was made evident that the ministers were on trial For the king demanded of them "what they thought of that Conventicle at Aberdeen, and whether they would condemne it or not."<sup>110</sup> In the end all attempts to procure a satisfactory response to the pressing issue surrounding the Aberdeen assembly concluded in ignominy for the eight Most importantly, Andrew Melville was incarcerated in the Tower of London, where he remained until being granted royal permission to go into exile in 1611 His nephew, James, spent the remainder of his life in Newcastle and Berwick being prohibited to return to Scotland, and the remaining six ministers were later permitted to return to their charges on the understanding that they were forbidden to transcend the geographical boundaries demarcated by their respective parishes.<sup>111</sup>

As a post-script to the above episode, it needs noting that Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops, probably in an attempt to absolve themselves of any blame for what befell the above ecclesiastics, sought to mitigate potential criticism by a demonstration of Christian charity Spottiswoode wrote a letter on behalf of the episcopate in August 1607 which successfully entreated the king that Robert Wallace might

be permitted to return to his parroche of  
Tranent, vnder conditioun that he sal in his sermonis  
no way medle with any thing twiching the estat, nor  
otherwyse muis any vnquyetnes in the Church, be  
sufferit to teache thair, and remain, confynit, during  
your Majesties gud plesure <sup>112</sup>

Furthermore, Spottiswoode personally could appear magnanimous towards Andrew and James Melville in the exchanges he had with each of them Towards the back end of 1608 (most likely November) the archbishop intervened directly in King James's initiative to have Andrew Melville admit fault and no doubt recant some of his earlier

---

<sup>110</sup>*OLEAS* Vol I p 60.

<sup>111</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 504. Melville *Diary*. p 709

<sup>112</sup>*Ibid.* p 102

expositions. Spottiswoode discharged William Cowper who had originally been handed the task by the king but who had "effectuated little " According to Calderwood, the archbishop

insisted with him, and obtained a forme of acknowledgement of some offence in his behaviour, which William Rig and James Nisbit, commissioners from the toun of Edinburgh, sent, to satisfie his Majestie, incensed against the toun, delivered to Mr James Melvill at their returne as they came by Newcastle<sup>113</sup>

Nevertheless, it has to be said that Andrew Melville was most likely correct in his view that the archbishop's overtures were far from benign He wrote to his nephew,

I have sent you a copie of submissioun, which Glasgow, your scholler, has taikin with him to the king, for this archbishop has beene three or four tymes with me; shewing, that the church laments my absence, and of his earnest desire to have me at home, *Sed non ego credulus illis*, and how Dunbar must have the honour of my deliverance<sup>114</sup>

While Andrew Melville, although highly suspicious of Spottiswoode's designs, was prepared to moderate some of his earlier outbursts in an attempt to appease the king, his nephew James was much less accommodating Archbishop Spottiswoode's endeavours to stem James Melville's vitriolic assaults against episcopacy and the royal supremacy in the church proved a good deal less efficacious

On his return from the court via Newcastle in June 1608 Spottiswoode sent two envoys to James Melville to request a meeting, ostensibly to discuss the threat posed to the Scottish church from the perceived growth in Roman Catholic recusancy<sup>115</sup> Melville refused the archbishop an audience and retorted via Spottiswoode's

---

<sup>113</sup>Calderwood *History*. Vol VI, p 820

<sup>114</sup>*Ibid* p 820

<sup>115</sup>See chapter five where this issue is discussed at length

messengers that "I have heard it often preached in the pulpits of Scotland, that Episcopacie was Poprie "<sup>116</sup> Moreover, Spottiswoode's former tutor advised

pray him to weiygh that sentence of Bernard *Christos duos habet individuos comites humilitatem et paupertatem, quos cum hujus temporis episcopi penitus excludent, non sponsi amicos sed hostes se profiteri.*<sup>117</sup>

Two months later, however, Spottiswoode clashed with Melville while residing with the earl of Dunbar at Newcastle. The archbishop, Gavin Hamilton, the Bishop of Galloway and Dunbar had been preparing to depart for the court with a polemic written by Melville fulminating against the royal supremacy in their possession. Additionally they were determined to convey to King James certain injurious expostulations the banished minister had made, or at least endorsed, against both the English and Scottish hierarchies.<sup>118</sup> Melville on receiving intelligence that Spottiswoode and Hamilton had gotten hold of his polemic and were intent on relaying it to the king pleaded with Dunbar to grant him a hearing. Melville denied disparaging the episcopate and informed the archbishop that "[t]hese tales are but forgereis." Spottiswoode in an irenical fashion held out an olive branch to his former college master by offering to intercede to persuade Dunbar not to present his views on the royal supremacy to the king. Indeed, the archbishop affected to show Melville how impolitic his judgement on the royal supremacy was. He warned him that "the king would be offended that he gave him no more place in the kirk but to be *ex sanctis fratribus unus*, for the king thought he had a high place."<sup>119</sup> Melville, however, contemptuously dismissed Spottiswoode's reproach, categorically reaffirmed his belief on the above, and informed the archbishop that he, "and suche as yee, putt

---

<sup>116</sup>Calderwood. *History* Vol VI p 732

<sup>117</sup>*Ibid* p 732

<sup>118</sup>Likewise he sent anti-Erastian episcopal instructions to the presbyterian delegations meeting at Falkland Palace in 1608 and 1609. Melville *Diary* pp 739-746, 782-785. The conferences at Falkland will be discussed in part two.

<sup>119</sup>Calderwood. *History* Vol VI pp 782-783

not the king in opinioun of farther than God hath given him, for they were his Majesty's greatest enemeis that did so "120

Just what Spottiswoode thought of the two Melvilles is difficult to adjudge Writing retrospectively, the archbishop described James Melville as

[a] man of good learning, sober and modest, but so addicted to the courses of Mr Andrew Melville, his Uncle as by following him he lost the King's favour, which once he enjoyed in a good measure, and so made himself, and his labours unprofitable to the Church 121

However, this view does not entirely tally with the opinion aparently expressed by Spottiswoode to a delegation of presbyterian ministers in 1609. When in response to the question "why Mr James Melvill was not sett at libertie? he answered, Mr Andrew had but a blast, but Mr James was a craftie bydding man, and more to be feared nor Mr Andrew "122 Although uncorroborated, the latter of the two views more likely corresponds to Spottiswoode's estimation of James Melville at this time. Furthermore, it gives credence to Calderwood's other assertion that the archbishop, accompanied by the Bishop of Galloway,

had so incensed the king against Mr James Melvill, that he purposed to remove him from Newcastell to Carlill, which would have beene verie greevous to him, becaus thereby occasioun of intelligence both from his uncle in the South, and from his freinds in the North, would have been taikin away 123

While King James might very well have contemplated having Melville relocated to Carlisle, he was moved to Berwick in 1610 instead, where he remained until his death in January 1614.124

---

120Calderwood. *History* Vol VI p 783.

121Spottiswoode *History* p 504

122Calderwood. *History*. Vol VII. p 46

123*Ibid* p 63

124McCrie, *Life of Melville* Vol II, pp 438-442



Although once again the evidence is somewhat tenuous, two presbyterian historiographers alleged that both Spottiswoode and King James exploited Andrew Melville's imprisonment to gain maximum political and ecclesiastical leverage over their presbyterian opponents. Calderwood claimed that prior to the parliament meeting of June 1609, Spottiswoode had travelled to London with the illusory intention of securing Andrew Melville's release, which he pointed out was conditional on Melville's acceptance of his offer of a teaching post at the University of Glasgow. Spottiswoode in a disingenuous manner, apparently disseminated the notion that he hoped that Melville would accept his offer and that he had handed the task of persuading the scholar to respond in the affirmative to Sir James Sempill. However, it has been claimed the Spottiswoode later "excused the matter, and said that the king had changed his mind".<sup>125</sup> Calderwood further implied that the archbishop, as well as James Law, the Bishop of Orkney, made it explicit that Andrew Melville and other confined ministers would and could only be set at liberty when concord was reached within the church, and this was wholly dependent on presbyterian acquiescence to the re-establishment of erastian episcopacy.<sup>126</sup>

If Row is to be believed, King James and Spottiswoode were still using the same ploy after the king gave his royal seal of approval to a request from the duke of Bouillon that Melville take up a teaching post at the University of Sedan of which the duke was patron. The king informed the archbishop of the move, and added "My Lord, yee will be well quite of him, he is the greatest if not the only, stickler against your estate in all Scotland ."<sup>127</sup> Nevertheless, the king instructed Spottiswoode to appear at an appointed time the following day when the king was in council with both his English and Scottish courtiers with an archiepiscopal supplication to the effect that Melville be sent home to Scotland to take up the post of Professor of Theology at Glasgow. Therefore the following day, having read Spottiswoode's plea, the king

---

<sup>125</sup>Calderwood *History* Vol VII p 46.

<sup>126</sup>*Ibid* p 46.

<sup>127</sup>Row *Historie* p 298-299.

turned to the noblemen present and said "my Lords, how good a man sitts there befor me upon his knees, know ye what this is he has put in my hands?" After enlightening the assembled, King James supposedly turned to Spottiswoode and added

My good Lord of Glasgow, this shows you to be ane good Christian that can heartilie forgive wrongs and have your greatest enemie, but, my Lord, it argues you to be no great politician, and I cannot grant this your humble and earnest supplication in Mr Andro Melvill's favours, for I have alreadie given him to the Duke of Bulloigne...<sup>128</sup>

If this theatrical account rings true, it was probably a deliberate strategy devised by the crown to down-play Spottiswoode's political ability and growing status within Scotland. This as will be shown was necessary for there appears to have been growing apprehension and disquiet amongst Scottish noblemen at the archbishop's acquisition of secular offices and authority. If the account is merely apocryphal it nevertheless symbolises the symbiotic relationship which existed between Spottiswoode and James VI - at least in presbyterian eyes.

While the need to implement royal justice and the advantages of confining and/or banishing non-conformist ministers far out-weighed the limited damage caused by the muted presbyterian back-lash, King James was, and remained, determined to suppress ecclesiastical dissent. On 21 February 1607, the king remonstrated with Balmerino for the council's failure (or unwillingness) to put a stop to certain ministers who offered up prayers to the banished and confined ministers during church services.<sup>129</sup> As an aside it is worth noting that the king was forced to take issue with his privy council once again on 20 January 1610 when it became apparent that an undisclosed number of the confined ministers "not onlie exceed the boundis limited unto thame, bot als preiche publictly in places far without the limitis prescryved unto thame..."<sup>130</sup> While

---

<sup>128</sup>*Row Historie* p 299

<sup>129</sup>*RPCS* Vol.VII p 510.

<sup>130</sup>*Ibid.* Vol VIII p 615

there is little to suggest that the council's ineffectiveness can be taken as a manifestation of presbyterian resistance or sympathy at the heart of the Scottish government, it does probably exemplify the difference between what the king expected of his government and what was actually possible in practice. That the prosecuted brethren provided a focus and a fulcrum for presbyterian dissent meant that those ministers who made mention of them in the public gaze were regarded as troublesome agitators who invited indictment. Two particular examples in which Spottiswoode took a keen interest are illustrative of the seriousness in which the king viewed the matter.

The first case involved John Fairfoul, the minister of Dunfermline. Although Spottiswoode's role here appears to have been limited to a position on the privy council which prosecuted the minister, it cannot be discounted that the archbishop was motivated by the fact that the earl of Dunfermline was his patron. While King James did not bother to divulge from whom he received the information, there is a high probability that Spottiswoode, as the king's chief ecclesiastical adviser, was the source of the accusation against the minister. The king wrote to the council on 23 October 1609 to register his extreme displeasure that Fairfoul

hes be the space of sex monethis and above bene  
commounlie accustomat to mak mentioun in his prayer  
after sermone of the brethren, alsweill within as without  
the cuntrey . . . whereby he wald by inference accuse us of  
persequitioun, condemne the judictory thair of  
wrangous and unjust preceding, and foster and  
manteyne the seid of all schisme and disordour within  
the Church. <sup>131</sup>

Consequently he commanded that Fairfoul be "punissit with rigour". The council responded by charging the minister to compeir before it on 23 November, whereon he was indicted of "ane verie grite offence" and entered into ward in Dundee.<sup>132</sup> The March following King James sent further instructions that he was to be moved to

---

<sup>131</sup>*RPCS* Vol. VIII, pp 601-602.

<sup>132</sup>*Ibid.* pp 374-375, 377-378.

Anstruther with the attached caveat that he was to be prohibited from attending church courts and other meetings <sup>133</sup>

The second instance, and one in which the archbishop was more directly involved since the case fell out within the confines of his archiepiscopal jurisdiction, involved George Dunbar, the minister of Ayr. On 12 October 1611, Spottiswoode wrote to Sir James Sempill of Beltrees notifying him of Dunbar's misdemeanour in saying public prayers for the banished ministers and the burgesses of Ayr's wilful neglect of duty in condoning the practice. The archbishop informed him that he had been apprehended seven miles from Ayr by the town's magistracy while on his way to Irvine to attend a meeting of the synod of Clydesdale. The burgesses had expressed deep remorse for their actions and pleaded with Spottiswoode to "interceid with his Maiestie and Council for thair Minister and thaim selfis."<sup>134</sup> However Spottiswoode informed the town authorities that

for any thing concernit my self I was most willing to forgif it, and suld never remember the sam, but his Maiesties interest for the better governement of thair Town, and the punishing of the Minister, wes a point that I belewit the Lordis of Privie Counsal wold not, and my self durst not medle in <sup>135</sup>

With this incident fresh in his mind Spottiswoode told Sempill that during the synod he "maid thaim a sermon of conscience, because those men do bragge much of it, and as I heard it touchit sum of thair consciences." The archbishop went to relay the proceedings against Dunbar by the council the previous day (11 October) where he was commanded to enter into ward in the town of Dumbarton.<sup>136</sup> Importantly, Spottiswoode inadvertently revealed his true mettle in his handling of the episode when he disclosed to Sempill that

---

<sup>133</sup>*RPCS*. Vol VIII p 618.

<sup>134</sup>*OLEAS* Vol I p 279

<sup>135</sup>*Ibid* p 279

<sup>136</sup>*Ibid* p 280 *RPCS*. Vol VIII p 258

I will not wryt any thing of the negligent handling of  
matteris, or how I wes compellit, being at Irwing, to  
summond witnessis in this mater vpon my own  
warrand, for thir thingis that wil not mend <sup>137</sup>

He concluded his letter by pointing out that the king had deemed it expedient to  
nominate the provost and baillies of the town, and more interestingly that

[m]en ar heir very hardly found that hes curage or witt  
to cary tham selfis with suche ane affectit people, and I  
wold glaidly haif sum Engliche man to reside thair for  
a season, be his Majesties directioun <sup>138</sup>

Ayr appears to have been left bereft of a replacement for Dunbar until at least April  
1612. On 10 April King James finally notified Spottiswoode that he was to have  
William Birney translated from Lanark to the church in Ayr. Moreover, Birney was to  
be made a dean of the Chapel Royal - no doubt as a financial inducement to ease any  
objections he might have expressed at the move <sup>139</sup>

Having highlighted the fears invoked by what was perceived as creeping  
anglicisation, and demonstrated Spottiswoode's role in the means by which the  
backbone of presbyterian resistance was broken, it is now essential to turn to his  
involvement in the ecclesiological transformation, the changes in religious practice  
and his acquisition of offices and authority in both the church and the state

---

<sup>137</sup>*OLEAS* Vol, I p 280

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.* p 280.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid* pp282-283

## ARCHBISHOP SPOTTISWOODE AND THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF ERASTIAN EPISCOPACY. PART II.

### CHAPTER THREE

The statutory changes which ushered in and established the ecclesiological metamorphoses were in large part legislated for by the general assemblies of December 1606 and June 1610. Having successfully resuscitated the redundant episcopate by infusing that institution with temporal authority, the stage was set for the reintroduction of the ecclesiastical and spiritual authority formerly accruing to bishops. With the *de facto* presbyterian leadership languishing in impotent isolation, the advocates of erastian episcopacy initiated, what was to all intents and purposes, their first iconoclastic blast against the presbyterian sacred cow of parity between ministers. In December 1606, under the pretext of improving the bureaucratic efficiency of the church in its fight against Roman Catholic recusancy, the assembly endorsed the crown's policy when it accepted the expedient of crown nominated constant moderators in presbyteries.

till the present sturres and fyre of dissention qwhilk is amangs the ministrie, and the great prejudice of the authoritie and credit, and the hinderance of the gospell and his Majestie's high offence, be qwenshed and taken away <sup>1</sup>

Tellingly, bishops were granted precedence over the ministry by the stipulation that they should automatically accede to the above office where they resided. Moreover, bishops were to be entrusted with appeals to the provincial assemblies.

in respect that his Majestie hes bestowed upon them, moyane and places qwhereby they may be able to beare out all the charges and burden of difficule and dangerous actions qwilk other ministers were not able to sustane, and lykewayes by their credit and place in counsell are able in sick causes, to procure greater

---

<sup>1</sup>BUK p 568

celeritie and execution of justice as in sick cases will be requisite <sup>2</sup>

In spite of the assembly's best endeavours to buffer the measure with thirteen caveats designed to prevent constant moderators from aggrandising further powers or exceeding the remit given them, the assembly had in reality conceded two critical points. Firstly, in establishing a presbyterial *primus inter pares* it had, in essence, been acknowledged that an absolute adherence to the fundamental principal of ministerial equality had had a detrimental affect upon the church's ability to combat heresy And secondly, by accepting that the episcopate had *a priori* justification for administrative pre-eminence in the church, the assembled had, whether consciously or not, paved the way for further constitutional and doctrinal change The bishops for their part, somewhat disingenuously, gave an assurance

that it was not their intention to usurpe and exerce any tyrannous and unlawfull jurisdiction and power over their brethren, and not to ingyre themselves any wayes unlawfullie in the Kirkes government .<sup>3</sup>

Notwithstanding the care taken over the selection of a responsive and compliant judicature, and that the imposing figure of Dunbar, the king's most exigent and thorough puppeteer master had been despatched north to pull the requisite strings to ensure success, and that it had even been alleged that the fate of those ministers summoned to Hampton Court hung in the balance, these facts do not fully explain the assembly's overwhelming endorsement of crown policy <sup>4</sup> A no-doubt bitter and reluctant David Calderwood, who had himself been censured for his recalcitrant stand against the implementation of the above measure, later conceded that of the assembled

[t]wo were *non liquet*, foure refused to vote, as wanting commissioun; 125 ministers agreed, all of them

---

<sup>2</sup>*BUK*. p 568

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid* p 569

<sup>4</sup>Calderwood *History* Vol VI p 601

compted with hope, feare, honour, money; or of the  
basest sort of the ministrie, as James Reid, Mr James  
Betoun Mr Johne Dalyell, Mr Adam Mitchell, and such  
others <sup>5</sup>

Although it appears inconceivable that left to their own devices Spottiswoode and other ministers with episcopal leanings could have orchestrated sufficient support to have initiated constitutional change within the church at this juncture, it is nevertheless, worth conjecturing that a significant proportion of the ministry were willing to forego an unflinching commitment to the presbyterian fundamentals of autonomous ecclesiastical jurisdiction and ministerial parity as part of a *quid pro quo* process

What the earlier Montrose Assembly of 1600's vote in favour of parliamentary representation succinctly demonstrated to those eager for ecclesiological change was that a majority of ministers (at the assembly at least) had concluded that a complete separation between church and state had proven prejudicial to the interests of the church. For crown support and a ministerial presence within the state apparatus appeared necessary if the church was to extend and consolidate itself throughout the peripheral areas of the kingdom, achieve the constant platt, and eradicate Roman Catholic recusancy. As Graham has convincingly shown, the church struggled to impose Reformed discipline on elite groups within the localities.<sup>6</sup> Consequently many reasoned that the acquisition of temporal authority was essential if ministers were to uniformly impose ecclesiastical discipline on all social classes within any given locality. As the above accusations laid against Chancellor Dunfermline by Forbes and Welsh would suggest, presbyters were bereft of the requisite social status and political authority required to seriously challenge or worry aristocratic malignants. Thus proponents of episcopacy made a determined effort in the early seventeenth century to exploit what influence they had in the state to achieve these ends. Nevertheless, as

---

<sup>5</sup>Calderwood *History*. Vol VI p 608. See also *BUK* p 572

<sup>6</sup>Graham *The Uses of Reform* pp 259-344



shown, the issue of the proposed union initially threatened an erastian episcopal settlement because it was perceived by many as an integral part of a crown inspired anglican agenda for the Scottish church. Likewise the harsh treatment meted out to the ministers who had constituted an assembly at Aberdeen the previous year and the most prominent and vocal presbyterians was evidently divisive and left a bitter taste in many mouths. Although it probably had the desired effect of dissuading wavering dissidents from actively opposing the crown's religious policy. It is none too surprising then that the commissioners of the assembly informed the king on 16 December that they "maid the beginning of oure travellis full of doubt and difficulties", to triumphantly end their communiqué by reporting that the assembly "wes concluded with greater moderation and vniformitie, nor ever wes sene in any former assemble" <sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, such triumphalism did not preclude disquiet and fervent opposition within a number of localities, <sup>8</sup> nor did it deter King James from commanding his Scottish privy council the following month to prosecute those individuals and presbyteries "too much addicted to anarchie and confusioun" for their defiant stance against the Act conferring constant moderators on presbyteries <sup>9</sup>

Although the archival sources are silent as to Archbishop Spottiswoode's direct involvement in the preparations for and actual deliberations of the assembly, his pre-eminence and importance in the church at this time is testified to in a letter sent to King James on 26 February 1607 by the lord high commissioner, John Graham, the earl of Montrose. The earl pointed out that

---

<sup>7</sup>*Letters and State Papers During the Reign of King James VI* (Abbotsford Club, 1838). pp 92-93.

<sup>8</sup>See *RPCS* Vol VII pp 347-348, 362, 369, 385, 427, 521-522 Vol VIII. pp 508-509 See also chapter 4, Spottiswoode in Glasgow and its Environs where this issue is addressed further. W Pearce. *The Stirling Presbytery, 1604-1612 and the re-imposition of an erastian episcopacy in Forth Naturalist and Historian* Vol 19 (1996) pp 120-121

<sup>9</sup>*RPCS* Vol VII p 299

The provision of constant moderators was soon arbitrarily extended to include synods, elevating the authority of the episcopal office still further. For more on this issue, how opposition was suppressed, and more specifically how Spottiswoode was received and fared as constant moderator of the presbytery of Glasgow and synod of Clydesdale see chapter 3 - Spottiswoode in Glasgow and its environs

having takin hardiment now, as of befoir, to write what his [Spottiswoode's] panes and travellis hes bein in the government of the Churche , maist cairfullie and diligentlie hes wsit him self with so good moderatioun, as I wische from myne hart everie one in that degrie carie the lyk precedour, who is meritable of many thankis .<sup>10</sup>

The crucial point to keep in mind is that Spottiswoode and his colleagues on the episcopal bench maximised their ecclesiastical profiles by exploiting their newly found political influence to advance the concerns of the church

It was largely a result of episcopal pressure that King James assented to the establishment of an annually held commission comprising equal numbers of ecclesiastical and secular personnel "to set down and conclude ane sufficient and reasonable stipend for the minister of ilk kirk that salbe contened in any of the creations" erected by the parliament in 1606 <sup>11</sup> Archbishop Spottiswoode felt compelled to pen a letter to the king on behalf of himself and his fellow bishops in August 1607 to protest at James's unwarranted inclusion of a further two secular figures as lord modifiers of stipends onto the commission, destabilising the equilibrium originally attained Spottiswoode forcefully reminded the king how

[a]t the first, we opponit as we culd, schewing how vnreasonable it wes to vrge our consent in the alienatioun of the Teindis from the Churche perpetuallie, and to consent so mony Churchis with a smal provisioun to every of tham out of the same, beyond quhiche no thing culd be heirafter desyrit, and not to admit ane equal number of ws in the making of this bargain, but being straited be the warrand, we haif yeildit to the forming of a commission according thairto <sup>12</sup>

The archbishop went on to reiterate the importance of ensuring that all ministers affected by the new creations be adequately remunerated However, Spottiswoode's

---

<sup>10</sup>*OLEAS* Vol I p 75.

<sup>11</sup>*RPCS*. Vol VII p 222

<sup>12</sup>*OLEAS* Vol I p 101

and his fellow bishops' timely intervention was not an unmitigated success, forcing the archbishop to restate the church's position and claim in the memorials he prepared for the king's consumption in early 1609<sup>13</sup> Thus the principle that all ministers who had recall to the commission should by right possess an (unspecified) adequate stipend was enshrined by a parliamentary Act in June 1609<sup>14</sup> Although nothing was achieved with regards to the wider ministry, it was nevertheless a portentous and significant start As Foster has shown, in the one hundred and thirty-three identified incumbencies affected by the legislative changes a substantial number of ministers were direct beneficiaries of the legislation<sup>15</sup>

In addition to the more publicised or at least more conspicuous episcopal interventions like the above, Spottiswoode and the other bishops must also have won the respect and gratitude of the clergy for their predilection to intervene on behalf of particular individuals with a financial grievance This point is worth emphasising for it largely dispels the popular presbyterian myth that the Scottish episcopate were little better than power and profit hungry megalomaniacs who were predisposed to worshipping mammon rather than the one true God Thus on 17 May 1606 the bishops acting collectively supplicated the king on behalf of the widow and son of the deceased minister, John Durie, to allow them to retain the pension granted to Durie by the crown<sup>16</sup> Spottiswoode personally primed the Bishop of Galloway prior to his impending journey south to confer with King James in February 1609

to remember the case of Lanerk, the possessors of the tithes be no excommunicated, and at the horn. Desire his Majesties favour for the grant of them to William Birnie, Minister there, whose disposition your Lordship knows to his Majesties service, and his Hienes letter for that effect to my Lord Treasurer that he may be possessed in the same with al convenient diligence.

---

<sup>13</sup>OLEAS Vol I. p 188 Calderwood *History* Vol VII p 5

<sup>14</sup>APS Vol IV p 431

<sup>15</sup>Foster. *The Church Before The Covenants* pp 159-161

<sup>16</sup>OLEAS Vol I. p 47. The son it is worth noting followed his father into the ministry.

Likewise remember the provision of Crammond, and the Bishop of Dunkeld interest to these titles <sup>17</sup>

The archbishop's interest in the financial provisions of the church was no calculated exercise in political expediency but continued unabated after erastian episcopacy became an ecclesiastical reality in June 1610. On 24 April 1612, Spottiswoode urged Sir John Murray of the king's bedchamber to honour his seigneurial pledges and obligations in ensuring that he had a church erected at Gretna. Murray had been granted possession of the teinds formerly belonging to the churches of Gretna, Redkirk and Annand in late August 1609 on the proviso that he would apportion competent stipends to the ministers serving thereat <sup>18</sup>. The archbishop pointed out to Murray that

the berar cummis him self, be the counsel of the Ministeris heir, to se qhat him self and his travellis can effectuat. And I culd not leave him vnaccompanyit with my letter, not only for this, bot also to pray yow that his Mansse may be buylt, his thre akeris of land at Redkirk gifen him, qhiche he sayis Robert Macbrair detenis from him, and some surer assignatioun of a stipend maid, seing he is ever compleing of payment at our metingis <sup>19</sup>

Spottiswoode further explained that it was apparently common for Englishmen to resort to the parish "and it is schame to se no course takin for a Churche to serve God in ." Moreover it was made implicit that locals and strangers alike were under no illusion who was responsible for this deplorable state of affairs. The archbishop ended,

I haif gifin often assurance to our Ministrie that it suld ben done ere now, and my credit with tham in this point is fallin in grit hasart, qherof I doubte not ye wil haif sum respect, altho thair be in this erand many griter causis to moue yow <sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>*OLEAS* Vol I pp 190-191

<sup>18</sup>*RPCS* Vol VIII p 554

<sup>19</sup>*OLEAS* Vol I pp 441-442.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid* p 442

Likewise Spottiswoode saw fit to notify King James on 10 July 1613 on behalf of the Archbishop of St Andrews and himself that they had successfully resolved a potentially damaging dispute between the Bishop of Galloway and William Birnie over the spiritualities of the Chapel Royal <sup>21</sup> Furthermore, in the same letter the king was informed that the re-establishment of cathedral chapters was contingent on the respective canons being sufficiently remunerated Lodging and land formerly set aside to meet the needs of canons was "now alienat and put away, and the dewtyis thair of annexit to the Crown in that woful Act of Annexatioun "<sup>22</sup> Spottiswoode consequentially appealed to the king that

til a better tym offer for restoring the saidis housis and landis to the Chapteris be publick Act, a comand may be gifin to the Thesaurar Deput and vnder resaveris, to suffer the Chanonis to vplift and collect the samin to thair proper vse, and qhair the fewis or alienationis sal be fund invalid in law, that the Thesausar and Advocat wil concurre as thai salbe informed for reducing the sam <sup>23</sup>

It needs to be noted here that Spottiswoode in particular, amongst contemporary ecclesiastics, was accorded a unique position in the exchequer This no doubt provided him with an special insight into what was actually achievable with regards to alleviating the pecuniary concerns of the episcopate and wider church

A letter written by the archbishop to the king from Glasgow on 29 December 1608 shines some light on Spottiswoode's extra-ecclesiastical activities, and on the trust King James placed in his leading churchman's ability and loyalty Spottiswoode wrote of

[t]he pain qhiche I haif takin, at your Maiesties commandement to gather a note of the pensiounis disponit furth of your Hienes rentis of this Kingdome, hes bred in me a desyr to proced in the work of

---

<sup>21</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol I pp 311-2.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid* p 312

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid* p 312

the Exchequer, and withal gifin a hope of effecting sum profitable  
service to your Maiestie <sup>24</sup>

He went on to explain that during four or five days spent in Edinburgh he had "turnit  
our sum bookis of former accomptis, and fund thairin many thingis for tym cumming  
maist nedful to be reformed "<sup>25</sup> Without elaborating further, he simply stated that he  
had passed his relevant findings on to the earl of Dunbar to deliver up to the king  
Spottiswoode urged the king to send his signed warrant commanding the  
establishment of a commission granting the archbishop royal authority to investigate  
what must be presumed to have been financial irregularities This Spottiswoode  
astutely calculated would "purchase a griter regard to our proceeding, and lykwyse  
minische invy qhiche can be no lesse against ws then otheris that interprysit the  
service before .." Maybe not unexpectedly, considering the ideology which  
underpinned erastian episcopacy and of the bishops dependence on the crown to  
advance their cause, the archbishop further stated that "it is not the leist parte of a  
Kingdomes happines to haif the King riche and wealthie, it gifis authoritie in peace,  
and makis him fearful to his enemyis in tym of warre "<sup>26</sup> The claim made by  
Spottiswoode that "nether is this your Maiesties Kingdom, how mean soever in  
comparisoun of that other, vnfurischit of revenewis sufficient to mantein the royaltie  
thairof, so as the samin be rightlie orderit,"<sup>27</sup> must have been music to the king's ears.  
He concluded his missive by proffering his further service in this cardinal task.

Henceforth, the farmers general of the customs informed King James that "wpone a  
motioun maid wnto us by . the Airchebischope of Glasgow" they had agreed to up  
their contribution to the royal coffers by 36000 merks per annum.<sup>28</sup> In return they  
requested that in future all disputes or controversy relating to the customs should be

---

<sup>24</sup>*OLEAS* Vol I p 179

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid* p 179.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.* p 179.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid* p 179.

<sup>28</sup>*Letters and State Papers* p 120 This letter is undated, but appears to have been compiled during the same year.

automatically referred to the exchequer "quhilk was the only competent judgement for suche maters untill the lait bred confusioun betuix the sessioun, and it did suppress the Exchekker altogether "<sup>29</sup> As a communiqué from the privy council to the king makes explicit, Spottiswoode continued his involvement in affairs pertaining to the custom levies <sup>30</sup>

The deplorable condition into which the crown finances had deteriorated in Scotland since the stringent reforms introduced by the Octavians in the mid-1590s had been abandoned has been attested to by Murray in his study of Sir John Skene and the exchequer between 1594 and 1612 <sup>31</sup> Murray has argued that Skene most likely penned his *Proposals anent the Order of the Checker*, which provided a critique of the government's failure to maintain the earlier reforms, between 1605 and 1610 Indeed, he has suggested that Skene most likely wrote his *Proposals* in either 1608 or 1610, for in the former year new arrangements were established for the management of the treasury, while in the latter the earl of Dunbar was granted the office of comptroller thereby combining the main financial offices in the kingdom in his person <sup>32</sup> While Murray's overall analysis appears sound, it was unfortunate that he entirely overlooked Spottiswoode's aforementioned momentous intervention For it was probably the archbishop's timely involvement in the affairs of the exchequer that led to the alterations in its constitution and personnel Moreover, it might very well have been Spottiswoode's intervention that prompted Skene to put pen to paper

In addition to the concerted attempts to right both the crown's and the church's financial wrongs and provide a solid material foundation for the ecclesiastical edifice and its office bearers, Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops were salient figures in the

---

<sup>29</sup>*Letters and State Papers* pp 120-121

<sup>30</sup>*RPCS* Vol VIII pp.589-590

<sup>31</sup>A Murray Sir John Skene and the Exchequer, 1594-1612 in *Miscellany One* (Stair Society, 1971) pp 125-136

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid* pp 131-132

church's endeavours to extend and consolidate its presence and influence in the Borders and in the Highlands and Western Isles While Archbishop Spottiswoode theoretically enjoyed titular provincial jurisdiction over both these areas, the greater part of the Scottish Borders actually lay within his diocese On 28 March 1609, in reply to King James's directive of the fifth of that month, the privy council granted the archbishop a wide ranging commission to undertake a visitation of the Borders. The king had directly related how "bipast barbaritie and uncivilitie" had resulted in the indigenous population "being voyd of all trew feir of God and religioun, wes the caus that the churcheis of the same, for laik of reparatioun, went all to decay and ruyne almost" <sup>33</sup> Since Spottiswoode was in regular contact with the king, it is probable that the original recommendation behind the visitation lay with the archbishop. Furthermore, it needs noting that as previously shown, Spottiswoode was a close political ally of the earl of Dunbar who had spearheaded a ruthless joint Anglo-Scottish campaign to subjugate intense factionalism, feuding, cross-border animosity and rivalry and all forms of criminal activity between 1606 and 1610 throughout the marches.<sup>34</sup> Therefore the archbishop's exertions in this region must be interpreted as an integral part of this wider campaign to "civilise" the Borders Spottiswoode was to call before him, consult and advise with local ministers and their parishioners as to the most efficacious means for procuring the repair of church buildings, planting ministers in the same, and ensuring they were adequately provided for and maintained in their livings He was granted further warrant "to do, use, and exercise quhatevir uther thing lauchfull may farder advance and set fordwart this busynes" <sup>35</sup>

The archbishop's visitation appears to have been focused particularly on the district of Annandale where he was confronted with a litany of dereliction and poverty. It

---

<sup>33</sup>RPCS Vol VIII p 564.

<sup>34</sup>K M Brown *Kingdom or Province Scotland and the Regal Union 1603-1715*. (1994) p 91. Donaldson *James V - VII* pp 227-228 RPCS Vol VII pp 504-505 for commission from the king to Dunbar

<sup>35</sup>RPCS Vol VIII pp 266-267



must be assumed that as one of the lords of the articles whose task it was to scrutinise and pre-select parliamentary legislation, Spottiswoode was responsible for the subsequent inclusion of measures designed to arrest and reverse the church's calamitous condition throughout this region<sup>36</sup> In June 1609 parliament declared that

the povertie of the Inhabitantis in these pairtis Is so great that it is Impossible that the kirkis Can ather be repairit or yit be sufficientlie plantit with ministeris In regaird of the meannes of the parrochines vnless certane of the saidis kirkis Lyand nixt adjacent To otheris Be vnitit and Annexit Togidder<sup>37</sup>

Consequently some twenty-four parish churches were amalgamated into groups of two and three through the need to rationalise and pool resources It is worth noting that Gretna and Redkirk were two of the churches paired amongst the above which provides accentuating grounds for Spottiswoode's sense of urgency in the above quoted letter to Sir John Murray

A charge brought before the privy council on 28 September 1609 by the lord advocate, Sir Thomas Hamilton and Robert Hunter, the minister of Sanquhar, speaks volumes for the culture of violence which was endemic in the border region.<sup>38</sup> Hunter told the council how he had complied with Archbishop Spottiswoode's instructions and journeyed to the kirk of Kirkpatrick Fleming to preach therein the previous Sunday. However on entering the church-yard he had been accosted by an amply armed and belligerent George Irving of Woodhouse who had duly threatened the minister that if he dared "teitch he sould let him sie a sicht that sould gar a cold sweit go over his hairt"<sup>39</sup> Irving had possession of the teinds of the aforementioned parish church and apparently interpreted the minister's arrival as a precursive move on behalf of the authorities to have the teinds re-appropriated to the church It evidently did not

---

<sup>36</sup>*APS* Vol IV p 413

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid* p 441

<sup>38</sup>*RPCS* Vol VIII pp 359-362 Spottiswoode himself was present in council

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid* pp 361-362

help matters that Irving believed he was being victimised by the minister, who he claimed had previously unjustly condemned him for his part in the murder of one "Johnnie of Locharbie". Hunter, undeterred by this hostile and intimidatory reception proceeded to the church and preached to the congregation as arranged. However, when the minister and congregation re-entered the kirk-yard having concluded the service they were attacked by Irving, certain of his kith and kin, and other followers numbering somewhere in the region of one hundred men. All were armed. The offenders

fiercely set upon Mr Robert and such of the parishioners as pressed to save him, shot a pistolet at them, and with lances, hagbuts, and pistolets chased him and them a mile from the kirk, wounding some <sup>40</sup>

Irving was found guilty and committed to ward in the capital's tolbooth. The rest of the accused were absolved of the crime, except two who were denounced as rebels for their failure to appear before the court.

As with the question of financial provision for the ministry, it is not being suggested that the church's impoverished presence in the Borders was transformed overnight, nor did lawlessness cease suddenly. However, a significant start had been made and Spottiswoode must have gained the plaudits of many as a major contributor in this enterprise. Interestingly, King James commanded the Bishop of Galloway on 20 January 1610 to emulate Spottiswoode's exemplary exertions on behalf of church and state in Annandale and Nithsdale by conducting a similar visitation of the churches in his own diocese.<sup>41</sup> It is lastly notable that Roxburghshire, Selkirkshire, Peeblesshire, Wigtonshire and the Stewarty of Kirkcudbright and Dumfriesshire and Annandale were amongst the several designated territories. Archbishop Spottiswoode was granted civil jurisdiction over as a commissioner of the peace in November 1610.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>*RPCS* Vol VIII p 362.

<sup>41</sup>*Ibid* p 616

<sup>42</sup>*RPCS* Vol IX pp 75-80. The other shires included Dumbartonshire, Renfrewshire, Lanarkshire,

As in the case of the Borders, the episcopate, in the persons of Spottiswoode, Andrew Knox, the Bishop of the Isles, and his successor Andrew Boyd were exponentially influential and successful in the re-framing and implementation of government policy on the Western Highlands and Islands, and in entrenching and extending the Reformed religion and the church's profile throughout the region<sup>43</sup> As Kirk has persuasively demonstrated, while the post-Reformation church made slow if somewhat sporadic progress in its mission to evangelise the Highlands, this process was energised and made much more effective after the advent of erastian episcopacy in the early seventeenth century, due in part to the indefatigable exertions and influence of particular bishops<sup>44</sup> A combination of judicial, fiscal and religious imperatives juxtaposed to government/Lowland cultural prejudice and chauvinism had facilitated a number of ineffective initiatives on the western seaboard between 1598 and 1607.<sup>45</sup> However the failure of the Lewis plantation, which Spottiswoode retrospectively attributed to the material and financial parsimony of the schemes' backers,<sup>46</sup> plus the inability and/or reluctance of the earl of Argyll and the marquis of Huntly to undertake a policy of repression against unruly clans duly forced the king and his Scottish government into adopting a more conciliatory approach to the "Highland problem".<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, it needs saying that the crown had little option but to take stock of what was actually possible in this matter. Especially after the king's proposal to the convention of estates in May 1608 for a military expedition to

---

Ayrshire and the bailiaries of Kyle, Carrick and Cunningham, Argyllshire and Tarbet, and Buteshire

<sup>43</sup>It is worth noting that Spottiswoode was instrumental in Andrew Boyd's elevation to the episcopate See *OLEAS* Vol I pp 303-304

<sup>44</sup>See J Kirk The Jacobean Church in the Highlands 1567-1625 In *Patterns of Reform* pp 449-487

<sup>45</sup>See A I MacInnes Crown, Clans and Fine Scottish Gaeldom, 1587-1638 in *Northern Scot.* Vol 13 (1993) pp 31-55 M Lee Jnr James VI's Government of Scotland after 1603 in *Scottish Historical Review* Vol 15. (1976). pp 49-53 Brown *Kingdom or Province* pp 91-92 D.Stevenson. *Highland Warrior: Alasdair MacColla and the Civil Wars* (1980). pp 24-28

<sup>46</sup>Spottiswoode. *History* pp 490-491

<sup>47</sup>See *RPCS* for various commissions and grants made to Argyll and Huntly and the marquis's prevarication Vol VII. pp 425-427, 504, 516-517, 520-521, 523-525, 529 See Spottiswoode. *History* p 505 The archbishop believed that Argyll and Huntly were "studying only the increase of their own grandeur, and striving whose command should be greatest" For an overview of the government's approach to the perceived Highland problem see also A I MacInnes *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stewart, 1603-1788* (1996) pp 56-81

the Western and Northern Isles comprising a joint naval and land assault on the region received scant support among those called upon to finance and oversee the operation <sup>48</sup>

Of course, Argyll and Huntly, the traditional administrators of crown policy and justice throughout the Highland region, continued to be relied upon. Argyll was granted plenipotentiary authority in 1611 in the confidence that he would systematically suppress the out-lawed Clan Gregor.<sup>49</sup> Spottiswoode later recalled that while the earl

made some beginning, and presented certain of the principalls to justice, but the neglect of their children, and their exhibition as was appointed, made them in after times no les troublesome to the Countrey then before <sup>50</sup>

It is worth noting that by 28 April 1613 Argyll's right to rate fines on resettlers of the Clan Gregor was transferred to a committee of the privy council. This comprised any three between the chancellor, the Archbishop of Glasgow, the secretary of state, the clerk-register, the treasurer-deputy and the lord advocate. Either Chancellor Dunfermline, Spottiswoode or the secretary, Lord Binning had always to be one of the three.<sup>51</sup> On 9 December 1613, Spottiswoode was one of the assignees of a proclamation to all the lieges within the sheriffdoms of Inverness, Cromarty, Argyll and Tarbet, as well as the counties of Sutherland, Caithness and Strathnaver, and part of Perthshire to rise to arms and assist the marquis of Huntly and his son, the earl of Enzie "for suppressing Allan Cameron of Lochiel and his rebel associates".<sup>52</sup>

In October 1608 the privy council sent the Bishop of the Isles to court with a letter notifying King James of Knox's "deutifull cariage and behaviour in your Majesteis

---

<sup>48</sup>See *RPCS*. Vol. VIII p 766 for King's James's instructions to the convention of estates. See Lee Jr *Government of Scotland after 1603*. pp 50-51. Lee describes the convention as recalcitrant.

<sup>49</sup>MacInnes *Crown, Clans and Fine* p 35

<sup>50</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 516

<sup>51</sup>*RPCS*. Vol X p 184. The work of the committee was kept separate from privy council business and is to be found recorded in *RPCS* volumes after the minutes of the full council proceedings.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid* pp 31-32

service in the Ylis, wherin he hes caryed himselff with very goode credite and reputacioun .".<sup>53</sup> This the councillors believed was due to the bishop's "awne credite and freindship amang the Ylismen " Lee has argued that it was the bishop who persuaded the king to moderate his stance on Highland policy and commission a new expedition led by Andrew Stewart, Lord Ochiltree, and the bishop himself<sup>54</sup> During the resultant expedition to the Isles, Ochiltree and Knox beguiled a number of Highland chiefs aboard a ship, kidnapped them, and brought them to the Lowlands where they were warded Although it has never been determined whether or not the ruse was preconceived elsewhere or undertaken on spec by the expedition's leaders, King James, Spottiswoode and other members of the privy council were quick to exploit the situation. On 6 February 1609 the archbishop was present in council to receive the King's written instructions as how best to proceed with the captive chiefs. It was deemed most appropriate that a special committee of nine be established, in which Spottiswoode, Knox, Ochiltree and the comptroller, David Murray, Lord Scone, had always to be present. The king's instructions speak volumes for the archbishop's political and administrative capabilities and of Spottiswoode's eminence within the Scottish political community by this date The committee was commanded

to convene at suche tymes and placeis convenient as you salbe required thairunto by the said Archiebishop of Glasgu, president of oure exchekquer thair, and to reasoun, advise, consult and deliberat upoun the best, reddiest, and most spedie meanis how that bipast savaignes and barbaritie which hes bene of so long continewance in those boundis may be ruled oute, and that civilitie, oure obedyence, and trew religioun (the onlie meane to presume bothe) may be planted ..<sup>55</sup>

This pre-eminent managerial role entrusted to Spottiswoode in the regulation and prosecution of Highland policy needs emphasising, if for no other reason that

---

<sup>53</sup>*RPCS* Vol.VIII p 534

<sup>54</sup>Lee Jr *Government of Scotland after 1603* p 51

<sup>55</sup>*RPCS* Vol VIII. pp 742-743.

contemporary historians, with the exception of Goodare, have either missed or ignored the fact <sup>56</sup>

While the Bishop of the Isles has been rightly given due credit for his tactful and skilful diplomacy in negotiations with leading members of Highland society at Iona in July/August 1609, it should be noted that while he enjoyed a degree of latitude, he was acting under instruction from the council Bearing Spottiswoode's influence in determining and approving Highland initiatives it is most probable that he was instrumental in drawing up the guide-lines given to the bishop Moreover, it must be presumed that the substance of the stipulations, regulations and responsibilities encapsulated in the *Statutes of Iona* would have been agreed to by the warded chiefs as a precondition of their release and return to the north-west.

In addition to the formulations focusing on the reform of Highland society and with implanting Lowland culture and values, those concerned with securing allegiance to and financial and material support for the church provided the requisite base on which to consolidate and extend the Reformed faith While there has been a tendency to compartmentalise Highland historiography and to focus on its distinctiveness, in a sense the church transcended the cultural divide <sup>57</sup> Thus Spottiswoode, Knox and Boyd did a great deal to silence or at least isolate their presbyterian detractors and must have won the support of many for their efforts to create a truly national church which was financially viable and staffed by a university educated ministry. Indeed, their success appears to have vindicated their conviction that the civil authority was an essential adjunct to religious reformation As a postscript, it needs saying that the successful progress made under the erastian bishops in the Highlands was put into

---

<sup>56</sup>J Goodare The Statutes of Iona in Context in *The Scottish Historical Review* Vol LXXVII. 1 No 203 April 1998 pp 31-57. See p 40 Goodare only records that Spottiswoode was convener of the commission on the Isles

<sup>57</sup>See J Dawson Calvinism in the Gàidhealtachd in Scotland in *Calvinism in Europe 1540-1620*. (1994) pp 231-253

reverse and all but eradicated as a consequence of the dislocation and upheaval caused by the Covenanting Revolution.<sup>58</sup>

Although Archbishop Spottiswoode appears to have had little direct involvement in the Ulster plantation or in the wider Irish church, the colonisation of the northern counties demands consideration since it greatly aided his task in both the Borders and the North-West Highlands. Moreover, the impact of Scottish Calvinism on the church in Ulster had ramifications for the rest of the British Isles through the promotion of Scottish theological susceptibilities and practice.<sup>59</sup> The plantation of Ulster which ensued after the flight of the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell in 1607 provided the Scottish government with an ideal opportunity for transplanting surplus and the most troublesome contingent of the population within the Borders.<sup>60</sup> This clearly made the imposition of religious, social and judicial control in the middle shires easier for Spottiswoode and others to accomplish. Likewise, the conquest and subsequent pacification of Ulster probably effectively led to the disbandment of Highland cateran groups which had for centuries figured prominently in Irish martial affairs through familial ties and the opportunity for financial gain. It needs little emphasising that the desired demilitarisation of the Scottish Highlands was evidently aimed at making the task of fomenting secular and religious change easier. A letter to Sir James Sempill in October 1611, in which Spottiswoode informed the knight of a discussion he had had with James Hamilton, the earl of Abercorn, while they journeyed to Edinburgh together, does indicate that the archbishop was interested in and enthusiastic about the Ulster plantation. He noted that

[b]y the way, I had large discourse with his Lordship of his Irisch voyage, the nature of that land and people,

---

<sup>58</sup>Kirk Jacobean Church in the Highlands, 1567-1625. In *Patterns of Reform* p 487.

<sup>59</sup>See below

<sup>60</sup>See M Perceval-Maxwell *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* (1973) pp 23-26 R.Gillespie *Colonial Ulster: The Settlement of East Ulster 1600-1641* (1985)

and learnit many thingis that I do think suld please his  
Maiestie wonderfully to hear, for the Plantatioun <sup>61</sup>

On 3 August 1610 the privy council notified the depute of Ireland of its approval of the Bishop of the Isles' appointment to the bishopric of Raphoe <sup>62</sup> It was evidently hoped that he would be able to replicate his success in the Western Isles and

that by his panes and travellis the ignorant multitude  
within that diocie may be reclaimed from their  
superstitious and popische opinionis and reducit to the  
acknwleiging of God and his trew worschip, which is  
the onlie fontane from quhense all dew obedience to  
lauchfull magistratis doeth ordinarilie flow . <sup>63</sup>

As Ford has shown, Knox's arrival in Ulster and his swift acquisition of the *de facto* leadership of the church in the northern counties marked a significant departure from the stance adopted by his Scottish predecessor, George Montgomerie, and the rest of the Irish episcopate Knox differed from his contemporary bishops in that he advocated reform in conjunction with suppression, rather than after it <sup>64</sup> Based on his Scottish experience he embarked on a rigorous policy of proselytisation and evangelisation His heavy emphasis on the pastoral role incumbent on bishops diverged from anglican practice, while his disinclination to accept the thirty-nine articles or the English *Prayer Book* ensured that Ulster reflected Scottish Calvinist orthodoxy Moreover, the bishop made a determined effort to propagate Scottish religious practice by promoting individuals who shared his theological outlook to Irish bishoprics Knox enlisted Archbishop Spottiswoode's help in his bid to advance two Scots, one of whom was James Dundas, to the vacant bishoprics of Down and Connor and Dromore in 1611. <sup>65</sup> Although it is mere supposition, such developments

---

<sup>61</sup>OLEAS Vol I pp 279-280.

<sup>62</sup>It is also worth noting that Lord Ochiltree was one of the principal undertakers of plantation in Ulster, being assigned the precinct of Mountjoy in county Tyrone The indebtedness he incurred financing the Highland expedition, coupled to his move to Ireland, forced him into selling his Scottish title to raise necessary funds by 1615 See Perceval-Maxwell *The Scottish Migration to Ulster* pp 97,147,327-328.

<sup>63</sup>RPCS Vol IX p 569

<sup>64</sup>A Ford *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590-1641*. (Frankfurt,1985) pp 166-167.

<sup>65</sup>Perceval-Maxwell *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* p 264



might have been used as a counter-argument against presbyterian polemicists who insisted that Scottish episcopalians were determined to anglify the Scottish church. Instead it could have been justifiably argued that they were actually intent on reforming certain areas of anglicanism by the exportation of Scottish theological preferences and forms of worship.

Returning to Scotland and the inexorable advancement in the power and influence of the episcopate, it is necessary to here outline the judicial changes which underpinned such an advance. James Melville's implicit claim that the episcopal party had been deliberately obscurantist in its negotiations with the presbyterians at Falkland Palace in 1608 and 1609 in the belief that intra-church negotiation and debate would pacify the opposition bears some weight.<sup>66</sup> Indeed, Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops were surreptitiously petitioning the king to restore commissarial jurisdiction to the episcopate at the same time. It must be recognised, nevertheless, that by this juncture the bishops had firmly seized the initiative in church affairs and were clearly in the driving seat. In February 1609 among the set of instructions penned by Spottiswoode for the Bishop of Galloway to mediate to the king, he specifically outlined the importance that the bishops attached to the re-imposition of commissarial jurisdiction. The bishop was to emphasise that

[s]ince this matter of the Commissariats importeth so much to the reformatioun of our Church government, as this being restored in a little time the rest may be supplied that will be wanting.<sup>67</sup>

Spottiswoode further instructed the bearer to elicit the king to have the earl of Dunbar involved in this matter. Moreover he was to point out that

since our greatest hindrance is found to be in the Session, of whom the most part are ever in heart opposite unto us, and forbear not to kyth it when they

---

<sup>66</sup>See chapter five

<sup>67</sup>*OLEAS* Vol I pp 188-189. Calderwood *History*. Vol VII p 5

have occasion, you shall humbly intreat his Majesty to remember our suit for the Kirkmens place according to the first institution, and that it may make at this time some beginning, since the place vacant was even from the beginning in the hands of the Spirituall side, with some one Kirkman or other till now..<sup>68</sup>

Spottiswoode, George Gladstones, the Archbishop of St Andrews, and James Law, the Bishop of Orkney, shortly after repeated the above petition. The fact that James Elphinstone, first lord Balmerino, the president of the court of session and one of the episcopate's main opponents had been stripped of office and cast into the political wilderness no doubt provided the bishops with an ideal opportunity to press home their claim.<sup>69</sup> While their letter is undated, it certainly gives the impression that the bishops had been constructively and successfully engaged in a campaign to win round their secular opponents to the idea that commissarial jurisdiction should be restored to the episcopate. They also reiterated their request to have Dunbar, "whose care and fidelitie, next unto your Maiesties favour, we onlie rest vpon", sent north to assist them in their quest.<sup>70</sup>

The resultant "*Act of the commissariatis and Jurisdictioun gevin to Archibischoppis and bischoppis*" made statute by the parliament held in Edinburgh during June 1609 testified to Spottiswoode's and his episcopal colleagues' powers of persuasion.<sup>71</sup> Although the particular constitutional and procedural detail was left for the episcopate to determine, the Act made the stipulation that for "ye restraining of vnlaw[ful]l deforcementis too frequentlie practisit within this realme ." a special court was to be established in the capital made up of four commissioners, two of whom were to be appointed at the discretion of the archbishops.<sup>72</sup> On 2 March 1610, Spottiswoode was among the signatories of the final draft which furnished bishops with the sole right to "decyde in causes beneficiall, materis of teyndis, causes

---

<sup>68</sup>OLEAS Vol I pp 188-189

<sup>69</sup>See chapter five on Balmerino's fall and Spottiswoode's involvement therein

<sup>70</sup>OLEAS Vol I p 191.

<sup>71</sup>A.P.S. Vol IV pp 430-431

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid* p 431

matrimonial, materis of sclander, [and] confirmation of testamentis . "73 They also afforded the costs to be incurred by each litigant in such transactions Melville made a pertinent, if somewhat hyperbolic, remark that by this development the episcopate had "finalie, became honorabill and rych Prelatis, quhair befoir they wer but Bisshopis of Baine "74 He furthermore alleged that the lords of session had to be recompensed by the annual payment of ten thousand pounds out of the crown's portion of the customs duties 75

As if to underline Spottiswoode's personal ascendancy, and in a sense confirm the unfolding ecclesiastical revolution, the archbishop was confirmed as an extraordinary lord of session in May 1610 According to the warrant issued by George Hay, the clerk-register, the archbishop was appointed to replace the recently deceased Mark, earl of Lothian, who had represented the spiritual estate in the session 76 Nevertheless, the warrant also purports to the deposition of Peter Rollock of Piltoun, who apparently had to be dismissed in order to restore the rightful number of extraordinary lords of session to four as specified in the requisite charters Although his interpretation and gloss on events should elicit a cautious response, Calderwood's version of the archbishop's appointment probably approximates to the truth. He stated that on 20 December 1609 the king inexplicably discharged all the extraordinary lords of session only to reinstate them the following month with Spottiswoode in Rollock's stead Calderwood correctly reasoned that the *raison d'etre* behind the move was to be seen in the memorials penned by Spottiswoode for the king, since "it was a devise sute of the bishops themselves to have a place in sessioun, for they made no conscience to meddle ather in civill or criminall maters."77 However, as the earlier

---

<sup>73</sup>*HMC. 72 Laing MSS I pp 114-121*

<sup>74</sup>Melville *Diary* p 781. A custom then apparently preserved at Twelfth-night, where a king, queen, bishop etc were chosen to regulate the festivities in each dwelling. The chief personage was called the King of Bane

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid* p 781 See also Calderwood *History* Vol VII p 42.

<sup>76</sup>*Letters and State Papers* pp 186-187

<sup>77</sup>Calderwood *History*. Vol VII pp 53-54

quotation taken from Spottiswoode's memorials confirmed, the bishops, whose ideology rejected and repudiated the notion that ecclesiastics need confine themselves to spiritual matters, were justified in pressing their legal entitlement to a place in the session as representatives of their own estate. The archbishop's arch-critic inveighed that

Spotswod, as he was the most ambitious of the number, so he was the peartest, and the first that taketh the place upon him, direct contrare to an article givin in by his father in the General Assembly, *anno* 1572, that the preaching of the Word, and administratioun of the civill justice, were not compatible in one man's person <sup>78</sup>

Keeping within the realm of judicial jurisdiction and prerogative rights, the creation of two courts of high commission for the two provinces of Glasgow and St Andrews, by means of the royal prerogative in February 1610, radically transformed the constitutional structure and character of both the church and to a lesser extent the state <sup>79</sup>

Archbishop Spottiswoode was present in the council to receive the king's proclamation creating these two novel institutions <sup>80</sup> Although these courts were officially erected to counter-act and punish non-conformity, Calderwood's assertion that the

true intent was to exalt bishops with an extaordinaire power never knowne or practised within the countrie, that it might make way for the ordinaire jurisdiction episcopall<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol. VII. p 54.

<sup>79</sup>See *RPCS*. Vol VIII pp 417-420 Calderwood. *History* Vol VII. pp 57-62. Spottiswoode *History*. pp 515-516. See also G I R. McMahon 'The Scottish Courts of High Commission 1610-38' in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 15 (1966) pp 193-209

<sup>80</sup>*RPCS* Vol VIII p 414

<sup>81</sup>Calderwood *History*. Vol VII p 62.

assuredly comes close to the mark, and evidently was the conclusion arrived at by many contemporaries. Indeed Spottiswoode later claimed that after the proclamation was made public there emerged

great discontent of those that ruled the estates, for that they took it to be a restraint of their authority in matters ecclesiasticall, nor did they like to see Clergy men invested with such authority<sup>82</sup>

After all, the injunction that the commission could "fine at their discretions, imprison, or warde anie suche persone who, being convicted before them."<sup>83</sup> clearly usurped the authority and the profits of justice formerly accruing to the secular courts. The archbishop also included in his *History* a list of thirteen directions or articles which he alleged accompanied the proclamation. These directions were clearly designed to enhance episcopal authority, and bear a striking resemblance to the legislative agenda put before the general assembly in June of that same year.<sup>84</sup>

While he acknowledged that it is mere supposition, McMahon has suggested that Richard Bancroft, the archbishop of Canterbury, in an effort to promote greater ecclesiastical uniformity throughout the British Isles, might have been influential in persuading the king in erecting the courts.<sup>85</sup> However, the contemporary presbyterian, John Row's contention that it was Spottiswoode and Gladstones who while at court planted the notion firmly in the king's head appears to be just as plausible, if not more so.<sup>86</sup> Indeed, the precept that

anie minister, preacher, or teacher of schooles, colledges, or universiteis, or to exhorting or lecturing readers within these bounds, whose speeches have beene impertinent and against the established order of the Kirk, or against anie of the conclusiouns of the

---

<sup>82</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 515

<sup>83</sup>*RPCS* Vol VIII p 419

<sup>84</sup>Spottiswoode *History* pp 514-515 Also see below

<sup>85</sup>McMahon *Courts of High Commission* pp 195-196.

<sup>86</sup>Row *Historie* p 267

by-past Generall Assembleis, or in favours of anie of these who are banished, warded, or confynned for their contemptous offences .<sup>87</sup>

would be pursued and punished rigorously by the courts, suggests that those responsible for the inclusion of this passage were pre-empting presbyterian disquiet and opposition to the imminent ecclesiastical reformation

King James gave notice to the privy council in October 1609 of his "grite desyre to restoir the utterlie supprest estate of Biscopis".<sup>88</sup> This he argued was "not onlie wee knowne to all our subjectis bot maid notour to many abroad in foreyne partis". In order to assess the financial and material wellbeing of each of the Scottish bishoprics and to ward against and discourage dilapidations, the king commanded David Murray, Lord Scone, John Bothwell, Lord Holyroodhouse, John Preston, president of the court of justice, Sir John Skene, the clerk-register, and Sir John Cockburn, the justice-clerk, to examine the accounts and transactions of each bishop and to report their findings to him Archbishop Spottiswoode appeared before the committee on 8 November 1609<sup>89</sup> In part this measure was probably designed to give notice to the rich and powerful that these new bishops were no mere tulchans like their forebears of the 1570s<sup>90</sup> The king was determined to ensure that his bishops were independently financially secure, so as not to be a drain on the crown's revenues and susceptible to aristocratic allurements and encroachments Having restituted the episcopate on a secure material footing and invested the bishops with secular power, the time was ripe for the restoration of their spiritual authority.

Notwithstanding the manifest episcopalian ascendancy within the church by March 1610, a letter from Spottiswoode to the king on the twelfth of that month indicates that opposition was still substantial - no doubt exacerbated by the creation of the two

---

<sup>87</sup>*RPCS* Vol.VIII p 419.

<sup>88</sup>*Ibid* Vol VIII p 600

<sup>89</sup>See *Ibid* pp 601, 604 for the council's positive response and for mention of Spottiswoode

<sup>90</sup>See chapter one

courts of high commission the previous month. The archbishop counselled the king to postpone the forthcoming assembly until 8 May.<sup>91</sup> King James complied, although he re-scheduled the meeting of the assembly to 8 June instead of May as Spottiswoode suggested - no doubt to give those advocating change extra time to plan ahead and successfully stifle or marginalise the voices of dissent. The king's missive was instructive and worth quoting at length since it bears testimony to the methodology adopted by the episcopalians which as conjectured above, won round both the sceptical and the unsure. James wrote

We will and require you to make choise of the most wise, discreet, and peacably disposed Ministers among you . and to advise anent the excommunicated Erles, what order shall be taken with them for their satisfaction of the Church, anent the late Erections, to communicat to our Commissioners the state of every church within any of the same, the maintainance allowed thereto, an overture for suppling the churches, which are not sufficiently provyded, and what is the best course to be taken for the ready payment of the Ministers .<sup>92</sup>

The following month the king commanded Dunbar that

aganis this enseweing Assemblye to be kept at our citey of Glasgow, you sall haif in reddynes the soume of ten thousand markes Scottis money, to be devydeit and dealt among suche personis as you shall holde fitting by the advyise of the Archbishoppis of St Androis and Glasgowe .<sup>93</sup>

Although Spottiswoode later alleged that the sum actually amounted to five thousand pounds Scots, and that it was provided as back-pay to constant moderators for their service since their installation in 1606,<sup>94</sup> Row's accusation that those "who voted the King's way, got the wages of Balaam", while those "who voted *negatve*, got no gold

---

<sup>91</sup>OLEAS Vol I. p 235 For more detail concerning the content of this letter, and Spottiswoode's advice to the king, see the following chapter

<sup>92</sup>OLEAS. Vol I p 238

<sup>93</sup>Ibid p 425 RPCS. Vol VIII p 844

<sup>94</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 513.

at all"<sup>95</sup> seems to bear more credence. Indeed, his claim that "some got more, and some less, according as the Bishops thought they deserved"<sup>96</sup> seems closer to the tenor of the instructions given by the king to Dunbar quoted above.<sup>97</sup> As if to conclude their scrupulous preparation for the assembly, Spottiswoode and Dunbar convened an unspecified number of bishops at Glasgow the week preceding the event.<sup>98</sup>

According to the archbishop "the King by his Letters [had been] daily urging the Bishops to take upon them the administration of all Church affairs".<sup>99</sup> Nevertheless, as shown, the king's aspiration was mutually desired by Spottiswoode and the majority, if not all, of his fellow bishops. Subsequently the general assembly held at Glasgow in June 1610 marked the full jurisdictional restoration of episcopacy. The assembly's enactments were further enshrined by parliament in October 1612, where Spottiswoode donned what was by now his accustomed role as a lord of the articles.<sup>100</sup> The choice of location was surely not incidental. Indeed, it is highly probable that Glasgow was chosen because by this juncture Spottiswoode had fully established his political authority and jurisdictional control over the burgh.<sup>101</sup> This would have provided him with the necessary means of monitoring and regulating the activities of all those present in the city to attend or lobby the assembly. Although the Glasgow assembly retained the skeletal structure of the prebyterian polity established *circa* 1581, the constitutional and doctrinal flesh which had provided it with substance was stripped to the bone. The assembled decreed that bishops were to hold and

---

<sup>95</sup>Row *Historie* p 276 See also p 274

<sup>96</sup>*Ibid* p 276

<sup>97</sup>See also *OLEAS* Vol I p 429 For instructions sent by the king to the lords auditors of exchequer on 24 October 1610 explicitly stating that Dunbar had been given warrant to provide the bishop of Orkney, as moderator of the assembly held at Linlithgow in 1608 three thousand and ten pounds to be distributed "to certaine Constant Moderators of Presbyteries, and otheris Ministeris, according to Our direction ."

<sup>98</sup>*Ibid* pp.198-199

<sup>99</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 512

<sup>100</sup>*APS* Vol IV p 469

<sup>101</sup>See chapter 4, Spottiswoode in Glasgow and its environs



moderate bi-annual diocesan synods and monitor the doctrine enunciated in exercises Crucially, they were re-invested with the powers of presentation, ordination, and deposition, given the right to undertake visitations or delegate others to do so in their name, and were to possess the requisite jurisdictional authority in excommunications and absolutions <sup>102</sup> For his part, the bishop was to be accountable to the general assembly for his actions and behaviour Moreover, in an attempt to ensure that only experienced men were elevated to the episcopate, it became statute that a prospective candidate had to be at least forty years of age and have served a minimum of ten years in the ministry General assemblies were to be held annually, although it was a further eight years before another was permitted

While Spottiswoode's role in earlier assemblies does not appear to have been particularly pronounced, he was eminent in this most critical of assemblies. The archbishop himself opened the proceedings by way of an exhortation upon the theme taken from the Book of Jeremiah "I would have cured Babel" Calderwood recorded that

[t]he maine drift of his discourses was to aggrede the sinne of sacrilegious persons By the way, he nipped also the laick patrons In end, he said this speche "Yee looke that I sould speeke some thing of the purpose for which this Assemblie is conveened I will say no more but this, Religioun must not be mainteaned after the maner it was brought in in this land It was brought in against authoritie, it must be mainteaned by authoritie ..<sup>103</sup>

In exclaiming the above point of view he was evidently parodying his royal master who made the same point in his *Basilikon Doron* <sup>104</sup> As will be demonstrated in a later chapter, the archbishop firmly believed that ecclesiastical order and discipline were the prerequisites to the establishment of a godly commonwealth Spottiswoode

---

<sup>102</sup>*BUK* pp 587-588

<sup>103</sup>Calderwood *History* Vol VII p 94

<sup>104</sup>See (ed) J P Sommerville *King James VI & I. Political Writings*. pp 25-26.

was then appointed moderator of the assembly by receiving the nominations of all but five persons present. As moderator it can only be assumed that he brought his considerable administrative and managerial skills to bear on ensuring that things went according to plan. Moreover, it was indicative of the confessional sea-change confirmed and made statute in this very assembly, that Spottiswoode persuaded those present to officially condemn the actions of the ministers who had met at Aberdeen in 1605. Nevertheless, Calderwood's allegation that the archbishop deceived the assembly into believing that if they assented to condemning the aforementioned Aberdeen assembly then the banished brethren would be permitted to return to their congregations might contain some kernel of truth.<sup>105</sup> Importantly, proceedings closed with the declaration

that none of the ministry, either in pulpit in his preaching, or in the publicke exercise speake and reasone against the acts of this present Assemblie, nor disobey the same under the paine of deprivatione being tryt and convict thereof, and specially that the question of equalitie and inequalitie in the kirk, be not treated in the pulpit under the said paine .<sup>106</sup>

As discussed in part one, the concept of "Apostolic Succession" through the episcopate was restored after Spottiswoode, Andrew Lamb and Gavin Hamilton travelled to England to receive episcopal consecration at the hands of the bishops of London, Ely, Rochester and Worcester. While it could be argued that this development marked the completion of the process to re-invest bishops with spiritual authority, it also inaugurated an assault on established doctrine and religious practice.<sup>107</sup> Before moving on to discuss Spottiswoode's rise to prominence in the diocese of Glasgow, it is worth considering what effect if any the death of the hugely influential earl of Dunbar might have had on the archbishop and the episcopate in general.

---

<sup>105</sup>Calderwood. *History* Vol VII p 97.

<sup>106</sup>*BUK* p 589

<sup>107</sup>This subject is discussed below

In Archbishop Spottiswoode's opinion, Dunbar had been

a man of deep wit, few words, and in his Majesty's service no less faithfull then fortunate, The most difficile affaires he compassed without any noise, and never returned when he was employed, without the work performed that he was sent to doe <sup>108</sup>

While it must be acknowledged that not everyone amongst the king's Scottish government might have acquiesced in the favourable judgement of Spottiswoode's obituary, there could be no disputing Dunbar's ability and influence. Not unexpectedly, the archbishop later confirmed that his untimely and premature death at Whitehall towards the end of 1611 "made a great change in our Estate". It is worth conjecturing that since Dunbar had provided an effective counter-weight to prominent lay opposition like that provided by the crypto-Roman Catholic earl of Dunfermline and the earl of Mar whose sympathies lay with the presbyterians, that the bishops likely viewed his demise with some trepidation. A letter written by Sir Thomas Erskine, viscount Fenton, on 9 March 1612 certainly appeared to give that impression. For the missive made the unsubstantiated claim that Spottiswoode had tried and failed in a bid to replace Dunfermline as chancellor <sup>109</sup>. While such an allegation was probably mere innuendo or rumour mongering, since a similar claim had been made a few years previously, it cannot be discounted out of hand. Nevertheless, the impact of Dunbar's untimely death was mitigated to a significant extent by the fact that the episcopate had by that date already re-established its ecclesiastical and temporal authority and thereby was less reliant on lay help to push through its legislative agenda. Although not of the same political stature as Dunbar, it is further worth noting that Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops found an admirable ally and replacement for the councillor in Thomas Hamilton, Lord Binning, who as secretary of state for Scotland from 1612 to 1626 and president of the court of

---

<sup>108</sup>Spottiswoode *History* p 516

<sup>109</sup>*Scottish Record Office* GD 124/15/27

session from 1616, was in an ideal position to aid the episcopate and help influence crown policy.

Calderwood noted that in late April 1612, the king summoned Chancellor Dunfermline, certain of his privy councillors and the bishops to court to advise and consult on who was best suited and the most acceptable candidate to fill the post of treasurer now left vacant through Dunbar's death. The up-shot of this meeting was that the "handling of the offices of the thesaurie, comptrollerie, and collectorie, was committed to eight councellors, or anie foure of them, the chancellor being always one."<sup>110</sup> Spottiswoode, whose experience in the exchequer made him an obvious choice, was appointed as one of the neo-Octavians.<sup>111</sup> However, the commission proved to be a short-lived expedient due to King James's bestowal of the office of treasurer on his new favourite at court, Sir Robert Ker. Ker, the rising star in the political firmament, was swiftly elevated to the peerage as earl of Somerset. His influence with the king and his predilection to advance family and friends, in turn, facilitated a major re-alignment of offices and alliances within the Scottish body politic.<sup>112</sup> Nevertheless the repercussions of such a development do not appear to have adversely affected the episcopate who now enjoyed an autonomous ecclesiastical power base. Indeed that Alexander Forbes, the Bishop of Caithness, had aligned himself with Somerset during the height of his influence might have fortuitously provided the Church of Scotland with another close link to the crown.<sup>113</sup> Although importantly, the favourite's close alliance with the crypto-Catholic Henry Howard, the

---

<sup>110</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.158.

<sup>111</sup>In addition to Spottiswoode and Dunfermline, the remaining six comprised the president of the session, the secretary of state, the king's advocate, Lord Scone, Sir Gideon Murray and Sir John Arnot, the provost of Edinburgh.

<sup>112</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.516-517. See also *OLEAS*. Vol.I. pp.315-320, where Spottiswoode was given the role of conciliator in an acrimonious dispute between Sir John and Sir James Skene which appears to have been one of the consequences of the resultant transference of governmental offices.

<sup>113</sup>Forbes unsuccessfully lobbied Somerset to press his claim to the vacant archiepiscopal see of St Andrews on the death of Gladstones in early 1615. See chapter 6: Roman Catholic recusancy II.

earl of Northampton, and other supporters of the Spanish party at court must have deeply troubled Spottiswoode and the wider church.<sup>114</sup>

Notwithstanding the political fall-out and evident set-backs from the untimely death of Spottiswoode's most powerful secular ally, the archbishop's ascendancy in both church and state was unquestionably a meteoric one between 1603 and 1615. Having charted Spottiswoode's spectacular acquisition of power and influence within and outwith the Church of Scotland, it is now necessary to assess whether his ascendancy at the centre was matched by a corresponding rise to prominence within the archiepiscopal locality.

---

<sup>114</sup>See Lockyer. *James VI & I*. pp.168-171. The issue of the Spanish match and Roman Catholicism will be discussed in chapter 6.

## ARCHBISHOP SPOTTISWOODE IN GLASGOW AND ITS ENVIRONS.

### CHAPTER FOUR.

John Spottiswoode's tenure in the archiepiscopal office at Glasgow needs to be viewed in centripetal terms. Indeed, the most evident feature of the period after Spottiswoode's arrival in the primatial city is one of the inexorable advancement in the archbishop's ecclesiastical, magisterial and lordly authority within Glasgow and the area which fell under the remit of the archiepiscopal office. This magnetic like acquisition of power and prestige sprung primarily from the royal well, but it needs to be stated that much of the credit for what was in effect a dramatic reversal of episcopal fortunes was due in large part to Spottiswoode's own political, administrative and juridical dexterity. Not since pre-Reformation times had an archbishop been as efficacious as John Spottiswoode in church, state and throughout his own locality. As a corollary, to enter contemporary debate for the moment, if one can justifiably talk of an *noblesse de robe* in a Scottish context then attention needs to be diverted from the legal profession to the Jacobean episcopate;<sup>1</sup> and Spottiswoode fits the bill admirably.

Since, as shown, Spottiswoode's appointment to the archiepiscopal see of Glasgow preceded the re-establishment of a fully authoritative and operational erastian episcopate, his role in both church and state remained somewhat ambivalent until the beginning of the second decade of the seventeenth century. Indeed, in some respects it was analogous to that enjoyed by those much maligned tulchan bishops, who as the chosen creatures of the nobility during James Douglas, fourth earl of Morton's regency in the 1570s had effectively alienated the overwhelming majority within the Church of Scotland firmly against episcopacy.<sup>2</sup> Subsequently, the restitution of the

---

<sup>1</sup>See for example; Wormald. *Court, Kirk and Community. Scotland 1470- 1625.* p.192. R. Mitchison. *Lordship to Patronage. Scotland 1603 - 1707.*(1983). pp.10-11. M. Lynch. *Scotland, A New History.*(1991). pp.237-238.

<sup>2</sup> See I.B. Cowan. *The Scottish Reformation. Church and Society in Sixteenth Century Scotland.* See

episcopate was regarded by a significant number of both religious and secular figures as a retrogressive measure which threatened the integrity of the Scottish Reformed Church and its visionary programme of religious and educational reform.

Furthermore, zealous presbyterians, following in the footsteps of the founders of Scottish Protestantism, anathematised what they clearly regarded as the grandiose political, social and economic trappings which went hand in glove with an episcopal establishment. Having already focused on Spottiswoode's endeavours to raise the episcopal phoenix within a national context, it is necessary to examine how the king's episcopal programme impacted on the archiepiscopal locality and determine how the archbishop overcame resistance from those with a vested interest in preserving the status quo.

During August 1604 the Glasgow presbytery commissioned its moderator designate, Robert Scot to visit the uncompromising presbyterian minister Robert Bruce with the intention of persuading him to "come to Glasgow [and] teache in ye hie kirk ye tyme of ye appointit fast."<sup>3</sup> It is evidently not indulging in hyperbole to suggest that this invitation is a good indication that a majority of ministers within the Glasgow presbytery were sympathetic to Bruce and opposed the cause of erastian episcopacy. After all beckoning Bruce to Glasgow was tantamount to treason for at this time the stalwart presbyterian was legally bound to Kinnaird House on his Airth estate. Although this was primarily a direct result of Bruce's disinclination to publicly acknowledge the verity of King James's version of events relating to the Gowrie affair of August 1600, it needs to be seen in a wider context. As Schmidt has shown, the peripatetic Bruce was one of the leading forces behind the embryonic presbyterian resistance movement during the first decade of the seventeenth century and as such the government's injunction against Bruce was designed to emasculate his influence

---

chapter entitled the triumph of Protestantism, particularly pp.122-123 & 131. Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. pp.41-42. Kirk. *Patterns of Reform*. See chapter 9, The Politics of the Best Reformed Kirks pp.334-367.

<sup>3</sup>Glasgow Presbytery Records. CH2/171/1C. f. 276.

within the Scottish Church.<sup>4</sup> The main focus of presbyterian opposition manifest itself in popular sacramental gatherings where a coterie of presbyterian ministers would preach, teach, discipline, consecrate and administer the communion elements, and presumably mobilise popular opinion against any alteration in ecclesiastical organisation and practice. Thus the invitation to Bruce had political overtones which are suggestive that Glasgow and its environs would offer a hostile reception to Spottiswoode on his entry into the primatial city, and that elements within the same would be deeply antagonistic to any enlargement of his powers.

Archbishop Spottiswoode did not take up residence within Glasgow until January 1605. The reason for the postponement of his transference from Mid-Calder to Glasgow reflects the titular nature of his office in addition to bearing testimony to the fact that Spottiswoode was engaged in more pressing concerns on behalf of crown and church. However when the move came it heralded an ecclesiological and magisterial metamorphoses within the burgh. Spottiswoode as the harbinger of this change was clearly apprehensive as to what type of reception his entry into Glasgow would procure. The archbishop's initial rose tinted impression was to become quickly discoloured. On 23 January 1605 Spottiswoode informed King James that

my cumming brocht suche contentment to al sorts of  
peple, that in the partis qhair my service lvis nothing  
wes heard but prayers for your Maiestie and  
gratulationis of the work intendit.<sup>5</sup>

This reference to the work "intendit" undoubtedly indicates that Spottiswoode arrived in Glasgow with a predetermined episcopal agenda ready to be set in motion.

Moreover as a close confidant of the king, and already at this stage James's chief ecclesiastic in Scotland it is highly probable that Spottiswoode was not only privy to the crown's plans for the Church of Scotland but was the brain behind some of the

---

<sup>4</sup>L.E.Schmidt. *Holy Fairs. Scottish Communion and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period.* (1989) pp.22-23. For more details relating to Bruce and the controversy surrounding the Gowrie episode see D.C.MacNicol. *Master Robert Bruce.* (1907). Especially pp.165-178.

<sup>5</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. p.12.



initiatives. This conclusion is given further verification by the archbishop's intimation that he had entrusted the messenger of his letter to James with

sum instructiouns to be communicat to your Maiestie  
tuiching our materis, quhilk I trust your Hienes sal  
favorable interpret; and if in your wisdom thair salbe  
fund meit, your Maiestie will haif care to se thair  
prosecute.<sup>6</sup>

Nevertheless, he went on to regrettably disclose to James that unidentified persons were urging the ministry within the vicinity of Glasgow to unite in opposition and agitate against the primatial residency. The brethren however, Spottiswoode pointed out, had initially embraced a more politic course and "professit thair wald gif obedience to your Maiestie, and conform thair selfis to the ordinances of the kirk."<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, by the time the archbishop wrote to the king he sardonically felt compelled to confess that

lest I suld want matter of exercise, thair begin in this  
Citie, by privat counsels and publick spechis in pulpit,  
to do what thair can for my disgrace, and wil nedis,  
because I haif toppit this matter (for so thair speik),  
bend al thair foris against me.<sup>8</sup>

However, Spottiswoode convinced in the legitimacy and the rightness of his and the crown's policy and actions stressed his determination to overcome and suppress all opposition to episcopacy and his person.

One of the main reasons for the initial compliance with crown policy the archbishop informed the king was due to the efficacious and exemplary endeavours of Patrick Sharp,<sup>9</sup> principal of the University of Glasgow and minister of Paisley, a theologian whom Spottiswoode had described to Isaac Casaubon as "learned and very cultured" prior to his elevation to the episcopate. Sharp was instrumental in achieving

---

<sup>6</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.13.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid*, p.12.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid*, p.12.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid*, p.12.

ecclesiastical acquiescence to the archiepiscopal appointment. The importance of having a loyal and reliable individual of Sharp's stature within the Glasgow presbytery needs little emphasising. Here was a man of a moderate disposition who could use what influence he had in the region to appeal to as wide a spectrum of opinion as possible.<sup>10</sup> His inestimable worth to those pursuing an erastian episcopal programme was accorded official recognition at the Linlithgow Assembly of December 1606 when he was appointed Spottiswoode's deputy constant moderator.<sup>11</sup> Thus the archbishop could rest assured that in his protracted absences from the locality, he had a trustworthy and able individual to step into the breach. Sharp would do what he could to ensure the brethren remained passive to the ecclesiological changes taking place and keep Spottiswoode informed of developments within the jurisdictional area covered by the presbytery. It is largely a measure of the success of this arrangement that the Glasgow presbytery stoically accepted the assembly's injunction on constant moderators as something of a *fait accompli* unlike the vociferous presbyterial protests and initial refusals to comply with the decree which emanated from other particular quarters of the kingdom.<sup>12</sup> This outcome was very likely in part the result of Spottiswoode's and Sharp's proselytising efforts on the virtues of resurrecting the episcopal edifice.

While there is no apparent reason to question the sincerity of Sharp's conversion to erastian episcopacy in the post-1596 period, it cannot be ruled out that his enthusiasm for implementing and arguing in defence of pro-episcopal enactments after Spottiswoode's entry into the city may in part have been a pragmatic response to the stark reality facing him after the archbishop's arrival. After all Spottiswoode, on account of his office, was chancellor of the university and possessed the authority to replace him as principal if he chose. Indeed, shortly after his arrival in Glasgow,

---

<sup>10</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. p.12. On Sharp see H.M.B. Reid. *The Divinity Principals in the University of Glasgow*. (1917). pp.106-114. *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology*. (1993) p.769.

<sup>11</sup>BUK. (ed). A.Peterkin. p.574.

<sup>12</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.503. Row. *Historie*. pp.244-245.

Spottiswoode ordered the university to reproduce a copy of its statutes so as to illumine the powers accruing to the chancellor which had fallen into abeyance.<sup>13</sup> Thus while there is no evidence to suggest that the archbishop ever had to threaten Sharp to ensure that his loyalty to the regime remained steadfast, it is nevertheless worth noting that Sharp, on account of the principalship was the only ecclesiastic whom the archbishop had direct authority over prior to the Glasgow Assembly's acts of 1610. It therefore cannot be wholly discounted that this was a key consideration which consciously, or otherwise, motivated Sharp to steer an erastian episcopal course. Furthermore, paradoxically this potential vulnerability can have only enhanced Sharp's eligibility as a candidate for an authoritative ecclesiastical role within the locality. Whether or not it is doing an injustice to both the archbishop and Sharp to look at their relationship in symbiotic terms and not simply as two prominent individuals with shared convictions, their achievements were considerable and cannot be disputed. Indeed, it is a reflection of their predominance in the area that they were nominated to carry out their own visitations of Glasgow in October 1613 and August 1614;<sup>14</sup> a concession which in theory at least is hardly conducive to the instigation of an effective, constructive and impersonal inspection of the archiepiscopal seat. Of course there is no suggestion that Sharp was anything other than a faithful servant of the archbishop. However highlighting his role sheds light on the way in which Spottiswoode was able to retain tight control of the church in his locality while absent at court, in Edinburgh or elsewhere.

Keeping with the subject of Spottiswoode's involvement in the internal dynamics of the church in the Glasgow region, the picture which emerges from the extant documentary sources from this period is slightly obscured. This is due to the absence of kirk session, synod and court of high commission registers. Nevertheless, the

---

<sup>13</sup>Durkan and Kirk. *The University of Glasgow 1451-1577*. p.301.

<sup>14</sup>CH2/171/2A. Precise dates are 20/10/13 and 24/8/14. Furthermore Spottiswoode was commissioned by the king to take part in a visitation of the university on 9 December 1613. *RPCS*. Vol.X.1613-1616. p.195.

survival of a single page of text relating to the archbishop's installation as constant moderator in the synod of Clydesdale and the complete, although weathered and tattered, presbytery records do provide a degree of clarification. The sources purport to convey the impression that prior to the watershed year of 1610 Spottiswoode was largely contemptuous and at times ran roughshod over presbyterial etiquette and conventions. This of course is not surprising, presbyteries were after all established to effectively make bishops superfluous figures within the Church of Scotland.<sup>15</sup> Therefore the authority and functions appertaining to the presbytery had to be emasculated or repudiated in order to legitimise and justify the existence of the episcopate. The archbishop therefore appears to have adopted a deliberate strategy to undermine the powers of the Glasgow presbytery with the intention of browbeating and demoralising those who opposed the re-institution of episcopal authority within a Scottish ecclesiological context. After the aforementioned date and the restoration of episcopal ecclesiastical authority - as well as its augmentation by the creation of two courts of high commission, Spottiswoode seems much more disposed to take part in presbyterial proceedings. Indeed, the Glasgow presbytery resembles little more than an archiepiscopal court after 1610 as Spottiswoode had forecast. For the archbishop had suggested to King James in a letter dated 12 March 1610 on the subject of the forthcoming general assembly that

wer it gud to vse the opportunitie to cutt tham  
[presbyteries] schort of thair power, and leaue tham a  
bare name, quhiche for the present may please, but in a  
litle tym sal evanische.<sup>16</sup>

While he clearly miscalculated the durability of presbyteries, he was in essence correct in claiming they would be little more than a bare name after their authoritative functions were transferred to the hierarchy.

---

<sup>15</sup>*Stirling Presbytery Records*. introduction by J.Kirk. pp.xi-xii and xviii.

<sup>16</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.235.

The earliest mention of the archbishop in the presbytery records precedes his arrival in Glasgow and is to be found in conjunction with a formal presbyterial request that he ride before the lords at the 1604 parliament as a representative of the city.<sup>17</sup> This is the only recognition accorded the archbishop in the register before August 1605 when the presbytery gave its consent in response to the archbishop's request for a licence granting him permission to travel south at the king's bidding. It furthermore gave acknowledgement to the fact that this would consequently result in a lengthy absence from his parishioners. More importantly, at this juncture the brethren registered their discontent and disapproval that Spottiswoode "hes not as yit subscrivit ye admisionne past in his faivours to ye bischoprik..."<sup>18</sup> It has to be surmised that the reason why the archbishop had not complied with this formality was because to do so would have been tantamount to acknowledging archiepiscopal subordination to the presbytery which in theory could have rendered him accountable to the presbytery for his actions taken in connection with his archiepiscopal office.

It is probably more than coincidence that Spottiswoode initially used his secular authority as a privy councillor to intervene in a matter affecting the church within the locality. While there was little unusual in this secular institution intermediating in particularly hostile disputes between the church and prominent members of lay society - especially in cases where presbyteries had excommunicated recalcitrant offenders,<sup>19</sup> the commission given to the archbishop to intervene in a dispute can only have helped blur the distinction between his ecclesiastical and secular personas and embellished his status throughout the diocese. On 13 June 1605 Spottiswoode was instructed and empowered, along with Walter, first lord Blantyre, to mediate in an acrimonious quarrel between the Glasgow presbytery and the laird of Badinheath.<sup>20</sup> The laird as a symbol of his social standing within the local community and in keeping with a

---

<sup>17</sup>CH2/171/1C. f. 279.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.* f. 300.

<sup>19</sup>Indeed by 1605 King James was insisting that no nobleman was to be excommunicated without his prior acknowledgement and authorisation. See Foster. *The Church Before The Covenants.* p.105.

<sup>20</sup>RPCS. Vol. VII, 1604-7. p.59.

longstanding tradition had commissioned and installed a sarcophagus in his parish church of Lenzie. Although such visual constructs had been proscribed by the post-Reformation church, Boyde of Badinheath had defiantly opposed the Glasgow presbytery's injunction that he immediately have the tomb removed from the interior of the church. As a result the presbytery had been left with little option but to impose its ultimate censure and excommunicated him. The privy council suspended the sentence, and since there is no more recorded of the incident it has to be presumed that the archbishop and lord Blantyre induced the recalcitrant laird to appease the brethren by removing the offending, and apparently idolatrous, piece of masonry from his local church. While this incident was a relatively minor affair and not altogether uncommon, it provides an opportunity to raise the issue of the inherent contradiction in the presbyterians' claim to complete autonomy in matters affecting the church. This paradigmatic attachment to a theological precept that church and state were wholly separate entities was increasingly being questioned by religious and lay alike which can only have made Spottiswoode's position increasingly tenable amongst those throughout the locality. Indeed, experience had shown that in such a politically and legally decentralised country as Scotland was at this time the church needed to forge a close working relationship with the state. How else but with the coercive authority of the government could the church combat aristocratic malignants within their own power bases?

In addition to the somewhat prosaic references to the archbishop in connection with his proprietary responsibilities as inheritor of an alms-house in the burgh of Glasgow<sup>21</sup> and written confirmation to the effect that Spottiswoode, along with Sharp, Andrew Boyd and Robert Scot had been commissioned as representatives of the Glasgow presbytery to attend the Linlithgow assembly,<sup>22</sup> there appears to be only one other legible entry in the register before 1610 in which the archbishop was

---

<sup>21</sup>CH2/171/1C. f. 306.

<sup>22</sup>CH2/171/2A.

specifically mentioned as a participant in a case before the presbytery. The particular case in question occurred in February 1607 and involved the crime of slaughter.<sup>23</sup> As well as being a blatant abomination in the sight of God and condemned by the brethren accordingly, murder, because of the vertical and horizontal bonds which bound Scottish society together, had the potential to escalate beyond the immediate familial members of the initial antagonists implicated in the fracas, and thus had to be treated with a certain amount of discretion and care. Therefore, it is impossible to know for sure whether Spottiswoode was present on account of his role within the local church or because he was a holder of barony and regality jurisdiction in the region. The archbishop could after all use this lordly authority to ensure that justice was seen to be done with the intention of deterring future revenge attacks during what was in effect already a turbulent period for the burgh. Furthermore, as an influential ecclesiastic and an enthusiastic centraliser, he was keen to show that the church was in the vanguard of the crown inspired assault on what they clearly regarded as the anachronistic institution of the bloodfeud.<sup>24</sup> The fact that Lord Blantyre and Sir Matthew Stewart of Minto were also present lends weight to the latter interpretation.

While after the restoration of episcopal ecclesiastical authority, Spottiswoode rarely found the time to participate in the presbytery's deliberations, he did, nevertheless, occasionally put in an appearance. No longer simply the adjudicator and reconciler in aristocratic brawls which threatened to destabilise the locality, he now played a pivotal role in the administration of ecclesiastical discipline. Thus on 5 January 1614 the archbishop wrote to inform the brethren of the presbytery that the previous Sunday he had gone in person to the kirk of Drymen where he "intimat to the people the deposition of Mr Edward Bryce from ye function of ye ministrie for his

---

<sup>23</sup>CH2/171/1C, f. 322.

<sup>24</sup>See K.M.Brown. *Bloodfeud in Scotland 1573-1625* (1986). For the fullest account of the institution of the bloodfeud, see especially chapter headed "ideology" - Christians and Gentlemen.

adultrie..."<sup>25</sup> It is likely that Spottiswoode's personal involvement in this particular ecclesiastical prosecution transcended the mere formality of fulfilling his obligations as archbishop for Bryce had been one of the more vociferous opponents to Spottiswoode's appointment as constant moderator of the synod of Clydesdale seven years earlier.<sup>26</sup> However, in November of that same year Spottiswoode directly intervened in two further matters which had given the local church cause for concern.<sup>27</sup> In both of these personal consideration cannot be ascribed as a factor in his involvement. This point needs to be made because with the archbishop heavily involved at the executive and legislative levels in both church and state the impression given in contemporary presbyterian critiques of the period is of the power hungry prelate who has little interest in anything other than personal aggrandisement.<sup>28</sup> Hence, after firstly conferring with members of his synod, the archbishop initiated proceedings against George Semple, the minister of Killellan, as a result of his "slandrous life and conversation".<sup>29</sup> Additionally, he found time to personally admonish John Carmichael of Meadowflat, captain of Crawford, for some vitriolic speeches he had made against the presbytery of Lanark.

To be sure, it could be argued that Spottiswoode's increased presence in the locality during 1614 was forced upon him by the unexpected capture, detention and trial of the jesuit, John Ogilvie, within the confines of the city.<sup>30</sup> For the archbishop played the key role in the prosecution of the priest and utilised the disciplinary capacity of the Glasgow presbytery to interrogate suspected accomplices.<sup>31</sup> He was determined that Ogilvie should be tried in Glasgow where he could better control events. Nevertheless, written confirmation of Spottiswoode's presence on other occasions in

---

<sup>25</sup>CH2/171/2A. folio 76.

<sup>26</sup>Letters and State Papers. p.118. Also in OLEAS. Vol.I. p.105.

<sup>27</sup>CH2/171/2A. f. 87 & 89.

<sup>28</sup>For example see Alexander Hume's Ane Afold Admonitioun To The Ministrie of Scotland in *Wodrow Miscellany*. Vol.I. pp.568-590. Row. *Historie*. pp.293 and 296.

<sup>29</sup>See FES. Vol.III. p.141.

<sup>30</sup>See chapter 4 for full details.

<sup>31</sup>CH2/171/2A. f. 92.



the presbytery records after 1610 is testimony to his enthusiasm and determination to ensure the church remained a potent force at the local level where it most directly impinged on the perceptions and behaviour of the laity. Thus, although Spottiswoode thought that the presbytery was a spent force which would quite naturally wither away in the foreseeable future, he continued to find it a convenient conduit through which church discipline could be channelled. Unlike the presbytery, the synod as a church court was more conducive to episcopal thinking on church polity.

The post-Reformation synod was a direct descendant of the medieval diocesan synod of bishop and clergy with the court's jurisdictional area still closely corresponding to the former diocesan boundaries.<sup>32</sup> Accordingly its retention was quite naturally an integral element in the episcopal agenda. It is worth stating that once general assemblies became a rarity after 1610, the bishops who had regained control of the synods in 1607 effectively used this court to direct ecclesiastical policy.<sup>33</sup> Although Spottiswoode was allegedly appointed as constant moderator of the synod of Clydesdale at the Linlithgow assembly of December 1606 it was not until the following August that the injunction was put into effect.<sup>34</sup> Although no specific reference is made to the Glasgow presbytery or the synod of Clydesdale, as Spottiswoode was later to acknowledge in his *History* opposition to constant moderators, in presbyteries as well as synods, was initially widespread and vociferous.<sup>35</sup> However, as the archbishop himself noted, "all this opposition proved vain, and they in end forced to obey".<sup>36</sup> He furthermore expressed the notion that those opponents and reluctant enthusiasts of constant moderators "did finde by experience this settled course much better than their circular elections." While visible resistance to Spottiswoode's appointment as constant moderator of the Glasgow

---

<sup>32</sup>Foster. *The Church Before The Covenants*. p.111.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid. pp.116-7.

<sup>34</sup>Scottish Record Office. *CH8/59*.

<sup>35</sup>David Hume of Godscroft accused Spottiswoode of directly using threats and intimidation to have constant moderators accepted by the presbytery of Peebles. See Calderwood. *History*. Vol. VII. p.144.

<sup>36</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.503.-

presbytery was it seems non-existent or at least muted, his acceptance by the synod of Clydesdale was only confirmed after the sitting members were pressurised into ratifying the alteration in their constitution by the threat of legal action.

As well as the likely theological objections to the appointment of the archbishop as constant moderator,<sup>37</sup> it is probable that there were more tangible reasons for the synod's initial reservations. After all, the previous year the synod had provided the Glasgow presbytery with authorisation to summon Spottiswoode to compear before them on the morning of the 22 July, on his return from the king's court, in the Black Friars church of the city to answer charges of non-residency, negligence in his pastoral duties and for his failure to subscribe to the caveats attached to his admission to the bishopric.<sup>38</sup> One other "greiff notishit be thame, and offens in his persone" which was recorded in detail in the synod register must remain a mystery. Thus although the presbytery did not oppose Spottiswoode's role as moderator *per se*, many of the brethrens' perceptions of the archbishop's status and role within the church were diametrically different to Spottiswoode's. Therefore a clash of sorts was looming on the horizon. That it was largely contained and gradually emasculated was down to the skilful application of both carrot and stick.

James, first earl of Abercorn, whose true confessional sympathies lay in the direction of Rome, was ironically entrusted with the task, by King James, of enforcing the assembly's decree on the synod of Clydesdale. His success and the methods he employed in achieving it are demonstrable of the way in which the ministry were browbeaten into admitting and accepting the elevated authority of bishops within the organisational structure of the church. As he notified the king, Abercorn, accompanied by the archbishop, appeared before the assembled synod on 18 August

---

<sup>37</sup>Constant moderators undermined the presbyterian belief that parity amongst the ministry was scripturally decreed and therefore unalterable. Enshrined in Second Book of Discipline, in *BUK*. see caps 2 & 4. Off the Office-beraris in particular; and first of the Pasturis and Ministris, pp.542-543, and Of Eldarschipis, and Assembleis, and of Discipline, pp.546-547.

<sup>38</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. pp.76-77n. Taken from Maitland Miscellany. Vol.II. p.409.

1607 and produced a copy of the assembly's statute on Spottiswoode's appointment as constant moderator.<sup>39</sup> The earl informed the king that

in the beginning thay maid greit oppositioun, allegeing  
the act nocht to have been concludit in forme, as was  
thair gifin out,...moderatione of synoddis nothing haid  
bene spokin.<sup>40</sup>

It is clear that the earl appeared prepared for just such a reply and as a consequence adroitly produced an affidavit signed by the moderator and clerk of the aforementioned Linlithgow assembly testifying to the verity of the article on constant moderators of synods. He thus left the synod members with a difficult dilemma, which he was quick to point out, for in order to stick to the claim that no such thing was agreed upon and ratified by the assembly, the ministers were in effect accusing the moderator and clerk in question of perjury - "quhilk being verefeit mak thame infamous," and left them at the mercy of his majesty. Furthermore, Abercorn deterred any would be accuser by reminding those present that it was within his powers to "mak fast" the person/s in question until a proper investigation and trial were conducted.

[I]n end, fynding thame selffis straittit with a present  
aunswer, and haveing signifiet to thame quhat  
command I haid for denunceing thame rebellis, and  
dissolving the synode incais of disobedience,...<sup>41</sup>

a firm majority resolved to accept the dictate. Only Edward Bryce and William Simpson remained outwardly hostile to the measure. Tellingly, Simpson was one of the members of the presbytery who had been originally commissioned to petition the synod for permission to prosecute the archbishop on the charges outlined above.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>*Letters and State Papers*. p.117.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid.* p.117.

<sup>41</sup>*Ibid.* p.118.

<sup>42</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. pp.76-77n.

Although it is requisite to note the extent and the form of opposition to Spottiswoode's appointment, or at least the disinclination of what very well appears to have been the majority of the clergy involved in this issue, there is possibly a danger in exaggerating the extent of the synodal aversion to the change. After all, after the matter was settled any lingering animosity to the archbishop as constant moderator was swiftly dissipated and the assemblage went on to address the question of Roman Catholic recusancy - no doubt to gail and antagonise the earl. Abercorn concluded his letter by noting that

na assemble this lang tyme keippit it better ordour, to  
all thair contentmentis, and that specialle be the  
archebyschop, then moderator, his prudent and grave  
gouvernement.<sup>43</sup>

It is worth commenting briefly on the prelude to the earl's letter on the above affair. Abercorn informed James that he had written to all presbyteries urging them to commemorate 5 August as a solemn day of prayer and thanksgiving for his majesty's providential deliverance at Perth seven years previously.<sup>44</sup> "[F]yreis of joy with all wther lauchfull takynniss" were to act as visible symbols of the nation's heart-felt relief and delight, thus turning 5 August into something akin to a pre-Reformation holy day. Apparently the instructions were willingly complied with. The institution of such a pseudo-holy day, was evidently designed to psychologically raise the profile of the king throughout the localities in his absence.<sup>45</sup> This probably indirectly helped Spottiswoode, and others involved in the implementation of an erastian episcopal programme.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup>*Letters and State Papers*. p.119.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.* p.117.

<sup>45</sup>For an explanation on how the cult of monarchy was embellished in this way, see C.Geertz. *Centres, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power in Culture and its Creators. Essays in Honour of Edward Shils.*(1977) especially p.152. See K.M.Brown. *The vanishing emperor: British kingship and its decline* in R.Mason. (ed). *Scots and Briton. Scottish political Thought and the Union of 1603.* p.68. D.Cressy. *Bonfires and bells: national memory and the Protestant calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England.* (1989).

<sup>46</sup>It is worth highlighting the following entry dated 19 August 1609 in the *Extracts from the Records of the burgh of Glasgow AD 1573-1642.* (1876) Vol.I. p.313. The bailleis and counsell

Although dissension had been overcome and opposition stifled with relative ease to the archbishop's appointment, the crown instigated further precautionary measures the following April in an effort to make sure that the ministers on the synod remained acquiescent. King James wrote to Sir John Houston of that Ilk, who was the current provost of Glasgow, instructing him to attend the forthcoming synod of Clydesdale due to be held on the second Tuesday of the month. Houston was given the brief of ensuring that

nothing be moved therein prejudiciall to the Actis of the  
Generall Church, bot specialllye any thing whiche  
might be derogatorye to the Actis concludit at the  
Linlithgow Assembly.<sup>47</sup>

Lucrative inducements were to be dangled in front of all ministers who in "any way deserve the same by the[ir] goode, quyet, and peceable cariage";<sup>48</sup> to ease their troubled consciences no doubt. In order to achieve the required result, Houston was to confer with Spottiswoode, who would advise and direct him as to the most appropriate course to proceed. On 19 April, the provost informed the king that he had successfully executed the above commands. Moreover, he was full of praise for the archbishop who in

the Moderatioun off the affairis,... hes so behavit  
himselpe, that not onlie your Maiesties well affectit  
serventis ar exceidinglie rejoycit, bot evin the adverse  
partie, so many off thame as ar in thir boundis, have  
thair mouthis stoppit, and ar compellit to praise God for  
your Hienes most wyse and providant caire in this  
redressinge off thair former confusiouns.<sup>49</sup>

---

ordanis ane warrand to be grantit to the maister of werk, John Bornis, for ansuering him of xvi li[b].xs. as for expenssis of wyne and confeitis spent at the Croce vpon the fyfte of Julii [should read August], the Kingis day, my lord of Glasgu being present with sindrie vthir honorabill men.

<sup>47</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. pp.126-127.

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.* p.126.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.* p.128.

Since Spottiswoode had nominated and rubber stamped Houston's candidacy for the post of provost,<sup>50</sup> the cynically minded might suggest that any alternative course of action other than lavishing praise on his archiepiscopal patron would have been politically suicidal and thus had to be avoided like the plague. Nevertheless, the archbishop's obvious talent at politicking and in the art of managing men does give some credence to Sir John's account. Indeed, this rings true not simply in connection with ecclesiastical affairs, but is self evident in secular matters.

One of the most contentious issues facing the burgh of Glasgow during the early years of the archbishop's residency in the primatial see was centred on the question of who enjoyed the ultimate say in the election of the burgh's provost, bailies and other councillors: the composition of the town council was also bitterly contested. The main catalyst of the friction which disturbed the burgh in the aftermath of the regal union was the political and social power vacuum left in the wake of the duke of Lennox's relocation along with his sovereign's. The void left by Lennox provided the burgesses of the burgh with an opportunity to press their claim for autonomous burghal authority. This matter needs to be addressed since, ultimately, it was the archbishop who filled the power vacuum and extended and consolidated his archiepiscopal grip over the city.

On 4 July 1605, Matthew Turnble, one of the city's magistrates, returned to Glasgow and presented to the council a letter from King James giving his consent in theory to the burgesses proposal that they be granted the right to elect their own magistrates.<sup>51</sup> No mention was made of Lennox and it has to be surmised that the burgesses correctly calculated that if they could convince the king of the financial and political merits of their case, then he would presumably persuade (and compensate) the duke for relinquishing his privilege of selecting the provost and bailies of the

---

<sup>50</sup>*ERBG*. pp.270 & 295.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.* p.228. The magistrates were under the impression that king James was about to grant Glasgow royal burgh status.

burgh. The king informed his Scottish privy council in November 1605 that he had moved Lennox to "demit and overgive all claim of right he could pretend to any superioritie abone the said citie in election off thair magistratis."<sup>52</sup> James added that

as the same wes frelie renuncit be him, so it wes oure  
intentioun to grant unto the said citie als grite fredome  
of electioun of thair awne magistratis yeirlie as ony  
uther frie burgh or citie within that our kingdome, and  
that the same sould be als frie as ony burgh of regalitie  
quhatsumevir.<sup>53</sup>

However by the 28 December the city authorities needed reassuring that the crown was sincere in its response to their request and not merely indulging in some political ruse to keep the city submissive during a period of political and ecclesiological flux. The earl of Dunbar was forced to intervene to make it known that contrary to the "wntrew reportis of the enemies of this commoun weill, quha intendis to withstand the libertie of this burgh," King James had granted them the right to elect their own officials and was not about to renege on this assurance.<sup>54</sup> There was, nevertheless, some confusion as to from when the injunction was to take effect for the following May Spottiswoode, acting on behalf of Lennox, appointed Robert Rowat baillie to adjudicate in the burgh justice court.<sup>55</sup> Thus whether Lennox's demittance was simply a statement of intent rather than an accomplished fact, it is understandable that the burgh councillors should have become somewhat perturbed by the duke's unilateral declaration. Spottiswoode as the executor of the duke's instructions does not appear to have been adversely affected.<sup>56</sup> As should become apparent, if anything, the archbishop by retaining the trust and approval of Lennox while gaining the confidence and respect of the burgh authorities, ultimately benefited from assuming the role of

---

<sup>52</sup>*Charters and other Documents relating to the City of Glasgow, A.D. 1175-1649.* (ed).

J.D.Marwick. (1894). p.269.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.* p.270.

<sup>54</sup>*ERBG.* p.243.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.* p.247.

<sup>56</sup>Spottiswoode himself questioned the renunciation of the bishopric by Lennox to King James on 26 December 1605. *OLEAS.* Vol.I. p.25.

arbitrator and conciliator. A draft copy of an Act of Parliament drawn up on 7 July 1606, and signed by the king declared that the city of Glasgow

in all tyme cumming sall haif als frie libertye in the electioun and cheising of thair magistratis yeirlye.....and that the approbatioun ather of thair archbischope or ony vther subject quhatsoever sall nawayes be requisite or necessarye, bot the same to stand effectuell in all respectis without thair consent askit or demandit thairto.<sup>57</sup>

However, the Act's implementation was forestalled by a rebellion in the burgh.

The depth and extent of the political and social debacle which confronted Glasgow in the early years of Spottiswoode's residency is exemplified by this one incident in particular. It illustrated the deep divisions which ironically provided the archbishop with an opportunity to reinstitute the pre-Reformation archiepiscopal right to elect the provost and baillies of the city. On 27 August 1606, the provost and baillies brought an action for armed insurrection against Sir Matthew Stewart of Minto, his son Walter, a number of their kith and kin, and various representatives of the crafts and commoners in the burgh.<sup>58</sup> The petitioners argued that their constitutional right to elect their own magistrates had been "thir mony yeirs bygane,...verie fer impared within the said citie, in sa fer as thair electioun wes not fre, bot in the power and handis of otheris..."<sup>59</sup> This apparent injustice they believed had been rectified by the duke of Lennox's renunciation of his right with the king's consent and endorsement to return this privilege to the city magistrates. However after

being persavitt be the freindis of the house of Mynto, quho, undir the said Duke of Lennox, had exercise of the officeis of the said toun in their personis, and they considering that be the saidis complenairis new libertie

---

<sup>57</sup>*Charters and other Documents relating to the City of Glasgow, AD 1175-1649.* p.271.

<sup>58</sup>*RPCS.* Vol.VII. pp.240-47.

<sup>59</sup>*Ibid.* p.241.



they could not have that sway, government, and  
authoritie...quhilk formalie they had,<sup>60</sup>

they did all in their power to hinder and reverse this new arrangement. The Stewarts of Minto successfully rallied the support of the crafts by exploiting their already existent resentment that they were under-represented on the burgh council. Thus the dissimulation of the claim that the merchant burgesses were intent on establishing an oligarchic stranglehold over the inhabitants of the city struck a resonant chord with elements of the local nobility, the crafts and the commons.

In July, having previously failed to solicit the support of the lords of the articles who had met to prepare and scrutinise legislation for the imminent meeting of parliament, the laird of Minto, and his followers, adopted a much more belligerent course, resorting to the politics of intimidation by assembling sixty-eighty armed men at the mercat cross of the burgh. On 23 of that same month Sir Matthew's son Walter, with a party of some forty men, made an attempt on the life of the provost, killing one of his company.

[W]er not that the Erll of Wigtoun, Maister of  
Montroise, and Laird of Kilsyth,...defendit the said Sir  
George fra thair invasioun, they had not fallit to have  
slaine him.<sup>61</sup>

It is surely a reflection of how bitter the grieved parties felt at the government sanctioned merchant usurption of office that the young Minto rashly returned with three hundred combatants. Although the resurgents were suppressed, then warded and forced into making significant pecuniary atonement,<sup>62</sup> the incident, nevertheless, was simply a symptom of the divisions in the burgh, not their cause and thus the question of how to resolve the divisions in the city was left unresolved. Indeed, on 1 October 1606, a piqued King James commanded that "for taking awaye any suche

---

<sup>60</sup>*RPCS*. Vol. VII. p.241.

<sup>61</sup>*Ibid.* p.245. The Sir George referred to was Sir George Livingstone of Bythswood.

<sup>62</sup>See also King James's letter relating to these events and the fines to be imposed on the guilty parties - 1 October 1606. *RPCS*. p.501, and correspondence from the privy council to Dunbar of 24 July 1606. In *Letters and State Papers*. p.83.

lyke occasioun of misdeamenour heirefter", the city magistrates accept unreservedly his choice of the baillies for the year to come.<sup>63</sup> Additionally, because he correctly believed that the main area of conflict had centred on the election of the provost, he declared that no provost would be appointed for the foreseeable future. The king informatively let all concerned know that he had firstly consulted Archbishop Spottiswoode, who had given his approval and consent, before making the above decision. Thus while conspiracy theorists would be hard pushed to argue that the king and the archbishop had engineered or fanned the flames of conflict, it does seem that they were determined to make capital out of the situation. Consequently there seems to have been a concerted campaign to raise Spottiswoode's political profile in the burgh.

A letter written by the archbishop on 11 November 1606, or shortly thereafter, for the king's consumption, speaks volumes of Spottiswoode's resolution and temerity in defending and enforcing crown/episcopal policy in the face of harsh opposition.<sup>64</sup> Indeed, the archbishop felt a strong compulsion to apologise for the length of the letter but he deemed it essential that the king be fully familiarised with

the dispositioun of the peple....and my panis takin with  
tham, sum tymis threatning, sum tymis perswading and  
warning tham out of pulpit to bewar of suche coursis as  
had the Ministeris taken in thair rebellious, qho thocht  
the libertie of the Kirk was hasarted in the obedience of  
your Hienes commandementis.<sup>65</sup>

Spottiswoode informed James that he had personally conveyed the regal instructions which had been "be sum of thair [magistrates] number so misconstrued, as it bred no

---

<sup>63</sup>*ERBG*, pp.255-256.

<sup>64</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. pp.207-10. This letter has been wrongly dated by the compiler of *OLEAS* to November 1609 when the events it discusses are clearly those of November 1606. Indeed, as will be shown Spottiswoode and the council were preparing to lobby the king for financial aid for the repair of the High Kirk, bridge and river during early November 1609. While relations between the two were amicable by this date, it will be shown that Spottiswoode had control of the magistracy.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid.* p.209.

little business, yet at last they were won to obedience."<sup>66</sup> Because the king's injunction had clearly infringed and in effect nullified his earlier grant, it could not have surprised the archbishop that the magistrates sought an adjournment to the 11th of the month to consider the constitutional implications of his highness's decision. However, as Spottiswoode wrote, the magistrates employed their time

in animating the Burgessis against the directionis...,  
wherein sum of the factious so prevailed, that in the  
morning of that eleventh day it was noised that all the  
people of the City would meet at the Tolbuith and oppose  
themselves, by taking protestationis in contrair of the  
letter.<sup>67</sup>

Furthermore, veiled threats were surreptitiously circulated to the effect that Spottiswoode would be ill-advised to appear before the council on that day "because in opposition their might fall out some things that would not easily be redressed." After Spottiswoode let it be known that he was impervious to intimidation and remained determined to execute the king's writ the magistrates adopted a more passive stratagem by refusing to meet with the archbishop on the appointed date. Spottiswoode kept the appointed time, and in the presence of Patrick Sharp, some undisclosed ministers, gentlemen and notaries allegedly compiled a list, intended for the king, of all those who had refused to attend, and who had impeded and opposed the royal dictate. The burghal authorities, evidently only too aware of their impotency in this situation, and of the futility in further resisting the inevitable bowed to crown/archiepiscopal pressure. As Spottiswoode explained

[t]he conscience of their misbehaviour, and fear of  
complainyng, drew them to intercede, in the evening,  
with me, by their Pastours, that I would not be hasty to  
advertise, promising at my desire to convene the nexte  
day and give a reverent answer: which they did...<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.207.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.* pp.207-8.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.* p.208.

The archbishop noted how after this episode there "apperit ane wonderful change in the peple, al of tham striving who suld be first in obedience and best reportit of". The crafts had met independently and had been only to happy to give their consent "acknowledging of your Maiesties favouris done to those of thair number that wer deteinit in warde" for their part in the tumultous proceedings in the burgh the previous July.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, the crown won their gratitude by increasing their representation on the city council against the wishes of the merchants.<sup>70</sup> Spottiswoode advised King James to renew his original command with the following accretion that

in the mean qhyl to chuse a discret Council of this Town, halfe of the merchantis, the other of the craftis according to the roll I haif sent, qhairin of both parties I haif warrand, and yit can not be weil resavit of that multitude without your Maiesties special directioun.<sup>71</sup>

Even at this early date then, and prior to his acquiring regality jurisdiction, he had more or less taken control of the burgh administration through his ability to determine the complexion and composition of the council.

To digress slightly for the moment, Spottiswoode concluded his letter to James by way of the following supplication which demands quoting at length.

Now, Sir, that matteris ar brocht to ane reasonable point in this place qhair your Maiestie wes plesit to set me, and generallie in the Kirk,.... I wald humblie begge leave of retyring, and yeild my Bischopruck to one that can serve, now qhen thingis ar setlit, better nor my self. Sir, I desyr the world suld se that ambioun did not set me on worke, but a desyr to serve your Maiestie in a gud worke that had many enemyis; and indeed, Sir, I find my burdens unsupportable.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. p.208.

<sup>70</sup>ERBG. pp.257-8.

<sup>71</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. pp.208-209.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid. p.209.

Was the archbishop seriously petitioning the king to relieve him of his office? It is certainly possible that Spottiswoode's petition was absolutely genuine. After all, his incessant labours on behalf of the crown and the cause of bishops might have momentarily taken their toll. However, it does seem more likely that the plea was designed to draw James's attention to the inadequacy of the capital resources at the disposal of the archbishop for the role assigned him. Moreover, it cannot be discounted that he was ambitiously angling for greater official recognition of his archiepiscopal office and status. After all this was an ideal way of drawing the king's attention to his own importance in the advancement of royal policy.

On 14 November, no doubt after a great deal of debate and negotiation, the council reconvened in the presence of the archbishop and presented him with a new proposal designed to at least salvage a modicum of burghal authority.<sup>73</sup> The magistrates suggested "for estableising of ane solid ordour in cheising of the magistratis heireftir, and for [the] quietnes of this toune," that the pre-Reformation practice of the council presenting a list of potential baillies to the archbishop from which he would select the baillies for the year ahead be reintroduced. With regards to the election of the provost, it was proposed that either the archbishop nominate two or three individuals from whom the baillies and council would elect one as provost, or the council choose and archbishop select. While there is little in the way of substantive evidence to prove it, it has to be conjectured that Spottiswoode and the crown had been manoeuvring for just such an outcome. It does seem inconceivable that the archbishop would not have used his time constructively to ensure that the magistrates reached just such a conclusion. To be sure, because Spottiswoode was largely untainted by long-standing antagonisms which had divided the city, had the ear and confidence of the king, and was accordingly on the political and social ascendancy, he provided the ideal candidate for assuming responsibility for overseeing the elections of the city's provost

---

<sup>73</sup>*ERBG*, p.257.

and baillies. The fact that he still occasionally acted on behalf of the duke of Lennox in the burgh should not obscure the fundamental point that he was first and foremost the king's man who put the vital interests of the crown and church before the sectional interests of prominent noblemen.<sup>74</sup> Spottiswoode, true to form, notified the council that he would have to consult with the king before responding to their overtures. James later insisted that his original instructions be adhered to (as Spottiswoode suggested he should) for the present year and that afterwards all nominees for either the provostship or baillie should be forwarded to the archbishop.<sup>75</sup> Furthermore, he complied with the archbishop's recommendation by insisting that eleven craft members be admitted to the council forthwith.<sup>76</sup>

By 7 March 1607 the burgh magistrates informed King James that they were "now satlit in a perfect peace and quyetnes, efter long and trublesum broylis, cheiflie be the cair and diligence of ....the Archibischop of Glasgu."<sup>77</sup> They furthermore told the king that on reflection they found the new settlement agreeable. Although the archbishop made it known that he was "weill pleisit to condiscend to thair said desyre", he yet again insisted that the king and the duke of Lennox would firstly have to formally endorse the new arrangement, which they duly did.<sup>78</sup> Spottiswoode by initially using his influence to cultivate a working relationship with the divided parties, astutely manufactured a situation out of which he emerged an indispensable and integral element in the political affairs of the burgh. However what was in essence an equitable working settlement that satisfied a wide spectrum of opinion proved to be merely a

---

<sup>74</sup>Two letters from Lennox to sir William Livingstone - one dated November 1606 and the other February 1611 make it clear that Spottiswoode remained within the duke's sphere of influence. *HMC* 72, Laing MSS I. pp.105 & 123.

<sup>75</sup>*ERBG*. pp.257-8. Dated 22 December 1606.

<sup>76</sup>Because Glasgow was a regional centre relying on inland rather than overseas she had a disproportionately high number of craftsmen to merchants and this probably intensified the demands of the crafts for greater representation. I.D.Whyte. *Scotland Before the Industrial Revolution. An Economic and Social History, c1050-1750*. (1995). p.205.

<sup>77</sup>*ERBG*. p.261.

<sup>78</sup>*Ibid.* pp.261-262.

step forward in the archiepiscopal acquisition of power in Glasgow and was thus ephemeral.

Although the nomination and election of provost and baillies went ahead without a hitch in the prescribed manner shortly after Michaelmass in October 1607,<sup>79</sup> already by the following year the archbishop was deviating from the agreed upon procedure. Spottiswoode, on 9 August 1608, sent James Tennent of Linhouse, his chamberlain, to the councillors to inform them that due to a heavy work schedule a postponement of the new elections was almost inevitable.<sup>80</sup> Then on 12 November the archbishop ignoring the guidelines which had been agreed upon wrote to the magistrates intimating that Sir John Houston, the current provost, was to remain in office for the coming year.<sup>81</sup> Was Houston being rewarded for his sterling service on behalf of the archbishop and crown at the synod of Clydesdale the previous April? In December Spottiswoode notified the council that the current baillies were also to continue in office for the year ahead.<sup>82</sup> By establishing this precedent Spottiswoode ensured that the politically and financially valuable portion of burgh patronage was at the disposal of the archbishop to reward friends and colleagues. Furthermore, it importantly consolidated, strengthened and reinforced archiepiscopal domination over the burgh bureaucracy.

Over and above the political and social turmoil which wrought havoc on the city during the early years of Spottiswoode's residency, local aristocratic disputes also had a tendency to result in violence in Glasgow's streets and wynds. Indeed, the threat to the peace of the burgh caused by the significant presence of the armed retainers of the local nobility, with their inflated sense of tribal loyalty, must have deeply troubled and

---

<sup>79</sup>*ERBG*, p.270

<sup>80</sup>*Ibid.* pp.287-288.

<sup>81</sup>*Ibid.* p.295.

<sup>82</sup>*Ibid.* pp.296-297.

angered the burgh community.<sup>83</sup> A letter written in September 1606, by Lord Blantyre to the laird of Pollock testifies to the above problem.<sup>84</sup> The letter in question was an exercise in damage limitation after their men had clashed violently within the city's confines. How common such clashes were is difficult to adjudge, but since Glasgow was the political, commercial, manufacturing, agricultural and ecclesiastical epicentre of a substantial area, the probability of armed aggression of one sort or another must have been fairly high. Hence in May 1609 the burgh authorities took substantive and costly precautionary measures to ensure that the public reconciliation of the Cunninghams and the Semples, which was scheduled to take place within the burgh, should proceed without incident to the detriment of the city.<sup>85</sup>

It needs saying that the rationale behind taking control of the magistracy transcended the wholly political and secular. For no matter what advocates of the two kingdoms theory might have fulminated to the contrary, the magistracy in Glasgow pulled the ministerial strings. This is not to suggest that relations between the two were other than harmonious. Nevertheless, the church's financial dependency on the burgh council, coupled to the fact that the magistracy collectively outnumbered the ministers on kirk sessions, must have made the management of this institution a highly desirable objective for Spottiswoode. The archbishop could not have failed to notice and possibly had even encouraged the council's injunction to the ministry of the burgh on 2 November 1605 that for the year to follow the ministers were to preach in the High Kirk each Tuesday and in the Trongate on a Thursday.<sup>86</sup> marriages and baptisms were also to be performed on these days. That on the same day the council responded favourably to the petition of Robert Scot, one of their ministers, for greater financial assistance with a one off annual payment of 95 merks reinforces the notion

---

<sup>83</sup> See K.M.Brown. *Burghs, Lords and Feuds in Jacobean Scotland* in (ed). M.Lynch. *The Early Modern Town in Scotland*. (1987). pp.102-124.

<sup>84</sup> *T-PM113/5*. Held in the Mitchell Library, Glasgow.

<sup>85</sup> *ERBG*. p.302. See also *Royal Letters and Instructions and other Documents from the archives of the Earl of Wigton, MDXX-MDCL*. p.34.

<sup>86</sup> *ERBG*. p.239.



that the ministry lacked sufficient resources to act independently of the magistracy.<sup>87</sup> It is worth conjecturing that since in reality the secular authorities did indeed exercise control over the ministry, that many clerics might have concluded or speculated that Spottiswoode would champion, or at a minimum place a higher premium on, the financial demands of the church and ministry. Of course having an ecclesiastic in an authoritative position in the state was not going to provide an immediate panacea to the ministers' problems as is evidenced by an entry in the council records dated 12 March 1608. For the ministry alarmingly drew the council's attention to

cokalandis oft publiſt and ſet out in this toun be ſum  
profane and insolent perſons, expreſ contrar the actis  
parliament and all Chriſtiane behaviour in reformat  
commane weillis.<sup>88</sup>

By the 11 June the council were further forced to confront the problem of Sabbath enforcement as a significant proportion of the burgh's inhabitants were regularly absent from church services.<sup>89</sup>

Finally, on 29 April 1609, John Bell and Robert Scot appeared before the burgh authorities to decry the dilapidatory condition of the High Kirk and metropolitan seat.<sup>90</sup> It cannot be ascertained whether they acted on their own initiative or had been notified by the archbishop, who was attending the court, to press the council to put out a call for voluntary contributions for the repair of the cathedral. Spottiswoode was certainly to be consulted on his return as to the most opportune method of approaching King James in the forlorn hope that he would give his consent to their "ingetting of the siluer of ald laid vpone ſindrie gentill mennis landis callit the commonis of the kirk." Whether there had been little enthusiasm shown towards the call for voluntary contributions or whether these were inadequate to match the scale

---

<sup>87</sup>*ERBG*, p.239.

<sup>88</sup>*Ibid.* p.275.

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.* p.282.

<sup>90</sup>*Ibid.* p.278.

of the problem, on 9 November, Robert Scot was nominated by the council to accompany the archbishop to the king's court.<sup>91</sup> They would alert James as to the deplorable condition not only of the cathedral but also of Glasgow's bridge and surrounding river and solicit material aid from him to pay for their restoration. The records are silent as to the success or otherwise of the enterprise. However this is largely incidental, for the fundamental point to bear in mind is that through Spottiswoode both the secular and religious burgh authorities had a more direct and effective link with the crown. It is no coincidence that in April 1611 through the archbishop's intervention the city was finally accorded royal burgh status - and the privileges this conferred.<sup>92</sup>

In order to partake of the duties and functions pertaining to his office, as well as fulfilling the king's high expectations of him, Spottiswoode required solid material foundations on which to edify and underpin his political, social and ecclesiastical role. A grant made under the privy seal on 4 June 1604 recognised that due to the annexation of the temporalities of bishoprics to the crown by Act of Parliament on 29 July 1587 Spottiswoode's original award, which consequently was restricted to the spiritualities of the archbishopric of Glasgow, was "nocht abill to beare out his charge and estait".<sup>93</sup> King James sought to rectify the archbishop's financial shortcomings by authorising the requisite governmental officials to augment Spottiswoode's income by restoring his right to the temporalities of the bishopric. Therefore

all and sindrie teinde fructis rentis emolumentis landis  
teindischavis uthir teindis fischingis feufermes  
superiorities proffitis and dewtes of the said  
archebischoprik quhatsumever with all and sindrie  
manie places castellis toures fortalices houss biggingis  
yairdis dewcattis lyand alsweill within the wallis and

---

<sup>91</sup>*ERBG*. p.308. *Register of the Great Seal of Scotland*. Vol.VI. entry 462, p.170-1.

<sup>92</sup>*Ibid*. p.319. Ratified by Act of Parliament the following year. *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*. Vol.VI. 1593-1625. p.484.

<sup>93</sup>,SRO. *PS1/74*. pp. 208v-209v.

precinct of the bischoppis place as ony utherpairt or  
place of this realm of Scotland,<sup>94</sup>

were placed at the disposal of the archbishop. Nevertheless, although his admittance to the temporalities certainly augmented his meagre income, the inflationary pressures of the period coupled to the fact that large tracts of land had been feued out by previous propriety superiors largely negated the beneficial effects of the award.<sup>95</sup> That the previous Roman Catholic archbishop had absconded with many valuables belonging to the see which Spottiswoode unsuccessfully endeavoured to re-acquisition only added to his financial plight.<sup>96</sup> Moreover much of the archiepiscopal property was in a dilapidated condition. Of course, the additional ecclesiastical and secular patrimony accruing to his office provided him with the ideal platform on which to build once he took up residence within the locality.

In April 1605 King James

haiffing consideratioun of the singular inclinatioun  
*ernest studie* great paine and travell takin be John  
archbychop of glasgow in estableness off the discipline  
of ye kirk of God and propagatioun of christis evangell  
within the same be advancing of ye ministrie serving  
with him in thair cair at glasgow and utherwaye<sup>97</sup>

commissioned the privy council to undertake the necessary steps to see that Spottiswoode was endowed with the parsonage and vicarage of the parish church of Glasgow. This annexation and incorporation of the parsonage and vicarage of the parish church into the archbishop's patrimony was excused and justified by parliament in July 1606 on the grounds that "the rentis and yeirlie proffeitis of the archibischoprik of Glasgow ar greatlie exhaustit be fewis pensiounis and otherwyes".<sup>98</sup> In August 1608 Spottiswoode was further rewarded for his tireless work "in his hines privat and

---

<sup>94</sup>PS1/74. p.209r.

<sup>95</sup>See Macinnes. *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641*. pp.4-5.

<sup>96</sup>See *HMC. Salisbury (Cecil) Manuscripts*. Vol.XIX. 1607. (1965). pp.130-131.

<sup>97</sup>Register of Presentation to Benefices. 1595-1607. CH4/1/3.

<sup>98</sup>APS. Vol.VII. p.330.

p[ar]ticular affairis...[and] also in ye publict effaires of yis realme."<sup>99</sup> Indeed, it is a reflection of the high esteem in which he was held by the king that he was granted the privilege of regality jurisdiction throughout the archbishopric. This in theory at least provided Spottiswoode with an extensive reservoir of patronage, judicial power and lordly influence to overawe opposition to erastian episcopacy. At the same time it gave the archbishop an ideal opportunity to win converts to the episcopal cause through well targeted benevolence and the exercise of good lordship. However, Spottiswoode, who was now routinely addressed as "my lord of Glasgow", had to delicately balance the need to consolidate and even re-appropriate archiepiscopal property and privileges with meeting the demands of his vassals for extended leases, feus, pensions and authoritative positions within the administration throughout the locality.<sup>100</sup> In addition to receiving regality status, the archbishop was granted the parsonages and vicarages belonging to the parish churches of Ancrum, Eskirk, Stobo, Eddilstoun, Kilbryde and Torrence.<sup>101</sup>

While the extra revenues from the profits of justice and ecclesiastical property flowing into the archiepiscopal coffers might have been expected to meet Spottiswoode's monetary needs, they proved inadequate to prevent an unexpected archiepiscopal financial crisis in May/June 1613. Spottiswoode, greatly perturbed, wrote to John Murray of Lochmaben on 2 June informing him of the anxious predicament he found himself having been

chargit be ane Jhon Belschese, Advocat, at the instance of Sir Robert Maxwel, to pay him, within sum sex or ten dayes, twelf thowsand merkis, qhair of I gaif my band, at his resignioun of New Abbay, to assuir him

---

<sup>99</sup>CH4/1/4. pp.19v-21v. RGSS. Vol.V. entry 2084, p.761. CH4/1/4, 1607-1617. pp. 20-22.

<sup>100</sup>For example, AGN. Vol.III, grant made to John Drew dated 31 October 1606. TD200/115, Mitchell Library. Grant to John Blair. See also the various grants and confirmations made by the archbishop in the RGSS. Vol.VI. entries; 1678, 1836, 1909, 1918. Vol.VI. 192, 194, 195, 196, 197, 201, 658, 932, 1025, 1195, 1207. *Charters and other Documents*. pp.291-294 & 295.

<sup>101</sup>CH4/1/4. p.20v. RGSS. p.761.

of that promise which was made by his Majesty to that effect.<sup>102</sup>

The archbishop pointed out that "I have no relief nor possibility to pay it, being otherwise burdened in my particular estate." Spottiswoode claimed that although the original grant made to him by the king would have provided him with sufficient revenue to make payment to Sir Robert

it was crossed, and ane discharge made of the same, That it might be few to others, and the same will not be granted that will be gotten for it, and I think none at all, as our poverty is this year.<sup>103</sup>

He appealed to Murray to intercede with the king to see that the original grant was re-issued, assuring him that it was in the financial interests of the crown which would receive a healthy annual return of 12000 marks. Proof that Spottiswoode was clearly distressed or at least very concerned at the damage this pecuniary irregularity might cause his person and office is given in the conclusion of his plea. He writes,

because this is a great business to me as any I have had in my time, and concerns me in much credit, I will pray your help into it, and that his Majesty be your vnderstand the strait I am like to fall in for that band, and propose the way of relief, that if it be likely of, I may provide for Sir Robert's payment...<sup>104</sup>

There does seem to be some confusion as to the true recipient of the above grant of New Abbey. The entry in the privy seal of 21 September 1612 makes no mention of the archbishop, but his younger son Robert.<sup>105</sup> However, as Spottiswoode's letter to

---

<sup>102</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I p.444.

<sup>103</sup>Ibid. p.445.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid. p.445.

<sup>105</sup>CH4/1/4. pp.77-78. Robert graduated with a Master of Arts degree from the University of Glasgow in March 1613. Interestingly, his father then sent him to study at Exeter College, Oxford, from where he completed his education by a lengthy spell in France, Italy and Germany. One of the principal reasons for his long sojourn on the Continent was contingent on his father's commission to him to locate and acquire ancient Scottish manuscripts and church records taken abroad by Roman Catholic monks and priests at the time of the Scottish Reformation to help in the compilation of a history of the Church of Scotland King James had given to the archbishop. Robert appears to have collected a number of works on his travels and significantly re-acquired *The Black Book of Paisley*. Since Archbishop Spottiswoode does not appear to have started his *History*, which he

Sir John Murray notes, the original grant made by the king had been to him personally. This is further corroborated by Spottiswoode's leading presbyterian critic, David Calderwood. He claimed in his *History* that the archbishop had been given possession of New Abbey by King James prior to his returning from court in February 1612.<sup>106</sup> According to Calderwood, Spottiswoode received the abbey as a means of appeasing him for the king's unwillingness to indict the marquis of Hamilton for some impolitic speeches he had made against the archbishop. The most likely explanation for this apparent discrepancy is that Spottiswoode sought to allay aristocratic and presbyterian criticism and resentment at what can have only been perceived as archiepiscopal aggrandisement by arranging for the grant to be made in his son's name. This additionally had the benefit of providing his son with some financial security, while in reality increasing Spottiswoode's range of patronage and influence. Instructively, in March 1613 his eldest son John had the title deeds to Holyroodhouse conferred on him.<sup>107</sup> As a corollary Spottiswoode also took care to see that in meeting his paternal obligations that his daughter Anne was also provided for during his residency at Glasgow and even unsuccessfully attempted to have his father-in-law's son succeed to the bishopric of Ross after John Craig's demise in 1613.<sup>108</sup> Whatever the true reason behind this apparent anomaly, Spottiswoode's liquidity crisis appears to have been short lived for he encountered no difficulty in laying his hands on £5000 Scots for a property transaction in August 1614.<sup>109</sup>

---

presented to King Charles in 1638, until the following reign this subject has been omitted from discussion. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the library belonging to Spottiswoode and his son Robert was estimated to have been worth in the region of £5000-£6000. It was allegedly broken up and destroyed at the outset of the Covenanting Revolution by a mob. Robert was made an extraordinary lord of session and a privy councillor on his return to Scotland in 1622. He was elevated to the post of president of the lord of session in November 1633. See *Practicks of the Laws of Scotland. Observed and Collected by Sir Robert Spottiswoode of Pentland*. (Published by his grandson, John Spottiswoode of that Ilk, Edinburgh, 1706). pp.iii-iv. G.Brunton and D.Craig. *An Historical Account of the Senators of the College of Justice*. (Edinburgh, 1832). pp.266-269.

<sup>106</sup>Calderwood *History*. Vol.VII. p.164.

<sup>107</sup>CH4/1/4. p.92.

<sup>108</sup>RGSS. entry 349, p.131. British Library. Add. MSS. 19,402. f.38.

<sup>109</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. p.362.

The final acquisition made by Spottiswoode during his triumphant tenure at Glasgow occurred in July and August 1614 when he successfully negotiated the transfer of Kilwinning Abbey from secular into archiepiscopal hands. Correspondence by Spottiswoode to both King James and John Murray of Lochmaben are demonstrative of his determination to see that this former ecclesiastical property and the lands conjoined to it be returned to the church. Firstly on the 29 July the archbishop informed Murray that he had contracted with Lord Burleigh for the rights to Kilwinning.<sup>110</sup> Burleigh had subsequently agreed to part with the property for the sum of £10000, half of which the archbishop stated he would personally stake. Spottiswoode went on to explain that Burleigh was

to cum him self with the securities and gift of the  
Abbacy in my person, qhairof, if ye hear any thing, I  
pray yow gif it the furtherance ye may. If he tak another  
advyse to stay or not to cum hastily, I wil send in this  
sum the gif to be signed, and his letter testifeing his  
consent....<sup>111</sup>

By 3 August Spottiswoode reported separately to both the king and Murray that the transaction had been completed:<sup>112</sup> it received the official seal of approval six days later.<sup>113</sup> Although Spottiswoode's principal consideration had centred on the negotiations with Lord Burleigh, the complexity of Scottish land ownership - especially in relation to the teinds, made it imperative that the archbishop reached an accommodation with other prominent landowners. Thus Spottiswoode was compelled to consult and conclude a separate contract with Sir Alexander Seton

anent the tithis of the Cunninghams landis, qhair thai  
haif any within the Churchis allottit to him; for the  
special Churchis qhair the Erle of Glencarn and his  
frenschip haif thair landis, sal in that portioun qhiche, be  
your Maiesties favour, is assignit to me.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.362.

<sup>111</sup>*ibid.* p.362.

<sup>112</sup>*ibid.* pp.364-365.

<sup>113</sup>*CH4/1/4*. p.110.

<sup>114</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.364.

It seems that Glencairn, or others of his kin, must have objected to or protested against the new arrangement for the archbishop curtly assured King James that

neyther haif the Cunnynghamis cause to complein,  
being better provydit for in the surtie of thair tithis, then  
tham selfis culd haif done, at the least in this, that thai  
sal not in thair competitoris handis, nor ar thai to do  
tham any reverence in that behalf.<sup>115</sup>

It has to said that Spottiswoode would very likely have received a favourable settlement from Seton since the archbishop had played a crucial part in the reconciliation of the nobleman and the king in a protracted dispute over his right to inherit the lands and titles of the House of Montgomerie.<sup>116</sup>

In the final analysis, Archbishop Spottiswoode's acquisition of secular and ecclesiastical authority at the centre of the political and ecclesiastical affairs of the kingdom were paralleled within the archiepiscopal locality. Opposition had been effectively neutralised and Spottiswoode successfully established both his political and ecclesiastical authority at the heart of the archiepiscopal see. However, there was one particular area of ecclesiastical policy which continued to give Spottiswoode cause for concern between 1603 and 1615 and this lay with the Church of Scotland's perennial difficulty at extirpating Roman Catholic recusancy. Since the archbishop devoted such a great deal of time and energy combating the widely perceived Catholic menace it is now necessary to focus on this subject and analyse the archbishop's and wider church's endeavour in this area.

---

<sup>115</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. pp.364-365. Seton held Glencairn accountable for the murder of his uncle. The two had clashed violently at the parliament of 1606. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.496. Thus there was most likely residual animosity between them.

<sup>116</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.518.



## ARCHBISHOP SPOTTISWOODE AND ROMAN CATHOLIC RECUSANCY. PART I.

### CHAPTER FIVE.

In July 1604, in a parliament in which Archbishop Spottiswoode was a conspicuous participant as one of the lords of the articles in drafting and scrutinising legislation, the political nation having re-pledged its commitment to the "Religioun presentlie professit and establissit within this realme" re-ratified

all actis of parliament maid againis Jesuitis/Papistis  
seminarie preistis and yair ressaitteris. And ordinis the  
samyn actis to have full effect and to be put into  
executioun in all pointis in tyme cumyng effir ye forme  
and tennour yairof.<sup>1</sup>

Although the post-Reformation Church of Scotland had from its genesis repeatedly called upon the state to provide the requisite backing in its 'godly' crusade to extirpate Roman Catholicism in Scotland, the obvious reluctance of the magistracy, in such a politically decentralised nation, to provide material and coercive support to the church in the years prior to the re-establishment of erastian episcopacy seriously jeopardised the kirk's programme of enforcing Protestant conformity throughout the localities.<sup>2</sup> Lynch, in his enthusiasm to re-write presbyterian historiography, has somewhat bizarrely discounted the Church of Scotland's very palpable fear of a renewed and relatively widespread resurgence in Roman Catholic recusancy between 1590 and 1616 as a mere reflection of a crisis of morale within the ministry itself.<sup>3</sup> However, it would appear that he has fallen into the same trap of which he accused David Calderwood - that of reading history backwards. For as Durkan, McLennan and Sanderson have conclusively shown, Roman Catholicism was without question reinvigorated by the jesuit and secular missions to Scotland from the late 1590s

---

<sup>1</sup> *APS*. Vol.IV 1593-1625. p.264.

<sup>2</sup> See K.M.Brown. In Search of the Godly Magistrate in Reformation Scotland in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. Vol.40. No.4, October 1989. On the issue of the decentralised nature of the Scottish constitution see J.Wormald. 'Princes' and the regions in the Scottish Reformation in *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*. (ed). N.Macdougall. (1983). pp.65-84.

<sup>3</sup> Lynch. Preaching to the Converted in *The Renaissance in Scotland*. p.326.

onwards.<sup>4</sup> While with hindsight it must be recognised that differences of opinion over strategy and tactics between the different Roman Catholic religious orders significantly weakened the effectiveness of the mission and that the number of priests operative in Scotland at any given moment between 1603 and 1625 was relatively small, the clandestine nature of the mission ensured that the kirk was unaware of this. Although political circumstances had changed a great deal, the jesuits in particular believed that it was possible to replicate the success of the Protestant Reformation of 1559/60 when a minority religion with significant aristocratic support and foreign backing supplanted the established faith. Spottiswoode and his fellow ministers were all too aware of jesuit strategy and as will be demonstrated this helps in part to explain their eagerness to impose seigneurial conformity. Moreover, seen in a wider European context, the kirk was justifiably alarmed at the striking success of the Counter-Reformation on the Continent during the early seventeenth century. The combined impact of Roman Catholic missionary zeal backed up with Habsburg military might ensured that much of Central Europe was returned to the papal fold. Spain still posed a real threat to the security of the Protestant Netherlands and the lustre of the former Calvinist citadel, Geneva, had evidently lost some of its former radiance.<sup>5</sup> Closer to home, the hopes of the French Huguenots had suffered a clear setback in 1593 when Henry of Navarre deserted the Protestant cause and converted to Roman Catholicism.<sup>6</sup> Although many Roman Catholics doubted whether Henry IV's conversion was sincere and five years later probably had their fears compounded when the French Protestants were granted toleration through the Edict of Nantes their strength and number was irrefutably diminished through war weariness, monarchical absolutism and the influence enjoyed by Roman Catholic clerics in the state apparatus.

---

<sup>4</sup>See J.Durkan. William Murdoch and the early Jesuit Mission in Scotland in *Innes Review*. Vol.35 (1984). pp.3-11. B.McLennan. Presbyterianism Challenged: A Study of Catholicism and Episcopacy in the North-East of Scotland, 1560-1650. (Aberdeen, 1977. Unpublished PhD thesis). M.H.Sanderson. Catholic Recusancy in Scotland in the Sixteenth Century in *IR*. Vol.21. 1970. pp.87-107. See also P.F.Anson. *Underground Catholicism in Scotland*. (1970). pp.12-25.

<sup>5</sup>See A.G.Dickens. *The Counter-Reformation*. (Re-print, 1992). pp.147-150.

<sup>6</sup>R.J.Knecht *The French Wars of Religion 1559-1598*. pp.77-83. M.Greengrass. *Essay on France in The Reformation in National Context*. p.62.

Thus it is necessary to gauge the success or otherwise the introduction of erastian episcopacy brought to the Church of Scotland in its endeavour to confront and defeat its Roman adversaries and at enforcing, at the very minimum, an outward display of lay conformity to the established faith. Particular emphasis will be given to Spottiswoode's role in these developments.

Although the more cynically minded presbyterian opponents of erastian episcopacy appear to have believed that the attack on Roman Catholicism was nothing more than an astute diversionary tactic introduced by the crown and the bishops to both aid and ease the ecclesiological transition<sup>7</sup> - and while there is an element of truth in their claim, as will be shown, this was not the dominant reason or cause of the clampdown. Nevertheless, the influence of the rejuvenated crusade against Roman Catholic recusancy was without question a unifying force around which disparate elements within the national church could unite behind the crown and episcopate. Two examples of the importance attached to this issue, and how this indirectly abetted the progress of erastian episcopacy by diverting opposition wrath on the minions of "antichrist" will suffice here. The first appertained to a disputation held at Falkland Palace in June 1608 between delegations representing episcopacy and presbyterianism. When the meeting was dissolved after agreement was reached that the articles produced by the presbyterian party would have to be presented before a general assembly and the king for further consideration, the disputation concluded by agreement that in

the mean while there be no publict speaking or preaching on either syde againis or with the present government of this Kirk, but that all sermons shall run aganis Papists their doctrine and ungodlie practises.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Row. *Historie*. p.250

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.* pp.245-247.

Indeed, the central theme of the general assembly in July 1608 was the “suppressing of papistrie and idolatrie”. In the assembly it was unanimously accepted that all within the church should

in the fear of God, lay down all rancour and distractione of hearts and affectiones, quhilk either of them hes borne against uthers in all tymes bypast, and be reconcilit in the heartie affectione of the word of God, and preachers of peace, Christian love and charitie to his people, to the effect that this heartie reconciliatione, their hearts and devyce may be conciliat for disappointyng of the crafty devyse of the enemy.<sup>9</sup>

While it was recognised that opinion was divided over the question of church polity and discipline, it was agreed to postpone debate on this highly controversial issue to an unspecified future date. A summary of the deliberations produced on behalf of the episcopate for the king on 30 July 1608 specified that although James Law, the Bishop of Orkney, had been chosen moderator of the assembly by a mere three votes, and while some unnamed persons had sought to disrupt the proceedings, “your Maiestie hes obtenit, with ane grit consent of all, the verry same thing wes intendit...”<sup>10</sup> Spottiswoode would provide the king with a detailed account on his forthcoming trip to the court. When the two parties met again at Falkland the following year to address the disputed issue of constant moderators and the power of bishops, their conference ended with the question unresolved and yet again the matter was postponed to an unspecified future date.<sup>11</sup> Tellingly, the clerics concluded their business with an exhortation on Psalm 74, in which the enemy referred to therein was no doubt taken to represent the Roman Catholic church, and closed proceedings by singing Psalm 33 which starts; “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.”[AV]. There was little doubt then that episcopalians and presbyterians were equally antagonistic towards Rome and its adherents.

---

<sup>9</sup>BUK. p.584.

<sup>10</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. pp.145-147.

<sup>11</sup>Melville. *Diary and Autobiography*. pp.779-780.

It largely goes without saying, since the two were intricately connected, that the sustained, co-ordinated and systematic assault on the forces of the Counter-Reformation in Scotland after the regal union, sprung from political considerations as much as from the purely religious and concerned above all else the question of the royal supremacy in church and state. Importantly, it was Roman Catholic and presbyterian opposition to the royal supremacy which made both so odious to King James VI whose support was integral to the success or otherwise of the campaign to extirpate nonconformity. In one fundamentally crucial aspect, militant Roman Catholicism and presbyterianism shared a common ideology which legitimised the deposition of 'tyrannical' kings, and even regicide when warranted. While Spottiswoode was an orthodox Calvinist whose up-bringing, education, and ministerial experience made Roman Catholicism anathema to him, he was also a committed proponent of the divine right of kings. As the principal pillar in the Church of Scotland and the most competent of James's Scottish bishops, Spottiswoode, not surprisingly, was charged with a leading role in the eradication of recusancy.

The dynamic which precipitated a determined clampdown on Roman Catholic recusancy in Scotland in the aftermath of the regal union, as well as in the other constituent parts of the British Isles, crucially came from King James himself and was a result of the discovery of the Gun Powder plot *circa* 5 November 1605. The nature and magnitude of this attempted holocaust, the purpose of which was the supplantation of the king and the British Protestant establishment, left a deep psychological scar on King James and his Protestant subjects who demanded harsh and immediate reprisals.<sup>12</sup> To be sure, the trial of the conspirators established that the jesuits and their fanatical followers had planned and attempted to bring the conspiracy

---

<sup>12</sup>Spottiswoode was one of the privy councillors who wrote to the king on 14 November 1605 to express their heartfelt relief that the plot had been foiled and their horror at the magnitude of what had been planned. See Historical Manuscripts Commission. *Salisbury Mss.* Vol.17. (1938). pp.486-487.

to fruition with the tacit support and encouragement of the Spanish government.<sup>13</sup> Not surprisingly, the politico-religious ramifications of the plot were not simply confined to England, but had a significant impact on Scotland as well. To Spottiswoode this "Monster of conspiracies...no Country nor age did ever produce... was a wickedness beyond all expression..."<sup>14</sup> Indeed, the archbishop as an exemplary erastian would have whole heartedly concurred with the sentiments expressed by the Edinburgh minister, John Hall, whom the archbishop had formerly commended to King James,<sup>15</sup> who informed the king "that the Antichryst...hes oppinlie set his ey on yow, as his greitest adversarie..." Hall prophetically saw in the king's "wonderfull delyverance" the workings of the divine providence: "God sent Moses against Egypt, Josua against Canaan, and Constantine of Britane blood against Gentill idolatrie. The same God hes King James to set against Popedome."<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, while James certainly believed that God's providential care protected him and guided his actions, to the extreme consternation of many of his British Protestant subjects, he remained unprepared to persecute Roman Catholics for their personal beliefs, and continued to differentiate between his loyal Catholic subjects who made an outward show of conformity and those whose convictions determined otherwise. The formulation of the *Oath of Allegiance* in the early months of 1606, with the stipulation that English Catholics would have to subscribe to it, was the king's initial attempt to weed out the treasonous tares from the loyal Catholic wheat.<sup>17</sup> A similar oath was likewise introduced into Scotland shortly afterwards. King James's leniency and irenicism, however, proved an almost constant source of friction between many of his Protestant

---

<sup>13</sup> *Complete Collection of State-Trials*. (London, 1776).

<sup>14</sup> Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.494-495.

<sup>15</sup> *OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.13..

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.* p22.

<sup>17</sup> For details relating to the Gun Powder Plot and the king's response to it see J. Wormald. Gunpowder, Treason and Scots in *Journal of British Studies*. Vol.24. No.2. (April,1985). pp.141-169. R.Lockyer. *James VI & I*. (1998). pp.127-128. D.H. Willson. *King James VI & I*. (1956). pp.223-circa 235, and L.F. Solt. *Church and State in Early Modern England 1509-1640*. (1990) pp.147-153. (ed).J.P.Sommerville. *King James VI and I. Political Writings*. pp.xx-xxi. W.B.Patterson. *King James VI & I and the reunion of Christendom* (1997). In particular see chapter 3 entitled Oath of Allegiance. pp.75-123.

subjects and the crown. As will be noted in these following two chapters, the promotion, reliance and toleration of both overt and crypto-Roman Catholic noblemen angered and frustrated Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops in Scotland, as it did his episcopal counterparts in England, whose task it was to enforce conformity throughout the localities.

Although there is no way of knowing for certain, there is a high probability that much of the intelligence relating to Roman Catholic recusant activity in Scotland came from the Archbishop of Glasgow. After all, as should be apparent, the archbishop, in addition to regularly corresponding with the king and members of his entourage, was a frequent visitor to the king's court.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, Spottiswoode enjoyed a commanding role in both church and state which placed him in the ideal position to offer advice to the king on the recusant problem. The king, moreover, was consciously affected by repetitious reports by the episcopate and wider church of widespread recusant activity in Scotland. On 26 September 1606, James was deeply concerned and furious at the apparent growth of Roman Catholicism throughout his native kingdom. He wrote to the privy council demanding to know why

the number of papistis in that your kingdome hath so  
nichtelie incresced, and that jesuitis and papistis have  
bene so oppinlie resett and intertenyed and no ordour  
tane thairwith, and that thair is hole familieis of  
recusantis, and mony of thame intertenyed in  
noblemenis housis and companyis.<sup>19</sup>

However, the failure of the Scottish government to put into operation effective counter-measures designed to bring non-conformist aristocrats to heel and root out Roman Catholic priests brought another firm rebuke from the king on 13 November of that same year. King James, having been informed that the Catholic nobility had resolutely abandoned all pretence of conformity to the established religion, wrote that

---

<sup>18</sup>Writing to Sir John Murray of Lochmaben on 9 January 1621, Spottiswoode claimed to have made forty-one trips to the royal court up to that point. Thus on average he made at least two journeys to court per year. *OLEAS*. Vol.II. p.644.

<sup>19</sup>*RPCS*. Vol. VII. pp.500-501.

"we can not wonder of the inexcusable negligence of you our Counsellouris."  
 Consequently, James commanded the council to act on the advice of the bishops and "wysest" ministers "to sett down the best and reddyest ordour that can be divisit for reduceing thame to gif thair perfyte obegance to the Kirk and conformitie in religion."<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, the king's continued reluctance to provoke or confront Roman Catholic noblemen over a matter of individual conscience probably nullified the force of his commands. Before turning to the legislative and administrative provisions adopted by the Scottish government, and Spottiswoode's involvement in their compilation and enactment, it is worth highlighting a specific incident which in essence encapsulated the virulent anti-Catholic mood engendered by the Gun Powder Plot and the king's response to it. The incident in question was the Balmerino affair in which the archbishop seems to have played a major if somewhat clandestine part.<sup>21</sup>

In short, the crypto-Roman Catholic, James Elphinstone, first lord Balmerino, the secretary of state for Scotland and president of the court of session, was the victim of King James's neurotic response to Cardinal Bellarmine's accusation of duplicity in his communications with the papacy. In reply to Pope Paul V's denunciation of the *Oath of Allegiance*, and Bellarmine's subsequent literary attack on it, in February James had published and distributed the *Apology* in defence of his right as a temporal prince to extract an oath of allegiance from his Catholic subjects.<sup>22</sup> Bellarmine responded by casting aspersions on the king's integrity by the publication of a letter reputedly written to Pope Clement VIII by James in 1599 in support of William Chisholm, the Bishop of Vaison's, candidacy to the College of Cardinals. The letter which emphasised the king's toleration of Catholics within his realm, apparently gave the

---

<sup>20</sup>*RPCS*. vol. VII. pp.502-503.

<sup>21</sup>For the fullest account of the affair, which includes Balmerino's own narrative of the episode see *Ancient Criminal Trials in Scotland 1488-1624*. ed. R. Pitcairn (1829-33) 4 Vols. Vol.II. pp.568-604. See also Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.507-508, 510-512.

<sup>22</sup>See *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus. OR AN APOLOGIE FOR THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE. AGAINST THE TWO BREVES OF POPE PAVLVVS QVINTVS, And THE late Letter of Cardinal BELLARMINE to G.BLACKWEL the Arch-priest.* in *King James VI and I. Political Writings*. (ed). J.P.Sommerville. pp.xx-xxi, 85-131.



impression that James was contemplating following in his wife's footsteps and converting to Catholicism by use of the salutations "*Beatissime Pater*" and "*Obedientissimus Filius*". Of course it needs to be acknowledged that the king had been courting papal recognition of his right to the English throne and was therefore deliberately obscurant. While James was assuredly genuine in his claim that he was tolerant towards Roman Catholics, there was never any likelihood that the king, in the tradition of Henry of Navarre, would abandon his strong commitment to Protestantism. Although Scottish Catholics told the pope as much, the publication of this letter at such a sensitive time left him determined to clear his name at all costs.<sup>23</sup>

While there is no doubt that Balmerino composed and sent the letter to Rome via Sir Edward Drummond whom Spottiswoode later categorised as an "avowed Papist",<sup>24</sup> as Willson persuasively argued, it is hard to believe he did so without the king's foreknowledge and consent.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, it seems that James concocted a version of events in order to show that Balmerino attained his signature to the letter by subterfuge. Without rehearsing a blow by blow account of this episode, suffice it is to say that after Balmerino's initial reluctance to take full responsibility for the letter, he succumbed under pressure, pled guilty and was subsequently tried, disinherited and sentenced to death. Although the sentence was tacitly commuted after the queen's intervention on his behalf, he was, nevertheless, forced into retirement on his estates where, according to Spottiswoode, he died a broken man in 1612. Interestingly, Balmerino did not see the king as the architect of his ignominious downfall, but instead believed the principal authors to be Spottiswoode, John, earl of Wigton, and Sir Alexander Hay of Newton and Whitburgh who succeeded Balmerino as Scottish secretary<sup>26</sup>. He made especial mention of the archbishop who while at court in October 1608 apparently

---

<sup>23</sup>See letter from the jesuit William Crichton to Sir Andrew Murray of Balvaird 27 January 1609 which states as much Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. pp. 581-582 and *OLEAS*. Vol.I. pp.180-181.

<sup>24</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.510.

<sup>25</sup>Willson. *King James VI & I*. p.146.

<sup>26</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.512. Brunton and Haig. *Senators of the College of Justice from 1532*.

incensed his Ma[jesty] that so long as I was officer,  
their state [bishops] could not be raised: And having  
assayed mannie other means to disgrace me, could  
effectuat nothing.<sup>27</sup>

Indeed, Balmerino went on to state that Spottiswoode and the earl of Wigton were concerned that the accusations relating to the papal communiqué were not serious enough to merit his political emasculation.<sup>28</sup> Marc' Antonio Correr, the Venetian ambassador accurately informed the doge and senate on 28 November 1608 that in spite of Queen Anne's intervention on behalf of the Scottish secretary and president the odds were heavily stacked against Balmerino. The fact that he was a Roman Catholic and the king's reputation was at stake left the crown with little room for manoeuvre.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, Correr left the recipients of his correspondence in no doubt that because the earl of Dunbar, Balmerino's "most bitter foe", had been despatched north to manage the trial, the secretary's fate had been sealed in advance.

There can be no doubt, however, that Balmerino was primarily sacrificed by King James as a convenient scapegoat on the altar of political expediency and that Spottiswoode was deeply involved in the proceedings. Nevertheless, the archbishop had alternative reasons for wishing the secretary removed from a position of authority within the Scottish body politic. Revealingly, Spottiswoode retrospectively recalled in his *History* that Balmerino was

A man of abilities sufficient for the places he injoyed in  
Session and Councell; but one that made small  
conscience of his doings, and measured all things  
according to the gain he made by them: The  
possessions he acquired of the Church kept him still an  
enemy unto it, for he feared a restitution should be  
made of those livings, if ever the Clergy did attain unto  
credit.<sup>30</sup>

---

p.252.

<sup>27</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. p.585.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.* pp.596-597.

<sup>29</sup>*CSP Venetian*. 1607-1610. (1904). pp.193-194. See also pp.184-5, 187, 189 for further details relating to the accusations and proceedings against Balmerino.

<sup>30</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.511.

Thus to Spottiswoode, Balmerino represented a substantive obstacle to episcopal progress in both church and state, while his thirst for riches damaged the financial welfare of the church. Notwithstanding the point that the secretary as a crypto-Catholic was regarded as a potential fifth-columnist, the belief that Balmerino's true God was Mammon probably made him all the more contemptible in the archbishop's view, and might account for Spottiswoode's only too apparent lack of scruples in partaking in the ruination of the secretary.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, if Spottiswoode was amongst the architects of Balmerino's political emasculation which seems most likely as the archbishop was a close political ally of Dunbar, then there is a strong probability that the true explanation for his zeal and use of unscrupulous methods lay in the fact that the aristocrat was president of the court of session which was the main obstacle in the bishops' campaign to have commissarial jurisdiction restored to the first estate. The replacement of a known adversary with someone more sympathetic to their cause, or at least more malleable, in the person of Sir John Preston was evidently advantageous. Indeed, as already noted, shortly afterwards Spottiswoode was himself made an extraordinary lord of session. Thus of the two most prominent administrative officials in the Scottish government - the chancellor and secretary, whom the archbishop implacably distrusted because of their overt hostility to erastian episcopacy, the former had been forced to chart a more politic course,<sup>32</sup> while the latter was quite literally destroyed as a result of plots Spottiswoode was conspicuously implicated in. Spottiswoode later interestingly noted that Dunfermline

who had been much ruled by the Secretary, was greatly afraid, as suspecting the next assault should have been made upon himself. But the King who knew his disposition, and expected that the Chancellor would carry himself more advisedly, especially in matters of the Church, the Secretary being gone,<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Zulager has indirectly confirmed Spottiswoode's assessment of Balmerino as "greedy and acquisitive" in his study of James VI's Scottish administration. See R.R.Zulager. *A Study of the Middle-Rank Administrators in the Government of King James VI of Scotland, 1580-1603*. (PhD thesis, Aberdeen, 1991). p.146.

<sup>32</sup>As discussed in the previous chapter on the establishment of erastian episcopacy.

<sup>33</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.509.

had correctly calculated that the earl would chart a more politick course in the future. This evidently strengthened the archbishop's hand in government and probably made his task of restoring secular as well as ecclesiastical power to the episcopate that much easier. It was particularly noteworthy, although not surprising, that Dunbar, along with the new secretary and president, Sir Alexander Hay and Sir John Preston respectively, were appointed as the king's commissioners to aid Spottiswoode in the task of restoring episcopal ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Glasgow assembly of June 1610.<sup>34</sup>

Balmerino, like his fellow crypto-Catholic Chancellor Dunfermline, had been a highly articulate and efficient administrator who had risen to prominence in the royal household in the 1590s.<sup>35</sup> His brother was Lord Elphinstone and consequently he was not devoid of influence within his locality. However, unlike the great territorial magnates like the marquis of Huntly, the earl of Argyll, or even the earl of Mar, whose vast kith and kin networks insulated them - to some extent at least, from the vagaries of royal policy, Balmerino was much more reliant on the king for his political authority and status within the kingdom. Although opposition to what was in effect the king's own ecclesiastical programme was fraught with danger, Balmerino's belief that the creation of an effective erastian episcopate was a direct threat to his (and other secular figures in the government's), political, legal and financial status, likely made the risk of incurring the king's wrath seem altogether justifiable in the circumstances. This conclusion is indirectly born out by Spottiswoode's comment that shortly before Balmerino's impeachment, the king had

employed him to deal with the Lords of Session, among whom he carried a great sway, for restoring the Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction to the Bishops; but he taking ways that he thought should not have been perceived, to disappoint the errand, drew upon himself the King's displeasure, and fared nothing the better because of his

---

<sup>34</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.512.

<sup>35</sup>*Scot's Peerage*. Vol.II. pp.556-562.

miscarriage in that business, when this occasion was offered.<sup>36</sup>

As the archbishop related, because Balmerino had already compromised his loyalty to the crown and accordingly antagonised the king by his attempts at preventing the restitution of the judicial authority of bishops, he had set himself up as the ideal candidate for the royal fall-guy. The Balmerino affair tellingly demonstrated that John Spottiswoode was a sagacious political operator whose ability, training and temperament made him equally efficacious in matters of state as in the church. Indeed, the archbishop was clearly not averse to entering into the machinations of the court and council, and to using what influence he had with King James to further the interests of crown, church and self. Such a determined and ruthless spirit would be paramount in the struggle against other avowed opponents amongst the Scottish nobility.

Archbishop Spottiswoode, not unexpectedly, was heavily implicated in the measures enacted by the Scottish government to end the practice of Roman Catholicism in Scotland. The offensive was essentially conducted on two fronts. The first involved an intensive campaign to purge Scotland of jesuits and seminary priests. The second, was aimed at the proselytisation of known Catholics - particularly noblemen, and at preventing future defections from the established religion. While the church courts, from kirk session to synod had and continued to play the leading role in this objective within the localities, in light of the heightened political and legal context in which the fight against Roman Catholic recusancy was waged, attention needs to be focused on the secular institutions of state in which Spottiswoode advanced the claims of king and church.

Although it is near impossible to give an accurate assessment of the strength of Roman Catholicism in Scotland in the first decade of the seventeenth century, the

---

<sup>36</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.511.

renewed effort by the jesuits, among others, to proselytise in Scotland when taken in conjunction with the church's distinct lack of progress in forcing prominent aristocrats to conform evidently heralded potential dangers which had to be speedily confronted. The re-ratification of past punitive anti-Roman Catholic legislation in the parliaments of 1604, 1607 and 1609, as well as the introduction of further innovative measures in 1607 and 1609, were regarded by Spottiswoode, and his fellow clergymen, as serious statements of intent.<sup>37</sup> A parliamentary edict of 1607 imposed significant pecuniary penalties on those found guilty of harbouring known excommunicated recusants. In 1609 a number of measures were introduced which sought to prevent the conversion of aristocratic scions to Roman Catholicism while travelling or completing their education on the European mainland. The heads of houses were to be held financially accountable for the failure of their sons to comply with these injunctions. While all proselytes who embraced the Roman religion while abroad automatically forewent the opportunity or their former right to an official appointment in the state, and would not be

sufferit auther directlie in thair awne personis or  
covertlie and indirectlie be ony utheris in thair  
names....[to] Inioy the possessioun of thair landis rentis  
and revenuiss Bot the same salbe mellit with intrometit  
with and upliftit to his maiesteis use.<sup>38</sup>

The episcopate, which took upon itself the task of ensuring that both church and state were fulfilling their Christian, legal and moral obligations to the crown, church and godly commonwealth by enforcing the anti-Roman Catholic enactments, witnessed an enhancement of its judicial authority, at the expense of lay officials, as a result of the perceived magnitude of the Catholic problem in this year. The archbishops and bishops were to compile annual accounts on all excommunicated recusants in their respective dioceses for the treasury and chancellery. Importantly, secular officials could "ressave no resignationis nor grant confirmationis nor

---

<sup>37</sup>APS. Vol.IV. pp.264, 371, 406-410 and 428-430.

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid.* p.407.

infertmentis to nor in favour of any of the personis whois names salbe conteinit in the said roll."<sup>39</sup> While the evidence is no longer extant, it seems almost inconceivable that Spottiswoode and his episcopal colleagues would not have exploited this situation to gain political leverage over their Roman Catholic seigneurial opponents.

However, the problems inherent in enforcing government legislation in such a politically decentralised country, where kith and kin obligations very often transcended notions of overlying loyalty to church and state, muted the effectiveness of law enforcement. Of course, the fact that Queen Anne herself was a practising Roman Catholic who persistently used her influence with the king to advance and protect the interests of her co-religionists, the pope and Spain undermined much of the legislation and compounded the archbishop's efforts.<sup>40</sup> Indeed it correctly gave the impression that James was only really interested in eradicating militant Catholicism whose ideology was diametrically opposed to the royal supremacy. Thus in spite of strident official pronouncements and precipitant action, on 11 February 1612, Spottiswoode and other members of the privy council had to concede that

Albeit, by divers Acts, the reset of or intercommuning with jesuits, seminary priests, and excommunicated papists is strictly forbidden, yet his Majesty is informed that the resort and reset of these "most pernicious pestis" is now more frequent than it has been for many years past, "and that the number of papistis growis and daylie increseis, who not onlie busyis them selfis, by resouning, dispersing of bookis, and urtherwise, to seduce his Majesteis good people to mak shipwrak of reigioun and to embrace the antichristiane popish errouris condempit be the lawis of this kingdome, bot with that they ar practizaris both aganis the estait and religioun, and so ar verie dangerous personis to haif ony oversight, tolleratioun, or residence within this kingdome."<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>*APS*. Vol.I. p.407.

<sup>40</sup>See *CSP Venetian. 1603-1607*. (1900). See correspondence entries 111, 118, 140, 143, 151, 229, 325. *1607-1610*. entries 146, 466, 811.

<sup>41</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.IX. p.331.

The council went on to urge the "moderatouris of exercises" to exercise greater vigilance in the detection and disciplining of recusants within the bounds of their jurisdiction. They were also to compile listings of offenders which were to be submitted to their respective provincial archbishop. Thus Spottiswoode would have known the extent of the problem, and was in theory ideally positioned to evaluate and initiate the requisite response. Nevertheless, the breakdown of ecclesiastical discipline in the second decade of the seventeenth century plus the church's failure to counter-act or quash the influence of prominent Roman Catholic noblemen, particularly in the north-east which continued to be a bastion and safe-haven for renegade priests, greatly weakened the bishops' response.<sup>42</sup>

Two further injunctions issued by the privy council to counteract the activities mentioned above are probably indicative of the growing influence the bishops had within the corridors of power. Firstly, on 2 July 1612, the council legislated to regulate domestic printing, publication, and sale of all religio-political works by enacting that the archiepiscopal stamp of approval was mandatory.<sup>43</sup> This was an unequivocal attempt to halt the spread of Roman Catholic, in addition to presbyterian, devotional, liturgical and polemical material. Furthermore, booksellers were admonished not to import books "wrettin be ony popishe or suspect wreater", without licence from their respective archbishop or the secretary of state. Secondly, in June 1614, in response to the revelation that Catholics from all over the continent were using the Scottish staple port of Campveere in Holland as a ferry terminal for their missionary endeavours to Scotland, a proclamation was speedily issued intimating that all passengers destined for Scotland would require a written testimonial from Arthur McDuff, the Scottish minister of the Scot's kirk at Campveere.<sup>44</sup> It seems the port was also acting as a conduit for Catholic religious and polemical works intended for this country. Notwithstanding Protestant vigilance, however, Roman Catholic priests

---

<sup>42</sup>See below

<sup>43</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.IX. pp.400-401.

<sup>44</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.327.



and presumably their works continued to enter Scotland through north-east ports like Aberdeen.<sup>45</sup>

While the finer details of Spottiswoode's direct involvement in the suppression of Roman Catholic activism are lost in the mists of antiquity, two specific episodes are illuminating. Firstly, a letter from King James, despatched from Greenwich on 31 May 1609 to the privy council, was demonstrative of the archbishop's active endeavour to root out and eradicate those proponents of the Counter-Reformation who were operative in their native Scotland.<sup>46</sup> It is, of course, axiomatic that as archbishop he would have been expected to have taken a keen interest and played a key part in the establishment of religious conformity within his province in particular and throughout the country in general. However, Spottiswoode's belief in the 'divine right of kings' which in essence was acknowledged with the statutory ratification of the king's position at the apex of both the temporal and spiritual realms in July 1606,<sup>47</sup> made not only the religious but the political connotations of Roman Catholic recusancy anathema to him and made its extirpation imperative. As previously mentioned, the ideological and theoretical challenge posed by the adherents of Rome, who like the presbyterians, vehemently denounced the notion that the king was, or could ever be, the supreme governor in the church as well as the state, made the advancement of Roman Catholicism not only heretical but treasonable as well. Thus to Spottiswoode, and the many other supporters of erastian episcopacy, the spread of Roman Catholicism did not simply represent a doctrinal challenge to the hallmarks of Protestantism and the ecclesiological establishment - by its dogmatic attachment to beliefs, practices and traditions viewed by Protestants to be superstitious and idolatrous since they lacked biblical sanction, but was additionally seen as a direct threat to monarchical authority and the very foundations of the godly commonwealth.

---

<sup>45</sup>McLennan. *Presbyterianism Challenged*. pp.211-220.

<sup>46</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.VIII. p.585.

<sup>47</sup>*APS*. Vol.IV. p.281.

In the letter, James praised his archbishop's diligence and 'worthy service' in not only the apprehension of the Augustinian friar William Paterson, and for discovering the whereabouts of the Roman Catholic theologian and controversialist John Hamilton, but in particular for Spottiswoode's ostentatious attempt to quash Roman Catholic recusancy in the environs of New Abbey and Dumfries in the south-west by his location, confiscation and subsequent burning of most of the religious paraphernalia belonging to the banished priest Gilbert Brown the previous month. The case of Brown is worth investigating in some detail as it is illustrative of the inherent difficulties the Reformed Church of Scotland had faced in consolidating and extending its presence and authority in the peripheral parts of the kingdom from its genesis in 1560. This position Spottiswoode and other contemporary episcopalians believed was untenable and had to be reversed. The situation persisted, and according to Lynch actually deteriorated, until King James initiated the revival of erastian episcopacy during the first decade of the seventeenth century and provided the church with the requisite state support which had been sorely lacking up to this point.<sup>48</sup> For from this juncture (as shown) ecclesiastics like Spottiswoode were able to capitalise on their new found role in government and mobilise political opinion and the essential state machinery against overt opposition to the established church and religion.

Brown, the titular abbot of New Abbey, had been ordained a priest in Paris on 28 March 1587, although it should be acknowledged that he had been a thorn in the flesh of the Scottish church since the late 1570s.<sup>49</sup> James Melville, the presbyterian minister and diarist, expressed a commonly held view when he wrote that Brown

evir since the Reformatioun of Religioun, had conteinit in ignorance and idolatrie allmost the hail South-west partis of Scotland, and had bein continowllie occupyit in practiseing againes the Religioune.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup>See M.Lynch, *Preaching to the Converted in The Renaissance In Scotland*, pp.308-312.

<sup>49</sup>For a brief overview of Brown's career see M. Dilworth, *Abbott Gilbert Brown: a sketch of his career*, in *Innes Review*. Vol.40 (1989). pp.153-158.

<sup>50</sup>Melville. *Autobiography and Diary*. p.616.

While the general assembly had repeatedly issued proclamations calling for state action to be taken against Brown as the principal figure responsible for the perpetuation of Roman Catholic worship in the south-west, and churchmen petitioned the privy council in like manner, no concerted initiative was instigated until after the union of the crowns.<sup>51</sup> Of course, prior to 1603, political expediency made the king reluctant to sanction civil procedures against Brown's influential co-religious protectors, the lords Herries and Maxwell whose support he might have required if forced into military measures to secure his rightful inheritance to the English throne. After the regal union, however, influential noblemen offering resistance to government policy became more expendable. Indeed it was testimony to the changed post-union political environment that John, ninth Lord Maxwell was forced to flee into exile in 1608 and was subsequently executed for murder and treason after his return to Scotland in 1612.<sup>52</sup> King James, it was clear, no longer viewed the south-west, along with the rest of the Borders, as a peripheral, although strategically important, area of the kingdom, but now saw it as an integral component of the Middle Shires of Great Britain whose pacification and conformity was essential to James's union scheme in particular and good government in general. In 1605, the government finally initiated proceedings and resorted to force in the apprehension of Brown. Nevertheless, in direct contrast to the harsh treatment meted out to the more dogmatic presbyterian opponents of the crown's ecclesiastical programme, Brown having been confined in Blackness for a single night was transported to Edinburgh Castle where he was 'liberallie intertained upoun the kingis expensses' and permitted visitors. He was soon allowed to depart for France with his religious possessions restored to him: allegedly conducting mass in the capital before his departure.<sup>53</sup> However, by the spring of 1608 he was active once more in the south-west before

---

<sup>51</sup>Dilworth. Abbot Gilbert Brown. *Innes Review*. Vol.40. pp.154-155.

<sup>52</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.504-505.

<sup>53</sup>Melville. *Autobiography and Diary*. pp.616-617.

being forced into exile by the authorities in August of that same year where he remained until his death at Paris in May 1612.

While Spottiswoode does not appear to have personally played a direct part in the capture of Brown, he, nevertheless, as the archbishop within whose province Brown resided, would have been privy to this action. Furthermore, as a close confidant of the king and someone whom James fully trusted and held in high esteem, it seems highly likely that he was an instrumental figure in the framing of the policy decisions which precipitated the offensive against Brown and his Roman Catholic associates. Whether the *raison d'être* for Spottiswoode's commission to the Borders in March 1609 from the king and council was the discovery of the whereabouts of Brown's religious effects, which would have been recognised as an essential part of the enterprise to strengthen the authority of church and state in the Middle Shires, or whether the archbishop received intelligence while in this region, he exploited the discovery to maximum effect.<sup>54</sup> The symbolic burning of Brown's vestments, chalices and other priestly possessions by the archbishop in the face of public hostility at the mercat cross in Dumfries on a market day in April 1609 marked the inauguration of a more acute phase in the church's campaign against recusants. Brown, it should be noted, had been a learned man who had exercised his intellectual talents on behalf of the Roman Church in the form of polemical works attacking the Protestant faith: Spottiswoode was rewarded for his sterling service in this instance with the books formerly belonging to Brown acquired from New Abbey.<sup>55</sup>

The second episode involved the apprehension, examination, trial and execution of the jesuit, John Ogilvie. Unlike the case of Brown, Spottiswoode was the principal figure involved in the proceedings against Ogilvie from his capture through to his subsequent execution. This incident has commanded a great deal of attention, by both

---

<sup>54</sup>*RPCS*. Vol. VIII. King James's instructions to the council, 5 March 1609 pp.564-565 and council's enactment pp.266-267.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.* Vol. VIII. p.301.

contemporary chroniclers and controversialists and in more recent historiography (or should that be hagiography), since Ogilvie provided the Roman Catholic church with its first and only post-Reformation Scottish religious martyr.<sup>56</sup> However, in addition to the intrinsic significance of this event *per se*, it importantly provides the fullest insight into Spottiswoode's character and politico-religious viewpoint up to this juncture, and therefore is worth focusing on at length.

It should be noted that the most detailed rendition of this episode was composed by Spottiswoode himself from the official records of the proceedings against Ogilvie, and published under the command of the archbishop and Thomas, Lord Binning, the secretary of state, by Andrew Hart in May 1615 less than three months after Ogilvie's execution.<sup>57</sup> In the preface appended to this account, the reader is informed as to the necessity of an official memoir "to obviate the misreportes of the enemies of true Releigion",<sup>58</sup> and there follows a defence of the government's actions and a diatribe against papal authority and jesuit practice. However, the fact that this work was written in the vernacular and not in the international idiom of Latin makes it clear that it was aimed at a domestic audience. Indeed, as should become apparent, the 'Trve

---

<sup>56</sup> Apparently a process for beatification began in 1628-9 but soon lapsed, and was not completed until 1929. He was canonized on 17 October 1976. See T.Collins. *Martyr in Scotland*. (1955). pp.231-264. W.J. Anderson. A Jesuit that calls himself Ogilvie in *Innes Review*. Vol.15. (1964). pp.56-65. J. Durkan. Two Jesuits: Patrick Anderson and John Ogilvie in *IR*. Vol.21. (1970). pp.157-161. D. McRoberts. Was blessed John Ogilvie a Highlander? in *IR*. Vol.15. pp.183-185. M.Dilworth. Three documents relating to St John Ogilvie in *IR*. Vol.34. (1983). pp.51-65.

<sup>57</sup> A Trve Relation of the Proceedings Against John Ogilvie, a Jesuit, Executed at Glasgow, the last of Februarie, anno 1615. Containing sundrie Speeches vttered by him at his Arraignment, and others, that assisted the Commissioners deputed for his Triall: with all that passed at his Execution. Included in R. Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. Vol.III. pp.332-354. See also Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.521-523, and the extant sources of Ogilvie's indictment and trial SRO. JC26/7/59, JC26/7/63 and JC26/7/66. See JC26/7/59 for the commission dated 24 May 1615.

<sup>58</sup> Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. pp.331-332. That same year the Roman Catholic church published the *Relatio Incarcerationes et Martyrii, P.Ioannis Ogilbei, Natione Scoti, e Societate Iesv Presbyteri. 1615*. Copy in Mitchell Library, Glasgow. The *Relatio* purports to have been written by Ogilvie himself while incarcerated awaiting trial and smuggled out by a willing accomplice. As will be shown, Spottiswoode's determination and vigilance in his dealings with the jesuit make it difficult to believe that Ogilvie would have been permitted the time and opportunity to compile an account of the proceedings against him. Nor would it seem that he would have been afforded the chance to meet with sympathetic guests. It must be concluded that the *Relatio* was the Catholic church's response to Spottiswoode account of the trial.

Relation', was primarily an apologia for the royal supremacy in church and state, and as such was probably directed at presbyterian recusants as well as Roman Catholic ones.

On 5 October 1614, Spottiswoode wrote to the king notifying him that he had apprehended a jesuit calling himself Ogilvie, and because "exemplary punishment" was deemed essential, he made a number of recommendations as to the best way to proceed in this instance.<sup>59</sup> Ogilvie, along with nine Roman Catholic adherents, had been captured in Glasgow by the archbishop and his cohorts the previous day having been surreptitiously active in the city since the preceeding August. He had been interrogated on the 5th by Spottiswoode, the bishop of Argyll, the lords Fleming and Boyd, Sir William Livingston of Kilsyth, James Hamilton, the provost of the city, Sir Walter Stewart of Minto and Sir George Elphinston of Blythswood. At this initial examination the authorities ascertained the priest's identity and that he had entered Scotland at the command of his ecclesiastical superiors at Martinmas 1613. He had remained in the north of the country, most likely in the Gordon territory of the north-east which as McLennan has persuasively shown provided a safe haven to priests arriving in Scotland,<sup>60</sup> until shortly before Easter 1614 when he embarked on a trip to the royal court, where he remained for some two months before returning to Scotland. Additionally, he confessed to being an expatriate Scot who had spent the last twenty one years on the Continent where he had attended the jesuit college at Grats and subsequently entered that order: more than this he was unprepared to divulge.<sup>61</sup> On this same day the city magistrates having conducted a rigorous search for Ogilvie's religious artefacts, discovered and acquisitioned vestments, a chalice and an altar, a number of relics which included a locket of hair from St. Ignatius, the founder of the jesuit order, a number of letters, and a catalogue previously drawn up by the fellow jesuit, Patrick Anderson comprising details appertaining to the

---

<sup>59</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. pp.385-387.

<sup>60</sup>B.McLennan. *Presbyterianism Challenged*. pp.183-187.

<sup>61</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. pp.335-336.

whereabouts of individuals who had been entrusted with the keeping of Catholic religious material for future missionary endeavours.<sup>62</sup> Evidently, the fact that his presence had gone undetected for near on two months in a city whose population was only in the region of some twelve thousand folk, and under the archbishop's gaze, clearly disturbed the archbishop and the rest of the Protestant establishment.

Whether or not the discovery of the catalogue exacerbated Scottish Protestant fears that a major Counter-Reformation offensive in Scotland was in the offing, or simply confirmed the view of many that Catholicism was winning converts throughout the country through the dereliction of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities to initiate a properly co-ordinated counter-offensive, the archbishop clearly believed that justice would have to be seen to be done. Spottiswoode personified Scottish ecclesiastical alarm when he abandoned his characteristically moderate manner and recommended the use of the boots or other suitable alternative methods of torture if Ogilvie remained uncooperative.<sup>63</sup> The archbishop made a sharp distinction between the recusant inhabitants of Glasgow, who were each to be fined in keeping with their social status, and the priest himself who had been the cause of their unlawful actions. One exception was made in the person of Robert Heggait whom Spottiswoode advised should be banished from the kingdom on account of the fact that he had been more heavily implicated in the heretical and treasonous activities in the city.<sup>64</sup> Spottiswoode, it is worth noting, ever mindful to strengthen the political and economic state of the archiepiscopate, successfully solicited King James to approve of his resuscitation of past practice and grant half the proceeds from justice in the environs of Glasgow to the archiepiscopal see, starting with this particular case.

It is informative that for the trials of both the jesuit and his followers, Spottiswoode strongly hinted that justice would best be served if entrusted to Sir Thomas Hamilton,

---

<sup>62</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.385.

<sup>63</sup>*Ibid*. p.386.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid*. p.386.

the secretary of state, Sir Gideon Murray, the treasurer-deputy, Sir William Oliphant, the king's advocate, Sir William Livingston of Kilsyth and himself.<sup>65</sup> Clearly the archbishop wanted to avoid a repetition of previous judicial proceedings against Roman Catholic priests like Gilbert Brown, whose lenient treatment inflamed Protestant opinion and indirectly reflected badly on Spottiswoode and the other bishops who were conspicuous figures in the government. After all, the bishops and other supporters of the king's episcopal programme had won over reluctant presbyterians by giving assurances that they would use their political and judicial authority against opponents of the Church of Scotland.<sup>66</sup> It probably also reflected the archbishop's distrust of prominent crypto-Catholic government officials like Chancellor Dunfermline, who held sway in the capital, to act in the best interests of the established church and faith.<sup>67</sup> As if to confirm Spottiswoode's suspicions that elements within the council were determined to undermine his authority and credibility, and marginalise the role of bishops in the state, on 26 October the privy council wrote to him with instructions that he send Ogilvie through to Edinburgh where a commission, presumably nominated by the council, would carry out a thorough examination of him.<sup>68</sup> Thus in a letter written on 12 November to John Murray, a member of James VI's bedchamber and a close confidant of the king, Spottiswoode complained that (unidentified) members of the council had taken steps to have Ogilvie transferred from Glasgow to Edinburgh. This is somewhat confusing since Spottiswoode had originally designated Edinburgh as the most suitable stage for the priest's arraignment. Nevertheless, during the intervening period, Glasgow must have been chosen as a more apt venue for proceedings, for Spottiswoode, with the aid of Sir Gideon Murray and Sir Alexander Hay, the clerk-register, "not without

---

<sup>65</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.386.

<sup>66</sup>See previous chapter on the reestablishment of Erastian episcopacy.

<sup>67</sup>*Memoir of Alexander Seton, Earl of Dunfermline* (Edinburgh, 1882). For a valuable insight into Dunfermline's influence in Edinburgh, see pp.84-85 where it took the king's direct intervention to stop the town from electing Dunfermline provost for an eleventh consecutive time. For an insight into his Catholic proclivities see pp.102-104 and 116.

<sup>68</sup>For those who comprised the council see *RPCS*. Vol.X. p.280. The bishops it should be noted were conspicuous by their absence. See also *OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.400.



difficultie,...obtenit the dyet suld keip in Glasgow, the 6 of December."<sup>69</sup> Once more, this was probably indicative of the archbishop's concern that Dunfermline and others intent on discrediting Spottiswoode and his episcopal colleagues were most influential in the capital.

Although the archbishop conducted a series of visits to Ogilvie while he was detained in Dumbarton Castle, with the intention of converting him and gaining from him details of jesuitical activity and objectives in Scotland, these were fruitless. Nevertheless, Spottiswoode informed John Murray that he had acquired indisputable knowledge that twenty seven jesuits, under the command of the Pope's legate, father Bell, were operating in Scotland.<sup>70</sup> Indeed the capture of another jesuit, James Moffat, in St Andrews, by George Gladstones, the resident archbishop,<sup>71</sup> probably convinced Spottiswoode and others of the verity of this claim. However, it is difficult to ascertain whether Spottiswoode actually believed that he had unearthed a major conspiracy which involved assassinating the king, was simply a victim of his own, or others, propaganda, or adroitly extrapolated from the known circumstantial evidence as the most efficacious means of focusing attention and highlighting the importance of the proceedings against Ogilvie. In summary, Spottiswoode informed Murray that the

course of Papistrie hes gone on so far heir, by the negligence of our Ministeris, the foolischnes of sum of our selfis that his Maiestie hes placit to hold tham to thair dutyis, and the favour born to tham be sum principal of our State, that I assure yow nothing kepis religioun heir, but his Maiesties countenance and favour to it; and the boldnes of the enemy with thair preparatioun apperis sik as, I am out of doubte, thai expectit at this tym sum mischeif to ben wrocht thair against his Maiesties sacred lyf..<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. pp.399-400.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid. p.400.

<sup>71</sup>RPCS. Vol.X. p.284. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.523. Moffet unlike "Polypragmatick Papists" like Ogilvie acknowledged his offences, condemned Ogilvie and was banished.

<sup>72</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. p.400.

He concluded the letter by issuing a warning to guard against the proverbial jesuitical wolves masquerading in sheep's clothing at the king's court. No matter what Spottiswoode's original intention had been, his portrayal of Ogilvie as a representative of an institution which actively encouraged and engaged in regicide dramatically altered the complexion of the whole affair. Of course there can be little doubt that jesuit doctrine in particular was abhorrent to the archbishop. Spottiswoode's mention of jesuits as the arch architects of the Gun Powder Plot in 1605 and as the assassins of two French kings in the preface of the *True Relation* was more than simply a politic justification for Ogilvie's execution. Indeed, his cognisance of specific jesuit and other Catholic polemical works like Mariana's, Franciscus Suarius's and Cardinal Bellarmine's which advocated or at least legitimised regicide most likely convinced Spottiswoode that Ogilvie posed a real threat.<sup>73</sup>

The commission arranged for Glasgow failed to overcome Ogilvie's obstinate reticence and he was transferred to the capital on 12 December, in accordance with the king's instructions,<sup>74</sup> where the commissioners once more gave him an inquisitorial grilling with no less negligible results. At this juncture, clearly exasperated and fearing that Ogilvie's silence masked a sinister plot, the commissioners resolved that depriving the priest of sleep was the best means of overcoming his obstinacy. To be sure, while this method of extracting information could have engendered hallucinations "it was perceiued, that he remitted much of his former obstinacie", for he disclosed the names of Roman Catholics who had previously received and offered him protection while he had been resident in Edinburgh. However, when proceedings were halted as a result of the Christmas recess it is again revealing that the archbishop was "vnwilling to discharge himselfe of that prisoner, till hee might at leasure worke him to a better minde". He promised to return to Edinburgh with the prisoner within the fortnight.<sup>75</sup> It was at this point that

---

<sup>73</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. pp.333-335. See also *Relatio Incarcerationes*. pp.36-37.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.* p.337.

<sup>75</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. p.337.

Spottiswoode along with the bishop of Argyll, Lord Fleming, Sir George Elphinston and James Hamilton received a commission from King James commanding them to ascertain Ogilvie's opinion relating to a series of questions penned by the king himself.

It must be noted that because religion and politics were fused together in the person of the king, the nature of political conflict and discourse was decidedly theological. Thus it should surprise no-one that the British Solomon, who for near on a decade had been engaged in acrimonious polemics with Cardinal Bellarmine and others in the Roman fold *vis-a-vis* the respective powers of kings and the pope, should have focused matters on the royal supremacy once made conscious that Ogilvie was part of a jesuit instigated conspiracy against his person. Since Spottiswoode included these questions in the *True Relation* and later incorporated them into his *History* they are worth quoting *verbatim*. They were as follows:

1. Whether the Pope be iudge, and haue power, *in spiritualibus*, ouer his Maiestie, and whether that power will reach ouer his Maiestie, euen *in temporalibus*, if it be *in ordine ad spiritualia*, as Bellarmine affirmeth?
2. Whether the Pope haue power to excommunicate Kings, (especially such as are not of his church,) as his Maiestie?
3. Whether the Pope haue power to depose Kings, by him excommunicated; and in particular, Whether he haue power to depose the King his Maiesty?
4. Whether it be no murther to slay his Maiesty, being so excommunicated and deposed by the Pope?
5. Whether the Pope haue power to assoyle subiects from the oath of their borne and natural allegiance to his Maiestie?<sup>76</sup>

These questions were eventually directed at Ogilvie on 18 January 1615 who answered in the affirmative to the first part of the first question as he did the second, but refused to declare his mind on the others, arguing that only the pope or someone

---

<sup>76</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. pp.337-378. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.521.

given authorisation by him could adjudicate on these issues.<sup>77</sup> This manifest commitment to the highest of jesuit ideals encapsulated in the unequivocal obedience to the notion of absolute papal supremacy set him on the path which ultimately led to the hangman's noose. Indeed, in spite of attempts by Spottiswoode, Robert Boyd and Robert Scot to reason with the priest and impress upon the gravity of his situation, he went on to condemn the oaths of allegiance and supremacy without prompting on these matters. Having been notified of the above particulars, King James set Ogilvie's trial to be kept at Glasgow on the last day of February 1615.

After receiving the king's instructions, Spottiswoode gathered together the provost and bailies of Glasgow and announced the time and place of Ogilvie's trial. He further peremptorily informed those assembled that the priest was only to be prosecuted in conjunction with the answers given in response to the five questions posed to him relating to the king's authority within his dominions.<sup>78</sup> While Ogilvie would almost certainly have disagreed with their conclusion, Spottiswoode and the others, charged with the judicial proceedings against the jesuit, left him in no doubt that he was being tried for treason and not heresy. Even at this late stage Spottiswoode pleaded with the priest to retract his original statement and acknowledge the royal supremacy in temporal affairs. If he did so, the archbishop promised to intervene with his majesty and the privy council on his behalf. Ogilvie, however, "thanked his lordship, for the good will and kindnesse offered; but he was so little minded to recall any thing hee had said, as when hee came to the place, hee would make a commentarie vpon his answeres."<sup>79</sup> Two days before the trial, Robert, earl of Lothian, the ministers of Glasgow and William Struthers, a minister from Edinburgh, made a last ditch attempt to persuade Ogilvie to abandon his erroneous and perilous course, but they too failed to dent the priest's obduracy.

---

<sup>77</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. p.338. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.522.

<sup>78</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. p.339.

<sup>79</sup>*Ibid.* p.339.

Since there could be no disputing Ogilvie's guilt in contravening the established laws of Scotland and in engaging in subversive activity on behalf of an alien potentate, the trial itself was a mere formality. Only the eternally optimistic could have hoped for a last minute recantation by a priest whose dogmatic conviction in the justness of his cause furnished him with the defiant resolution and fortitude necessary to confront his persecutors. Nevertheless, while the outcome was never in any doubt, the trial crucially provides a window into the character and ideology of the archbishop who usurped the roles of both crown prosecutor and defender of erastian episcopacy.

After the indictment had been read out, and the Acts of Parliament produced to substantiate the claims made therein, William Hay, acting in the capacity of deputy crown attorney, made a summation designed to emphasise the heinous nature of Ogilvie's transgressions which prompted an inflammatory rebuttal from the jesuit. Ogilvie refused to acknowledge the authority and competency of the judicatory, and further stated that he did not "giue a rotten figge" for the established laws of the land as they were enacted by "partiall men, the best of the land not agreeing with them". The priest attempted to justify his stance by arguing that because King James and the assembled played "the runneagate from God" he could "not acknowledge him, more than this old hatte!".<sup>80</sup> Spottiswoode, somewhat shocked and angered by Ogilvie's outburst, intervened at this point and implored the priest to adopt an approach more befitting a churchman or else his right to reply would be revoked. Ogilvie agreed to temper his responses but once again reiterated his disinclination to acknowledge the charges laid against him or the authority of the assize: as if to add fuel to the fire he denounced the jury.

After the jury were sworn in, the indictment was re-read, and they were presented with the statutory evidence and Ogilvie's signed affidavit. It was at this stage that Spottiswoode, as the king's adjutant-general in ecclesiastical matters in Scotland,

---

<sup>80</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. p.344.

grasped control of the proceedings in order to fend off and refute the priest's assertions and allegations. Ogilvie's quip that he was innocent and was duty bound to re-enter Scotland if released were met with derision. The archbishop further asserted that the accused in refusing to answer the questions posed in the indictment was

of the opinion of the rest of your sect, who in their bookes maintaine, that it is booth lawfull and commandable to slay kings, if the Popes commission goe foorth once for it.<sup>81</sup>

Ogilvie apparently retorted with an allusion to the 'Two Kingdoms' theory, mistakenly insisting that he had done no more than "the Ministers did at Dundie; they would not acknowledge his Maiesties authoritie, in spirituall matters, more than I."<sup>82</sup>

Spottiswoode countered by curtly pointing out that Aberdeen and not Dundee had been the venue of the dispute in question and that the ministers involved had not contended the king's authority. Rather the controversy had hinged on whether his majesty's commissioner possessed the power to terminate the proceedings. Moreover, the archbishop pointed out that the ministers mentioned were but a small minority in the Church of Scotland, who had acknowledged their error and received the king's pardon or else been punished accordingly.

Bearing in mind that this account of the clash between the archbishop and the jesuit was composed by the archbishop for public consumption, it is of crucial importance for an understanding of Spottiswoode's personal view at this juncture that he expostulated a definitive synopsis of his ecclesiological viewpoint. He emphatically declared to Ogilvie that

our religion teacheth us to acknowledge his Maiestie, our onely supreame iudge, in all causes. The King is keeper of both Tables, and his place beares him not onely to the ruling of his subiects in iustice, and

---

<sup>81</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. p.346.

<sup>82</sup>*Ibid.* p.346.

preserving equitie amongst them; but euen to maintaine religion and Gods pure worship, of which he should haue principal care. Your lord, the Pope, hath not onely denied this authoritie to Kings, which God giueth them, but usurpeth to himselfe a power of deposing and killing, when he is displeased; and it were the lesse to be regarded, if this his usurption had gone no further then your pennes; but you haue entred, by this pretended right, the throats of the greatest Kings, as your practise vpon the two last Henries of France beares witnesse. You are not able to lay such imputation vpon vs, nor our profession which teaches, that, next vnto God Almightye, all men are bound to feare, serue, and honour their Kinges.<sup>83</sup>

In formulating the above passage, Spottiswoode was expressly stating his personal repugnance of the ideology which propelled and gave legitimisation to the actions of the Roman Catholic monarchomachs. Nevertheless, it is worth speculating that he might also have been taking a side swipe at those presbyterian opponents who in the tradition of Knox and Buchanan propounded theological and contractual theories justifying the removal of 'tyrannical' kings. Moreover, by adroitly focusing his offensive on the concept of the 'Two Kingdoms' he was able to tarnish presbyterianism with the papist brush. A ploy which had been used to productive effect by episcopal opponents of presbyterianism or puritanism in England.

The archbishop, applying the skills of disputation acquired at Glasgow under Andrew Melville's principalship, went on to use scriptural and historical precedents to contest Ogilvie's iteration of the Roman Catholic view that the pope was the divinely sanctioned successor to St. Peter, whom Christ had entrusted with the keys of His kingdom. The jesuit based his stance on two principal points; namely that Christ had instructed Peter to feed his sheep and that Scottish kings had been subject to the pope as head of the Universal Church ever since the kingdom had been converted to Christianity. Spottiswoode countered by firstly arguing that Catholics read into the words of Christ a meaning never intended by the Lord, and that Peter himself had

---

<sup>83</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. pp.346-347.

never interpreted them in this light.<sup>84</sup> Indeed, to the archbishop St. Peter "teacheth vs a farre other doctrine, in his first Epistle, fift chapter, and second and third verse."<sup>85</sup> While Spottiswoode believed he was a paradigm of these apostolic precepts, it is somewhat ironic that his presbyterian foes clearly thought otherwise. He then reiterated the Calvinist doctrinal position that the succession was not personal but doctrinal;<sup>86</sup> which the Roman Church had fundamentally deviated from. Such a stance it should be noted also distanced him from *jure divino* episcopalians south of the Scottish border.<sup>87</sup> With regards to the historical defence of papal supremacy, Spottiswoode argued that papal centralisation of the Church was nothing more than an innovating encroachment.

Long it was ere the pope of Rome came to the height of commanding Kinges, and not till hee had oppressed the church, vnder the pretext of Saint Peters keyes, bearing downe all the Bishops within Christendome: which hauing done, then hee made his inuasion vpon princes, and that by degrees.<sup>88</sup>

Spottiswoode concluded by instructing the assembled to do their duty as Christians and as loyal subjects of the king in pronouncing sentence on Ogilvie.

The jury retired for a short period to deliberate before giving their verdict. It was unanimously agreed upon that Ogilvie was guilty of all the offences contained in the indictment. Sentence was swiftly pronounced that he should be hanged and quartered. Afterwards the archbishop asked the priest if he had anything further to say. Ogilvie replied, "No, my lord, but I giue your lordship thanks for your kindnesse, and will

---

<sup>84</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. pp.348-349.

<sup>85</sup>1 Peter 5: 2-3. Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. (A.V)

<sup>86</sup>Clearly Spottiswoode was not a proponent of the divine right of bishops, who justified their stance on the argument that bishops were the divinely sanctioned successors to Christ's twelve apostles.

<sup>87</sup>See J.P.Sommerville, The Royal Supremacy and Episcopacy 'Jure Divino', 1603-1640 in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. Vol.34. No.4, October 1983. pp.548-558.

<sup>88</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. p.349.



desire your hand." However, Spottiswoode refused, insisting that Ogilvie first acknowledge his offences. Likewise, the archbishop would not permit the priest to address the people at his execution if he remained unrepentant.<sup>89</sup> Ogilvie remained steadfast to the end: he was hanged some three hours after sentence had been pronounced.

Interestingly, Spottiswoode in his account of the execution demonstrated that he was not disinclined from adopting a favoured and highly effective ploy of his presbyterian opponents in pandering to, and exploiting, the popular belief relating to how an individual died.<sup>90</sup> To the majority of contemporaries, those certain of salvation faced death with courage and assurance. By contrast, the archbishop informed his readers that Ogilvie, as a result of the fundamental impotency of the Roman Catholic reliance on saintly intermediaries instead of Christ alone, died badly, afraid, alone and uncertain of salvation. Spottiswoode ended his account of the proceedings against Ogilvie by intimating that since the priest's execution he had been informed that Ogilvie had disclosed to unnamed persons while incarcerated

That if hee had escaped his apprehension at this time,  
and liued till Whitsunday next, hee should haue done  
that which all the Bishops and Ministers, both in  
England and Scotland, shoulde neuer haue helped!<sup>91</sup>

Whether or not there was a major jesuitical conspiracy in operation, which seems unlikely, Spottiswoode in all probability would have rested assured in the knowledge that an implacable enemy of the Church of Scotland and the state had been eliminated.

Viewed in relative terms it would have to be concluded that the Church of Scotland fared pretty well in the confessional battle with its Roman Catholic adversaries between 1603 and 1615. Archbishop Spottiswoode in particular must have been fairly

---

<sup>89</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. p.350.

<sup>90</sup>Mullan. *Episcopacy In Scotland*. pp.133-134.

<sup>91</sup>Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. p.352.

well satisfied by the introduction and reiteration of a host of legal impediments designed to deter would be recusants and bring practising Roman Catholic non-conformists to heel. The ruination of the crypto-Catholic Balmerino plus the apparent neutralisation of his co-religionist Dunfermline must have been viewed positively by the archbishop and his fellow churchmen. Lastly, the notable success recorded by the church in its detection and removal of priests like Brown, Ogilvie and Moffat was cause for optimism. However, the king's persistent reluctance to rigorously implement the law against members of his nobility for what he considered to be a matter of individual conscience seriously weakened the effectiveness of the church's campaign of extirpation. Moreover, the distinct lack of aristocratic compliance coupled to the breakdown in ecclesiastical discipline throughout the localities - especially in the post-1615 period, nullified the advances outlined above.

## ROMAN CATHOLIC RECUSANCY. PART II.

### CHAPTER SIX.

If Archbishop Spottiswoode and the Protestant establishment had hoped that the public execution of the jesuit priest, John Ogilvie, would discourage and deter other priests and their followers and protectors from engaging in recusant activity in Scotland they were naively mistaken. If anything, it would be fair to conclude that the situation deteriorated further during the remaining ten years of James VI's reign and that King James himself was to blame for this intensification of confessional strife in Scotland. While it must be acknowledged that the main issue confronting Spottiswoode and the wider church during this period centred on the question of religious reform and innovation, and its enforcement within the Church of Scotland, the king's official but tacit promotion of a policy of toleration of Roman Catholicism while courting a Spanish match for Prince Charles undermined the kirk's efforts at its eradication and ensured this issue remained high on the church's agenda. Moreover, by contrast, the king's heavy-handed treatment of presbyterian non-conformists over the same period for their dogmatic opposition to religious change antagonised many ministers and lay people alike in Scotland and made Spottiswoode's task of implementing liturgical reform more difficult than it might have been. Indeed it must be presumed that crown policy played directly into the hands of those who had mischievously claimed that the re-establishment of bishops would slowly but inexorably lead the church back to Rome. Although Spottiswoode would have had little difficulty refuting this charge, he, like his English metropolitan counter-part, George Abbot, was deeply concerned over royal policy during a time of Protestant setbacks and reversals in Europe.<sup>1</sup> Spottiswoode it will be shown, continued in his belief that Roman Catholicism posed a major threat to national security and the established faith. Although this subject commands attention on its own merit, it also,

---

<sup>1</sup>See S.Holland. Archbishop Abbot and the Problem of Puritanism in *The Historical Journal*. 37. 1. (1994). p.30.

as hinted above, provides an invaluable context in which to view the extent of opposition to the king's five articles which will be looked at later. However, before assessing the threat and difficulties posed to Spottiswoode and the church generally by the continuance and perceived growth in Roman Catholic recusancy between 1615 and 1625, it is necessary to briefly turn to Spottiswoode's prestigious translation to the metropolitan see of St Andrews.

George Gladstones, the Archbishop of St Andrews, finally died on 2 May 1615 having been incapacitated through illness since the start of the year.<sup>2</sup> In the forthright opinion of Spottiswoode, Gladstones had been

a man of good learning, ready utterance and great invention, but of an easie nature, and induced by those he trusted, to do many things hurtfull to the Sea, especially in leasing the titles of his Benefice for many ages to come...<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless, it should be noted that Spottiswoode appears to have developed selective amnesia in compiling the above obituary. For as formerly noted, King James's lavish disposal of former ecclesiastical lands and revenue from the metropolitan see to favoured courtiers would suggest that Gladstones was not wholly to blame for the pecuniary problems which beset his incumbency at St Andrews. The archbishop further recorded that Gladstones, presaging scurrilous attacks on his character, past conduct and manner of death by intractable presbyterians like David Calderwood and John Row, penned a declaration on his death-bed professing that "he had accepted the Episcopal function upon good warrant, and that his conscience did never accuse him for anything done that way".<sup>4</sup> The Bishop of Galloway, William Cowper, preached the funeral oration and Gladstones's body was interred in the south-east aisle of the parish church of St Andrews. There is no indication that

---

<sup>2</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.197.

<sup>3</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.523.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.* p.523. Calderwood described Gladstones as "both ambitious and covetous", while Row went further in calling him a "filthie bellie-god beast". See Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.197. Row. *Historie*. pp.304-305.

Spottiswoode attended the funeral and it must be presumed that he had already left Scotland for court where he was to consult and deliberate with King James over proposed modifications in the constitutional and doctrinal standards of the Church of Scotland.

It must have come as no surprise when the Archbishop of Glasgow was chosen to succeed Gladstones as metropolitan. As conclusively demonstrated, Spottiswoode was, and had been for some ten years or so, the king's chief churchman north of the border. His high public profile and political authority made him the obvious candidate for the prestigious translation to St Andrews. Although it is worth noting that a letter sent from Alexander Forbes, the Bishop of Caithness, to Sir Robert Ker on 3 May 1615 would suggest that he personally believed he and not Spottiswoode was the ideal candidate for the vacant office.<sup>5</sup> A commission granted under the privy seal and issued in the king's name from Greenwich on 30 May 1615 officially made operative Spottiswoode's move from Glasgow to St Andrews.<sup>6</sup> Calderwood later asserted that Spottiswoode returned to Glasgow from court on 10 June

seeming altogether ignorant who had gotten the gift of the bishoprick of St Andrews till one of his servants, waiting in Edinburgh upon the King's patent, sent to him to come in hast to Edinburgh.<sup>7</sup>

Moreover, he further alleged that the archbishop had feigned disappointment on receiving notification of his translation and had expressed a strong desire to remain at Glasgow. Although Calderwood's claim cannot be corroborated, it does seem inconceivable that the king would have failed to discuss the move with Spottiswoode during the archbishop's visit to the court.

---

<sup>5</sup>OLEAS. Vol.II. 437. NLS. *Denmilne MSS.* 33.1.3. f.46.

<sup>6</sup>SRO. CH4/1/4. ff.117v-118r.

<sup>7</sup>Calderwood. *History.* Vol.VII. p.197.

As early as January 1615 the move was being mooted within the highest echelons of the king's government. Thomas Hamilton, Lord Binning, the king's secretary of state for Scotland, wrote to John Murray of the king's bedchamber to give notice that Gladstones "hes passed ane dangerous fit of apoplexie. It is supposed that ane new assault may be more difficill to put af."<sup>8</sup> Tellingly Hamilton, whom Gladstones had described as "the fourteenth Bischope of this kingdome" in August 1612,<sup>9</sup> gave forth his recommendation that

[i]f his place vaik, and his Majesty might be pleased to mak Glasgow his successour, and promote Orknay to Glasgow, it wald recompens thair knowne merite, and gude seruice, incourage vthers to imitate thame, and reduce the churche gouvernement to that happie estate, which his Majesty hes long wished, be the wisdome and godlie example of these wourthie men.<sup>10</sup>

These same sentiments he repeated in another communiqué to Murray later that same month.<sup>11</sup> Whether he had conversed with Spottiswoode prior to expressing his preference to Murray, who was the conduit through which all official correspondence was channelled, cannot now be determined. However, it is difficult to believe that Spottiswoode, with his political drive and ambition, had not made contingency plans to ensure such an outcome.

A year after his translation to St Andrews, Archbishop Spottiswoode, as moderator, presided over the first general assembly to be held in Scotland since 1610. Ostensibly the assembly had been called in order to

obviate the great increase of Papistrie within this realme, and to try out the just causes thereof, to the effect that sufficient remedies may be provydit for redressing of the same in all tyme coming.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>*Melrose Papers*. Vol.I. pp.193-194.

<sup>9</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. pp.294-295.

<sup>10</sup>*Melrose Papers*. Vol.I. p.194.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid*, pp.195-196.

<sup>12</sup>*BUK*. p.589. For the full proceedings of the assembly see pp.589-599. See also Calderwood.

Although a sceptically minded David Calderwood was later to hypothesise that this general assembly, held in Aberdeen during August, had been held for ulterior motives,<sup>13</sup> there can be little doubt that Spottiswoode along with the overwhelming majority of contemporary Protestants was genuinely concerned at what was perceived to be an inexorable increase in Roman Catholic recusancy within Scotland. However, notwithstanding the high profile conversion of the earl of Argyll in 1619 and the concomitant relative success of the Irish Franciscan mission to the Western Isles, there is little evidence to suggest that popery was winning converts in Scotland to any significant degree in the final ten years of King James's reign.<sup>14</sup> On the contrary, the breakdown in ecclesiastical discipline coupled to the divisions accentuated and compounded through the introduction of the five articles of Perth, when taken in conjunction with the king's ambivalent domestic and foreign policy appears to have indirectly given Scottish Roman Catholics the confidence and opportunity to openly defy the church within their localities. It was this overt opposition to the established faith that helps to account for the noted increase in papist recusancy during this period. Protestant apprehension was further exacerbated by the success of the Counter-Reformation in Europe.

Over the duration of the assembly, old anti-recusancy legislation was re-enacted and new measures devised to improve the efficiency of the church's canonical armoury in readiness for a renewed assault on popery. Lists were to be compiled of prominent and notorious Roman Catholics and submitted to Archbishop Spottiswoode and his successor in Glasgow, James Law, so that offenders might be summoned to compare before the high commission "and punished as accords." Unfortunately, because the records of the high commission are no longer extant it is difficult to assess the archiepiscopates' performance in this regard. Law in particular, it might be

---

*History*. Vol.VII. pp.220-231. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.528.

<sup>13</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.221, 227.

<sup>14</sup>These issues will be discussed below.

conjectured, had to contend with conflicting loyalties to church and family, since his brother, David, was a jesuit priest who had been actively engaged in missionary work in Scotland under the alias of Thomas Mackie.<sup>15</sup> He had been an associate of the jesuit, William Murdoch during the first decade of the century, and had ministered to the marquis of Huntly at Strathbogie and in the household of George Gordon of Gight. Bishops and ministers were warned to be more vigilant and commanded to intensify their efforts in rooting out priests and their adherents and protectors. Teachers, medical practitioners and apothecaries were to be scrutinised and approved by a bishop before a licence could be granted allowing them to practise their respective professions. For jesuits and other priests regularly masqueraded in these guises to evade detection. All activities which smacked of popery, like pilgrimages to holy wells and shrines which were still not uncommon even in Central Scotland in the early seventeenth century,<sup>16</sup> were to be suppressed, and William Scot, William Struthers, Patrick Forbes, the laird of Corse, and the Bishop of Galloway, William Cowper were set the task of countering and refuting Roman Catholic works and propaganda.<sup>17</sup> Not unexpectedly, greater care was to be taken to ensure that suspect noble men and women remained loyal or conformed to the established religion. Prohibitive measures were adopted to halt the dilapidation of benefices and bishops were ordained to ensure that churches in the patronage of aristocratic recusants were planted with well qualified and provided for ministers - "sic as the kirks of Bellie, North Berwick, Cockburnspath, Paslay, and wthers..."<sup>18</sup> Finally, it was decreed that

as ane of the maist speciall means for staying the increase of Poperie, and setting of the trew religione in the hearts of the people is, that ane speciall care may be taken in the tryell of young children, their education, and how they are catechisit, qwhilk in the meantyme of the primitive church was most carefully attendit, as one of the most effectual meanes to cause young children in

---

<sup>15</sup>Durkan. *William Murdoch and the Early Jesuit Mission in Scotland*. pp.6-7.

<sup>16</sup>See Pearce. *The Stirling Presbytery, 1604-1612*. pp.125-126.

<sup>17</sup>*BUK*. p.592. Scot was minister at Cupar in Fife, Struthers one of the ministers of Edinburgh.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid*. p.594. See also Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.231.



their tender years drink in the trew knowledge of God  
and his religione...<sup>19</sup>

A sentiment which the late Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556), the founder of the jesuit order, would have heartily echoed.<sup>20</sup>

While residing in the capital, shortly before or possibly on the early morning of 5 November the previous year, Archbishop Spottiswoode penned a draft of the sermon he intended giving to commemorate "that great delyverance" of the Stewart dynasty and the Protestant establishment from the infamous gunpowder treason ten years previously. From his words it is possible to gauge the extent and depth of Spottiswoode's distrust and loathing of "that Balaam of rome, ye destroyer of ye Christian world, [and] his pestilent ministers ye jesuits".<sup>21</sup> Moreover, when it is recalled that similar sermons were made annually by clergymen throughout Scotland, and indeed throughout the length and breadth of the British Isles, it is highly plausible that the day of remembrance added to, or was one of the principal causes which lay behind, the national neurosis regarding the ever present threat posed by the forces of the Counter-Reformation.<sup>22</sup> The sheer magnitude of what had been attempted clearly left an indelible mark on the archbishop's consciousness. He would exclaim to his hearers

searche al antiquitie, no example is in story that cummis  
neir it. The parisian Massacre, q[ueen] Maryis  
persecutioun, ye invasioun of ye Spanische armada in  
ye 88 and al ye popische cruelties also, this one  
wickitnes puttis down.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>BUK. pp.594-595. This issue will be discussed later.

<sup>20</sup>See N.Davies. *Europe: A History*. (1996). p.496.

<sup>21</sup>NLS. Ms.2934: 5960-5996. The only sermon with a date attached was composed for 5 November 1615. However, since one of the last sermons in the manuscript on 2 Thessalonians was written shortly after the death of James VI, it has been presumed that all the works cited were composed during Spottiswoode's first ten years in St Andrews.

<sup>22</sup>See P.Lake. Anti-popery: the Structure of a Prejudice in *Conflict In Early Stuart England. Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*. pp.72-106 for an account of the endemic fear and hatred of Roman Catholicism throughout the British Isles.

<sup>23</sup>Ms.2934.

Not unexpectedly, Spottiswoode saw God's providential and merciful hand in the uncovering and prevention of the plot. Indeed he drew a dramatic parallel with the Israelites' miraculous deliverance from the murderous intentions of Pharaoh and his army at the Red Sea.<sup>24</sup> The archbishop would urge his audience to

record yis mercy of god in o[u]r hearts, tel o[u]r  
children, that they may tel it to yair children, and after  
yam throw al generations to ye end tymis yis may be  
rememberit.<sup>25</sup>

For he was convinced that within "a few yeirs" the Roman church would deny any involvement in the conspiracy. He pointed out that they "haif made a question if ever thair wes suche a pope as pope Jane [Joan] a woman; zit no fewer that thritty wryters of y[a]t tym may be producit... al romanists" to witness to the contrary.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, the notion that the superior of the English jesuit mission, Henry Garnet, who had been executed for his part in the gunpowder plot, had been accorded martyr status by Rome deeply appalled Spottiswoode. In offering up a prayer to God, the archbishop would expostulate

we beseeche ye o[u]r defender & protector of us,  
confound yese enemyis y[a]t delyt in blood, that tak  
co[un]sel together for undermining yi kirk.... preserve  
yi servant o[u]r soveraigne from y[ai]r treasons, let his  
crown flourische stil upon his head, stablische his  
throne, lenthen his dayis & destroy his enemyis. gif him  
comfort in his quen, & joy o god in his posteritie. grant  
wisdom to his counsel, fidelitie to his servants, loyal  
and obedient hearts to al his subiects...<sup>27</sup>

Tellingly, he made explicit the dangers posed to both church and state by permitting "popische, haters of ye truthe", to help devise and implement the temporal policy of government. Rumours of further jesuit plots to kill King James during both 1615 and

---

<sup>24</sup>See Exodus 14.

<sup>25</sup>Ms.2934.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid* 2934. On the rather bizarre issue or legend of Pope Joan see P.Stanford. *The She-Pope: A Quest for the Truth Behind the Mystery of Pope Joan*. (1998).

<sup>27</sup>Ms.2934.

1616 which were conveyed to the population via the pulpits of Edinburgh must have added poignancy to Spottiswoode's words.<sup>28</sup> Likewise, the last minute reprieve allegedly granted to the advocate William Sinclair along with Robert Wilkie and Robert Cruikshanks convicted of concealing the jesuit priests, Ogilvie and Moffat, and participating in the Mass the previous year, while on the scaffold, on 14 August 1615, can only have added to speculation that there were indeed Catholics in high places who were determined to advance and protect their co-religionists.<sup>29</sup>

This anti-Roman Catholic theme was not restricted to 5 November, however, but was commonly reverberated in Spottiswoode's more prosaic sermons. In a series of sermons similarly composed shortly after his translation to the archbishopric of St Andrews, Spottiswoode continued to make denunciatory attacks on the Roman Catholic church. While expositing on the title of "*The Catholick epistle of Jude*", he lambasted the Roman church for what he argued was its usurpation of the title Catholic. "[Y]e papists", he noted, "that wilbe called by that name, haif lost ye truth of it, being fallen from the faith of Chryst most persidiously".<sup>30</sup> Spottiswoode further pontificated

qhat can a roman catholick be else, but one y[a]t vnder  
ye false name of a catholick divideth him self from ye  
catholick churche to cleaven vnto a part q[he]rof  
q[ui]che is at rome....qhilest yai joye to be called  
catholicks yai dois but glorie in y[ai]r own schame, the  
title as yai abuse it, being now ye very badge and mark  
of ane apostat and heretick.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.197,211-212. Although Calderwood retrospectively interpreted the news as disinformation given out to "grace the king", this in no way invalidates the claim that it struck a resonant chord at the time.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.* p.202. Calderwood's assertion contradicts the judicial evidence cited by Pitcairn in his *Criminal Trials*. Vol.III. p.376. Sinclare and Wilkie were banished from the king's dominions, while Cruikshanks was debarred from Edinburgh during the previous month.

<sup>30</sup>Ms.2934.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*

Commenting elsewhere on the third and fourth verses of Jude, the archbishop sharpened his rhetorical edge by wielding Old Testament analogies to bolster his argument. Citing the 26 chapter of the *Book of Genesis* he recalled how

[a]s ye servants of Isaac, qhen ye Cananites stopped yair wells did open yem again,... and wold not yield the inheritance of y[ai]r master to ye heardsmen of Isaac, no more must we endure that truth of religion to be choaked w[i]t[h] heresies or ye inheritance of o[u]r lord to be taken from us by any adversaries.<sup>32</sup>

"[P]apists", Spottiswoode insisted, had

alterit ye faith of chryst, and made up a new religion of y[ai]r own, q[ui]ch by al ye subtil and ordinary practises yai can invent, stil goe about to set up and reestablish.<sup>33</sup>

The archbishop, along with his Scottish Protestant contemporaries, evidently regarded Roman Catholicism as a very real and ever present threat. This is not to say that he, and indeed they, did not differentiate between the religious orders -especially the pope's shock troops, the jesuits - who had embarked on a sustained and tenacious mission to proselytise and return Scotland to the Roman fold, and lay Catholics who had pledged their loyalty to the crown. Nevertheless, it seems inconceivable that Spottiswoode and company did not retain a kernel of suspicion and doubt relating to the trustworthiness, true intentions and ultimate loyalty of even those Romanists who had taken the Oath of Loyalty to the king. After all, in Scotland, as in England, it was seigneurial encouragement, support and protection which provided the jesuits and other seminary priests with the opportunity to proselytise throughout the localities.

During Spottiswoode's tenure as Archbishop of Glasgow, he not unexpectedly developed a particular interest in George, first marquis of Huntly. The marquis appears to have become the chief target in the sights of Spottiswoode and his episcopal

---

<sup>32</sup>*Ms. 2934.*

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*

colleagues. Huntly, had from the late 1580s been the most powerful of Scotland's Roman Catholic magnates. Indeed, John Leslie, the former Roman Catholic Bishop of Ross, testified to the high hopes placed in Huntly by the protagonists of the Counter-Reformation as far back as 1580 when he described the eighteen year old earl to Cardinal de Como as "another Joas, rescued from the cruelty of Atholiah, in hopes that he may restore the worship of God in Scotland, one of these days".<sup>34</sup> His authority in the north and north-east, his family connection to one of King James's most trusted and favoured courtiers - Ludovick, second duke of Lennox, and the fact that the king both liked the marquis and needed his assistance in bringing into effect his Highland policy, however, persistently compounded the archbishop's and wider church's dilemma in procuring Huntly's loyalty to the established faith.<sup>35</sup> To be sure, the church was not devoid of power and influence. Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops likely gained a great deal of credit for the tough line taken with the marquis between 1608 and 1610, when he was excommunicated by the Linlithgow assembly and subsequently warded in Stirling Castle where he was forced to undergo a lengthy period of religious instruction by Patrick Simson, the minister of Stirling, followed by an inquisitorial grilling by Spottiswoode, and his fellow bishops of Orkney and Caithness.<sup>36</sup> However, notwithstanding, the subsequent excommunication of John Gordon, one of Huntly's household who had accompanied his lord to Stirling, the episode would also reveal the limitations of the church's power. Spottiswoode and other members of the episcopate fared no better in their attempts to proselytise the earls of Errol and Angus.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>*Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI.* (ed). W. Forbes-Leith. (Edinburgh, 1885). p.139. Leslie's scriptural analogy was taken from 2 Kings 11:1-3.

<sup>35</sup>*DNB*. Vol.VIII. pp.186-190. *Scot's Peerage*. Vol.IV. pp.541-545. *The Records of Aboyne MCCXXX - MDCLXXXI*. (New Spalding Club, 1894). pp.499-526. See also the eight letters sent to Huntly by King James prior to 1603 duplicated in the *Miscellany of the Spalding Club*. Vol.III. pp.213-216.

<sup>36</sup>See *BUK*. pp.576-578. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.513. Central Region Archives. CH2/722/4. *Stirling Presbytery Records*. See entries: 5/7/09, 12/7/09, 6/9/09, 1/11/09, 22/11/09.

<sup>37</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.513.

Bearing in mind the location of the marquis's confinement, it should be noted that King James not surprisingly solicited the support of John, earl of Mar on 23 April 1609. In testimony to Huntly's political and social standing, the king interestingly left Mar in no doubt of how dependent he was on his backing and involvement in this enterprise to have both Huntly and Errol conform. Notwithstanding his assured reliance on Dunbar, the king further explained that Mar's support was absolutely crucial for the "frequent posting of the Bishops", the king suggested was "much censured as a thing unfitting and skandallous for men of their function and place, and urtherways there coming hither to be hardly misconstrued by those wairdit as if they were the onely cause of their deteyning".<sup>38</sup> The king's letter indirectly helps to confirm the limitations of episcopal power at this juncture. Moreover, the crown's self-professed reliance on Mar and the earl's apparent disinclination to come to the aid of the Jacobean episcopate tends to undermine or at least significantly weaken the contention advocated by Goodare of an absolutist state in Scotland after the regal union.<sup>39</sup> While in rhetorical flow King James might inform the English parliament in 1606 that he governed Scotland effectively by the pen, and there can be little doubt that he aspired to absolutism, there is little evidence to suggest that the power of the localities was greatly diminished throughout his entire reign. As an corollary it is worth recalling that far from playing the active part of crown prosecutioner, Mar put aside all confessional differences by consenting or possibly arranging the marriage of his son and heir to the daughter of Francis, earl of Errol only a few months later.<sup>40</sup>

A letter dated 12 March 1610 in which the archbishop remonstrated with King James on account of his desire to have Huntly released from his confinement indicates that Spottiswoode was no royal lackey content to simply follow royal instructions no

---

<sup>38</sup>*HMC. Mar and Kellie. 60. Vol.I. pp.60-61.*

<sup>39</sup>J.Goodare. *The Nobility and the Absolutist State in Scotland, 1584-1638 in History. (1993). pp.161-182.*

<sup>40</sup>*HMC. Mar and Kellie. 60. Vol.I. p.65 The Scots Peerage. Vol.III. p.577. He furthermore consented to the marriage of his daughter, Anna, to the earl of Rothes who confessional sympathies also lay with Rome. See Stirling Presbytery Records. CH2/722/4. 28 June 1615.*

matter the cost to the well-being of the episcopate and the church. In the letter, the archbishop pointed out that even though the marquis had subscribed to the articles relating to the royal supremacy presented to him on 13 November 1609, while confined in Stirling Castle,<sup>41</sup> to permit him to return to the north-east while still lying excommunicate

will not fail to bred gritt offense. The Ministeris of those partis that haif ever ben affectit in your Hienes service salbe gritlie disheartit, and otheris our enemyis be glaid of the occasioun to say, that nothing hes ben meant in the effect against Papistis. Besydis, those North countreyis ar so stil inclynit, so it is thocht his presence is ynoughe to schake Religioun thair, vnlesse his return be with gud cautionis, and the sam knowen and vnderstand to al.<sup>42</sup>

Spottiswoode was not indulging in hyperbole when he referred to the effect Huntly's presence had in his own locality. As McLennan has persuasively demonstrated, Huntly's influence and example were paramount in the survival, consolidation and even revival of Roman Catholicism in the north-east of Scotland from the late sixteenth century.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, he was hardly exaggerating when he concluded his study by suggesting that had the principle of self-determination been optional in the early seventeenth century, then large swathes of the north-east under the guidance of the marquis would most likely have reverted to Roman Catholicism.<sup>44</sup> Nevertheless, in spite of the archbishop's warnings, Huntly was released from his ward by December of that same year still under the sentence of excommunication.

By 10 July 1613 both the Scottish archbishops had dropped their overt opposition to lifting the sentence of excommunication from the marquis, since in effect it had

---

<sup>41</sup>*Letters and State Papers During the Reign of King James James VI.* p.175. For the articles presented to and subscribed by Huntly. He had been excommunicated by the general assembly held at Linlithgow in July 1608, and confined in Stirling Castle from where attempts were made at converting him to the Reformed faith.

<sup>42</sup>*OLEAS.* Vol.I. pp.235-236.

<sup>43</sup>McLennan. *Presbyterianism Challenged.* pp.68-222. See in particular pp.183-186.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.* p.222.

been annulled when he had been permitted to communicate while at the royal court in England. A precedent which the marquis repeated with success a mere two years later. However, the archbishops insisted that before they did so, Huntly would have to make a public profession of conformity to the established church and faith.<sup>45</sup> Nevertheless, Spottiswoode informed John Murray a year later that "We hear nothing of his reconcilioun to the Churche, nor that ony thing hes been proponed tuiching his offices." The archbishop intimated how this situation reflected badly on episcopal authority and seriously weakened the church in its purge of Roman Catholicism in the north-east. Indeed, he noted that prior to Huntly's release from the sentence of excommunication "he had in his parochie only thre recusantis, he hes this yeir threscore and threttein."<sup>46</sup> While Spottiswoode had clearly underestimated or deliberately down-played the strength of Roman Catholicism in the marquis's back-yard for dramatic effect, he was correct in emphasising the sense of security, confidence and even triumphalism which Huntly's presence in the locality proffered his co-religionists. Moreover, when it is recalled that the marquis's locality provided both a staging-post and a retreat for jesuits and other priests in Scotland, it is little wonder that Spottiswoode and his colleagues placed such emphasis on the need for his conversion or prosecution.

On 22 June 1616 King James wrote to Archbishop Spottiswoode in reply to an aggrieved letter the metropolitan had penned on behalf of himself and his episcopal colleagues on the thirteenth of that same month.<sup>47</sup> The letter had provided James with an outline of the proceedings the bishops had taken against the marquis of Huntly in the court of high commission, and bitterly complained of the unwarranted meddling and intervention of Chancellor Dunfermline, who allegedly had countermanded the commission's injunction by securing Huntly's release. No doubt desirous to diffuse a potentially debilitating political crisis and to placate and heal the all too obvious

---

<sup>45</sup> *OLEAS*. Vol.I p.311.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* pp.351-352.

<sup>47</sup> *OLEAS*. Vol.II. pp.471-472.



acrimony and mistrust between the first estate and the crown's chief minister in Scotland, the king sought to deflect criticism by lavishing praise on the bishops for their valiant attempts to move the most powerful Roman Catholic nobleman in the kingdom to conform to the established religion - "especially at this time of so great defection and apostasy in the North". Moreover, James implied that the situation had arisen as a result of a break-down in communications between the Scottish government and the court and that his instructions had been misunderstood and unadvisedly and rashly implemented. While he went on to give credit to the church for the initial success it had enjoyed in its zealous crusade to root out and extirpate Roman Catholic recusancy, he urged Spottiswoode

to sett foreward in so good a cause, without fainting or wearying; because at this time of the Marquess his imprisonment, every man will be in expectation of some real effect and work of reformation.<sup>48</sup>

Although King James hastened the archbishop and his fellow churchmen to retain their utmost vigilance in the battle against their confessional adversaries throughout the entire kingdom, the king explicitly directed them to focus their energies and resources on the "said Marquess his name, kind, and dependents", promising his full support and backing in this enterprise. This injunction, it should be noted, stood out in distinct contrast to the king's response to Roman Catholic recusancy elsewhere within the British Isles. Due to his over-riding desire to procure a Spanish match for his heir, the king effectually prorogued the rigorous implementation of the penal laws against his Roman Catholic subjects and actively promoted a policy of toleration towards them.<sup>49</sup>

On 16 July the Scottish privy council reissued an injunction which had denounced as rebels on 26 and 27 June 1615 Patrick Butter, the tutor to the marquis's children, Adam and [space] Gordon, sons of Alexander Gordon, "Cornellet", Thomas Gordon

---

<sup>48</sup>OLEAS. Vol.I. p.471.

<sup>49</sup>See T.Cogswell. England and the Spanish Match in *Conflict in Early Stuart England*. pp.107-133.

of Overhall, Patrick Gordon in Rayme, James Gordon in Letterfoure, Alexander Gordon of Cornewatt, William Gordon, "appeirand" of Benholme, Thomas Gordon of Battorie, James Gordon of Dawach and John Gordon of Ugstoun. All had contemptuously ignored summonses from the high commission to answer charges of "papistrie and resset of papistis, jesuitis, and seminarie preistis".<sup>50</sup> The above were all the marquis's "men" and it was surely a demonstrable reminder to the church and central government that their power and authority were negligible in the north-east where they could not command the support and loyalty of the leading magnate in the region.<sup>51</sup> Spottiswoode and his fellow councillors were forced to concede that

the personis foirsaidis hes most proudlie and  
contempnandlie remanit sen the tymes respectively of  
thair denuntiatioun, lyke as thay do yit, unrelaxt, taking  
no regaird of the said horning, bot hantis, frequentis,  
and repairis publictlie and avowedlie in all the pairtis of  
the north at thair pleasour...<sup>52</sup>

As Spottiswoode had anxiously foretold in a letter to Sir John Murray in December 1615, "the successe of this proceding with him [Huntly] dependis al our Papistis resolutiounis."<sup>53</sup> King James ended his letter by expressing his resolve in the prosecution of two particular Catholic recusants. "Cornelet Gordoun's wife" was to be tried with the full vigour of the law for her audacious verbal assaults on her parish

---

<sup>50</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.XI. p.576.

<sup>51</sup>Having meticulously scrutinized the extant kirk session, presbytery and diocesan synod records pertaining to the north-east during the period of this study, McLennan has conclusively shown that notwithstanding the very obvious attachment to Roman Catholicism by the cadet branches of the House of Gordon, many other influential families made no secret of their commitment to Rome. Thus in addition to the Gordons of Gight, Newton, Letterfourie, Craig, Cluny, Bounty, Auchendoun, within the jurisdictional bounds of the bishops of Moray and Aberdeen, the Cheynes of Essilmont, Arnage and Raymiston; the Woods of Boniton; the Bannermans of Waterton; John Kennedy, laird of Kernak; the Grays of Scheves; the Frasers of Phillorth; the laird and lady of Dalgety; the Bairds of Auchmedden; Michael Fraser, the laird of Technurie and his wife; John Forbes, laird of Blacktown; Thomas Menzies, the laird of Balgowrie; John Leslie, the laird of Wardes and his wife; and a number of the bugess and professional community in the burgh of Aberdeen were all notorious recusants. See *Presbyterianism Challenged*. pp.188-215. Of particular interest Thomas Menzies and other known Catholic recusants within the jurisdictional bounds of the presbytery of Aberdeen unsuccessfully appealed to Spottiswoode for clemency when they were excommunicated for their defiant stance against the established faith. See *Kirk Session of Aberdeen*, May 12, 19, 26, June 26, 30, July, 7, 14, and August 18, 21, 25, 31, 1622.

<sup>52</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.XI. p.576.

<sup>53</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. p.

minister and for her daring attempts to debar the local congregation from attending Sunday worship. Likewise, he informed Spottiswoode of his command to the treasurer-depute to dispatch the Royal Guard in pursuit of George Gordon of Gight and his men who had contemptuously failed to compear before the high commission.<sup>54</sup>

Gight, "ane profest and avowed trafficquing papist and adversair to God and his treuth" had not only been summoned for his overt hostility and active defiance of the established church, but for the vengeful act of retribution he and his kith, kin and followers had imprudently taken against Sir Francis Hay of Brunthills for the murder of his brother Adam Gordon during the month of March that same year.<sup>55</sup> The incident is worth highlighting for therein lies one precipitant factor in the marquis of Huntly's politic absolution from the sentence of excommunication. The earl of Errol, it would seem, similarly received absolution as a consequence of the political outfall of Gight's rash action. Sir Robert Gordon in his account of the affair laid great stress on how Gight's arbitrary and summary dispensation of justice had severed the long-standing friendship between the Gordons and the Hays, and especially between their respective chiefs, Huntly and Errol.<sup>56</sup> Sir Robert noted how Errol spurned all the marquis's overtures of recompensation and reconciliation and how eventually the two magnates appeared in Edinburgh "with all their freinds on either syd; so that the whole kingdome was divyded in two factions, readie to fall together by the ears."<sup>57</sup> Although both Errol and Huntly were persuaded to await the king's forthcoming arrival and submit to his arbitration and judgement, relations between these two individuals and their huge followings remained strained until 1627 when the marquis's third son married the earl's daughter. It is surely no coincidence that these powerful Catholic

---

<sup>54</sup>See Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. Vol.III. pp.402,418-428. *RPCS*. Vol.XI. pp.494, 575-577.

<sup>55</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.XI. pp.575-576. For full details on this event and the subsequent feud between the Houses' of Gordon and Hay, see *The House of Gordon*. Vol.I. (New Spalding Club, 1903). pp.238-251.

<sup>56</sup>Sir Robert Gordon. *A Genealogical History of the Earldom of Sutherland*. (1813). pp.340-341.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid*. p.341. The Venetian secretary noted that both noblemen had the capability of putting between 5000-6000 fighting men in the field. See *CSP Venetian*, 1615-1617. p.489.

noblemen were both absolved during the above crisis. It does indeed seem likely that King James used the absolutions as a bargaining ploy in order to ensure that the two men submitted to his royal will, avoiding a clash of arms which would not simply have had a devastating effect on the north-east but would have seriously destabilised the entire kingdom.<sup>58</sup> Alternatively, the two noblemen themselves might have reasoned that it was worth outwardly conforming to the Protestant religion in order to have their full civic rights restored. This would presumably have given them both the freedom to press their cases through the proper legal channels. To be sure, the fact that King James was involved in delicate negotiations with the Spanish ambassador over the marriage of Charles to the Spanish infanta likely hastened all parties to seek a swift resolution to what was undoubtedly a potentially damaging and embarrassing situation in which the king would probably have had to take a stand against either or both of his most influential Scottish Roman Catholic subjects.

If the king's reputation was tarnished somewhat in his dealings with Huntly and Errol in the eyes of the church, the sincerity of his resolve to combat Roman Catholicism must have been continually open to question. For when the countess of Sutherland was summoned to appear before the high commission in Edinburgh in April 1616 "to ansuer for her suspected religion", her son, the courtier, Sir Robert Gordon intervened with the king on her behalf and initially obtained an intermittence until July. Subsequently, during the intervening period, Sir Robert won an assurance from King James that she would be permitted "an oversight and toleration of her religion dureing the rest of her dayes... provyding that shoe wold not harbor nor recept any Jesuits."<sup>59</sup> Was it permissible for her to receive secular priests and others from different religious orders? What sort of message did this send out to the wider country? There can be little doubt that Protestants throughout Scotland must have

---

<sup>58</sup>See *Melrose Papers*. Vol.I. pp.256-257, 281-282, 296. for an additional account of the governments endeavours to reconcile the differences between Huntly and Errol.

<sup>59</sup>Gordon. *History*. pp.340-341. Her late husband had been called to compear before the High Commission and warded both in St Andrews and Edinburgh between February 1614 and March 1615 account of his confessional leanings. See p.298.

believed that Catholic recusants were being treated more leniently than Protestant ones. Therefore Spottiswoode's and his fellow bishops' endeavours to stamp out Roman Catholicism were in the process of being undermined and discredited by a somewhat Janus-faced King James. It need be noted that it was during this very period that the king was publicly promoting the unification of Western Christendom and rapprochement between Protestants and Rome.<sup>60</sup> Whether or not he genuinely believed such a move was remotely possible or the overture was a deliberate ploy to curry favour with Spain and the papacy like his previous subterfuges of 1599, his overtures delighted and encouraged Catholics. Conversely, they sent a shock wave through the Scottish and English Protestant establishment.

Turning the spotlight back on the marquis of Huntly, he had been excommunicated by the Linlithgow assembly eight years previously and had periodically given the church the impression that he was on the verge of overcoming or reconciling his doctrinal objections to Protestantism. Huntly had been called to compear before the high commission on 12 June to answer charges that he had "caused his officers discharge his Tenants from hearing the Sermons of some Ministers, with whom he made shew to offend."<sup>61</sup> Huntly had been warded in Edinburgh Castle having defiantly refused to subscribe the *Confession of Faith* before the commission when he had persisted in his implacable opposition to the Reformed Faith. Nevertheless, he had been released on the privy council's order having been summoned to court by the king six days later. King James responded swiftly to Spottiswoode's missive by firmly rebuking the council for undermining the commission's authority and by rescinding his earlier warrant, which he had issued in response to Huntly's request for a licence for an audience with his sovereign prior to his imprisonment. Indeed, James informed Spottiswoode that he had despatched the earlier communiqué unaware that Huntly had been incarcerated and that the letter should not have been "interpreted as a

---

<sup>60</sup>W.B.Patterson. *King James VI & I and the reunion of Christendom.*

<sup>61</sup>Spottiswoode. *History.* p.525.

warrant for his relief thereof".<sup>62</sup> Apparently oblivious to the fact that Huntly was already on the road heading south, the king sent Patrick Hamilton, his secretary-deputy at court, north with orders that the marquis was to re-enter into custody until further notice.<sup>63</sup> Hamilton, however, intercepted Huntly at Huntingdon, a mere day's ride from London, where the marquis successfully rebuffed Hamilton's entreaties that he return to Edinburgh and re-enter into ward by persuasively arguing that if he were to be granted an audience with King James he would finally abandon his defiant stance against the Reformed church whereby satisfying the demands of both the king and the Church of Scotland.

Interestingly, Spottiswoode's later account of the incident differs significantly from Calderwood's in the degree to which the earl of Dunfermline was implicated in undermining the high commission's authority by procuring Huntly's freedom. According to Calderwood, Dunfermline had merely cast the deciding vote in favour of the marquis after the privy council, in which Spottiswoode had been absent, had been evenly split on whether he should have been immediately released, retained in ward or whether the matter should have been referred back to the high commission, which legally speaking should have been sole arbiter in this case.<sup>64</sup> Conversely, Spottiswoode, possibly nursing resentment from past encounters with Dunfermline, saw the crypto-Catholic's actions in a much more malevolent light. The archbishop gave the distinct impression in his *History* that Dunfermline used his influence in council to sway the vote in his co-religionist's favour. As a result the episcopate's ire was solely directed towards Dunfermline. When confronted by the outraged bishops the chancellor contemptuously responded "[t]hat he might enlarge without their advice any that were imprisoned by the high Commission." Moreover, "he cared not what their Church thought of him."<sup>65</sup> A reference by the Venetian envoy, Antonio di

---

<sup>62</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. p.471.

<sup>63</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.525-526.

<sup>64</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.212.

<sup>65</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.525.

Michiel, who that same year likened Dunfermline's status in Scotland to that of a viceroy does indeed suggest that Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops were correct in directing their anger towards the chancellor.<sup>66</sup> After all he had made no secret of his hostility towards erastian episcopacy and was one of the few individuals in government who possessed the requisite political muscle and arrogance to hamper and obstruct ecclesiastical policy. According to Spottiswoode, a number of undisclosed ministers sought the king's intervention and utilised their pulpits to vent vitriolic attacks on Dunfermline for what they evidently regarded as his unlawful abuse of his political authority and rank.<sup>67</sup> The archbishop's statement is given credence by Calderwood's assertion that on 7 July William Cowper, the Bishop of Galloway directed his sermon in St Giles "upon the enemies of the Kirk; [and] inveighed against the chancelour for maintaining of Papists."<sup>68</sup> Moreover, the Bishop of Caithness was sent to court to provide the king with a direct and detailed account of the chancellor's involvement in the episode. Nevertheless, probably on account of the fortuitous outcome of this whole incident, Dunfermline emerged largely unscathed. In spite of the obvious mistrust which had existed between Spottiswoode and Dunfermline, it should be noted that they appear to have developed and exhibited a healthy mutual respect for each other. In acknowledgement of this, Spottiswoode preached an "excellent" oration at Dunfermline's funeral in June 1622.<sup>69</sup> To Spottiswoode's evident surprise, King James appointed Sir George Hay, the clerk-register to succeed Dunfermline in the prestigious and highly influential post of chancellor. Interestingly, Hay like his predecessor appears to have been a crypto-Catholic.<sup>70</sup> While the king no doubt had good and valid reasons for promoting

---

<sup>66</sup>*Calendar of State Papers. Venetian, 1615-1617.* p.605.

<sup>67</sup>Spottiswoode. *History.* p.525.

<sup>68</sup>Calderwood. *History.* Vol.VII. p.218.

<sup>69</sup>See *Memoirs of Alexander Seton.* p.144. Calderwood. *History.* Vol.VII. pp.548-549. Spottiswoode. *History.* p543.

<sup>70</sup>Hay had been educated in the Scot's College at Pont-a-Mousson under the tutelage of his uncle and Roman Catholic priest, Edmund Hay during the late 1580s. Although he naturally gave the impression that he was first and foremost a loyal supporter of the king who indeed played a leading role in the ratification of the five articles by the parliament in 1621, it would seem that he was in correspondence with the Catholic mission on the Continent. See *Scot's Peerage.* Vol.V. pp.220-223.

Hay, his decision yet again sent mixed signals to those engaged in the fight against Catholicism, for it rightly suggested that loyalty to the crown was the one and only criteria for political and social advancement in Jacobean Scotland.

The revelation *circa* 8 July that the marquis had not only been granted a royal audience but had communicated at Lambeth Palace on the previous day having received absolution from the sentence of excommunication from the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, must have engendered widespread feelings of indignation and incredulity within the Church of Scotland.<sup>71</sup> Although a conspiratorially minded David Calderwood strongly believed that the whole episode had been a mere ruse devised to indirectly advance the king's ecclesiastical policy in Scotland and that Spottiswoode was privy to a great deal more than he was ever willing to reveal or admit, the subsequent responses by both King James and the archbishop suggests otherwise. Indeed, as suggested above, the absolution was granted on the grounds of political expediency. On Sunday 14 July, preaching to the congregation gathered in the "Great Kirk" in Edinburgh, Spottiswoode forcefully but dejectedly responded to the insatiable demand for answers as to why Huntly had been released out of ward. He expostulated that it was not his

purpose to speake against anie persons that are in eminent places, seing his Majestie hes provydit that the like sall not fall out heirefter. Yitt... it behoveth the bishops and the ministers to be borne with, to utter their greefe, when Papists are so farre countenanced, not onlie in the North, but also in the verie heart of the countrie.<sup>72</sup>

The archbishop's transparent disillusionment with the campaign to eradicate Catholicism in Scotland was palpable. As long as King James tolerated what churchmen like Spottiswoode considered to be fifth columnists not only throughout the kingdom in general but specifically within the central administration a pervasive

---

See below.

<sup>71</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.218.

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.* pp.218-219.



neurosis would continue to exist both within and outside the Scottish church. Indeed, it does appear that the archbishop correctly entertained doubts over the veracity of Huntly's *volte-face*.

Additionally, in an effort to plaster over the cracks which were threatening to do irreparable damage to the *entente cordial* which had been slowly developing between the English and Scottish church hierarchies, both King James and the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to Spottiswoode on 23 July in a politic attempt to justify their actions and dispel any fears that Abbot's intervention intimated English canonical superiority over the Church of Scotland.<sup>73</sup> James argued that the absolution had been performed "out of a Christian necessity". He explained that the only major stumbling block to Huntly's conversion, which had centred on the question of Christ's presence in the sacrament of communion, had finally been overcome or resolved. Therefore it was judged pertinent that the marquis communicate at the earliest possible opportunity.<sup>74</sup> Probably aware of the fragility of Huntly's conversion, or maybe even harbouring suspicions that the marquis's avowed change of heart was a spurious and calculated gesture designed to force the Scottish clerical hounds off his scent, the king implied that he feared any delay in sending him back to Scotland could have jeopardised what could nevertheless be portrayed as a significant coup for the crown and the Protestant church.

Writing from his residence in Croyden, Abbot reiterated King James's sentiments in stressing that "it was held to strike the iron whilst it was hot".<sup>75</sup> Of course the felicitous timing of the Bishop of Chester's consecration at Lambeth Palace on 7 July, where a "solemn Communion was to be celebrated" in the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London and the Primate of Ireland among others, provided an ideal occasion and setting for such a visible demonstration of the

---

<sup>73</sup>OLEAS. Vol.II. pp.474-478.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.* p.475.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.* p.476.

magnate's conformity. The archbishop was nevertheless keen to point out that many English ecclesiastics had conveyed their grave misgivings over the legality and canonical implications of the absolution which had been given at the king's insistence. Moreover it had been experts on the civil law which had justified and legitimised the action on the ground that Huntly had stated his intention to reside south of the border for a considerable period of time. The English metropolitan made recognition of the independent authority and jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland and explained that on the evening preceding the communion he had canvassed the view of the Bishop of Caithness who had given his assurance that "it was my best way to absolve the Lord Marquess, and answered me that it would be well taken by the bishops and Pastors of the Church of Scotland."<sup>76</sup> Although Forbes later denied giving his consent on behalf of the Church of Scotland. Both these letters were read out at the forthcoming assembly and incorporated into the register of the proceedings.

While the above letters went some way in mitigating Scottish reaction to Huntly's absolution, pressure from the Church of Scotland compelled King James to later concede that the marquis should satisfy Scottish church protocol by complying with the demands of the general assembly due to meet on 13 August 1616.<sup>77</sup> On 15 August John Gordon of Buckie appeared on behalf of Huntly and presented the assembly with the marquis's supplication. Huntly acknowledged his past errors and gave a solemn undertaking to remain steadfast in the Protestant Faith. Furthermore, he promised to ensure that his children received a Protestant education. The assembly, however, was unwilling to let Huntly off the hook quite so easily, insisting that the suitably penitent nobleman should compare personally before the assembly on the twenty-first to hear himself fully absolved from the sentence of excommunication.<sup>78</sup> As a result Spottiswoode accompanied by Archbishop Law of Glasgow, the Bishop of

---

<sup>76</sup>OLEAS. Vol.II. pp.476-477.

<sup>77</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.528.

<sup>78</sup>See *BUK*. p.593. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.528. Spottiswoode mistakenly recalled that Huntly was absolved on the first day of the assembly after his supplication was read out to the assembled.

Brechin, Lord Binning, the treasurer-deputy and the laird of Corse visited Huntly and conferred with him for some two or three hours over the manner of his absolution and what was expected of him in return.<sup>79</sup> Huntly fully complied with the church's stipulation and made his appearance in the assembly on its last day of business. After reiterating the commitments he had given in the above supplication, the marquis further agreed to communicate in Scotland at the earliest opportunity. He promised to use his immense influence to ensure that his servants and domestic staff attended Reformed worship on a regular basis and were obedient to the strictures of the established church. He personally gave an undertaking to shun the company of Roman Catholics. He put the ritualistic icing on the cake when he finally subscribed the *Confession of Faith* in the full glare of the assembly. Finally, as a token gesture of his change of heart, he stated his intention to plant vacant kirks within his locality. Spottiswoode, the Bishop of Moray and Patrick Forbes, the laird of Corse were given the task of modifying the respective stipends of the ministers planted in these churches. The spectacle ended when Spottiswoode absolved the marquis from his excommunication "led and deducit against him, and receavit him againe into the bosome of the Church".<sup>80</sup>

In his letter to the king on 22 August, Lord Binning noted that this "is one of the workis of your maiesties most excellent wisdome, whairfra all men expect gude helpis, to the peace of the estate and churche of this kingdome."<sup>81</sup> He likewise singled out Spottiswoode; "his modestie, pacience, wisdome, and travellis, whairby he so conteaned the whole number within the boundis of duetie and obedience, as did greatlie facilitat the good successe of the bussines."<sup>82</sup> It is evident, however, from Binning's words that many in the church correctly regarded Huntly's display as pure theatre and his words as mere rhetoric. Huntly, no doubt relieved to have had his full

---

<sup>79</sup>*Melrose Papers*. Vol.I. pp.619-620.

<sup>80</sup>*BUK*. pp.597-598.

<sup>81</sup>*Melrose Papers*. Vol.I. p.620.

<sup>82</sup>*Ibid*. p.620.

civic rights restored, triumphantly returned to court accompanied by the duke of Lennox on 24 August.<sup>83</sup> He was re-admitted to the Scottish privy council on 27 February 1617.<sup>84</sup> However, the long looked for transformation and cooperation from the marquis never materialised.

On 22 July 1619, Spottiswoode was one of the signatories to a commission granted to the Bishop of Moray to locate and apprehend the great number of

jesuittis, seminarie preistis, and trafficquing papistis, haunting, resorting and repairing within the boundis and dyocie of Murray... persuaiding and allureing our goode subiects to declyne the trew religioun and imbraice thair superstitious errouris, to the offence of God and contempt of our auctoritie.<sup>85</sup>

Similar commissions were issued to the Bishop of Ross on 29 July 1619 and to the Bishop of Aberdeen on 27 July 1620.<sup>86</sup> The above reference to "our auctoritie" belies the unacknowledged fact that it was the marquis of Huntly not the government and church who exercised real authority in the north-east. On 21 November 1621 it was reported that the notorious James Gordon, the laird of Letterfurrie, whose residence was only some six miles distance from Strathbogie, had held

a publict masse in his house at noon day, the gates standing open, to which eight score persons were warned, of which number were some of his owne tenants compelled to be present.<sup>87</sup>

However four months were allowed to lapse before a commission was issued to Huntly on 19 March 1622 to apprehend and detain the above laird. The commission, moreover, called on the marquis to apprehend John Gordon of Fernaughty, and commanded Ogilvy of Clova to likewise apprehend George Ogilvy of Whitehills who was at the horn for resetting jesuits and other itinerant priests.<sup>88</sup> Not surprisingly

---

<sup>83</sup>*CSP. Domestic. 1611-1618.* (1858). p.391.

<sup>84</sup>*RPCS. Vol.XI.* p.48.

<sup>85</sup>*Ibid.* Vol.XII. p.35.

<sup>86</sup>*Ibid.* Vol.XII. pp.47, 344. See also pp.681, 722-723.

<sup>87</sup>Calderwood. *History.* Vol.VII. p.515.

<sup>88</sup>*RPCS. Vol.XII.* pp.681-682. See below for details of the synod of St Andrews sentence of

Huntly consistently placed a higher premium on protecting his kinsmen and tenants - and most likely his co-religionists, than administering the letter of the law. The marquis did not simply procrastinate and obstruct the process of law, however, but was able to exploit what influence he possessed with King James to procure the freedom of professing Roman Catholics residing or detained within his sphere of influence. In December 1623, Huntly obtained a warrant from the king which he duly presented to the privy council repealing the sentence of excommunication pronounced against three recusant kinsmen of the Bishop of Ross, surnamed Panter, who had formerly been in the service of the marquis's mother. Moreover, the warrant crucially prevented the Bishop of Aberdeen from pursuing them while at the horn. King James also sent a communiqué direct to Archbishop Spottiswoode, urging him to write to the Bishop of Aberdeen and the three ministers who had been "most earnest in the processe of excommunication" against the recusants, namely Andrew Cant, David Forrester and John Ross, in order to ensure that they heeded the king's decree.

Writing from his primatial residence at Dairsie on 27 May 1622, Spottiswoode briefed John Murray of Lochmaben on how the church had fared in its prosecution of prominent Roman Catholic recusants from the north-east. The archbishop complained how on 24 May Sir John Ogilvy, unlike his brother Francis who had "subscryved and gaif satisfioun" had compeared before him and openly

acknowledgit his defectioun, or rather professit his equivocatioun in the oath he had formerly made for Religioun, and so declarit he wes, and had ben, ane Catholick Roman, and did so continue.<sup>89</sup>

Ogilvy was ordered, on the pain of banishment and a one thousand merks fine, to enter Dundee by 1 July where he was to remain for the space of a month. Here he was to confer with the Bishop of Brechin whose task it was to overcome the doctrinal barriers to Ogilvy's faithful conversion. Gordon of Letterfurrie also compeared "anent

---

excommunication against Ogilvie.

<sup>89</sup>OLEAS, Vol.II. See pp.681-682. See below for thwe synod's proceeding against Sir John.

the masse said in his house the fyft of November, and the feast qhair of I advertisit in winter thei kept... and denyit the fact..."<sup>90</sup> It is worth speculating that the fact that the laird allegedly celebrated Mass on 5 November must have added sacrilegious insult to injury to Spottiswoode and his fellow Protestants. The archbishop informed Murray that the witnesses they had called all failed to appear, "alleging dyverse excuses". As a result, Spottiswoode had commanded the bishops of Aberdeen and Moray "to examin them in the north, qhair thei dwel, and return thair report to ws the 26 of Junj, and warned him to compeir the sam day and answer for his apostasie". Intriguingly, Spottiswoode pointed out that he had gone no further because he had given his word to the marquis of Huntly "to challenge for no furder at this tym then the Messe denyit, and to demit him free." That Spottiswoode was forced to depend on the compliance and cooperation of Huntly is once more surely an indictment of the crown's and church's authority and policy in seriously combating and eradicating Roman Catholicism in Scotland.

Archbishop Spottiswoode concluded his report on Roman Catholic recusancy in the north-east by pointing out to Murray that he had been left with no option but to excommunicate the tutor of Huntly's children. Additionally, it must have pained him somewhat to have to concede that

[o]theris of them that wes summond apperit not, qhom we ar to denunce: Thair insolence in the north partis is excedinge, open contempt of Preaching and Ministeris, insulting against the King of Bohem; and asking the Ministeris qhat good thair prayeris have done? feasting the Spaniardis that ar com from Dunkirk to these partis, and scoffing al that professt Religioun.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup>OLEAS. Vol.II. p.681. The presbytery of Fordyce finally initiated proceedings to have the laird excommunicated in 1625, although it took them a full four years to achieve this. See McLennan. *Presbyterianism Challenged*. p.195.

<sup>91</sup>OLEAS. Vol.II. p.681. See below for the impact that developments on the continent and the king's foreign policy had on Scottish Protestant opinion.

Nevertheless, Spottiswoode noted that the "good newis that cam lately of the victorie in the Palatinat haif compecsed them sumqhat, and thei begin to fear a turn."<sup>92</sup>

Remaining briefly in the north-east, like the marquis of Huntly, the earl of Errol's absolution was also a sham.<sup>93</sup> On 18 November 1613, Spottiswoode was amongst the councillors who denounced the earl for his "obstinate perseverance in papistrie". Notwithstanding attempts by the high commission to impel him to conform to Protestantism and a lengthy spell of confinement at St Andrews over the winter of 1614-1615, Errol remained devoutly steadfast in his adherence to the old religion. Writing to the king from St Andrews on 3 April 1617, Spottiswoode informed James that

the Erle of Arrol hafing satisfeit the Churche in suche thingis as wer presently requyrit of him, is absolvit from his Excommunicatioun at St Andrews, this secund of Apryl.<sup>94</sup>

Moreover, the archbishop intreated the king to provide the privy council with his warrant in order that it might speedily implement the requisite legal requirements to release Errol from his residential confinement. Nevertheless, Spottiswoode poignantly added that he wished Errol "may inioy the freedom of a good subiect, qhiche we hope in God he sal proove."

It was clear that the archbishop doubted whether the earl's conversion was genuine. Spottiswoode's scepticism would appear to have been vindicated for Errol, along with John, second earl of Kinghorn, were called to compear before the privy council on 28 March 1620 to answer for sending his son to France with Patrick Con, "a known Papist".<sup>95</sup> Kinghorn had permitted his brother to travel in their company. Con, who

---

<sup>92</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. pp.681-682.

<sup>93</sup>Errol declared in his will, dated 9 June 1628, that he had lived, a true and sincere apostolic Roman Catholic, and expressed the wish that his children, friends, and all others should embrace the faith. See *Scots Peerage*. Vol.III. p.576. McLennan. *Presbyterianism Challenged*. pp.186-188.

<sup>94</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. p.501.

<sup>95</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.XII. pp.240-241. Kinghorn was certainly no Roman Catholic. However, unlike his father, Patrick, he consistently opposed the crown's ecclesiastical policy. See *Scot's Peerage*. Vol.VIII. pp.291-299.

was a "servitour" to the earl of Errol had been detained by the baillies at Leith on his return from France. On inspection the port authorities had discovered a chest in his possession which on opening had revealed

sundrie Popishe treatises and works, and diverse missives directed to sundrie noblemen, and others of inferiour ranke, and amongst the rest, one to the Clerk of Registrie, Sir George Hay...<sup>96</sup>

Although Con, along with the letters and works found in his possession, was presented to the privy council, mysteriously, the whole matter was brushed under the carpet.

Protestant apprehension and bewilderment must have been further compounded during the winter of 1620 by incessant but fallacious reports that over two hundred jesuits and other priests were active throughout the country. According to Calderwood, two of the above were held in the castle of St Andrews, "and weill interteaned" till they were inexplicably released on the king's command.<sup>97</sup> Two particular case studies from 1620-1621 are indicitive of the insurmountable obstacles facing Archbishop Spottiswoode and those charged with effectively combating Roman Catholicism in Scotland. On 18 May 1620 one Father Anderson was arrested while in possession of various religious paraphernalia and interrogated by Spottiswoode, Law, representatives of the magistracy of Edinburgh and a number of undisclosed ministers.<sup>98</sup> While Anderson was generally co-operative and willingly admitted that he had conducted Mass in Scotland on many occasions, he obstinately refused to divulge details concerning the very people who had provided him with accommodation and offered him protection from the intrusive eye of the church and local authorities. Moreover, he adamantly refused to give up the names of his scattered and secretive flock. By 13 February he was released on the king's command at the bidding of the French ambassador. He was to be placed on the first ship that

---

<sup>96</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.426.

<sup>97</sup>*Ibid.* p.455.

<sup>98</sup>*Ibid.* pp.443-444.



sailed for France. What enraged and infuriated Protestants like Calderwood, however, was that the king ordered the authorities "to furnishe him with honest apparrell, to pay the charges he was at in the Tolbuith, [and] to give him an hundreth punds sterline..."<sup>99</sup> No such "humanitarian" concern was shown to recalcitrant presbyterians. Although it is likely that Spottiswoode would have wished to avoid creating further martyrs as in the hugely publicised case of John Ogilvie, he and his contemporaries must have grown increasingly disillusioned with their inability to end lay adherence to the Roman church and the succour and protection it correspondingly offered to itinerant priests. Their problem was exacerbated by the pope's insistence that all banished priests should strive to return to their country of origin.

The second case only purports to confirm the church's predicament. In the autumn of 1620, Edmund Canna, a thirty year old Irish Franciscan priest, was captured and held captive in the tolbooth of Stirling.<sup>100</sup> Four or five days later he was transferred to St Andrews where he was apparently examined by Spottiswoode. It is highly likely that the archbishop took a keen interest in this particular individual, for he had personally issued a licence to Canna while the priest was detained in Edinburgh Castle, permitting him to sail for either France or Flanders on the proviso that he never return to the king's dominions as far back as 17 September 1617.<sup>101</sup> The priest resurfaced in Yarmouth in October 1621 having sailed there on a Dundee stoop and sought permission to proceed to Zealand. However, when an investigation was conducted the baillies noticed that the warrant Canna was carrying had been issued over four years previously, although the Franciscan argued that he had "got his pass in September last." Nevertheless, it would appear that the priest was allowed to continue on his journey once James Patterson, a mariner from Dundee, confirmed that Canna had been delivered to him by two of Spottiswoode's servants only five weeks

---

<sup>99</sup>Calderwood. *History*. p.456.

<sup>100</sup>*Ibid.* p.460.

<sup>101</sup>*CSP. Domestic 1611-1618*. p.485.

previously with orders that he was to be transported to the Continent post-haste. The archbishop had promised to meet all expenses.<sup>102</sup>

Notwithstanding Spottiswoode's likely embarrassment with being re-acquainted with a Roman Catholic priest he had personally expelled from Scotland four years previously, the archbishop must have been deeply concerned over Canna's whereabouts after his initial banishment. How had he managed to avoid detection for so long? More importantly, who had offered him shelter and protection? Bearing these questions in mind, it is hardly surprising that the church kept a watchful eye on suspect Roman Catholic recusants - especially amongst members of the nobility. As comparative English historiographical studies have convincingly demonstrated, there was a slow but steady increase in aristocratic Roman Catholicism south of the Border in the early seventeenth century. Importantly, it has been shown that Counter-Reformation Catholicism in England was a seigneurial religion, which survived and showed a modest expansion due to the support it received from the landed classes.<sup>103</sup> This trend appears to have been mirrored in Scotland.

The surviving "*Record of the Diocesan Synod of St Andrews Benorth the Forth*" would suggest that Archbishop Spottiswoode took a keen interest in prominent individuals inclined to popery within his direct jurisdictional territory.<sup>104</sup> On the third and fourth of October 1615 Spottiswoode presided over his first synod meeting since his move from Glasgow. During its deliberations it was reported by the exercise of Cupar that both the ladies of Parbroath and Craighall had finally "subscryved ye confessione of fayth and giffen yair oathes yairupon."<sup>105</sup> The archbishop, no doubt

---

<sup>102</sup>CSP. Domestic 1619-1623. p.302.

<sup>103</sup>See B.Coward. *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714*. (1994). p.80. R.Clifton. Fear of Popery, in *The Origins of the English Civil War*. (Ed) C.Russell. (1973). pp.152-154.

<sup>104</sup>S.R.O. CH2/154/1. See ff.180-274. for the requisite years.

<sup>105</sup>*Ibid.* f.180. The lady of Parbroath was probably Margaret, the daughter of Sir George Seton of Parbroath, who had a long record of Roman Catholic non-conformity. She was married to Sir John Scrimgeour who possessed extensive lands in Forfarshire. See *Scot's Peerage*. Vol.III. p.313. J.Durkan. William Murdoch and the Early Jesuit Mission in Scotland. p.7. The lady of Craighall was likely related to Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall, who had made his name defending the presbyterian

having consulted with the synod members, instructed the representatives of the exercise of Cupar to carefully monitor the said women's progress, ensuring that they both regularly attended Sunday worship and communicated at designated times. Similarly, the exercise of Dundee was commanded to see that Andrew, seventh Lord Gray celebrated communion before Martinmas (11 November) having failed to comply with an earlier injunction that he partake in the sacrament in his parish church. That Gray was heritable sheriff of Forfarshire must have made it doubly important that he conformed. Moreover, that a known recusant was permitted to retain such a key office by King James exacerbated the church's difficulty at law enforcement.<sup>106</sup> The exercise of Arbroath was also instructed to initiate proceedings against one [space] Lyndsay, the lady of Lawtoun after it was discovered that she "hes not resorted to ye kirk for hearing of ye word and hes not communicate yeis dyvers yearis bygane."<sup>107</sup> Anticipating the assembly's injunction of August 1616, the names of all excommunicates and non-communicates were to be collated and handed over to Spottiswoode. However, the minutes of the synod meetings for the second and third of April 1616 and for the first and second of October of that same year testify to the synod's failure to attain their stated objectives.

In April 1616, while the lady of Parbroath had satisfied the synod in obediently observing the Sabbath, by October she had still defiantly resisted taking communion in the Reformed manner. The lady of Craighall appears to have refrained from even the pretence of attending church on the Sunday morning. Although when pressed for a reason for her absence she argued that she was unable to resort to her local church while her husband was warded in the tolbooth of Edinburgh.<sup>108</sup> Similarly, Lady Lawtoun and Lord Gray, in spite of assurances to the contrary, had failed to

---

ministers prosecuted for holding a general assembly in Aberdeen in 1605.

<sup>106</sup>Andrew, seventh Lord Gray succeeded his father Patrick, a notorious Roman Catholic recusant who had played an instrumental part in the plots of the late 1580s and early 1590s, in 1612. He resigned the sheriffship in the following reign. See *Scot's Peerage*. Vol.IV. p.286.

<sup>107</sup>*CH2/154/1*. f.180. Lady Lawtoun was the daughter of Lord Spynie.

<sup>108</sup>*Ibid.* f.192.

communicate by October 1616.<sup>109</sup> The above named recusants were added to in April 1616 by the inclusion of John and William Seton, whom the exercise of Cupar had indicted for their conspicuous absence from church on the Sabbath and for their disobedience in forsaking the celebration of the sacrament.<sup>110</sup> Probably suspecting that the residences of the above named persons, and to be sure others within the synodal boundaries, would be the intended destinations for excommunicated papists, the synod "considering how grypt hurt commeth be ye resort of excommunicate persons", somewhat impotently threatened that "all ressetters of yame and esp[ecia]ll[y] of ye Laird of Gicht...salbe proceidit against according to ye Lawes of ye kirk".<sup>111</sup> Whether or not the ladies of Parbroath, Craighall and Lawtoun, and John and William Seton ever fully satisfied Spottiswoode and the ministers of the synod cannot be determined as no more is recorded of them prior to 1625, although it has to be doubted. Lord Gray remained defiantly committed to the Roman religion. He was stripped of his sheriffship during the early years of Charles's reign and finally excommunicated for his faith under the Covenanting regime in 1649. The most likely explanation for the absence of the above names in the synod register from 1617 was that these were simply subsumed in the substantial and expanding number of Protestant non-communicants after the imposition of compulsory kneeling at receiving the communion elements by the Perth assembly of 1618. Nevertheless, it has to be doubted whether individuals with such a pedigree of recusancy ever truly abandoned their commitment to Roman Catholicism.

Not until April 1621 did the synod redirect its attention to the problem of recalcitrant Roman Catholics. Those representing the exercise of Meikle were instructed to pursue Sir John Ogilvy of Craig and Sir George Ogilvy of Whitehills "quha ar suspect of papistrie and give grypt offence be their scandalous behaviour that

---

<sup>109</sup>*CH2/154/1. ff.201, 202, 203.*

<sup>110</sup>*ibid. f.195.*

<sup>111</sup>*ibid. f.197.*

way".<sup>112</sup> Both men had previously been in trouble with the church authorities on account of their non-conformity and had been forced to subscribe and swear to uphold the doctrine enunciated in the *Confession of Faith*. The brethren, however, were "to proceed against them for their apostacie and mak them swear and subscrieve *de novo*." Notwithstanding the synod's endeavours to proselytise the above individuals, they were left with no option but to excommunicate Sir John in April 1624 and Sir George in October of that same year as "obstinat refractarie papist[s]".<sup>113</sup> In April 1622 it was reported that the area around Arbroath was "trublit with many papists". Accordingly, action was to be taken against David Gairn of Latoun, Henry Guthrie of Colstoun, John Gairn in Muirhouse and Francis Ogilvie of Newgrange.<sup>114</sup> Likewise the exercise of Forfar was to take issue with David Benton of Carsgowrie, who was finally excommunicated in April 1624; the church's efforts at rehabilitating him having proved to be a lesson in abject failure.<sup>115</sup> Again in October 1623, the synod made a request to Archbishop Spottiswoode, who was absent from the court's meeting, that he have Andrew Fethie called before, and prosecuted by, the high commission. Although without the high commission registers it cannot be ascertained whether he did indeed compear before the court on account of his apostasy, he was, nevertheless, excommunicated for his "wilful recusancie" along with two other non-conformist Roman Catholics in April 1624.<sup>116</sup> It is lastly worth noting that proceedings were also initiated against Robert Douglas, the brother of the laird of Glenbervie, in October 1623.<sup>117</sup> Although there is possibly no direct correlation between the synod's clampdown against recusants in the early 1620s and happenings on the Continent, it is, nevertheless, more than pure coincidence that it coincided with Protestant reverses in Europe.

---

<sup>112</sup>CH2/154/1. f.243.

<sup>113</sup>See *Ibid.* ff.261, 271.

<sup>114</sup>*Ibid.* f.247.

<sup>115</sup>See *Ibid.* ff.248, 261.

<sup>116</sup>*Ibid.* ff.260-262. These were John Anderson "portioner of Achrennie" and George Abercrombie of "Patelpie" (near Dundee).

<sup>117</sup>*Ibid.* f.260.

Reporting on events in Scotland, Girolamo Lando, the Venetian ambassador, informed the Doge and Senate on 20 November 1620 that the

rage against the Spaniards and their partisans is extreme, and the people speak very openly against them... There are endless discussions in which one hears that they not only want to break off all negotiations for a Spanish marriage and help the Palatinate, but Bohemia also and every other interest of the Evangelical religion. They are also highly incensed at the action of the King of France against the Huguenots...<sup>118</sup>

There can be no doubt that Lando correctly judged the mood of public opinion in Scotland. On 10 April 1621 Spottiswoode appointed a fast to be held throughout the entire kingdom on the last Sunday in June and the first Sunday in July as a propitiation for

the gryt increas of al sorts of sins in ye land; The p[rese]nt distressed estait of the reformed kirks in forrain kingdomes as in France, in Boheme, in Palatinate for the delyverance and preservation of christianitie from the tyrranie of Turks and papists, and for the preservation of the king... from the daylie plots and conspiracies of his enemies<sup>119</sup>

The following April the archbishop again proclaimed a public fast to be kept on the first two Sundays in May for the Protestant churches of Germany, France and Bohemia. In addition, financial aid was also in the process of being collected for the Huguenots in France.<sup>120</sup> It is further worth noting that Scottish levies were raised to fight for the king of Bohemia and for the recovery of the Palatinate.<sup>121</sup> To be sure, such actions and events focused public attention on the Roman Catholic question and raised Protestant fears of an invasion headed by the Catholic superpower Spain on Scotland. The urgency shown by the Scottish government to improve fortifications at Montrose and Leith coupled to its strong desire to purchase large quantities of

---

<sup>118</sup>*CSP. Venetian. 1619-1621. pp.478-479.*

<sup>119</sup>*CH2/154/1. f.244.*

<sup>120</sup>See *Ibid.* ff.247, 248.

<sup>121</sup>See Calderwood. *History.* Vol.VII. p.444. *CSP. Venetian. 1619-1621. pp.185, 206, 262, 478.*

gunpowder from the Continent in early 1622 would appear to confirm Scottish trepidation.<sup>122</sup>

While in London lobbying King James on behalf of the Scottish political community for permission to hold a parliament, whose consent was essential to raising the desired revenue for a military campaign for the recovery of the Palatinate, Spottiswoode wrote to Lord Erskine.<sup>123</sup> The letter, dated 18 February, briefed Erskine on the current position of the respective armies in the Palatinate and Bohemia. In it Spottiswoode pointed out that "[i]t wold appear that his maj[esty] expectis good and honest dealing at ye Spanische hand, q[uai]rin I beseech god, he be not deceavit."<sup>124</sup> Did Spottiswoode seriously believe that King James was being deceived by that "Spanish Machiavelli", Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuna, Count Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador? Whether or not the archbishop personally believed that the king was being duped by the wily Spaniard cannot now be ascertained, although recent research would suggest that the king was more than a match for the Spaniard.<sup>125</sup> However, there can be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of James's Protestant subjects believed he was, as did the French and Venetians.<sup>126</sup> Notwithstanding the king's pursuit of a long-lasting peace in Europe through a marriage alliance with Spain, events both at home and abroad only compounded Scottish fears.

The conversion to Roman Catholicism and defection to Spain of the earl of Argyll in November 1618 must have deeply worried the Scottish Protestant

---

<sup>122</sup>See *CPS. Venetian. 1621-1623. p.307. Calderwood. History. Vol.VII. pp.543-544.*

<sup>123</sup>See chapter 7 for further details on the parliament of 1621, the convention which preceded it, and Spottiswoode's involvement therein.

<sup>124</sup>*S.R.O. GD124/15/46.*

<sup>125</sup>*R.Lockyer. James VI & I. pp.147-148.*

<sup>126</sup>For King James foreign policy and Protestant hostility towards it see M.Lee Jnr. *Great Britain's Soloman: James VI & I and His Three Kingdoms.* (1990). pp174-175. Fincham and Lake. *The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I.* pp.182-186. S.J.Houston. *James I.* (reprint 1986). pp.67-98. D.M.Loades. *Politics and the Nation: 1450-1660.* (4th ed.1992). pp.379, 381-385, 394. Askrigg. *Letters.* pp.383-384. For the view of the Venetian ambassador, Girolamo Lando see his *Relation of England in CPS. Venetian. 1621-1623. pp.442, 446-447.*

establishment.<sup>127</sup> While Argyll does not appear to have cut the high political profile associated with either his father or later with his son, his defection from the established religion, nevertheless, seriously threatened to undo the steady advance and consolidation of the Protestant faith which the church - particularly in the persons of Andrew Knox, the Bishop of the Isles and Spottiswoode, although in a less direct but altogether noteworthy manner, had laboured hard to procure and establish to date. It is surely no coincidence that the Franciscan mission to the north-west of Scotland was undertaken shortly after Argyll's conversion.<sup>128</sup> Although Spottiswoode was to note retrospectively that "whether he was perverted by his English Lady who was Popish, or that to gain the favour of Spain he did change his religion, is doubtful",<sup>129</sup> it is evident that at the time rumours were circulating to the effect that Gondomar had been the true architect of Argyll's flight from Scotland,

under various, quite, vain hopes that he would be well treated, honoured and pensioned in Flanders by the archduke and the Catholic king and raised to great and important positions.<sup>130</sup>

A communiqué from Antonio Donato on 7 March 1619 noted that the king had been greatly disturbed by the defection by "one very capable of commanding a fleet."<sup>131</sup> However, the fallout from the proposed marriage between Prince Charles and the Spanish Infanta probably did even more to raise the level of Protestant anxiety and hostility both in Scotland as well as England.

News in 1622 that the king was intending to extend his newly and officially instituted toleration of Roman Catholics in England to Scotland was met with utter disdain. Spottiswoode later logically argued that the

---

<sup>127</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.XI. pp.467-468. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.351.

<sup>128</sup>On the Franciscan mission to the north-west see J.L. Campbell. *The MacNeils of Barra and the Irish Franciscans in IR*. Vol.5. (1954). pp.33-38 and Some notes on the Irish Franciscan Mission to Scotland by the Rev. Cathaldus Giblin in *IR*. Vol.4. (1953). pp.42-48. D.MacLean. *Catholicism in the Highland and Islands, 1560-1680 in IR*. Vol.3. (1952). Anson. *Underground Catholicism in Scotland*. pp.20-25.

<sup>129</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.539.

<sup>130</sup>*CSP*. Venetian. 1617-1619. pp.170-171.

<sup>131</sup>*Ibid*. p.485.



better and wiser sort, who considered the present estate of things, gave a farre other judgement thereof: for as then the King was treating with the French King for peace to the Protestants in France, and with the King of Spain for withdrawing his forces from the Palatinate, at which time it was no way fitting that he should be executing the rigour of his laws against Papists at home, while he did labour for peace to them of the Religion abroad.<sup>132</sup>

If the archbishop held this opinion in 1622, which must be doubted, he was most certainly in a minority. However, Calderwood's allegation that at a convocation of bishops arranged by Spottiswoode at St Andrews on 22 April 1623 it was agreed that "it was not expedient to be rigorous with Papists, during the time the prince was in Spain" does give credence to the archbishop's claim. Nevertheless, even his English counterpart, George Abbot, strenuously attacked the imposed toleration and the Spanish match.<sup>133</sup> By 14 November 1622, King James deemed it necessary to inform the Scottish privy council that he had never countenanced extending the toleration of Roman Catholics to Scotland. Notwithstanding the king's political and dynastic ambitions, and Spottiswoode's attempts to mitigate the fallout from them, the archbishop was nevertheless palpably relieved, as were the rest of the Scottish Protestant establishment and their English counterparts, when the proposed marriage fell through.<sup>134</sup> Nevertheless, the whole episode had badly tarnished the king's standing and reputation as Defender of the Faith amongst many of his Protestant subjects who continued to cast a suspicious eye on his lenient treatment of Roman Catholic recusants through to the end of his reign.

In the final analysis it would have to be concluded that Archbishop Spottiswoode's and the wider church's sustained and determined campaign to extirpate Roman Catholic recusancy in Scotland was only partially successful. Spottiswoode in

---

<sup>132</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.543.

<sup>133</sup>*Ibid.* pp.578-580.

<sup>134</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.544-545. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.580. Row. *Historie*. pp.332-333.

particular had used his not insubstantial ecclesiastical and political influence to make statute measures designed to suppress Catholic non-conformity. That the Church of Scotland very often failed was due in part to the innate conservatism of the Scottish governing elites whose obligations to kith and kin very often transcended loyalty to both the church and state. However, the inconsistency of crown policy, which officially and regularly called for the suppression of Roman Catholic recusancy while tacitly turning a blind eye to seigneurial non-conformity, greatly damaged the credibility and standing of the Scottish episcopate through its close association with the crown. The situation was exacerbated further after 1615 by the king's imposition of liturgical alterations which to presbyterian propagandists signalled the start of the slippery path which would inevitably lead back to Rome.

## ARCHBISHOP SPOTTISWOODE IN ST ANDREWS AND ITS ENVIRONS, 1615-1625.

### CHAPTER SEVEN.

"... as the saving doctrine of Christ is the life of the Church, so discipline is, as it were, its sinews..."<sup>1</sup>

Just as John Spottiswoode's entry into the archbishopric of Glasgow heralded something of an ecclesiological revolution, his translation to St Andrews precipitated no less a seismic upheaval. Spottiswoode, as he had done in Glasgow, arrived in the metropolitan see with a pre-determined set of reforms ready to be set in motion. The reforms in question manifest themselves in a series of ecclesiastical articles which he had penned whilst visiting the king's court in May/June 1615.<sup>2</sup> To be sure, the articles in question were committed to paper in consultation with King James whose mind can be discerned in their detail. These gave ample notice that the constitutional, doctrinal standards and the established forms of worship long adhered to in the Church of Scotland were inexorably on the brink of being re-shaped in an tangibly anglican mould. Spottiswoode made it clear that he was in favour of further constraints on clerical liberty through the abolition of extempore prayer during the Sabbath service. He justified the need for such a stance on the premise that all too often ministers abused this practice and as a consequence "bothe the people ar neglectit, and thair prayeris prove often impertinent."<sup>3</sup> He further demanded that the *Scottish Confession of Faith* be re-drafted in order that it should concur "so neir as can be with the Confessioun of the Englische Church." A solemn form for electing and inducting nominees to the episcopal bench was to be made statute; although expediency dictated that the current vacancy at St Andrews created by the death of George Gladstones should be filled by recourse to the present English practice for translating

---

<sup>1</sup>Calvin. *Institutes*. Vol.II. p.453.

<sup>2</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. pp.445-446.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.* p.445.

bishops.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, a uniform order was to be established for planting ministers. On the discipline front, Spottiswoode articulated his view that "Canonis and Constitiounis must be concludit and set forthe, for keping bothe the Clergie and Kirkis in ordoure."<sup>5</sup> With regards to religious practice, certain undisclosed aspects of the marriage service and the sacraments called for modification. Children were to receive episcopal confirmation. Finally, it is necessary to point out and acknowledge that Spottiswoode regarded the establishment of a general assembly as an essential means of procuring a degree of consensus and legitimisation to his proposed reforms. However, this assembly itself was to be innovative and conform to the "Convocatioun House heir in England": a point seemingly altogether overlooked by both Calderwood and Row when they denigrated the proceedings of the assembly as unconstitutional.<sup>6</sup> While there can be no doubt that Spottiswoode favoured the anglican ecclesiology, subsequent events would suggest that the archbishop's stated objective to have the Church of Scotland conform to the doctrine and practice of its southern neighbour was a mere sop to appease King James.

Among the above reforms, those chiefly concerned with the establishment of good order and uniform discipline within the Church of Scotland were evidently not simply *a priori* constructs designed for the future edification and good government of the church, but as will be shown were drawn up in part to help stifle disorder and suppress presbyterian non-conformity, both active and passive, in the present. In addition, they were intended to counter-act what would appear to have been relatively wide-spread apathy and complacency among the ministry. This chapter aims to assess the extent of this problem and consequently identify Spottiswoode's response to it. Subsequent chapters will look at the archbishop's role in the establishment and imposition of liturgical and constitutional change in the Church of Scotland.

---

<sup>4</sup>The *Forme and Maner of Ordaining Ministers: and Consecrating of Arch-Bishops and Bishops Used in the Church of Scotland* was finally drawn up and published in 1620. See *The Miscellany of the Wodrow Society*. Vol.I. pp.597-615.

<sup>5</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. p.446.

<sup>6</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.222-223, 227. Row. *Historie*. p.306.

One of the principal causes for the archbishop's inability, or failure, to effectively confront and tackle the vexed question of Roman Catholic recusancy within the metropolitan localities of St Andrews "benorth" the Forth had been invariably contingent upon the widespread collapse of church discipline or order. This issue must be addressed here for two crucially important reasons. Firstly, because so much of Spottiswoode's time and energy during his first ten years as metropolitan was devoted to re-establishing, or re-imposing, clerical discipline, and to restoring, or reinvoking, a strong sense of pastoral duty and responsibility among the ministers under his authority. Secondly, it is necessary to disprove the notion articulated by Foster *et al* that there was little sense of discontinuity after the authority and powers accruing to presbyteries were transferred to bishops in 1610. This can only help debunk the myth that the Church of Scotland was at relative peace and was operating smoothly prior to the imposition of the five articles of Perth in 1618. On the contrary, while the imposition of the five articles did antagonise and alienate a significant proportion of the laity, who were as a consequence increasingly hostile to the bishops as the agents of ecclesiastical reform, tellingly these anglicising innovations *only* exacerbated and increased clerical angst and resistance to erastian episcopacy; they were not its fundamental cause.

The anarchic situation which confronted Spottiswoode at his first convention in charge of the diocesan synod of St Andrews north of the river Forth in October 1615 is strongly suggestive that many ministers within the locality were opposed to or sadly disillusioned with the hierarchically re-structured Scottish church. Of course it has to be recognised that the local church had suffered ill-discipline and discord in and around St Andrews prior to the re-establishment of the episcopate.<sup>7</sup> However, it will be demonstrated that this time the root cause of the collapse lay in presbyterian opposition to erastian episcopacy. The alarming discovery that a firm majority of the presbyteries which comprised the synod were guilty of maladministration can only

---

<sup>7</sup>See Graham. *Uses of Godly Discipline*. pp.156-162.

have appalled the new metropolitan. Presbyteries, or exercises as they were now called, were infrequently convened, poorly attended and all too often the exercise or addition and common head - where biblical exposition and doctrinal issues were scrutinised and discussed, were altogether omitted from their proceedings. From the scrutiny of the respective presbytery registers the archbishop promptly discovered that the meetings of the presbytery of St Andrews were "evil kept".<sup>8</sup> Moreover, the brethren that did attend seldom bothered entreating the addition and had altogether failed to entreat the common head for the last two or three years. The presbyteries of both Arbroath and Kirkaldy were likewise irregularly attended, while Dunfermline never convened in winter and only met bi-monthly at other times. Similarly, Forfar met but "ance in ye fifteine dayes."<sup>9</sup> As in the case of St Andrews, Cupar, Kirkaldy, Perth and Mearns received a stinging rebuke for failing to entreat of the common head.

In 1616, the synod found fault with Kirkaldy and Perth twice for omitting the common head.<sup>10</sup> One year later, Cupar, Mearns, Kirkaldy and Perth were again censured for the same oversight; Forfar was admonished to keep the exercise.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, the archbishop, who was absent from proceedings, was to be solicited to obtain two warrants releasing John Carmichael and William Row from their crown imposed parish confinements.<sup>12</sup> Ironically both men were now turning their captivities to their own advantage in resisting overtures from the synod to return and take their place in their respective exercises of St Andrews and Perth. Both these stalwart presbyterians had been signatories of the anti-erastian episcopal *Protestation* of 1606.<sup>13</sup> As previously discussed, Carmichael had incurred the king's wrath for his defiant stance against the crown and bishops at Hampton Court in 1606. While Row

---

<sup>8</sup>CH2/154/1. f.183.

<sup>9</sup>See *ibid.* ff.183-184.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.* ff.194, 201-202.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.* ff.210-211.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.* ff.208, 211.

<sup>13</sup>See Row. *Historie.* p.430.

had been confined within his parish boundaries for his vociferous opposition to constant moderators of synods in 1607. Both these men remained defiant opponents of erastian episcopacy. Although no names were given in the synod entry, as late as October 1623, the son of the former metropolitan, Alexander Gladstanes, the archdean, felt compelled to request a licence from the archbishop commanding recalcitrant presbyterians under restraint to attend both presbytery and synod meetings.<sup>14</sup>

In April 1617 St Andrews was also "gravelie rebuikit" for not keeping presbyterial meetings.<sup>15</sup> By October they had done little to make amends and again were chastised for their meetings were infrequently attended - especially by those resident in the town, and the addition was commonly neglected.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, those at fault were going uncensored. Once more it was revealed that Cupar presbytery often avoided the addition and omitted the common head altogether.<sup>17</sup> In April 1618 it was again reiterated that the brethren of St Andrews presbytery "repair very negligentlie to yair ordinar meittings, the Commoun head seldom entreated, and no disputs at any tym".<sup>18</sup> By October 1619, clearly exasperated, Spottiswoode commanded Alexander Gladstanes, as acting moderator of the presbytery of St Andrews to take the requisite steps to ensure that absentees, particularly on the coast side, received censure. Likewise, frequent absentees from the presbytery of Cupar were to be pursued and upbraided. It was decreed that both Perth and Dundee were to keep order "*omni modo*".<sup>19</sup> A year later the situation was no better within the St Andrews presbytery. However, among the most notorious of the offenders, John Dykes, Andrew Murray, Ephraim Melville and Andrew Auchinleck were to be threatened with suspension from the ministry for their consistent absenteeism and disdainful attitude towards both

---

<sup>14</sup>CH2/154/1. f.259.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.* f.209.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.* f.213.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.* f.214.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.* f.217.

<sup>19</sup>See *ibid.* ff.226-228.

synodal and presbyterial discipline.<sup>20</sup> Cupar and Kirkaldy were again admonished for poor attendance. In April 1622, yet again, St Andrews, Cupar and Kirkaldy were censured on account of their meetings being "very evil kept". John Dykes, Ephraim Melville and Andrew Auchinleck were charged to compear before the high commission on 24 May.<sup>21</sup> Murray, it must be presumed provided the authorities with a legitimate excuse for his absence or either acceptably expressed contrition and gave assurance of conformity. By contrast Dykes, who was widely respected for his acute intellect, had a long pedigree of opposition to the royal supremacy and bishops. He had formerly incurred the king's wrath for his scathing attack on King James's *Basilikon Doron*, had been a signatory of the *Protestation* of 1606 and had refused an honorary doctorate in 1616.<sup>22</sup> While less is known of Ephraim Melville and Andrew Auchinleck, other than the former was minister of Pittenweem and the latter Largo, Melville, as the son of the diarist James, had every reason to be deeply resentful and hostile towards a regime which had persecuted, imprisoned and banished his father and uncle.<sup>23</sup> Although it is not known whether the three men appeared before the high commission, as will be demonstrated below, the commission's enforcement of monetary fines and of placing restrictions on the movement of suspect ministers did next to nothing to dampen the flames of resistance to erastian episcopacy. In October 1622, it was Dunfermline's turn to be heavily criticised for its failure to keep the exercise.<sup>24</sup> By October 1624, it must have come as a refreshing change for the diocesan synod in finding itself forced to impose limitations on those permitted to attend the exercise of St Andrews to only those ministers, elders, students, expectants and other lay members resident within the precinct of the presbytery.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>CH2/154/1. ff.237-238.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.* f.246.

<sup>22</sup>Melville. *Diary*. pp.444, 488. Row. *Historie*. p.430. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.222.

<sup>23</sup>See *FES*. Vol.V. under presbytery of St Andrews.

<sup>24</sup>CH2/154/1. f.251.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.* f.266.



In a church which placed such a high premium on the inerrancy and sufficiency of the Word of God, the failure and neglect of ministers to convene the exercise appeared to set a disturbing precedent. Spottiswoode like many of his contemporary churchmen believed that society was on the verge of catastrophic breakdown due to apostasy and a wilful disregard to follow God's commands as expressed in His Holy Word.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, in an undated sermon on 2 *Thessalonians* composed during this period, he told his congregation that

because of the decaying tym we live in... in place of  
charitie malice abounds, we nourische hatred w[i]t[h]  
dissimilation, and make stryf and contention o[u]r  
glorie.<sup>27</sup>

To remedy the effects of such ungodly attitudes and malignant behaviour, Spottiswoode implored his audience to "emulate ye glorie of ye kirk y[a]t Paul so much commends, studying so to professe and so to practise as yei did..." The conspicuous non-compliance of ministers to convene and resort to the exercise, the fundamental function of which was to safeguard Reformed orthodoxy through the "correct" interpretation and application of Holy Scripture surely provided confirmation that this was indeed a degenerate age. Spottiswoode, commenting on the *Epistle of Jude*, has provided posterity with an invaluable window through which can be viewed the archbishop's perception of early seventeenth-century Scottish society. He wrote that the epistle was

...ane exhortatioun to al ye faythful, to be constant in  
y[ai]r professioun, and to beware of false teachers y[a]t  
wer crept in to seduce yam, qhose doctrin and maners  
wer bothe of yem damnable, and for qhom horrible  
punishments wer prepared. Except they wold incurre ye  
lyk judgements, he tells yem, yai must beware of yair  
course, and not follow it, for qhosoevir takis libertie to  
sinne and commit wickitnes, sal be most certainly  
destroyed. This he prooves from dyverse examples...  
And then he tellis vpon a particular ennumeratioun of  
y[ai]r sinnes; vncleannes, contempt of magistracie,

---

<sup>26</sup>See Graham. *The Uses of Reform*. pp.1-3. Williamson. *Scottish National Consciousness*. pp.1-47.

<sup>27</sup>NLS. Ms.2934. f.23v.

intemperance, crueltie, covetousnes, ambitioun, ryot, vnprofitablenes in y[ai]r places, inconstancie, barrennes in yem selfis, vnstablenes in doctrin, impatience... Q[hai]rvpon follows a most pithy exhortatioun to beware of suche persons, to edifie yem selfis in ye faith, keep yem selfis in ye love of God, and study to recover so far as in yem lyis som meeknes, or oy[e]rs w[i]t[h] a holy serenitie.<sup>28</sup>

Spottiswoode then poignantly added,

I culd not bethink my self of a fitter subiect to read vnto yow. For we live in a tym q[ua]irin al these evils doe abound, wickitnes prevailes every qhair, seducers goe about and ar busy to corrupt the myndes of men, and draw yem away from ye truthe. People ar ready to be corrupted, zea al of ws haif corrupted o[u]r selfis, mispent ye graciouse tym we haif had, by turning the grace of o[u]r God as it is said in yis epistle into lasciviousnes.<sup>29</sup>

In one sense the exercise attempted to provide an antidote or remedy to counter the worst effects of such lasciviousness through the correct exposition of the Truth. Notwithstanding the obvious affront to his archiepiscopal authority, for this reason, Spottiswoode used his synod as a vehicle to re-enforce clerical attendance at exercises. Particular proof pertaining to the invidious effects of such clerical laxity was provided in April 1620 when Spottiswoode and the assembled brethren of the synod received a written complaint and supplication for redress from certain of the parishioners of Kilspindie and Raitt. They both lambasted and lamented

ye gryt lousnes of yeir people and manifold enormities that daylie ar committed because no discipline hes bien vsed nor exercised their thrie zeirs bygane, for punishment of vyce and reformation of maners and the maist part of the elders and deacons refuse to give their concurrence and assistance to that effect.<sup>30</sup>

While a synodal delegation led by John Guthrie, the minister of Perth, worked hard to remedy and reconcile the emergent symptoms of what had originally been an

---

<sup>28</sup>*Ms.2934. f.34.*

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid. f.34.*

<sup>30</sup>*CH2/154/1. See ff.228, 233.*

acrimonious split between the minister of Kilspindie, George Symmer, and his congregation,<sup>31</sup> such ill-discipline was not unique to Kilspindie. Disputes between ministers and patrons and/or parishioners, long-term clerical absence from their parishes, and the pernicious effects of ministers eschewing their duties and responsibilities to farm acquired land adjoining their glebes led to similar problems and were combated by Spottiswoode through his diocesan synod.<sup>32</sup> Before turning the spot-light on the other measures implemented by the archbishop to have the Gospel disseminated throughout his diocese, it is worth hypothesising as to the cause of why so many ministers evaded reverting to the exercise - and more importantly why their actions invariably hampered the imposition of ecclesiastical discipline.

David Calderwood, writing in reply to William Cowper, the Bishop of Galloway's, *Dikaiologie* in 1614, poured scorn on the 1610 ecclesiastical settlement which left presbyteries shorn of authority and unable to take action without episcopal approval. He condemned this fact in his *Confutatioun*. "As for presbyteries", he wrote,

bothe the name is abolished and the power tane away  
be act of Glasgow... and nothing left but a weeklie  
meeting of brethren for exercise in doctrine[,] the  
quhilk wes in our kirk befor the presbiterie with  
iurisdiction therof wes set up and suorne to.  
[H[owbeit such meiting of presbiters remaines[,] the  
questioun is not whether presbiters be abolished but  
whether the government of presbyteries be abolished.<sup>33</sup>

Presbyteries, he added

may meit as yit for exercise in doctrine but that being  
endit sensurid, and the nixt exerciser appointed, the  
present moderatour for doctrine hathe no moe pouer  
except it be a new deputieship and delegat pouer from  
the Bishop. Whatsoever farther is done only be

---

<sup>31</sup>CH2/154/1. f.236. Guthrie, as a loyal supporter of the episcopal regime, was translated to St Giles, Edinburgh, on 15 June 1621. See *FES*. Vol.V. p.233. Although appears to have diffused the acrimony between Symmer and elements of his congregation, the fact that he was moved to Meigle in 1622 might suggest that the rift was never entirely healed. See *FES*. Vol.IV. p.214. Vol.V. p.270.

<sup>32</sup>See CH2/154/1. ff.192, 212, 229, 237, 244, 248, 251-252, 257, 258, 260, 261, 262, 271-273.

<sup>33</sup>NLS. *Wodrow Collection LXXVI, No.2*. The *Confutatioun* of ye *dikaiologie*, 1614. f.44. I wish to thank Dr Vaughn Wells for kindly drawing my attention to this work.

oversicht [and] permissioun till thair be sattled in thair  
possessioun.<sup>34</sup>

Furthermore, in contradiction to Spottiswoode, the presbyterian polemicist attributed "schisme, ignorance, luckwarmness, neutralitie and inclinatioun to poprie", not to a general societal breakdown but to the abandonment of presbyterianism and the re-establishment of episcopacy. Calderwood, it must be said, was no presbyterian maverick, but spoke for a substantial number of disaffected ministers. There is no doubt that many ecclesiastics under Spottiswoode's archiepiscopal jurisdiction shared in his conviction that the presbytery had been merely preserved to provide a conduit through which the bishop could communicate his decrees and impose discipline. As such, *jure divino* presbyterians regarded it as a vestigial church court in its newly constituted form. Clerical absence from such an institution could and likely should be interpreted as demonstrable resistance to episcopal power and authority. In other words, presbyterian withdrawal from the exercise should be understood as a visible form of active protest against the diminution of presbyterial authority. Indeed, the repudiation of the term presbytery for brethren of the exercise from 1610 can only have fuelled clerical apprehension and opposition towards those responsible for the creation and oversight of the new structure. For although the terms presbytery and exercise previously appear to have been used interchangeably, the exercise as an institution preceded the presbytery by some twenty years.<sup>35</sup> Indeed, since its genesis in 1560, the exercise had only met for mutual scriptural and religious instruction.<sup>36</sup> It had no independent jurisdiction and did not possess the ability to impose ecclesiastical discipline. Hence the transference of presbyterial authority to bishops in 1610, coupled to the assembly's omission to address the question of what disciplinary functions were to be retained at the district or presbyterial level, was deeply resented by many. It should surprise no-one that many ministers concluded that the new

---

<sup>34</sup>The Confutatioun of ye dikaiologie. ff.51-52.

<sup>35</sup>See Rev. A. Edgar. *Old Church Life: Lectures on Kirk Sessions and Presbytery Records*. (1885). pp.345-348. Foster. *The Church Before The Covenants*. pp.93-95.

<sup>36</sup>See First Book of Discipline cap.XI. For Preaching and Interpretation of the Scriptures, & c. in Knox. *History*. Vol.II. pp.315-316.

settlement nullified and revoked the ecclesiological wisdom which had long prevailed up to that date, only to replace it with an inferior polity which had no scriptural warrant. Although largely speculative, it is possible that Spottiswoode and like-minded episcopalians were attempting to inculcate the false impression in the minds of religious and lay alike that they were re-forming the church on the model erected by the reformers prior to the erection of presbyteries in 1581. After all, it was ostensibly on this theme that the archbishop strove to refute Calderwood's assertions when he penned and had published his *Refutatio Libelli de Regimine Ecclesiae Scoticae* in 1618.<sup>37</sup> What can be stated with some certainty is that those historians like Donaldson, Foster, Morrill and Mullan who have eloquently argued that the 1610 settlement was equitably concluded and produced a church polity where power was divided between bishop and presbytery have shot far wide of the target.<sup>38</sup>

Further proof that the church had been rent asunder by the imposition of erastian episcopacy was obliquely provided in the conversion of Alexander Henderson to presbyterianism. Henderson, as revealed by Henry Guthry in his *Memoirs*

had been in his youth very Episcopal, in token whereof, being a professor of philosophy in St Andrews, chose archbishop Gladstones for his patron, with a very flattering dedication, for the which he had the kirk of Leuchars given him shortly after.<sup>39</sup>

Henderson's appointment to Leuchars which took place circa 1612, however, initially aroused the bitter indignation and overt opposition of the congregation who regarded the archiepiscopal appointee as an intruder.<sup>40</sup> On the day of his induction Henderson

---

<sup>37</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. pp.29-62. Spottiswoode attempted to prove that bishops in the guise of superintendents had the official and authoritative sanction of the Scottish Reformation church. In contrast, he traced the origins of presbyterian discipline to the return to Scotland of Andrew Melville from Geneva in the mid-1570s.

<sup>38</sup>Donaldson. *James V-James VII*. p.207. Foster. *The Church of Scotland before the Covenants*. pp.31,199. See J.Morrill. Three Stuart Kingdoms in (ed). J.Morrill. *The Illustrated History of Tudor & Stuart Britain*. (1996). pp.81-82. Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. p.119.

<sup>39</sup>H.Guthry. *The Memoirs of Henry Guthry, Late Bishop of Dunkeld*. (2nd ed.1747). p.24. Guthry was minister of Guthrie parish church within the bounds of the presbytery of Arbroath and was therefore a member of the same synod between 1623-1632.

<sup>40</sup>For biographical details see W.M.Campbell. *The Triumph of Presbyterianism*. (1958). pp.37-50. J.Reid. *Memoirs of the Westminster Divines*. (reprint 1982). pp.284-345.

arrived at the church only to discover the doors barred against him. Although the induction went ahead as planned after he and those charged with the service gained admittance through a window, such an ignominious start left an indelible stain on Henderson's conscience: he still felt compelled to openly express contrition for what he confessed was his unlawful intrusion into the charge before the Glasgow Assembly which met some twenty-six years later. Shortly after his arrival at Leuchars, however, Henderson switched allegiance from the episcopal to the presbyterian camp, after hearing the charismatic Robert Bruce preach in the nearby kirk of Forgun.<sup>41</sup> This most likely took place during a celebration of Holy Communion sometime during 1613 when Bruce having positively responded to numerous invitations to preach in Lowland churches, was attacked by the authorities for conducting what can only be described as a preaching tour of the presbyterian citadels.<sup>42</sup> Bruce had taken for his text John X.1: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." Although it cannot be categorically stated that Bruce's sermon wrought a spontaneous transformation on the young minister, it has been noted that from this event Henderson withdrew his presence from the archiepiscopal court and instead formed a close association with the elderly presbyterian minister of Cupar, William Scot.<sup>43</sup>

This incident again would appear to confirm the existence of a presbyterian fifth column at work in the church, especially in its former presbyterian heartlands. Indeed of the forty-two signatories of the 1606 *Protestation* at least twenty were still ministering in Fife, Perth and Angus and the Mearns. The overwhelming majority of

---

<sup>41</sup>See *FES*. Vol.V. The minister of Forgan, which was located within the presbytery of St Andrews, was one Simeon Durie.

<sup>42</sup>See Schmidt. *Holy Fairs*. p.23.

<sup>43</sup>Guthry. *Memoirs*. p.24. Scot had been one of the defiant presbyterian ministers summoned to Hampton Court by the king in 1606. He remained a resolute presbyterian throughout his life. He was the author of two major works which laid claim to the divine and historical highground for presbyterianism. Both compositions denigrated erastian episcopacy and argued it would inevitably lead the church back to Rome. See *The Course of Conformity, as it hath proceeded, is concluded, should be refused*. (Amsterdam, 1622). *An Apologetical narration of the State and Government of the Kirk of Scotland*. Also see Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. pp.141-143.

whom were still defiantly opposed to erastian episcopacy.<sup>44</sup> The fact that Bruce had been invited to preach in Fife during his authorised leave from internal exile in Inverness was itself an act of political defiance. As Schmidt has rightly pointed out, when the opportunity presented itself, Bruce's ministry was commonly peripatetic and frankly subversive. It seems inconceivable that Archbishop Gladstones would have conspired in the matter, or turned a blind eye to the potential fall-out from having such an out-spoken opponent of the episcopal regime in his diocese had he possessed foreknowledge of Bruce's presence. Regardless of the finer details surrounding this event, there can be no doubt that Spottiswoode was faced with significant opposition to his office on his arrival in the metropolitan see. Of course such opposition does not fully account for the collapse of presbyterial discipline. Even the pro-episcopal archdean, Alexander Gladstones, had to be chastised by the archbishop for his procedural complacency. Spottiswoode, in a letter written to John Murray of Lochmaben on 22 December 1615 brushed aside Gladstones' slight that the archbishop had taken a dislike to him and was unjustly persecuting him. Spottiswoode explained that

I know nothing qhairin he can tak that suspicioun,  
except that for sum oversightis commitit in the keeping  
of their exercise of St Andrewis, I found fault with him,  
before the Sinode, because he wes Moderatour of the  
rest, and at that tym namit another for this half yeir.<sup>45</sup>

This privilege was the sole preserve and at the discretion of the archbishop. In consequence, Spottiswoode called the archdean before the bishops of Ross and Caithness and himself where he prevailed upon him to "follow his callinge, and behave him self with greater gravitie unto it, and not a cumpany bearer with common folkis in drinkinge..." Evidently Gladstones transgressions, in Spottiswoode's opinion,

---

<sup>44</sup>See Row. *Historie*. p.430. *FES*. Vols.IV & V. under presbyteries of Perth, St Andrews, Cupar, Dunfermline, Kirkcaldy, Kinross, Meigle, Brechin and Dundee. These were William Erskine, Colin Campbell, William Scot, James Ross, John Gillespie, John Colden, John Row, John Ogilvie, John Scrimgeour, John Malcolm, William Row, Edmond Myles, John Carmichael, John Dykes, William Young, Henry Duncan, Robert Colville, David Barclay, John Weymss and William Cranston.

<sup>45</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. pp.461-462.

surpassed the procedural, but as is clear from the content of his extant sermons, he expected ecclesiastical office holders, above all, to lead holy and thus exemplary lives. Confronted by both overt and covert opposition, as well as a general degradation in clerical discipline, it is now necessary to return to the measures introduced by the archbishop to ameliorate or reverse this tendency and its worst effects on the spiritual lives of ministers and people within the region.

On 3 October 1615 Spottiswoode having consulted "learned brethren" in his synod was determined to "tak order for setting downe ane conformitie of discipline."<sup>46</sup> Moreover, in an effort to ensure that ministers were complying with episcopal injunctions and fulfilling their didactic and pastoral duties, moderators with the assistance of selected ministers were commanded to undertake the visitation of each kirk within the bounds of their respective presbyteries on an annual basis. The following day in response to the disquieting discovery that too many of the clergy were undutifully lax in imparting Christian instruction and knowledge to their parishioners, the synod ordered that all ministers must catechise on a weekly basis. Moreover, all pastors were commanded (ineffectually as shown above) to attend weekly meetings of the presbytery where the exercise, addition and common head would impart and expand upon their knowledge and understanding of the faith.<sup>47</sup> In addition, ministers were urged to engage in more private study. In October following, all presbyteries were told to make a copy and retain for regular consultation the newly drafted *Confession of Faith*.<sup>48</sup> By April 1623 each exercise was commanded

to have sum controversie intreated at least evrie moneth  
once and disputs to be had theirupon, and that such  
brethren as ar aged be disburdened their of, and their  
place supplied be the younger brethren.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup>CH2/154/1. f.180.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.* f.184.

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.* f.206. The new Confession of Faith will be discussed in the next chapter.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.* f.257.



In a similar vein, in October 1620, Spottiswoode instructed Drs Robert Howie and Peter Bruce as well as Alexander Henderson to critically scrutinise the new catechism drawn up by John Hall, Patrick Galloway and John Adamson in order to pave the way for its publication and widespread distribution.<sup>50</sup> Two years later, however, the synod again thought it essential to issue a further injunction to the effect that all ministers "ar appoynted to Catechise sum part of yair flock evrie Saboth day efternoon; and then sum vther day as they may most convenientlie."<sup>51</sup> Crucially, in order to reinforce the paramount importance attached to catechising, in October 1624 the synod decreed that every minister was to inform his parishioners

that nane of na qualitie hierafter salbe admitted to the  
Communion bot such as resort with their hail families to  
the Catechising at the ordinar tyme apoynted  
theirunto.<sup>52</sup>

Although this injunction was no doubt music to the ears of both Roman Catholic and presbyterian non-conformists, it has to be doubted whether the archbishop seriously entertained the notion that such a measure could be enforced on the most powerful in the kingdom without jeopardising the material well-being of the church throughout the localities. It must also be recognised that this injunction had a dual function for it was equally directed against those people who refused to kneel to receive the communion elements. Since the function of the catechism was to impart or indoctrinate both young and old in the basics of orthodox Reformed Christianity, it is no wonder that Spottiswoode, and many others besides him, feared that the breakdown in such approaches and mechanisms was opening the door to apostasy and the church's Roman adversaries.

The importance attached to study and the teaching of the Scriptures pervaded Spottiswoode's extant sermons. He attributed particular prominence to this theme

---

<sup>50</sup>CH2/154/1. f.238. The choice of such individuals whose sympathies lay with presbyterianism was clearly designed to demonstrate and underline the Reformed orthodoxy of the *Confession*. Moreover, Spottiswoode probably hoped to ameliorate or win round opposition to the new order.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.* f.252.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.* f.268.

while preaching on Psalm 86:11; "Teache me thy way o lord, I wil walk in thy truth, unite my heart to fear yi name." While articulating the biblical role of the ministry, the archbishop told a no doubt attentive congregation that "[w]e ar callit to be teachers, and wil we doe o[u]r office wel, we must be learners stil." However, Spottiswoode was sorely critical of the then current clerical state of affairs where it was

ye fault of many, after yai ar receavit once to teache a flock, yai haif no more care to be taught y[e]m selfis: sum out of a conceat, that yai ar furnischit sufficiently, and need not to mak any furder provisioun; others, as so taken up w[i]t[h] ye caus of ye world, yai can find no tym for learning, and yai ar, that never think of y[ai]r charge...<sup>53</sup>

The archbishop scathingly denounced the apparent inability of many ministers to preach a sermon of their own composition, which he felt had the detrimental effect of making "preaching to be despysit". This in turn only alienated intelligent lay-folk who found better ways of occupying their time during the hours of divine service. Spottiswoode reminded his audience that "yair can be no good teaching, q[hai]r yair is no learning". Turning his attention to the laity, the archbishop reproached those who believed that it was enough that they knew and could recite the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, regularly attended worship and partook in the celebration of holy communion. They he argued "deceave yem selfis". Spottiswoode concluded his sermon by drawing those there present's attention to the point that "qhen we hear suche a saint of gods as David was praying to be taught, let us al acknowledge o[u]r ignorance, and confesse we haif need to be instructit".<sup>54</sup>

In keeping with this theme of Spottiswoode's and his diocesan synod's attempts to regulate the various activities, functions and duties of those charged with the dissemination of the Gospel, in April 1624 all readers within the diocese were called to convene the following October to "receave directions and iniunctions anent their

---

<sup>53</sup>*Ms. 2934*. See sermon on Psalm 86:11.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*

office, and be subject to tryell anent their lyf and conversation".<sup>55</sup> The upshot of the October meeting was the issuing of a directive to the effect that

ordinar readers in al Congregations salbe tyed to read in  
the publict audience of the people only such prayers  
[that] ar printed in the comoun psalme buik and ordainit  
be the Kirk of Scotland to be red publictlie.<sup>56</sup>

However, possibly the most significant reform during these years took place in the study of divinity at St Andrews university.

In an attempt to ensure that clerics and lay alike were suitably possessed of religious instruction and Reformed doctrine, and were acceptably conformist to the present regime, greater care was taken to administer and regulate the study of divinity in Scotland's prime seat of learning. On 10 June 1616, King James, writing from Greenwich, notified Spottiswoode, in his capacity as chancellor of the University of St Andrews, along with the rector and professors of his desire to introduce major reforms within the university for "the advauncemente of Learning, and care of the benefite of that Place, as the Principall fountayne of Religione and good Letters in that Our native Kingdome".<sup>57</sup> Evidently the re-emergence of St Andrews as the ecclesiastical capital of the kingdom provided an added incentive to ensuring that the university procured a reputation for excellence. Details of the proposed reforms the king had entrusted to his chaplain, Dr John Young, the dean of Winchester and son of his former tutor and confidante Peter Young, who had been commissioned to convey them to all concerned and oversee their implementation. Although James was not averse to plying the art of dissimulation, his claim that the reforms were his considered response to being "crediblie enformed of divers thingis requiring Reformatioun, and divers good Orders requisite to be established among you" rings true. As highlighted previously, Archbishop Spottiswoode had advocated educational

---

<sup>55</sup>CH2/154/1. f.264.

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid.* f.271.

<sup>57</sup>OLEAS. Vol.II. pp.805-806.

reform to the king as a necessary means of countering and neutralising the hold of presbyterian ecclesiology in the hearts and minds of future generations of prospective ministers. Similarly, his predecessor in St Andrews held identical views. Indeed Gladstones had been intent on remodelling the university on the templates provided by both Oxford and Cambridge after a commission of visitation headed by the future English metropolitan, George Abbot, had recommended such a re-structuring in 1608.<sup>58</sup> However, it is worth conjecturing that more pressing matters, like the reclamation of ecclesiastical authority by the episcopate, was given precedence and therefore the reform was postponed to an undetermined future date.

The articles, which numbered thirteen in total, were obviously devised with the clear intention of undermining and supplanting the presbyterian ethos meticulously planted and nurtured by Andrew Melville between 1578 and 1606. Indeed as a lord of the articles, it must be presumed that Spottiswoode was instrumental in making statute the "Act in favoures of ye Vniversitie Off Sanctandros" which revoked Melville's New Foundation of 1579 in the parliament of 1621.<sup>59</sup> Through the rhetoric of improving educational standards, the articles provide demonstrable proof of the crown's determination not only to consolidate and strengthen the grip of erastian episcopacy on Scotland, but would suggest that the university was regarded as a test-bed by the crown for additional innovations to be foisted on the Church of Scotland. Among the most noteworthy of the articles, King James first offered the carrot of re-ratifying and reinforcing all grants and privileges enacted by his royal predecessors prior to the Reformation. This was directly followed by an injunction commanding the reinstatement of the pre-Reformation practice of conferring degrees "upon learned men in all artes and sciences, but speciallie on such as studie in Divinitie."<sup>60</sup> Importantly, no-one was to be accorded the degree of bachelor or doctor without having sufficiently demonstrated a proficiency to preach in Latin as well as English. Of

---

<sup>58</sup>See R.G.Cant. *The University of St Andrews: A Short History*. (1970). p.59.

<sup>59</sup>APS. Vol.IV. p.682.

<sup>60</sup>See OLEAS. Vol.II. pp.807-809.

particular interest, article four stipulated that the Archbishop of St Andrews was to appoint all divinity graduates to preach in St Giles or the Chapel Royal within the capital before an audience made up of Scotland's social and political dignitaries within a year of graduating. Such appointees were to be attired

in a hoode agreing to their degree, so that they may be knowen to be men fitte for the prime places of the Churche; for it is Our speciall pleasour that hereafter none be preferred to eminent places in the Churche but such as passe their degrees in the Universitie, are Batchellour in Divinitie at the leaste; and that none be admitted to the sacred order of Bischopes but such as shalbe first Doctors.<sup>61</sup>

It could hardly be construed as straining the imagination to suggest that this injunction was principally devised in order to refute and dispel any lingering or residual affection and commitment to presbyterian principles. For it effectively drove home the fact that the Church of Scotland was now firmly founded upon meritocratic and hierarchical precepts. Only the most educationally talented *and* conformist individuals who caught the archbishop's and the establishment's eye and ear would be promoted to authoritative and prestigious charges and positions within the church. Of course, such a system precluded many of the most able and gifted intellects in the church who read of no scriptural sanction for such a polity and practice.

The ceremonial forms and rituals adhered to and performed in both Oxford and Cambridge were to be adopted in conferring degrees. On 29 July, Young duly conferred doctorates upon Robert Howie, rector of the university, Peter Bruce, the dean of faculty, David Barclay, professor of divinity and minister of St Andrews, James Blair, professor of divinity, James Martin, principal of St Salvator's College, Patrick Melville professor of Hebrew, John Strang, minister of Errol and soon afterwards principal at the College of Glasgow, Henry Philip, minister at Arbroath, and Theodore Hay, minister of Peebles and archdean of Glasgow.<sup>62</sup> Calderwood has

---

<sup>61</sup>OLEAS. Vol.II. p.807.

<sup>62</sup>See OLEAS. Vol.II. p.490. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.222. Cant, *The University of St*

it that the committed presbyterian divines John Carmichael, David Mearns and John Dykes each spurned the offer of a doctorate. It is also worth noting that the archbishop's younger brother James, who had accompanied Young to St Andrews to carry out the king's commission, also had the degree of doctor bestowed upon him after publishing his thesis *Concio J.Spottiswodii... quam habuit ad Clerum Andreanopoli... pro gradu Doctoratus*.<sup>63</sup>

Presaging one of the infamous five articles of Perth, other anglicising impositions included the solemn keeping of the key pre-Reformation Christian festivals of Easter, Christmas, Ascension-day and Whitsunday: the masters and students of the New College being required to preach thereupon from the relevant scriptural texts.<sup>64</sup> Although the keeping of such holy days was not unknown in the Reformed tradition as they were legitimated in the *Second Helvetic Confession* composed by Heinrich Bullinger in 1561, the Church of Scotland had from its inception rejected and proscribed their observance.<sup>65</sup> In true Constantinian fashion the king and royal family were to be prominently venerated centre-stage, not simply in the reverential remembrance of 5 November where "a Latine oratione *in laudem Regis*, with solemne thanksgiving for all hys deliveries at other tymes, the fyft of August then especiallie...", but importantly the same prayers and recitations were to be repeated daily "in all the Colledges throughout the Kingdome whiche are used in the Churche of Englande, together with the same Confessione in the beginning of prayer..."<sup>66</sup> Less controversial was James's pledge to see through to fruition, with all possible haste, the former archbishop of St Andrews' laudable effort at ensuring that the university was furnished with a library consistent with its status as Scotland's prime seat of learning. Indeed, it must have given Spottiswoode great satisfaction to witness its completion

---

*Andrews*. p.61.

<sup>63</sup>See *Breefe Memoriall*. p.4. *DNB*. Vol.XVIII. p.818.

<sup>64</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. p.808.

<sup>65</sup>*Knox. History*. Vol.II. pp.

<sup>66</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. p.808.

during 1618, although the library remained inadequately stocked prior to the generous endowment of Alexander Henderson after the Second Reformation of 1638/1639 and the re-establishment of presbyterianism.<sup>67</sup> Finally, in order to confirm and underpin the New College's elevated estate, and to ensure it received a continuous compliment of divinity students, each diocese was to raise the requisite expenditure required to finance and maintain a minimum of two students throughout the course of their degrees. Spottiswoode, as moderator, presumably steered this last injunction through the general assembly which met some two months later. The statute further stipulated that at least half of those selected from the dioceses should be "sonnes of poor ministers, and be presented be the Bischops of the diocies to the place."<sup>68</sup> The cynically minded might very well conclude that this was also a calculated act designed to provide the episcopate with additional leverage over ministers within their dioceses. After all, only the most doctrinaire of ministers would have risked sacrificing their heirs' future prospects in the interests of upholding prebyterian doctrinal purity. However, no matter what King James's ultimate intentions were, as stated, Spottiswoode's genuine wish to raise, or re-establish, the optimum standards of doctrinal knowledge and pastoral care would suggest that such Machiavellian machinations should be largely discounted.

Cant's assertion that Spottiswoode was less directly interested in the university than Gladstones, appears on the face of it correct. This he infers was due to Spottiswoode's increasing embroilment in the growing tensions within both church and state.<sup>69</sup> Although there is undoubtedly a kernel of truth in his claim, it is nevertheless a caricature of the truth. While Spottiswoode had no scholarly pretensions towards the contemplative and cloistered atmosphere of the university, it must be concluded that he was a more effective overseer than his archiepiscopal predecessor. Spottiswoode was a talented administrator who possessed more political acumen and authority than

---

<sup>67</sup> Cant. *The University of St Andrews*. p.60.

<sup>68</sup> BUK. p.596.

<sup>69</sup> Cant. *The University of St Andrews*. pp.59-61.

Gladstones. Moreover, he certainly appears to have had a fuller grasp of the need to create a more accountable, structured and properly financed divinity faculty. Cant's claim that internal opposition and widespread resentment at external interference, coupled with a distinctive dearth in productive theological scholarship compared with Aberdeen is strongly indicative of Spottiswoode's and his accomplices' failure to achieve their stated objectives seems to miss the principal point. For as will be shown in the following chapter, the archbishop's aspirations for the church did not completely match the anglicising ones of his monarch or for that matter the ceremonially and liturgically minded ones of the Aberdeen doctors. The archbishop's ultimate failure lay in his naive belief that it was possible for the Scottish church to square its commitment to Reformed orthodoxy with the anglicising and later arminian pretensions of the royal circle. Ironically, it was not the failure of Spottiswoode's religious or educational objectives which facilitated, or at least contributed to, the Second Reformation, but their success in churning out ministers imbued with Reformed ideals which made resistance to arminian and liturgical innovations almost inevitable.

In April 1616, Spottiswoode having delegated the power of visitation to the moderators of presbyteries, instructed those charged with visitations to record "ye estate of ye manse gleib privilegis and moyen of ye kirkis" among their other findings in a small register.<sup>70</sup> The main rationale behind this action was revealed in October of the same year when the archbishop implemented the general assembly's earlier injunction relating to the provision of divinity students for the New College by commanding that all the kirks within his jurisdictional territory were to be stented and ministers were to subscribe to this new foundation. This was to

containe all clauses needfull for further caus of so good  
ane work and sp[eci]ally yat ye pr[esen]tatione of the

---

<sup>70</sup>CH2/154/1. f.193.



students foursaid belong to ye archbishop and his  
successours in ye synode.<sup>71</sup>

The following April, in Spottiswoode's absence, the synod forwarded a formal request to the archbishop asking him to use his influence to see that the measure was made statute in the forthcoming parliament.<sup>72</sup> In order to allay any fears that the revenue raised was being misappropriated for other purposes, in April 1618 Spottiswoode deemed it necessary to introduce accountability. Those entrusted with the education and care of the bursars were ordered to provide the respective moderators of the exercises within the diocesan synod with a "perfytt accompt" of their undertakings and expenditures by October next.<sup>73</sup> Moreover, in April of the following year, a motion set forward in the privy conference, which met to scrutinise and determine the synod's business agenda, that presbyteries should be accorded the privilege of presenting bursars for the New College was positively received. Moderators and their associated brethren were appointed to "advyse in their several bounds how the sam may be done maist solidlie and profitablie."<sup>74</sup> However, notwithstanding the underwritten legal safeguards and the archbishop's and his synod's attempts to demonstrate that the assessment raised was being wisely spent, many ministers initially either procrastinated or altogether refused to pay their part towards the contribution to the scheme. Although it cannot be discounted that those who did not pay failed due to pecuniary problems, nevertheless, there is a definite correlation between those cited in the synod register for non-payment and those absentees from synod, and presumably presbytery meetings. Hence there is a strong likelihood that those who withheld payment did so for they were unprepared to contribute to a scheme which was devised and administered by the crown and archbishop.

In October 1619, John Caldercleuch, the acting moderator of the exercise of Cupar, was instructed to exact payment from Adam Mitchell, the minister of Moonzie, under

---

<sup>71</sup>CH2/154/1. f.205.

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.* f.208.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.* f.219.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.* f.225.

pain of suspension from the ministry. In the event of Mitchell's refusal, his kirk session was to be pressed for remuneration of the sum. Likewise, in the presbytery of Kirkaldy, John Chalmers, James Wilson, John Gillespie, John Tullis and Andrew Lawmouth had all failed to meet their pecuniary obligations. Nevertheless, the moderator, John Mitchelson, reported to the synod that Lawmouth had already consented to pay and that Archbishop Spottiswoode had travelled and met with John Gillespie (the father of George and Patrick) and John Tullis, soliciting a promise that they would stump up their due. Unnamed members of the exercise of Dunfermline, along with John Ross, James Ross and George Pittillock of the presbytery of Meigle were similarly admonished to make swift reparation.<sup>75</sup>

At the same October meeting, Spottiswoode and the assembled clerics, after taking into account the relative wealth of the presbyteries which comprised the synod, declared that the diocese of St Andrews north of the Forth "sal furnish and pay zeir lie for six bursars in theologie".<sup>76</sup> The presbyteries within the region of Fife were to finance three students, while the exercises within Angus, the Mearns and Perth would pay for the remaining three. Thus on the equitable basis of ability to pay, a directive was issued to the effect that the presbytery of St Andrews would support one bursar, as would Cupar, while Kirkaldy and Dunfermline between them would pay for the third. Outside Fife, Perth and Dundee would fund one divinity student, Arbroath another, and Forfar, Brechin and Meigle the other. Each bursar was to receive forty merks per quarter for their board.

Spottiswoode and his colleagues also sought to eliminate, or at least alleviate, the wealth differentials between presbyteries by introducing subsidies into the scheme, whereby St Andrews and the Mearns subsidised Forfar to the tune of £7 and £5 respectively. Meanwhile the exercise of Kirkaldy was instructed to contribute £14 to

---

<sup>75</sup>CH2/154/1. ff.227-228.

<sup>76</sup>*Ibid.* f.229

Cupar to "mak our fourscoir lib. for ilk bursor."<sup>77</sup> Although the archbishop reinstated the pre-1610 right of presbyteries to choose and present candidates to the New College, archiepiscopal authority was upheld by the added caveat that the metropolitan could intervene and replace any student he deemed "vnfit for ye place aither for vncapablenes to learn theologie, for dumbnes of ingyne, not studying or evil maners".<sup>78</sup> The archbishop also possessed the right to intervene where a selected bursar's presentation to the New College was contested, as he was forced to do in October 1624 when James Smith's candidature was opposed.<sup>79</sup> Notwithstanding Spottiswoode's and his diocesan synod's labours to devise a just and acceptable settlement, many ministers continued to withhold payment. In April 1622 it was reported that the contribution was "slowlie payed by al, and for ye most pairt neglected."<sup>80</sup> Consequently, Spottiswoode was left with little option but to threaten all those negligent of non-payment with suspension from the ministry. However, his apparent unwillingness, or tendency to indulgence, prevented him carrying through the threatened suspensions thereby compelling him to repeat this warning in both April 1623 and 1624.<sup>81</sup> While such parsimonious defiance must have been a bureaucratic and financial irritant, it did not prevent the diocesan synod from meeting its stated obligation of funding six bursars annually.<sup>82</sup> Henceforth all existing ministers were to be forced to sign a written pledge committing themselves to payment, while an expectant's admittance to the ministry was to be made contingent on his signed promise to undertake regular and prompt payment of his portion towards the contribution.<sup>83</sup>

As the sun receded on the Jacobean age, it seems retrospectively appropriate that in October 1624 Spottiswoode with "vniforme consent of the brethren assemblit" should

---

<sup>77</sup>CH2/154/1. f.229.

<sup>78</sup>*Ibid.* f.230.

<sup>79</sup>*Ibid.* f.270.

<sup>80</sup>*Ibid.* f.248.

<sup>81</sup>*Ibid.* ff.256, 263.

<sup>82</sup>See *ibid.* ff.258, 260-261, 270-271.

<sup>83</sup>*Ibid.* f.263.

have set down a minimum standard of educational attainment for admittance to the ministry. Although the archbishop had authorised Drs. Peter Bruce, Robert Howie and George Martin to draw up the formula, it must be presumed that he directed, oversaw and thoroughly examined the work before giving it archiepiscopal assent.<sup>84</sup> An expectant presented to a presbytery for examination was required to produce a written testimonial to the effect that he was

ane man of blameles lyf and conversation... hes passed his cours in philosophie in such ane vniversitie, and since that tym he hes bien exercised in sum honest calling or studie, aither in ye vniversitie or in sum vther privat place quhair he hes behaved and caryed himself wiell.<sup>85</sup>

Moreover, he had to have attained the age of twenty-five years. Having met these statutory stipulations, the expectant was next required to demonstrate his mastery of the biblical languages; Greek and Hebrew. After sufficient proof of his erudition or at least competency in the original scriptural writings, the expectant proceeded to "be examined vpon the grounds of Religion". Revealingly it was declared that expectants who had not studied at and graduated from the New College

sal at least be astricted to ansueir, according to the doctrine set doun be Calvin in his Institutes, [a]nd by Beza in his questions and Confession, except he be verssed also in vther learned wrieters and be abl be his awin industrie and prudence to mak chois of the best and soundest ansueirs to the purpose.<sup>86</sup>

Although Spottiswoode had long abandoned Calvinist ecclesiology - that is if he had ever been fully committed to it prior to the institution of erastian episcopacy - in broad terms he was nevertheless dedicated to Calvinist theology. Herein lies a paradox, since the works of both Calvin and Beza were in essence hostile to erastian

---

<sup>84</sup>CH2/154/1. f.264.

<sup>85</sup>See *ibid.* ff.269-270.

<sup>86</sup>*Ibid.* f.269.

episcopacy and the compromise between Rome and the Reformed churches of the Swiss Confederacy that manifest itself in anglicanism.<sup>87</sup>

The prospective minister had then to articulate the fundamental differences between Protestantism, especially the Reformed version, and the church of Rome. It was regarded as imperative that all clergymen be attired with the full armour of God to withstand and deflect the counter-Reformation assault previously described. The formula insisted that expectants should be at least cognisant with "the grounds set down be Kemnitius in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini* in so far as he agrees with our *Confession of Faith*..."<sup>88</sup> Where Martin Chemnitz's, the Lutheran polemicist's, *magnus opus* was at odds with Reformed orthodoxy the expectant was to identify the controverted point and enunciate the contrary Reformed doctrinal position.<sup>89</sup> The expectant would then proceed to make a sermon or lesson in private upon a passage of Scripture presented to him in both English and Latin, before advancing onto the public exercise. Finally, he would be tried by the archbishop and the divinity faculty within the University of St Andrews before being admitted to the office of the ministry.

The above reforms appear to have been generally well received, because they were acceptable to presbyterians and episcopalians in equal measure. By contrast, the enforcement of clerical discipline was handicapped by the obvious opposition of doctrinaire presbyterians, whose estrangement was exacerbated by the imposition of the articles ratified at Perth. Moreover, the sheer logistical difficulties which confronted the archbishop in the administration of an archdiocese which stretched from Angus in the north to the border with England, coupled to the operational ineffectiveness of the diocesan synod which met only twice annually made

---

<sup>87</sup>See P.White. *The via media in the early Stuart Church* in (ed). K.Fincham. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. (1993). pp.211-230.

<sup>88</sup>CH2/154/1. f.269.

<sup>89</sup>See B.M.G.Reardon. *Religious Thought In The Reformation*. pp.323-324. for details of Chemnitz and his work.

Spottiswoode's task a monumental one. On the subject of the synod, in light of the above disciplinary difficulties, it is necessary to establish the extent of the archbishop's authority in that particular church court.

The diocesan synod of St Andrews north of the River Forth convened in St Andrews in early April and October on an annual basis - its sister synod south of the river met approximately one month later in the capital. As the title provides ample verification, the diocesan synod was the archbishop's principal church court and Spottiswoode presided over its proceedings. He opened each assembly with a sermon; convened the privy conference to scrutinise and arrange the synod's business agenda; appointed ministers to critically probe respective presbytery registers; passed judgement or issued injunctions having listened to the collective advice of the synod; nominated moderators of presbyteries; and appointed a deputy to preside in his stead when unable to attend the synod in person. Foster, in his apparent eagerness to demonstrate continuity with past presbyterian practice, has quite incredulously underplayed the archbishop's power in or over the synod.<sup>90</sup> Indeed, he ignores the diocesan appellation given to the synod in the register by continuing to refer to the synod as the synod of Fife. While he does acknowledge the archbishop's dominant position within the court as well as conceding the revealing point that neither archbishops nor bishops were subject to the discipline of either synod or general assembly, he incredibly notes that he found no evidence in support of Calderwood's claim that the archbishop enjoyed untrammelled power in his diocesan synod. However, Foster's conclusions fly in the face of the evidence. Both Calderwood and Hume of Godscroft recognised, and led scathing literary attacks on the authority of bishops in their diocesan synods.<sup>91</sup> Writing in 1614, Calderwood accurately noted that the

---

<sup>90</sup>See Foster. *The Church Before The Covenants*. pp.114-117.

<sup>91</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.75, 129-139.

Bishop then [as] moderator of his diocesan assemblie is nothing els but visitor of his presbiters at the diocesan assemblie. The rest of the assembly ar not lyk senatoris and fellow judges with him but only informers for tryall of others and reddy to be tryid them selves.<sup>92</sup>

Furthermore, Foster overlooks the obvious point that even in the archbishop's absence the synod could not implement directives nor impose discipline without firstly obtaining archiepiscopal consent.

Although Foster similarly concluded that the number of absentees, which averaged twenty-one between 1617 and 1620, was not altogether insignificant,<sup>93</sup> he failed to appreciate that many of these absentee ministers were staunch presbyterians who made a regular habit of evading meetings of the synod. Thus amongst the most regular and notorious offenders were William Scot, John Carmichael, John Scrimgeour, Adam Walker, John Wood, John Ross, George Haitlie, James Ross, John Chalmers, Richard Wright, Alexander Youngson, James Ross of Forteviot, John Dykes, John Row, James Bennet and Alexander Simson most of whom can be shown to have been critics of the new ecclesiology.<sup>94</sup> Is it not likely that they shared with Calderwood the view that it was detrimental to the interests of "true" Christianity to attend a synod ruled by an anti-Christian bishop?<sup>95</sup>

While the problem posed to Spottiswoode by synodal absenteeism should not be over-exaggerated, it does nevertheless tend to support, or help substantiate, the contention that there was within the diocese a recalcitrant presbyterian minority actively opposed to episcopacy. Moreover, absenteeism *per se* made the

---

<sup>92</sup>Calderwood, *Confutatioun*. ff.45-46.

<sup>93</sup>Foster. *The Church Before The Covenants*. p.116. See CH2/154/1. From the synod minutes those recorded as absent without a legitimate excuse between October 1615 and October 1624 were as follows: in 1615 - only 2 names recorded; April 1616, 12 plus all the ministers of the presbyteries of Meigal and Forfar, excepting 2, who had got the date of the meeting wrong. Oct.1616; none recorded. Apr.1617; 21. Oct.1617; 25. Apr.1618; 22. Oct.1618; no meeting noted. Apr.1619; 17. Oct.1619; 18. Apr.1620; 17. Oct.1620; 30. Apr.1621; 10. Oct.1621; no meeting noted. Apr.1622; 18. Oct.1622; 33. Apr.1623; 11. Oct.1623; absenteeism not mentioned in register - Spottiswoode absent. Apr.1624; 10. Oct.1624; 12.

<sup>94</sup>*Ibid*, see ff.s above.

<sup>95</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.132.

implementation of discipline problematic. In April 1618 Spottiswoode re-imposed an earlier archiepiscopal decree to the effect that future unexcused absentees from the synod would be fined "ten pounds".<sup>96</sup> Nevertheless, as shown, the injunction failed to deter non-attenders and had to be repeated in October 1620 when "for better keeping of the meetings at Synods and ordinar exercises in al tymes hereafter..." it was ordained that a copy of the act of 1611 be made and presented to the moderator of each presbytery.<sup>97</sup> However, moderators had to be pressed to levy fines against absentees in October 1622, which would once again suggests that monetary fines were far from efficacious.<sup>98</sup> Notwithstanding archiepiscopal visitations, which were largely confined to the warmer months of the year, Spottiswoode regularly kept in touch with ministers in his jurisdiction via a steady stream of correspondence with the presbyteries throughout his archdiocese.<sup>99</sup> In this manner the archbishop was kept aware of developments in the localities, could issue commands and offer advice, and arrange convenient dates for giving collations, confirmations and such like. Before moving on to address Spottiswoode's involvement in the controversial alterations to the forms of worship long adhered to in Scotland, it is finally necessary to focus attention on the archbishop's efforts at ensuring that both the archdiocese and the ministers in his jurisdiction were adequately provided for.

While Foster was correct in his assertion that the church's endeavour to secure adequate financial and proprietorial provision for her ministry was increasingly propitious throughout the Jacobean episcopate, Archbishop Spottiswoode was far from pleased with its progress. Spottiswoode was and remained a vociferous opponent of the dilapidation of benefices and a passionate advocate in favour of the

---

<sup>96</sup>*CH2/154/1*. f.219.

<sup>97</sup>*Ibid.* ff.238-239. For earlier injunction see f.62.

<sup>98</sup>*Ibid.* f.252.

<sup>99</sup>See for example SRO. *CH2/185/3*. Presbytery of Haddington, 1613-1627. During 1617 letters sent/received on 21 May, 11 June, 18 August, 19 October. 1618; 11 Feb, 29 March, 15 June. 1621; 3 January, 5 September, 11 September. 1622; 3 April. 1624; 24 January. *CH2/242/1*. Presbytery of Linlithgow, 1610-1617. 1615; 5 October, 11 October, 15 November. 1616; 24 July. 1617; 30 July, 27 August. *CH2/242/2*. 1621; 24 June, 12 September. Central Region Archives. *CH2/722/4*. Presbytery of Stirling, 1612-1617. 1616; 3 January, 3 July, 10 July, 24 July.



restitution of the church's pre-Reformation patrimony. As shown, he had been personally successful at Glasgow in re-establishing the archbishopric on a secure financial footing. Moreover, his influence in the creation and administration of a commission to modify clerical stipends and plant vacant churches which was reconstituted in 1617 was quite transparent; as was his fortuitous advocacy of the need to re-allocate funding to cathedral chapters which received the requisite statutory backing in May 1617.<sup>100</sup>

In 1616, Spottiswoode had published at the press of Andrew Hart, Sir Henry Spelman's *De non temerandis ecclesiis, or the Rights and Respects due to Churches, written to a gentleman, who having an appropriate parsonage, employed the Church to profane uses, and left the parishoners uncertainly provided of Divine service in a parish there adjoining*.<sup>101</sup> In this short treatise Spelman had forcefully and provocatively sought to show how the divine institution of tithes had preceded the Law and therefore remained in force throughout Christendom. They had been from time immemorial hallmarked for the exclusive remuneration of the church's office-bearers. Secular acquisition of tithes was an abomination in the Englishman's opinion and could only incur Godly retribution. Although this work was no doubt important in its own right, it is more significant that the archbishop wrote the preface accompanying the Scottish edition which Spottiswoode had printed without the author's knowledge.<sup>102</sup>

Spottiswoode explained that by publishing the work he hoped to encourage its author to proffer an extended edition. Although his principal reason for doing so was to prick the consciences of churchmen and those lay holders of former ecclesiastical patrimony, thus bringing the issue into the public domain. "Who seeth not th' estate

---

<sup>100</sup>See *APS*. Vol.IV. pp.529-530,531,534.

<sup>101</sup>See J.Cooper, Archbishop Spottiswoode 1565-1639, in *Transactions of the Glasgow Archaeological Society*. (1924, Series 7). pp.91-92.

<sup>102</sup>*Ibid*. The preface is printed in full pp.94-96.

of the Church of Scotland, as concerning the Patrimonie, that it goe daylie from worse to worse?" he wrote. The archbishop condemned the clerical abuse of church property and revenue: the

selling and making-away of the Church Rights, without conscience: the buying and bartering of Benefices, with your shamelesse and slavish courting of corrupt patrons, hath made the worlde think, that things Ecclesiasticall, are of the nature of Temporal things, which may be done away at your pleasures.<sup>103</sup>

He further told his readers that there

is no impietie against which it is more requisite you set your selves in this time: for besides the abounding of this sinne, and the judgement of God upon the Land, for the same: who doeth not fore-see in the continuance of this course the assured ruine and decaye of true religion?... Of all Persecutions intended against the Church the Julian was ever helde to be the most dangerous: for, *occidere Presbyteros*, is nothing so hurtfull, as *occidere Presbyterium*: when men are taken away, there is yet hope that others will be raised up in their places: but if the meanes of maintenance bee taken away, then followeth the decay of the Profession it selfe...<sup>104</sup>

Moreover, in Spottiswoode's view to "rest upon the benevolence of people, as it is a beggarlie thing, and not beseeming the dignitie of the Ministrie". As experience had shown, to rely on the generosity of lay patrons was to undermine the authority and well-being of the church. Therefore he posed the following rhetorical question to his fellow-clergymen

[s]houlde any looke carefullie to the Vine-yard, than the keepers? Repent, therefore, and amende your owne negligence in this behalfe, and call upon all others for amendment...<sup>105</sup>

In addition to the above general plea for the retention and extension of the Church of Scotland's patrimony, Spottiswoode commonly exploited his archiepiscopal authority

---

<sup>103</sup>Cooper. *Archbishop Spottiswoode*. p.94.

<sup>104</sup>*Ibid*. p.95.

<sup>105</sup>*Ibid*. p.96.

to procure adequate provision for individual charges within his province. Furthermore, in exercising personal lordship and giving his consent to grants of land and property in his jurisdiction, or where his influence held sway, Spottiswoode consistently made the issue of adequate provision for parish ministers a central concern.<sup>106</sup>

In a revealing letter, which echoed the sentiment expressed in the above preface, written to lord Dundas on 10 May 1616, the archbishop made the collation of one James Ross to the charge of Livingstone conditional on the noble patron's increasing the stipend of 300 merks which he declared was "too mean to intertain a minister".<sup>107</sup> Spottiswoode reminded Dundas of his duty as a responsible patron to provide sufficient provision for his local kirk. Referring in the abstract to patrons, he explained to his lordship how

[i]n the beginning thai wer chusit to defend the right of churchis, and had y[ai]rfor the nominatioun gifin yem of the intrant, but otherwyse, and al is now abusit. If zow sal for y[ou]r part sal gif otheris of yat kynd ane example to amend, zow sal haif ye blessing of god vpon zo[u]r house and substance... And in ye day of y[ou]r last account sal find more joy in yis one thing, than the qhole world culd oy[er]wyse afforde.<sup>108</sup>

In a similar vein Spottiswoode commonly utilised his diocesan synod to press the rights and needs of the church and her office-bearers throughout the locality.<sup>109</sup>

Keeping on this theme of clerical provision and property, possibly the most impressive, certainly the most revealing acquisition Archbishop Spottiswoode made during his early years as metropolitan was the purchase of the estate and parish church of Dairsie which were held in the name of his eldest son John.<sup>110</sup> As Ash has

---

<sup>106</sup>For example see *Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum*. 1609-1620. Nos. 1512, 1524, 1883, 1434, 1632, 1761, 1823, 1838.

<sup>107</sup>NLS. *ADV/MSS 80.1.1*. f.82.

<sup>108</sup>*Ibid.* f.82.

<sup>109</sup>*CH2/154/1*. ff.203,208,227,251,262.

<sup>110</sup>The estate was purchased from John Lermouth of Balcomie in April 1616, while the parish church with the parsonage, vicarage, manse and glebe included in the grant, was acquired from the

rightly argued the acquisition of Dairsie meant more than simply a desire on behalf of Spottiswoode to extend his personal and familial patrimony and wealth. For Dairsie stood at the heart of the pre-Reformation archiepiscopal patrimony, and its reclamation signalled Spottiswoode's determination to win back for the archiepiscopal see its ancient wealth and privileges, thus re-establishing its position at the centre of the ecclesiastical, political and social life of the nation. As a visible sign of Spottiswoode's status within the locality, the archbishop directed his resources towards the restoration and refurbishment of the newly acquired archiepiscopal castle at Dairsie. The building was also expanded by the addition of two circular towers at the south-east and north-west corners of the property.<sup>111</sup> Bearing in mind his incessant advocacy in favour of pecuniary and proprietorial resources for the church, it was particularly appropriate that the archbishop should have financed the building of a new parish church at Dairsie in 1621. Ash has noted that the new church was probably erected on the site of the original one. The church was built on a rectangular design and was seventy-seven and a half feet long by thirty-three feet wide. If Ash is correct, Spottiswoode is to be given credit for the architectural design and refurbishment of both the exterior and interior of the building. Spottiswoode's taste could only be described as eclectic. The church was constructed in the popular Gothic style with additional features like the doorway at the east end showing distinctively Scottish Renaissance influence. It has been suggested that some of the main features incorporated into the building, like the burial crypt situated at the east end, plus the buttresses and elaborately carved windows were directly copied from Glasgow and from Spottiswoode's previous parish kirk of Mid-Calder.<sup>112</sup> Moreover,

---

duke of Lennox during 1619 - although the transaction only passed the Great Seal in June 1624. See *Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum*, 1609-1620. pp.522-523, entry 1432. *Ibid*, 1620-1633. p.53, entry 163. *Protocol Book of John Hay, Vol.V. f.187*. M.Ash, Dairsie and Archbishop Spottiswoode in *RSCHS*. Vol,XIX. (1976). pp.125-133.

<sup>111</sup>Ash. *Archbishop Spottiswoode*. p.129.

<sup>112</sup>*Ibid*. pp.129-130. See also G.Hay. *Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches*. (1957). pp.43-45.

Spottiswoode's close identification with King James was reflected in the "great east door", the blueprint for which came from the doorway of the Chapel Royal at Stirling Castle erected under the auspices of the king in 1594 for Prince Henry's baptism. Set above the main entrance to the church were Spottiswoode's initials and family coat of arms with the inscription "*Dilexi Decorum Domus Tuae*". Next to these remain two small holes which in all likelihood accommodated two crossed crosier staffs to ostensibly designate the church's principal use as the archbishop's residential place of worship.

Ash has questioned Hay's proposition that Dairsie was erected as a model for others to follow, arguing, by contrast, that Dairsie was a private, almost an introverted kirk.<sup>113</sup> However, this building was not a private chapel dedicated for the sole use of the archbishop but a public place of worship. While Spottiswoode likely used the small church for private prayer and meditation, and no doubt would have conducted public worship on occasions, John Rutherford was and remained parish minister. This is evident from the archbishop's consent to renewing an excambion made between Rutherford and the previous laird of two and a half acres of land in the vicinity of the manse in April 1623.<sup>114</sup> Before leaving the subject of the church at Dairsie, it is worth briefly commenting on the interior of the building. Since the date of the church's construction is inscribed above the entrance as 1621 there can be no question as to when Dairsie parish kirk was built. However, since the only extant description of the interior of the building has been gleaned from the iconoclastic proceedings of the synod of Fife during the early 1640s, it cannot be determined whether or not the various kneeling desks, crosses, the armorial bearings of Scotland and England and the partition wall described as "superstitious monuments" by the archbishop's covenanting detractors were part of the original fabric of the church or were later

---

<sup>113</sup>Ash. *Archbishop Spottiswoode*. p.131. Hay. *Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches*. p.44.

<sup>114</sup>CH2/154/1. f.257.

Caroline additions.<sup>115</sup> Given that the church was erected in the same year in which the divisive five articles of Perth received parliamentary approval there is a strong possibility that the refurbishments were also Jacobean. What needs to be said, however, is that such ecclesiastical accoutrements were installed to bear witness to the ecclesiological and liturgical transformation wrought on the Scottish Jacobean church. This would appear to confirm the position taken by Hay that the interior of Dairsie was designed on an anglican and erastian template to provide an example for others to follow.

Just how much it cost Spottiswoode to finance the building and restoration work undertaken at Dairsie at his instigation is unknown. However it is highly suggestive that his plea to the king's Scottish secretary, John Murray of Lochmaben, in a letter dated 9 January 1621, was at least partially successful. Spottiswoode lamentably informed Murray that

the burthenis that ly vpon me... render my service the less profitable, and force me to live at home, and more obscure, except qhair necessitie preasis me to attend.<sup>116</sup>

The archbishop described how he had "spared no expense" in the king's service, having made forty-one trips to court alone. He deprecatingly, if somewhat disingenuously, continued

I left Glasgow, and took my self to a gritter charge, with less provisioun, only, as God is my witness, to advance the busines, qhich men, thocht more able then my self, wold not be so willing vnto...<sup>117</sup>

Spottiswoode explained that his money problems had deteriorated further by a sharp fall in the price of corn, which had reduced his income by half from the previous year. "[B]eyond my annuellis, litle remayns to my self, and in qhat case I suld leave my

---

<sup>115</sup>Ash. *Archbishop Spottiswoode*. pp.131-132. Cited from Selection from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife. (Abbotsford Club, 1837). Hay. *Architecture of the Scottish Post-Reformed Churches*. p.45.

<sup>116</sup>OLEAS. Vol.II. p.644.

<sup>117</sup>*Ibid.* p.644.

children, if God suld visit me, he knowe." It seems certain that the archbishop's impecunious condition was mitigated slightly by his rather surreptitious, if profitable, appointment as collector of the tax conceded to the crown by parliament in January 1621.<sup>118</sup> Nevertheless, the harvest failure and resultant famine which blighted Scotland in the first half of the 1620s must have put a further strain on the archiepiscopal coffers in the remaining years of King James's reign.

To be sure the archbishop felt justified in decrying the dilapidation of the archiepiscopal benefice at St Andrews which to some extent had continued unabated under his predecessor. However, as previously stated, the real difficulty lay with an insolvent king who never quite managed to resolve the problem of rewarding lay loyalty and service to the crown out of former ecclesiastical property with his aspirations for the Scottish church. Moreover, Spottiswoode's crusade to set the church on secure financial and proprietorial footing made him enemies, or at least stoked fires of resentment, among those noblemen who had profited most from the exercise in ecclesiastical asset stripping which the post-Reformation church had yet to arrest. The archbishop and his fellow clerics were not alone in voicing concern over the resources at the church's disposal. Lord Binning told the king in no uncertain fashion in a letter dated 3 March 1617 that the nobility's avaricious and insatiable hunger for land and riches had "almost overthrown both the Churche and Crowne."<sup>119</sup> Of course, as Spottiswoode was only too well aware, the reclamation of former church patrimony was often a lengthy and legally complex affair. On 20 December 1616 a delegation of the privy council enlightened the king as to the difficulties they had encountered in their attempt to meet the royal command in favour of the Archbishop of St Andrews "anent the restoring and repossessing of him to that assignatioun of victuall, quhilk is disponit furth of the thridds of his benefice, to the

---

<sup>118</sup>See *OLEAS*. Vol.II. pp.649, 655. The issues of the parliament of 1621 and its granting of a tax for the military reclamation of the Palatinate will be addressed later.

<sup>119</sup>*Melrose Papers*. Vol.II. p.274.

castell of Edinburgh..."<sup>120</sup> The assignation, which had been given parliamentary sanction in 1606, lay in the possession of the earl of Mar, as keeper of the castle. Mar, who was to be compensated out of the royal rents, not surprisingly proved reluctant to be dispossessed of a "constant and sure rent, vnder pretext of that whilk wilbe vncertaine, and to dispone the same to the said archiebishop". Moreover, he deferred yielding by successfully arguing that it would take the authority of a parliament to nullify or alter the previous grant of 1606. In consequence, Spottiswoode was awarded a small additional pension which he forewent in May of the same year when parliament rubber stamped the transfer in the archbishop's favour.<sup>121</sup> The same parliament also united the provostry of Kirkleuch into the archiepiscopal patrimony with specific exceptions.<sup>122</sup> Spottiswoode, it would seem, with his more formidable political and administrative stature, triumphantly wrung concessions and grants out of King James where his metropolitan predecessor, Gladstones, had dismally failed. However, Spottiswoode's policy established a trend, which appears to have gathered pace in the Caroline era, and placed himself and his fellow bishops on a collision course with powerful lay vested interests reluctant to forego lands and rents at the expense of an ever more powerful church.

---

<sup>120</sup>*Melrose Papers*. Vol.I. p.269.

<sup>121</sup>*APS*. Vol.IV. pp.551-552.

<sup>122</sup>*Ibid.* p.634.



## ARCHBISHOP SPOTTISWOODE AND THE FIVE ARTICLES OF PERTH. PART I.

### CHAPTER EIGHT.

"...som care to be great, oy[e]rs to be riche, oy[e]rs to be learned, few care to be holy. Zit it is holines y[a]t makis us Christians."<sup>1</sup>

Archbishop Spottiswoode's first ten years in the metropolitan hot-seat in St Andrews were marked by profound changes in the nature of Reformed worship and practice in Scotland. Since these innovations have been well documented and commented upon<sup>2</sup> - especially the so-named *Five Articles of Perth*, this chapter aims to focus predominantly on Spottiswoode's attitude towards the innovations and his role in their evolution and implementation within the church. Moreover, in light of these marked changes, it is also necessary to analyse Spottiswoode's theological convictions or predilections. Did he wish to procure the importation of anglicanism to Scotland *en masse*? Was he merely a royal lackey, carrying out crown policy without scruple? In truth, neither of these questions can be answered in the affirmative. Therefore, the *raison d'etre* behind Spottiswoode's support for the confessional and liturgical upgrades, and more controversially for the king's five articles must be sought. The final chapter will assess the archbishop's reaction to the growing tide of non-conformity resultant largely from the unpalatable crown inspired diktats.

As shown, John Spottiswoode was the key Scottish driving force behind the instigation of measures designed to consolidate as well as advance episcopal power both within and outwith the Church of Scotland. Moreover, integral to these aims went the driving conviction that little could be achieved without re-enforcing ecclesiastical discipline, doctrine and practice uniformly throughout the kingdom. It

---

<sup>1</sup>NLS. Ms. 2934. f.36v. From Spottiswoode's exposition of Jude 3-4.

<sup>2</sup>See I.B.Cowan. *The Five Articles of Perth*, in (ed) D.Shaw. *Reformation and Revolution*. (1967). pp.160-177. G.Donaldson. *The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637*. (1954). pp.27-40. W.D.Maxwell. *A History of Worship in the Scottish Church*. (1955). pp.43-77. Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. pp.151-162. G.W.Sprott. *Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI*. (1871). pp.ix-xxxvii.

was in light of these objectives that the compilation and distribution of the new *Liturgy* and *Confession of Faith* need to be considered. Although King James and not Spottiswoode was the principal figure behind these initiatives, the archbishop was, nevertheless, fully supportive of the liturgical and confessional revisions. However, it needs to be stressed that the underlying reasons behind Spottiswoode's support and promotion of the new *Liturgy* and *Confession* differed significantly in one particular aspect from those of his sovereign. It is quite clear that James was intent on fostering or procuring greater uniformity not simply within the Scottish church but between the churches of England and Scotland.<sup>3</sup> Spottiswoode, on the contrary, only fully concurred with the king in his former ambition. Indeed, it is likely that the archbishop took charge of both directives in order to pre-empt or forestall further, more obvious, anglicising impositions.

Turning firstly to the *Liturgy*, as noted in the previous chapter, Spottiswoode was highly critical and bewailed what he perceived to be widespread clerical abuse of extempore prayer. Additionally, it was shown how Spottiswoode genuinely believed that deteriorating intellectual standards amongst the ministry, coupled to the church's widespread negligence in fulfilling its didactic responsibilities were having a seriously detrimental effect on the peoples' perception of divine service. The revised *Liturgy* would help, to some extent at least, in ameliorating and reversing this trend. At the Aberdeen assembly which met in August 1616 it was decreed that

ane uniforme order of Liturgie or Divine Service be sett  
doun to be read in all Kirks on the ordinarie dayes of  
prayer, and every Sabbath day before the sermone, to  
the end the common people may be acquainted  
therewith, and by custome may learn to serve God  
rightlie.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>See Lee Jnr. *Great Britain's Soloman*. pp.179-182. C.Russell. *The Problem of Multiple Kingdoms c.1580-1630 in The Causes of the English Civil War*. (1990). pp.46-51.

<sup>4</sup>*BUK*. pp.595-596. See also Spottiswoode. *History*. p.528. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.229. Row. *Historie*. p.306.

The task of revising the *Book of Common Prayer* was given to Patrick Galloway, Peter Hewat, John Adamson and William Erskine. The choice of these men, who were not supporters of erastian episcopacy, would suggest that there was indeed ample support throughout the church for upgrading the *Liturgy*.<sup>5</sup> Calderwood noted that Spottiswoode made the further stipulation that the finished draft was to be submitted to a commission established to meet in Edinburgh on 1 December. Although this commission was principally set up to investigate the widespread dilapidation of benefices and address the perennial issue of ministerial stipends, it is important to note that it was also ordained to inspect the Canon Law compiled by James Law, the Archbishop of Glasgow and William Struthers, who had been given the remit of systematising the Acts of past general assemblies as part of the ongoing process of centralisation.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, the commission which comprised the episcopate and other prominent clerics was to have scrutinised the revised form of service with a view to granting consent for its publication. However, it would appear that the dispute with King James over the unconstitutional inclusion of his five articles intervened and forced the postponement of the commission. In light of the existence of a further two draft revisions which the late Professor Donaldson attributed to 1616-1617, it would seem that the assembly's commissioned version, which carried the appellation of Hewat's draft, never received the consent of the church or crown.<sup>7</sup> The contentious imposition of the infamous five articles deferred further discussion or work on the service book until the following reign.

On the question of the up-dated *Confession of Faith*, as early as July 1612, Sir Alexander Hay informed the king that on his arrival in Scotland he had delivered a new draft version of the *Confession* to Spottiswoode and Gladstones as directed,

---

<sup>5</sup>See Spratt. *Scottish Liturgies*. pp.xxi-xxii. In Peterkin's version of the *BUK*, Peter Elliot is named instead of Peter Hewat. This is likely due to an error either in the original register or in the printing of this edition for Hewat's name is appended to the draft version printed by Spratt.

<sup>6</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VIII. p.111. Spratt. *Scottish Liturgies*. pp.xviii, xx. *BUK*. pp.596, 598.

<sup>7</sup>See G.Donaldson. A Scottish Liturgy of the reign of James VI in *Scottish History Society, Miscellany X*. (1965). pp.90-91. This form of service carries the name of William Cowper, Bishop of Galloway, pp.92-117. The other two liturgies are included in Spratt, *Scottish Liturgies*.

"whereanent they ar to wryte, and send vp there owne opinionis."<sup>8</sup> Although the author of the document was not disclosed, it has to be presumed that it was compiled in England under King James's auspices. Hay, however, was forced to concede that both archbishops had been unimpressed by the document, for on "leiving the divines to there owne functioun, I wes the more vnable to yeild thame satisfioun in there doubttes..." The king's emissary failed to elaborate further on what point/s or head/s the archbishops had objected to, or expressed grave misgivings over. Nevertheless, it is worth speculating that it was as a consequence of the archbishops' disapproval that John Hall and John Adamson were commissioned to draw up another revision in 1612. Hall and Adamson were widely connected and respected divines in Scotland,<sup>9</sup> and their appointment to this task was likely calculated to win widespread backing and approval both within and outwith the church. The new *Confession* was presented to the general assembly in August 1616, where William Cowper, the Bishop of Galloway, Dr John Howie, George Hay, Patrick Forbes, the laird of Corse and soon to be Bishop of Aberdeen,<sup>10</sup> and William Struthers were appointed to peruse the document before its publication and distribution.<sup>11</sup>

The new *Confession* was more unequivocally Calvinistic than its predecessors of 1560 and 1581 - if the doctrine of double predestination is to be taken as the determining characteristic. However, in equal measure, it also sought to endorse or enshrine the anti-Calvinistic doctrine of erastianism as a principal component of the church's creed.<sup>12</sup> It stated that

---

<sup>8</sup>*Letters and State Papers*. p.213. The compiler of these papers wrongly attributed this letter to July 1613. However, with its explicit reference to the forthcoming parliament's obligation to raise the necessary revenue to help with the costs of lady Elizabeth's marriage, the letter was more likely written on 4 July 1612. See *APS*. Vol.IV. p.475.

<sup>9</sup>See (ed) Sprott. *Scottish Liturgies*. pp.xxi-xxii.

<sup>10</sup>Spottiswoode was instrumental in persuading Forbes to accept the offer of the bishopric in the early months of 1618. Forbes was consecrated by Spottiswoode in St Andrews in May of that same year. See *OLEAS*. Vol.II. pp.542-556. See also *Collections upon the Life of Patrick Forbes, Baron of Oreil and Laird of Corse, Minister of Keith and Bishop of Aberdeen in Wodrow Biographical Collections: Divines of the North-East*. (New Spalding Club, 1890). pp.245-269.

<sup>11</sup>Sprott. *Scottish Liturgies*. p.xix. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.226.

<sup>12</sup>The complete *Confession* is given in Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.233-242. In particular, see its unequivocal endorsement of double predestination pp.233-234. On the issue of erastianism see

God has ordained kings, princes, and magistrates, for the good of the commonwealth, for the better governing in the kirk, and to be nursefathers of the samine. And, therefore, all their subjects are bound in duetie to obey them in all things they command lawfullie, not repugnant to the will of God...<sup>13</sup>

The final head claimed that the Church of Scotland was "one of the most pure kirks under heaven this day, both in respect of trueth in doctrine, and puritie of worshipe". Calderwood spoke for many when he sourly noted that this last clause was added to "approve all the corruptions alreadie brought into our kirk".<sup>14</sup> However, the new *Confession of Faith* was not commissioned merely to provide concrete legitimisation to the structural alterations which were already a palpable reality in the church, but strongly hinted that other fundamental reforms were to follow at the instigation of the church's "nursefather". Profound changes, indeed, already had been introduced which had had a transformative effect on the nature of Reformed worship in Scotland. Moreover, it is important to recognise that the king probably viewed the *Confession* as a mechanism designed to draw the churches of the British Isles closer together. Thus like the new Scot's *Confession*, the *Irish Articles* of 1615 were unequivocally predestinarian and incorporated the English *Lambeth Articles* of 1596.<sup>15</sup> William Scot, the minister of Cupar, was quite certain that the new *Confession* was

devised of purpose to thrust out the former Confession, subscribed and sworne by persons of all Estates, and binding them to maintaine the established Discipline, and to detest and renounce all traditions, and ceremonies devised by Antichrist for wanting the warrant of the Word.<sup>16</sup>

---

W.Cunningham. *Historical Theology: A review of the principal doctrinal discussions in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age*. 2 vols. (First published Edinburgh, 1882. 1991 reprint). Vol.II. pp.557-582.

<sup>13</sup>Calderwood. *History*. p.241.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.* p.226.

<sup>15</sup>Lee Jnr. *Great Britain's Solomon*. p.182.

<sup>16</sup>Scot. *Apologetical Narration*. p.245.

On the question of the church, Archbishop Spottiswoode personally believed that "a kirk may be corrupted with errors, zea even with Idolatry and yit be truly accounted God's kirk."<sup>17</sup> Crucially, he contended that

q[hai]rsoevir ye foundatioun is kept, the word of God truly preached, and ye sacraments of Chryst truly administered, for errors or corruptions, no man may separat himself from ye kirk q[hai]rin God hathe cast him.<sup>18</sup>

In Spottiswoode's mind there could be no question that the Church of Scotland was a true and pure member of the Universal Church. He further explained that from its very origins

[i]t did ever professe one and rissen Chryst. [A]t ye first more purely, afterwards more corruptly, and now by the mercy of God it professis the sam Chryst more purely again. [F]or as ye new dressing and weeding of a garden is not a new planting, and as ye repairing of ye decayis of a temple, is not the building of anoy[e]r temple, so in o[u]r kirk superstitioun is cast out, and the abhominations of poperie reiectit, the puritie of God's service restorit according to God's own word and so by ye mercy of God we continue ye sam kirk, but purged and reformed, y[a]t we wer at ye first.<sup>19</sup>

The archbishop rejected the popular notion of a particular covenanted or chosen church or nation. On the contrary, he argued that the Scottish church was part of the Catholic or Universal Church militant. Therefore,

so the kirk of God, howsoever it be scatterit in place, and in knowledge one of anoy[e]r, as in France y[ai]r is a kirk, and in Poland a kirk, and in Germany a kirk, a kirk in England, and another heer w[i]t[h] vs, yet al mak but one militant kirk vpon ye earth... for yei meet al in ye root Chryst...<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>NLS. Ms. 2934. f. 12. See Spottiswoode's sermon on Isaiah 5:2.

<sup>18</sup>Ms. 2934. f. 12.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid. f. 12.

<sup>20</sup>Ms. 2934. f. 12.

Thus, Spottiswoode's perception of the Church Universal, was the orthodox position adopted by Luther, Calvin and the Reformed Church in general.<sup>21</sup> The Catholic Church, he told his flock,

is a company of men gatherit together, not by secturn or chance, not by human reason or policie, not zit by any worthines of o[u]r own, but by the meere mercy and goodnes of God, calling and sanctifying, and preserving yem throw Jesus Chryst vnto everlasting lyf... y[a]t ye members of yis kirk, ar no wickit nor prophane persons, but sik as God hathe called effectually... for howsoever thair be in the Catholick Churche two sorts of people, som y[a]t profit Chryst and believe in him vnsayandly, oy[e]rs y[a]t mak a schow of faith, and keep a formal profession only. The Catholick Churche is made up only of ye former, and not of ye latter sort.<sup>22</sup>

That Spottiswoode placed such a heavy emphasis on the apostolic doctrine of the true Catholic Church helps in part to explain his bitter antipathy towards his Roman Catholic adversaries. It has been alleged, however, that there was a growing emphasis among pro-presbyterian divines to follow the Federal Theology first enunciated in Scotland by Robert Rollock *circa* 1596, which laid great stress on the covenanted nation.<sup>23</sup> This would suggest that not only ecclesiology divided episcopalians and presbyterians during the first three decades of the early seventeenth century. However, since the archbishop was himself a great admirer of Rollock's works, such a development should not be exaggerated during the Jacobean period when the

---

<sup>21</sup>See Reardon. *Religious Thought in the Reformation*. pp.71-76, 102-103, 153-155, 196-198.

<sup>22</sup>*Ms. 2934*. f.36v.

<sup>23</sup>This issue is discussed at length in J.B.Torrance. *The Covenant Concept in Scottish Theology and Politics and its Legacy*. In *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Vol.34. (1981). pp.225-243. *Covenant or Contract? A study of the theological background of worship in seventeenth-century Scotland*. In *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Vol.23. (1970). pp.51-76. J.Ford. *The Lawful Bonds of Scottish Society: The Five Articles of Perth, The Negative Confession and the National Covenant*. In *The Historical Journal*. Vol.37. (1994). pp.45-64. A.H.Williamson. *Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI*. (1979). pp.64-85. It is also clear from Spottiswoode published sermon to the Perth assembly (see below) that he admired at least one of the Heidelberg theologians, Girolamo Zanchius, who was credited with developing federal theology. See R.T.Kendall. *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*. (1979). pp.38-39.

hierarchy was universally composed of divines whose theology was decidedly Calvinistic.<sup>24</sup>

On the perennially thorny question of church/state relations, and the power and role of the magistrate in the church, Spottiswoode's view remained consistent. Indeed, in one respect, it was more in line with the position adopted by Calvin than the resistance theory developed in Scotland by Knox and Buchanan.<sup>25</sup> While preaching on Isaiah 5:1-8, the archbishop likened the vineyard not to the nation of Israel but to the Church. "[S]ince the kirk is called the lord's vineyard, God must be ye lord and owner of it."<sup>26</sup> Considering the accusations made against Spottiswoode and his fellow episcopalians by stalwart presbyterians that in accepting the royal supremacy they had directly contravened the Word of God, it was no coincidence that the archbishop should indirectly counter this charge in his sermons. He reminded his hearers that the "lord forbids, said Naboth to Achab, that I sel out vnto thee my vinyard, the inheritance of my father."<sup>27</sup> Spottiswoode similarly did not view the acceptance of religious innovations as a mere capitulation to the power of the state. Indeed, by adroitly fixing his congregation's mind on the prophet Nathan's astute and tactful censuring of King David in *2 Samuel 12*, the archbishop highlighted the Church's role in chastising and rebuking wayward kings. Nevertheless, Spottiswoode decried papists, anabaptists and all others who refused to recognise the lawful authority of the magistracy, whose power was ordained of God.

---

<sup>24</sup>See D.G.Mullan. *Theology in the Church of Scotland 1618-c.1640: A Calvinist Consensus?* in *Sixteenth Century Journal*. Vol.XXVI. No.3. (1995).

<sup>25</sup>See Calvin. *Institutes*. Vol.II. chapter xx - Of civil government. See Calvin's exposition of Romans 13 in *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans and Thessalonians*. (ed) D.W.Torrance and T.F.Torrance. (1960). pp.280-288. On the one hand Calvin rejected rebellion and resistance to constituted authority in these works. However, he was absolutely committed to the two kingdoms theory and therefore was a firm opponent of erastianism. See also A.H.Williamson. *Scottish National Consciousness*. pp.8-9, 107-116. R.A.Mason. George Buchanan, James VI and the presbyterians in R.A.Mason (ed). *Scots and Britons*. pp.112-137.

<sup>26</sup>NLS. Ms.2934. See sermon on Isaiah 5:1-8.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*



Returning to the religious alterations, Spottiswoode was part of the privy council which judged it necessary to reinforce the parliamentary enactment of October 1612, by decreeing that "the eating of flesh during Lent, and upoun Wednisdayis, Fridayis, and Setterdayis, hes bene prohibit and dischargit..."<sup>28</sup> On 8 March the following year the archbishop was again present when the council found it requisite to issue a further proclamation

for the stricter keeping of the season of Lent with re-specification of the [financial] penalties for non-observance by eating or selling meat during the forbidden tyme.<sup>29</sup>

Notwithstanding the dispensations granted on specious health grounds to John Scot of Scotstarvit and William Drummond of Hawthornden that they could eat meat throughout the Lenten season of March 1615,<sup>30</sup> the repeated need for such state injunctions would suggest that many flouted the law in this particular matter.<sup>31</sup> Of course, this cannot be construed as revelatory, for such a development - no matter the economic expediencies calculated to justify such legislation, must have been adjudged retrogressive to many Scots. Deeply embedded memories of brutal repression such as the episode graphically retold in John Knox's *History*, of the Protestant martyrs executed at Perth in 1544 under the command of the infamous Cardinal Beaton for consuming a goose upon a Friday were ingrained in the Scottish Protestant psyche. Moreover, in a church which prided itself on its Calvinist orthodoxy, such a measure must have been viewed with consternation as a repudiation of established dogma. Calvin after all had been in no doubt that the observance of Lent was a "gross delusion".<sup>32</sup> While little ink has been expended over the principal cause of or reaction to the prohibition during Lent, when taken in conjunction with the reimposition of a universally held Communion service at Easter, the above development is of major

---

<sup>28</sup>*RSPC*. Vol.X. p.12.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.* p.218.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.* p.831.

<sup>31</sup>See *RSPC*. Vol.XI. pp.26-27.

<sup>32</sup>Calvin. *Institutes*. Vol.II. pp.465-466.

significance. On 3 March 1614 the privy council made statute that "upon a motion made be the Archbishop of Glasgow, who pretended to have his Majesties warrand for that effect," Holy Communion was to be celebrated throughout the kingdom on 24 April.<sup>33</sup> Legal proceedings were threatened against all absenters. Further proof that Spottiswoode was the key clerical figure charged with the implementation of ecclesiastical policy is again provided in the fact that his was the only episcopal presence in the council on 21 March 1615 which decisively decreed that

communiounis salbe celebrat throughoute the hail  
kirkis of this Kingdome upoun ane day yeirlie, to witt,  
Pasche day, reserving alwayes to the faderis and  
ministeris of the Kirk the pouer and freedome of  
appointing of suche otheris dayis for ministratioun of  
ther communioun as they in thair wisdome fra tyme to  
tyme shall think meete.<sup>34</sup>

Although the prohibition on eating meat during Lent appears to have been widely flouted, and the injunction on the celebration of Holy Communion at Easter aroused the ire of dogmatic presbyterians, King James's insistence on further radical alterations simply fanned the flames of resistance still further.

Returning to the deliberations and conclusions of the Aberdeen assembly, these were conveyed to the king on behalf of the church by the Archbishop of Glasgow and the Bishop of Ross. While the king expressed his general approval of the resultant legislation, he strongly objected to the Act anent the confirmation of children. He dismissed it as a "meer hotch potch" and insisted his own re-draft along with another four articles were surreptitiously added to the canons of the church.<sup>35</sup> James fully concurred in the stipulation that children had to be able to rehearse the Lord's Prayer, the Apostle's Creed, the Ten Commandments, and answer questions on the small catechism in order to be eligible for confirmation. However, he was adamant that this task should be conferred solely upon bishops. The remaining four articles prescribed

---

<sup>33</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.I. p.325.

<sup>34</sup>*RSPC*. Vol.X. pp.316-317.

<sup>35</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.528.

that the Communion elements were to be received kneeling instead of sitting which had been the method practised in Scotland since the inception of the Reformed church. Communion, moreover, was to be administered to the sick and dying in their homes. Similarly, the sacrament of Baptism was to be administered privately at the request of parents. Lastly, the holy days of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension and Pentecost were to be commemorated annually.<sup>36</sup>

In response to the king's rather unpolitic and absolutist styled prompting of the episcopate to forego constitutional niceties in the interests of the crown, Spottiswoode replied on behalf of the church. He explained in a reverential but frank and equally insistent manner that the articles could not be simply inserted among the canons of the church without its general approval.<sup>37</sup> Importantly, the archbishop sincerely believed that those who held authoritative positions in the church “must labo[u]r to haif ye consent of thair brethren, altho in gifts and place yei be thair inferiours”.<sup>38</sup> This emphasis on consensus and consent helps in part to explain Spottiswoode's unwillingness to covertly introduce religious reforms simply at the king's bidding. The metropolitan persuasively advised James to implement a moratorium on this matter until his forthcoming return visit to his native kingdom which he had planned for the following summer.<sup>39</sup> In all likelihood, Spottiswoode's political instincts would have told him that a period of time was necessary to gauge the mood of the church before implementing further changes. The intervening months would also provide the requisite opportunity to canvass support and win round doubters by the common application of both carrot and stick. Furthermore, he no doubt calculated that opposition was less likely to be outrightly vociferous or scathing

---

<sup>36</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.529.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.* p.529.

<sup>38</sup>NLS. *Ms. 2934*. f.21r. From exposition on 2 Thessalonians 1:1-2.

<sup>39</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.529. Calderwood noted that rumours to the effect that the king intended to visit Scotland in the summer of 1617 were first heard shortly after the return of the chancellor, secretary and Archbishop Spottiswoode from court in late April 1616. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.211.

in the king's actual presence. Shortly afterwards, the king wrote to his Scottish privy council giving them assurance of his resolve to revisit Scotland.

In this letter, which has been erroneously dated to June 1617, James sought to dispel rumours that his visit signalled his intention of instituting major alterations in both the ecclesiastical and civil spheres. On the contrary, his desire, he informed his councillors, was born out a "Salmon-like instinct" to return to the country of his birth. He insisted that he would confine himself to settling particularly acrimonious and complicated disputes and ending any abuses he might discover. Nevertheless, he was prepared to concede that

[a]s for making anie alterations or reformatiōns in the state of that government, eyther ecclesiasticall or civile, it is trew wee wilbe glad that by our presence as manie thingis tending to good as may be, may have their setting in the time of our being there...<sup>40</sup>

Although the king's own reasons were purposefully clouded in ambiguity, the extant evidence leaves little room for debate as to the true motivation behind his return to Scotland at this time. King James, no doubt conscious of the fact that his Stewart predecessors had not been renowned for their longevity, and increasingly aware of his own mortality in the wake of Prince Henry's death, Queen Anne's and his own deteriorating health, was determined both to secure his dynastic inheritance for his son and to see through to fulfilment the realisation of his vision for a solitary British state. This is not to argue that the regal union was seriously under threat from either country, but to suggest that the crown's desire of fostering greater political, religious, economic, legal and cultural assimilation through time had largely failed to materialise. Hence, the king was determined to accelerate or re-awaken interest in the process. Thus, in addition to channelling his energy into the creation of a particularly British ecclesiology, it is also very noticeable that the drive to re-establish the cross-border commission on the Borders, to reinvest authority in Scottish Justices of

---

<sup>40</sup>*Letters and State Papers*. pp.302-303.

the Peace, and the appointment of prominent Englishmen to the Scottish privy council, emanated directly from the king.<sup>41</sup> Widespread awareness of James's true intentions amongst both governments probably accounts for the major reason why his planned visit was so generally met with disapproval.<sup>42</sup> Indeed, writing to Sir Dudley Carelton on 17 March 1617, John Chamberlain informed his fellow English privy councillor that "I never knew a journey so generally disliked both here and there".<sup>43</sup> Further antipathy towards the proposed visit clearly manifest itself in the meeting of the Scottish Convention of Estates during March 1617. The estates had been called to give their assent to the raising of a tax to help finance the king's visit. However, as secretary Hamilton later informed King James, only Archbishop Spottiswoode's intervention and resolve forestalled a dissolution born out of fear and mistrust of the crown's true intentions.<sup>44</sup> As was to be made evident in the parliament which convened in June of the same year, those who had benefited through the dilapidation of benefices and the erection of temporal lordships feared a royal revocation or retraction in the church's favour. This distinction needs to be made for it is in this context that Spottiswoode's role and motivations must be assessed.

Over the succeeding months, the king and his Scottish privy council issued a host of injunctions in preparation for his forthcoming visit.<sup>45</sup> By far the most controversial of which were the king's instructions for the refurbishing of the Chapel Royal at Holyroodhouse. He had commissioned Inigo Jones to plan the decoration of the interior of the chapel in a definitively anglican style.<sup>46</sup> Thus with little regard to Scottish sensibilities, an altar, candle holders, two organs, stalls for choristers,

---

<sup>41</sup>See *CSP. Domestic 1611-1618*. pp.473, 474, 477. *RPCS*. Vol.XI. see introduction and pp.137, 169, 216-217, 313-317, 344-348, 386-387, 627-628. *APS*. Vol.IV. pp.535-541.

<sup>42</sup>See J.Nicols. *The Progresses of James the First*. Vol.III. p.255. *CSP*. Venetian 1615-1617. Letters from Lionello to the Doge and Senate dated 8/12/16, 30/3/17 and 6/4/17. pp.373, 476, 477. *CSP*. Domestic 1611-1618. p.414.

<sup>43</sup>Nicols. *Progresses*. Vol.III. p.255.

<sup>44</sup>*Melrose Papers*. Vol.II. pp.270-278.

<sup>45</sup>See W.A.McNeill and P.G.B.McNeill. The Scottish Progress of James VI, 1617 in *The Scottish Historical Review*. Vol.LXXV, 1:No.199. (April, 1996). pp.38-51.

<sup>46</sup>Nicols. *Progresses*. Vol.III. p.230. See letter from John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton, 7/12/16.

statuary of the twelve apostles and four evangelists, and portraits of the apostles, along with personifications of the Christian virtues of Faith, Love and Hope and other religious representations were to be installed on the orders of the king.<sup>47</sup>

Spottiswoode noted that "a foolish and idle rumour went, that the Organs came first, now the Images, and ere long they should have the Masse."<sup>48</sup> Notwithstanding the hyperbolic nature of such a jibe, these fears were not confined to opponents of episcopacy, for the Scottish hierarchy was likewise deeply disturbed by James's actions. That they were justified in expressing concerns and holding suspicions seems to have been born out from extraneous contemporary sources. By January 1617, the English privy council were under no illusion that the king's "object is to establish the English hierarchy in Scotland, which the Scots dislike."<sup>49</sup> The communiqué further highlighted Scottish hostility to the measure and the king's determination to press on regardless. It continued

[a]n organ builder sent their declares he would have been better used amongst the Turks. The King says he will take Coventry in his return, and make the puritans their receive the communion on their knees.<sup>50</sup>

William Cowper, the Bishop of Galloway, as dean of the aforementioned chapel wrote to James entreating him in particular to withdraw the numerous incongruous portraits. These "images" were widely perceived as idolatrous for they repudiated or nullified Scottish Reformation practice and lent themselves all too easily to the adoration of the ignorant and the superstitious. To his petition, it must be noted, Cowper secured the signature of Archbishop Spottiswoode, along with those of the bishops of Aberdeen and Brechin, as well as the highly regarded ministers, Patrick Galloway and John Hall. Although Spottiswoode willingly advanced and supported moves to have anglican church government and procedural mechanisms replicated in Scotland, he opposed King James's design to have anglicanism exported to Scotland lock, stock and barrel.

---

<sup>47</sup>See Nicols. *Progresses*. p.230. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.530. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.II. pp.242, 244-245. Row. *Historie*. p.307.

<sup>48</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.530.

<sup>49</sup>CSP. Domestic 1611-1618. p.414.

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid*. p.414.

Not unexpectedly, King James was especially indignant that such an influential contingent of his self-appointed hierarchy, including his metropolitan, should dare question the rectitude of his royal wisdom. He accused his detractors of ignorance for their inability to distinguish between "pictures intended for ornament and decoration and images erected for worship and adoration".<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless in spite of his protestations to the contrary, James, reluctantly relented over this relatively minor issue in the knowledge that such notable resistance could have had the potential to seriously jeopardise his larger agenda. However, he somewhat ingenuously argued that it "was not done for ease of their hearts, or confirming them in their error, but because the work could not be done so quickly in that kind as was first appointed." Cowper, shortly afterwards, informed the widely esteemed minister of Stirling, Patrick Simson, that he had received censure not only from the king, but also from the Archbishop of Canterbury. He worriedly added that the

king in his letter has boasted us with his English doctours, who (as he sayes) shall instruct us in these and in other points, except we refuse instruction God make us wise and faithfull, and keepe us from their usurpation over us, which now is evidentlie perceived, and hardlie taken by us all.<sup>52</sup>

Although unlikely, the spectre of a possible Scottish replay of the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, or of the proceedings instituted against the eight eminent Scottish presbyterians in the same venue in 1606, with the Scottish hierarchy now in the dock clearly must have filled Cowper, as well as Spottiswoode and others, with trepidation.

On the evening of 12 May 1617, a number of unnamed "great officers and Bishops of Scotland" met with King James at Berwick in preparation for his return trip to Scotland.<sup>53</sup> While royal protocol and etiquette no doubt account for this rendezvous,

---

<sup>51</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.530.

<sup>52</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.244-245.

<sup>53</sup>CSP. Domestic 1611-1617. p.466.

it is worth noting that a conference was arranged with the Scottish contingent and the bishops of Winchester and Lincoln on church matters. Although mere conjecture, it might not be too far from the truth to suggest that the king had directed his anglican bishops to start the work of converting the Scottish hierarchy to English church ceremonial and rites. King James entered Scotland the following day.<sup>54</sup> He was accompanied by the duke of Lennox; the earls of Arundell, Southampton, Pembroke, Montgomerie and Buckingham; the bishops of Ely, Lincoln and Winchester; and sundry others, among whom was the rising star in the anglican firmament, the future primate, Dr William Laud, who was chaplain to Lancelot Andrews, the Bishop of Ely.<sup>55</sup> The fact that Andrews, Laud, Richard Neile, the Bishop of Lincoln and James Montagu, the Bishop of Winchester, were known arminians would suggest that the king had either completely lost touch with Scottish ecclesiastical opinion or, as seems more likely, was intent on confrontation.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, as an aside, historiographical orthodoxy has it that King James was himself committed to the Calvinist theology of grace, and thus was a firm supporter of the doctrine enunciated in the *Confessions* cited above and in the *Canons of the Synod of Dort* of 1619.<sup>57</sup> It is nevertheless noteworthy that those closest to the king were of a quite different theological hue. Moreover, King James allegedly told the Dutch ambassador in 1610 that he had changed his doctrinal viewpoint.<sup>58</sup> Without entering into a debate about the king's theological preferences, it is the contention of this thesis that for James VI political considerations nearly always took precedence over Christian doctrine - with the

---

<sup>54</sup>For the full itinerary of the king's visit to Scotland see McNeill and McNeill. *The Scottish Progress of James VI, 1617*. pp.38-51. J.Nicols, *The Progresses of King James the First*. Vol.III.

<sup>55</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.246. Nicols. *Progresses*. Vol.III. pp.317-318, 344.

<sup>56</sup>See N.Lossky. *Lancelot Andrewes: The Preacher (1555-1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England*. (1991). N.Tyacke. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640*.

<sup>57</sup>On the synod of Dort which refuted arminian teaching and re-affirmed the unconditional and gracious character of election; an atonement limited in its extent and design to the elect; human depravity which is total in extent so that man cannot procure his own salvation; invincible divine grace; and the perseverance of the saints see Cunningham. *Historical Theology*. Vol.II.371-513. P.Y.De Jong. *Crisis in the Reformed Churches: Essays in Commemoration of the Great Synod of Dort, 1618-1619*. (1968). See also *The Theological Function of the Doctrine of Predestination in A.E.McGrath. A Life of John Calvin*. (1990). pp.211-218.

<sup>58</sup>Fincham & Lake. *The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I*. p.189.



notable exception of his belief in the divine right of kings which was sacrosanct. On re-entering his Scottish capital on 16 May the king proceeded to St Giles church where Archbishop Spottiswoode made "a flattering sermone upon the 21st Psalm, and thanked God for his prosperous journey."<sup>59</sup> It needs to be said that Spottiswoode's welcoming address was genuine. For while it would be fair to conclude that he opposed the king's vision of a unified British church, based on an anglican template - especially the high church arminianism of Andrews, Laud, Neile and Montagu which was gaining ground in England, the archbishop was aware that King James's presence was all but essential to wring financial concessions and support for ecclesiastical policy out of the Scottish political community. Spottiswoode, it should be emphasised, unlike the king, was very definitely committed to a Calvinist theology of grace. He eschewed the accusations advanced by Roman Catholics and Protestants of arminian leanings that the biblical doctrine of predestination was the precursor of and directly led to antinomianism. He pointed out the illogicality of such a criticism in a sermon on the *Epistle of Jude* by explaining that "to be elect and given to sinne implies a contradiction, because qhom God hes chusit, he hathe chusit to be holy and without blame."<sup>60</sup> Moreover, he comforted his flock with the knowledge that their election, salvation and sanctification were entirely due to the grace of god, and it was "not his manner to beginne a good worke, and leave it vnperformed..."

To the apparent dismay of many, on Saturday 17 May, at the king's command, an anglican service was conducted in the Chapel Royal with the singing of choristers, surplices and the playing of organs. Within a few weeks James had ordered all members of the nobility, council and episcopate within the vicinity of Edinburgh to attend the Whitsunday service arranged for 8 June at Holyrood. Communion was to be received kneeling in the English fashion. Calderwood recalled that Chancellor Dunfermline, the secretary, Thomas Hamilton, Sir George Hay, the clerk of register,

---

<sup>59</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.246. Nicolls. *Progresses*. Vol.III. pp.317-318.

<sup>60</sup>NLS. *Ms.2934*. f.36v.

the earl of Argyll and the bishops of St Andrews, Glasgow, Ross, Brechin and Dunblane were among those who fully complied with the king's injunction.<sup>61</sup> William Cowper, while present, initially refused to kneel, although in the face of mounting pressure to conform, his opposition proved ephemeral. The marquis of Hamilton and the earls of Mar and Glencairn, who all evinced decidedly presbyterian credentials, also eschewed kneeling to partake in the sacrament. On the Tuesday following they were admonished for their wilful resistance, and along with the remaining bishops and secular dignitaries who had not been present, were ordered to make amends on the approaching Lord's Day. However, while by the 15 June all the bishops and an undisclosed number of the nobility had fully complied with the king's instructions, it must be noted that over half of the Scottish nobility notified had indirectly made their resistance known by ignoring the summons altogether.<sup>62</sup> Many of the unnamed members of the nobility did not simply take umbrage at the royal imposition of kneeling at Holy Communion, but balked at the crown's wider church policy. On 6 June, the king's English secretary, Sir Thomas Lake, writing from Edinburgh, briefed Sir Dudley Carleton on the preparations for the forthcoming parliament. He explained that the king's intention was to

procure better maintenance than the ministry here hath, and some conformity between this Church and ours in England in the public service, whereof of the first it is hard to guess, so many great men are interested in the tythes. Towards the other his Majesty hath set up his Chapel here in like manner of service as it is in England...<sup>63</sup>

Thus it would appear safe to presume that James's actions and innovative policy alienated a significantly large section of the Scottish nobility. This in turn must have made Spottiswoode's and his colleagues' task of re-establishing ecclesiastical

---

<sup>61</sup>Dunfermline, Hamilton and Hay, not unexpectedly considering their respective governmental positions, played a leading part in the ratification of the articles by the parliament of 1621.

<sup>62</sup>Opposition and resistance to episcopacy and the five articles will be the main theme of the final chapter.

<sup>63</sup>Nicols. *Progresses*. Vol.III. p.335.

discipline within the localities doubly difficult after the king returned to England. Indeed, there was a tangible distrust and dislike exhibited towards the Scottish episcopate during the actual sitting of the parliament.<sup>64</sup> Moreover, as implied previously, such discontent was fuelled by an explosive mixture of nationalist sentiment and opposition to ecclesiastical change which threatened not only religious practice but the financial and social standing of members of the aristocracy. Both Spottiswoode and Calderwood in recalling the proceedings of the parliament of June 1617, which the metropolitan had inaugurated with a sermon, noted the deep distrust of many aristocrats.<sup>65</sup> Calderwood in particular was quite explicit in his claim that the nobility "feared a prejudice to their estate, and namelie, touching the dissolution of the erectiouns, and the right they had to the tythes".<sup>66</sup> Nevertheless, while Spottiswoode and fellow supporters of the episcopal regime must have been relatively pleased with the resultant legislation passed in their favour, King James failed to secure his main objective.<sup>67</sup>

The king, it should be made clear, had never intended using the parliament to directly impose his five articles upon the Scottish church. However, it had been his desire to introduce legislation which would have enabled him to enforce them upon the church with relative ease. The definitive piece of legislation he placed before the Lords of the Articles stipulated

[t]hat whatsoever conclusion was taken by his Majesty with advice of the Archbishops and Bishops in matters of externall policy, the same should have the power and strength of an Ecclesiasticall law.<sup>68</sup>

Nevertheless, James yielded to the episcopate's plea that a "competent" number of presbyters should also be permitted a voice in the drafting of ecclesiastical policy,

---

<sup>64</sup>*CSP. Domestic 1611-1618*, p.472.

<sup>65</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.531. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.250.

<sup>66</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.250.

<sup>67</sup>See *APS*. Vol.IV. pp.529-534, 551-556. See previous chapter for Spottiswoode's endeavour to secure adequate funding for the church.

<sup>68</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.531.

although he forcefully ruled out the perennial re-establishment of general assemblies. "[F]or the Bishops must rule the Ministers, and the King rule both, in matters indifferent and not repugnant to the Word of God."<sup>69</sup> Clearly, however, the king's interpretation of things indifferent differed radically from the majority of his Scottish subjects and he was forced to withdraw the article entirely in the face of vociferous opposition.<sup>70</sup> The gulf which existed between English and Scottish practice and belief was amply exemplified at the funeral of one of the English guards who happened to die while on royal duty in Scotland. Valentine Carey, the dean of St Paul's, London, while officiating at the funeral, asked all those there present

to recommend with him the soul of their deceased brother unto Almighty God, which was so ill taken that he was driven to retract it openly, and to confess he did it in a kind of civility rather than according to the perfect rule of divinity.<sup>71</sup>

Exception was also taken to Laud's donning a surplice as the deceased was about to be laid to rest. Suffice to add at this juncture that King James failed to achieve the principal objective of his trip to Scotland. Moreover, he appears to have held Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops accountable for his ill-judged and badly timed venture. Calderwood wrote that the king

was so incensed at the bishops, speciallie at the Bishope of St Androes, becaus they made him beleeve they had dressed all maters, that he had noe more adoe when he came to the countrie but to give his presence. But now, finding himself disappointed, he called them dolts and deceivers.<sup>72</sup>

In an attempt to appease the king and diffuse a potentially debilitating crisis for the Scottish episcopate, Spottiswoode hastily convened a meeting of thirty-six specially selected ministers at St Andrews during July.<sup>73</sup> The meeting which was arranged to

---

<sup>69</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.531.

<sup>70</sup>See *ibid.* p.531. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.249-253. This issue will be further dealt with in the final chapter.

<sup>71</sup>Nicols. *Progresses*. Vol.III. p.344. *CSP. Domestic 1611-1618*. p.473.

<sup>72</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.271-272.

<sup>73</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.533.

coincide with the king's stay with the metropolitan at St Andrews, appears to have been a rather desperate attempt to pacify James by winning the chosen brethren's unconditional assent to the five articles. The king personally tried to reassure the assembled ministers that his intentions were pure and for the good of the church. However, he did not disguise his anger and disgust of those who had strenuously opposed the royal prerogative in the church, and who consequently had petitioned parliament to have his royal designs thwarted. Nevertheless, James made it abundantly clear that he meant to have the five articles ratified and uniformly imposed.<sup>74</sup> The brethren, however, insisted that a general assembly was first called to determine the rectitude of accepting the articles in question. Although, the ministers told the king that "they found no reason to the contrary, and knew the Assembly would yeeld to any reasonable thing demanded by his Majesty", it is quite evident that both James and Archbishop Spottiswoode had their doubts. For when Patrick Galloway, in reply to the king's demand for an assurance that the assembly would give its consent to the articles, suggested that the metropolitan should act as guarantor on behalf of the brethren there present, Spottiswoode refused, pointing out that he had previously "been deceived by them, they having against their promise in the time of Parliament taken the course which they did".<sup>75</sup> Nevertheless, King James eventually gave way to the calling of an assembly after Galloway gave assurance of a positive outcome.

It is likely that Spottiswoode discussed the preparations for the forthcoming assembly in some detail with the king as he accompanied him part of the way on his journey homewards at the beginning of August. The archbishop remained in England, "having gone to the baths for the benefit of his health" until late September.<sup>76</sup> As a corollary, Calderwood mischievously noted that the archbishop had ulterior motives for travelling south. While he pointed out that Spottiswoode "went to the baines, pretending he was diseased. In the mean tyme ariseth a scandell, that his wyffis maid

---

<sup>74</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.533-534.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.* p.534.

<sup>76</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.XI 1617-1619. p.240.

was with childe to him", there is no additional extant evidence to substantiate this claim.<sup>77</sup> Without further evidence, however, such a rumour need remain mere fabrication deliberately spread to malign the metropolitan's character and standing by the enemies of episcopacy.

Diocesan synods were convened as usual in October shortly after Spottiswoode's return where commissioners were chosen for the impending assembly. According to Calderwood, the archbishop prorogued the diocesan synod of St Andrews to 4 November in order to forestall the election of anti-episcopal commissioners nominated at St Andrews on 5 October. However, this directly contradicts the minutes recorded in the diocesan synod register. For Spottiswoode convened his synod on 7 October. Moreover, the minutes noted that

[a]nent ye directing of Commissioners to ye approaching g[e]n[er]all assemblie it wer thought expedient that such of the brethren as ar p[rese]nt of everie particular exercise sal goe apairt severallie and mak nomination of such quha salbe in readines quhensoever the assemblie salbe convocated... with full power and commission from the rest to vote, conclude and determine according to ye word of God anent yeis articles salbe proponed to them be his Majesties commissioners.<sup>78</sup>

Although the use of selection and intimidation cannot be entirely ruled out, it seems more likely that the episcopate and others charged with winning the assembly's assent to the five articles eschewed strong-arm tactics because they themselves were less than enthusiastic about the road down which James was leading the Church of Scotland. Cowan's assertion that a large number of commissioners were absent because only three weeks notice was given of the approaching assembly can hardly account for the

---

<sup>77</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.276.

<sup>78</sup>CH2/154/1. f.215. Thus Dr Peter Bruce and William Murray were nominated from St Andrews; Dr James Philip and James Irvine for Arbroath; John Erskine and Andrew Milne for the Mearns; Dr John Strang and John Guthrie for Perth; William Cranston, Willaim Scot and John Caldercleuch for Cupar; Robert Roth and Edmond Mylls for Dunfermline; John Mitchelsone and John Gillespie for Kirkaldy; Henry Fullertoun and David Williamson for Forfar, and William Malcolm and George Pittilock for Meigle. This list of names also tends to contradict Row's contention that only pro-episcopal and compliant figures were chosen. See Row. *Historie*. p.313.

absence of the representatives of some seven dioceses.<sup>79</sup> For while the privy council issued an official proclamation to the effect that the assembly would be held at St Andrews on 25 November on the fourth of that very month,<sup>80</sup> it is highly probable that all the diocesan synods had already met and nominated their representatives just as Spottiswoode's had during the early part of October. Many churchmen knew the assembly was imminent and it is hard to believe that Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops had not intimated the date of the assembly to all interested parties in advance of the official government proclamation.

Archbishop Spottiswoode himself took charge and directed the affairs of the meeting. He laboured to convince the sparsely attended assembly that from the very inception of the Reformed Church of Scotland during the Reformation

the greatest hinderance the Church received, proceeded from the Ministers themselves, who for the pleasure of ill disposed people spared not to provoke his Majesty to just anger: exhorting them for the glory of God, the honour of the Gospell, and their own good, to take another course, and preferre the favour of their King, under whom they enjoyed so many blessings, to the vain applause of factious persons.<sup>81</sup>

Notwithstanding the metropolitan's pleadings and promptings, however, little was achieved except for a lukewarm, if fudged, acceptance of private Communion and a commitment to the principle that ministers would personally distribute the Communion elements to each recipient in their respective congregations, before the assembly was dissolved after only two days deliberation. Lord Binning writing to King James on 28 November, informed him of Spottiswoode's

feare of your majesties offence be delay of your just and godlie desynes, maid him so passionatlie instant, as he could scarce be induced be any persuasion to accept any doutfull or delatorie ansuer, and moved him to

---

<sup>79</sup>Cowan. *The Five Articles of Perth*. p.169.

<sup>80</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.XI. pp.253-254.

<sup>81</sup>Spottiswoode. *History*. p.534. See also Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.285. Row. *Historie*. pp.313-314.

threaten thame with your majesties resolution to ordane  
be actis and penall proclamations aganis the  
contraveners, to have all these articles vndelayedlie  
obeyed, schewing to thame how disgracefull it wald be  
to the Kirk of Scotland, in the judgement of all the  
reformed churches in Europe, that our ignorant and  
obstinat refusall of so godlie and lawfull propositions,  
sould force your majestie, be your Christian authoritie,  
to compell thame to do that which thair dutie sould  
have moved thame to embrace, with thankfull  
acknowledgement of your majesties caire to have the  
abuses of oure churche discipline reformed, and rightlie  
conformed to the vniversall order of all the rest of the  
true Christian Churches in Europe...<sup>82</sup>

There can be little doubt that the archbishop tried desperately to gain the assembly's acceptance of the articles. However, Spottiswoode did so mainly to avert a damaging confrontation with the king which would only have benefited the opponents of episcopacy and the church's Roman adversaries.

Not unexpectedly, King James's response to news of the proceedings was a mixture of contempt and fury. He notified his two Scottish archbishops on 6 December that he considered the outcome an absolute "disgrace". Consequently, he insisted that Spottiswoode and Law "discharge all Modification of Stipends from this year to any Minister whatsoever, such excepted as have testified their affection to our service at this time".<sup>83</sup> Moreover, he commanded them and their fellow bishops to celebrate Christmas day by preaching in their sees from appropriate texts.<sup>84</sup> King James ended his letter with the following admonition: "[s]ince your Scottish Church hath so far contemned my clemency, they shall now find what it is to draw the anger of a King upon them." He further informed Spottiswoode on the eleventh of that same month of his utter dissatisfaction with the two least controversial articles which the assembly

---

<sup>82</sup>*Melrose Papers*. Vol.II. pp.624-625.

<sup>83</sup>*OLEAS*. Vol.II. p.524. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.535.

<sup>84</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.288. Spottiswoode preached in St Giles, Edinburgh, on Christmas day. Calderwood added that before his sermon, "he commendit the King for his care to maintain the puritie of religion, and circumspection that nothing be brought in into the kirk but that which is indifferent of itselfe. He laboured to move that festivall dayes were observed with preaching and prayer, not long after the apostles' time."



had accepted after modifying them without the king's knowledge or consent.<sup>85</sup>

Although the king never abandoned his desire to have the articles officially accepted by the church, he ensured that his Scottish privy council issued a proclamation on 22 January 1618 to the effect that the five holy days must be observed.<sup>86</sup> Moreover, the fact that Spottiswoode was present probably suggests that he was privy to the king's action in advance. It would appear evident then that such a deterioration in crown-church relations quickened Archbishop Spottiswoode's sense of urgency and stiffened his resolve to have the five articles ratified. Greater care and meticulous planning went into ensuring that the Perth assembly was not merely a re-enactment of the previous one. At the April meeting of the archbishop's diocesan synod of St Andrews north of the river Forth it was decreed that

[a]nent the directing of Commissioners to ye  
g[e]n[er]all assemblie q[ue]n it sal pleis his ma[jes]tie  
to apoynt ane. It was thought expedient that such men  
salbe nominat furth of evrie p[re]s[b]y[tri]e as ar wyse  
and discreit and wil give his ma[jes]tie satisfaction  
anent theis articles proponed be his highnes  
Commissioners in ye laitt g[e]n[er]all assemblie haldin  
at St androis.<sup>87</sup>

On 25 August 1618, in what had become almost obligatory fashion, after the king's letter had been read out, Spottiswoode, as nominal head of the Church of Scotland, preached to the Perth assembly on its opening day on the rectitude and necessity of accepting the five articles. The archbishop took for his text *1 Corinthians XI:16* - "But if any man seeme to bee contentious, wee have no such custome, neither the Churches of God."<sup>88</sup> Due to the importance and urgency of the occasion and to the fact that this sermon was the only one of the archbishop's to be published for public consumption, it needs to be examined in some detail. For the sermon would appear to

---

<sup>85</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.525-526. *Ibid.* pp.535-536.

<sup>86</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.XI. pp.296-297.

<sup>87</sup>*CH2/154/1*. f.219.

<sup>88</sup>See *Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. pp.65-87.

provide a synopsis of Spottiswoode's learning and personal belief on matters of crucial contemporary import.

Spottiswoode left no-one in any doubt that the articles would be sanctioned regardless of Scottish disquiet and opposition. He explained to the delegates there present that he personally considered the innovations as adiaphoristic and believed that the majority of those there present shared his viewpoint. Nevertheless, he was prepared to confess that he regarded their imposition on the kirk as both injudicious and untimely. "They are new and vncouth", he told his audience,

such things as we have not bene accustomed with; and novations in a Church, even in the smallest things, are dangerous... Had it beene in our power to have disswaded or declined them, most certainly wee would.<sup>89</sup>

However, in a typically erastian manner, the archbishop made it clear that disobedience to the king, "whom I hold it religion to offend", was a much greater evil than the acceptance of largely innocuous religious innovations. Later during this same sermon he apologised to the "godly" but insisted that "the offence of our gracious soueraigne is more to vs than theirs and a thousand more".<sup>90</sup> Making direct reference to his chosen text, Spottiswoode exclaimed:

[a]s the Apostle speakes here of contention, so I say of disobedience, we have no such custome, nor the Churches of God. We leave that to Papists and Anabaptists, that carry no regard to authoritie. Our religion teaches vs to obey our superiors in all things that are not contrarie to the Word of God...<sup>91</sup>

The archbishop tellingly, but mischievously, cited Calvin, that most authoritative of the Reformed divines, to give credence and provide the requisite backing for his argument.<sup>92</sup> Spottiswoode was, however, prepared to acknowledge that there were

---

<sup>89</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. pp.65-66.

<sup>90</sup>These same sentiments were repeated by David Lindsay, the Bishop of Brechin, in his *The Reasons of a Pastor's resolution, touching the communion*. (London, 1619).

<sup>91</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. p.66.

<sup>92</sup>While Calvin unquestionably taught obedience to the magistracy, he clearly did not consider such

indeed ceremonies, although he did not specify which, if pressed upon the Scottish church, it was their Christian duty to resist. Nevertheless, the five articles in question were not amongst these. Sticking to this theme, he further pointed out that

[t]he substance of the dutie God hath given vs in the Word, from which we may not goe; but for these things that belong to the outward administration, ecclesiasticall wisdome hath to define what is convenient...<sup>93</sup>

Spottiswoode argued that apostolic practice was an inexact guide in matters pertaining to church ritual and ceremonial. Again, in order to underline his Reformed or Calvinist credentials, he backed up his statements by recourse to both Calvin, and his equally esteemed successor in Geneva, Theodore de Beza. Nevertheless, he must have been aware that the authoritative judgement of both of these colossal figures within the Reformed tradition was on the side of those against the innovations. Turning from the general to the particular, Spottiswoode went on to outline the legitimacy of each of the articles in turn.

On providing holy communion to the sick, bed-ridden and dying in their homes, Spottiswoode asserted that this had been agreed to in principle by the last general assembly. Although he was lamentably aware that some ministers were refusing outright to administer the sacrament to their bed-bound parishioners, he argued they had no justification for their willful stance on theological grounds.

Why this Sacrament, that is the seale of God's promises, and a speciall meane of binding vp our communion with Christ, should bee denied to such as desire the same in that time, there can be no reason.<sup>94</sup>

Calvin, Bucer, Bullinger and Zepperus were cited to provide added ballast and credibility to the archbishop's reasoning.<sup>95</sup> On the legitimacy of ministers performing

---

matters as adiaphoristic. See 22n.

<sup>93</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I p.69.

<sup>94</sup>*Ibid.* p.74. See also pp.73-75.

<sup>95</sup>On the question of the sacraments in Protestant thought in the Reformation era see E.Cameron. *The European Reformation*. (1991). pp.145-167. Reardon. *Religious Thought in the Reformation*. pp.76-78, 200-203.

the sacrament of baptism outwith the parish church during the normal hours of divine service, Spottiswoode pointed out that the general assembly had previously agreed to the same ordinance as far back as 1602.<sup>96</sup> In order to contradict those delicate souls who argued that such a development would foster "the Popish opinion of the necessitie of Baptisme", the archbishop quoted the view of Bucer who had held that to withhold the sacrament "for want of solemnities... opens a doore to the Devill, to bring in the contempt of Christ's Ordinance, and our whole redemption by him."<sup>97</sup> Calvin was further cited in defence of the change.

As for confirmation, Spottiswoode, like his doctrinal mentor Calvin, bewailed the church's past negligence in nurturing the young's biblical knowledge and spiritual development.<sup>98</sup> While the Aberdeen assembly had previously agreed in substance to the restoration of confirmation, King James, as previously noted, had objected to the measure, for the Act had made no provision or specification for the laying on of hands, which task he furthermore insisted should have been restricted to bishops. The archbishop dismissed suggestions that the practice had been a relatively late addition devised by the Roman Catholic church by making direct biblical reference to Luke and to the influential opinions of the early church fathers; Jerome, Augustine, Cyprian, Tertullian and Eusebius.<sup>99</sup>

Turning to the specified holy days, Spottiswoode repugned those who argued their restitution was leading the Scottish church back to Rome. He rhetorically asked, "had

---

<sup>96</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. p.75.

<sup>97</sup>See *Courtenay Reformation Classics*. Martin Bucer. Vol.IV. On Baptism pp.286-307. See also Visitation of the Sick which includes A Form and Method for Imparting Absolution and the Sacrament of the Supper to the Sick. pp.430-448.

<sup>98</sup>Calvin. *Institutes*. Vol.II. p.632.

<sup>99</sup>See *Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. pp.76-77. From a perusal of Spottiswoode's extant manuscript sermons it is clear that he was well versed in the patristic sources. See in particular his sermons on Jude and 1 and 2 Thessalonians. ff.21-82. Luke laid great stress on the role of teaching in the Apostolic Church in his Acts of the Apostles.

this argument beene of any force, would the reformed Churches have agreed so uniformly in the observation of them?"<sup>100</sup> He truthfully further explained that

[a]ll of them, so farre as I know, keepe holy the dayes of Christ's Natiuitie, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, with the descent of the Holy Ghost. The Churches of Bohemia, Vngarie, Polonia, Denmarke, Saxonie, and High Germanie: The Helvetian Churches, the Belgique, and those of the Low Countreyes; The French, English, and Geneva itselſe, in the beginning of reformation observed them all.<sup>101</sup>

The archbishop pointed out that Geneva still solemnly kept Christmas, and referred his audience to the *115 and 128 Epistles of Calvin* for the reasons why the others were abrogated.<sup>102</sup> Notwithstanding Calvin's theological reservations, Spottiswoode pointed out that many notable theologians, including Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, Heinrich Bullinger and Girolamo Zanchius, had all commended the commemoration of the aforementioned holy days.<sup>103</sup> Although the archbishop acknowledged that a Reformed synod meeting in Middleburgh in 1584 had abolished the commemoration of all Christian festivals with the specific exceptions of the Lord's Day, Christmas and Christ's ascension, he reminded the assembly of the caveat introduced by the synod that if the magistracy determined to retain others then it was conducive on all ministers to preach at the designated times "to turne the people's idlenesse into godly exercises and businesse". Spottiswoode concluded by reminding his hearers that

[h]is Maiestie, as you know, hath charged all his subjects by Proclamation, to abstaine from seruile labour in these times, and it should become vs well, as that Act speaks, to turn them from all idleness to godly exercises.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup>Spottiswoode *Miscellany*. Vol.I. p.77.

<sup>101</sup>*Ibid.* p.77.

<sup>102</sup>Calderwood similarly cited Calvin to refute Spottiswoode's assertion. Moreover, the presbyterian writer pointed out that the celebration of Easter and Christmas had only been reintroduced after Calvin's banishment from Geneva in April 1538. Consequently they had been retained as a sop to the town's magistracy after the reformer's return. See *Perth Assembly*. 1619. For more on Calvin's forced exile from, and return to, Geneva see McGrath. *A Life of John Calvin*. pp.98-100.

<sup>103</sup>*Ibid.* p.78.

<sup>104</sup>Spottiswoode *Miscellany*. Vol.I. p.78.

The archbishop then turned to the last and by far the most controversial of the articles, that of kneeling to receive the communion elements.

Spottiswoode reminded his audience that Christ had not instituted a particular posture incumbent on future generations of Christians while communicating. Furthermore he poured scorn on those zealous presbyterians who passionately remained committed to the contrary view. Indeed, the archbishop sought to demonstrate the illogicality of their standpoint by suggesting that to replicate Christ's actions would more accurately warrant reclining as opposed to sitting to partake of the Lord's Supper, would exclude women from the sacrament, and would restrict its celebration to the early evening.<sup>105</sup> In equal measure, Spottiswoode adamantly denounced the notion that kneeling at the reception of the Communion elements implied any sanction of or submission to the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. Peter Martyr (Pietro Martire Vermigli) and Peter Mouline were cited to further refute this erroneous dogma.<sup>106</sup> The archbishop even acknowledged that while Beza had "not approven this gesture of kneeling, yet did he never esteeme it idolatrie, as some of our spirits doe".<sup>107</sup> Interestingly, in his sermon Spottiswoode alluded to a pamphlet written by "some perverse spirit" from England in 1608 as the principal cause of hardening attitudes on this question.

Worse and more desperat blasphemies did never any  
Arriane cast out; for this directly he saies, That in the  
receyuing the holy Communion, we ought not vse any  
right, that may signifie our inferioritie vnto Christ,  
neyther should we abase ourselves there, but  
acknowledge and think vs his equals.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup>See Mark 14:12-26; 1 Corinthians 11:17-34.

<sup>106</sup>The Roman Catholic church reaffirmed its commitment to the real physical presence of our Lord in the consecrated Communion elements at the Council of Trent in 1551. Such a view was utterly repudiated by all Protestants. See Reardon. *Religious Thought in the Reformation*. p.315. Pierre du Moullon knelt to receive the Communion elements while visiting King James's court. See below.

<sup>107</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. p.79.

<sup>108</sup>*Ibid*. p.80. Although Spottiswoode did not disclose the name of the author, it is worth noting that it might have been among the many pamphlets published around that date by English separatists and anabaptists. See P.Milward. *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources*. (1978). See pp.48-68.

Although, it must be recognised that Spottiswoode's doctrinal adversaries would equally have eschewed such a blasphemous view, nevertheless, the archbishop likely regarded the dissemination and absorption of such unorthodox opinions as symptomatic of the ever increasing licentiousness which he so studiously preached against and sought to combat through stricter ecclesiastical discipline within the localities. Spottiswoode concluded his defence of kneeling by explaining that

I think sitting in the beginning was not civilly instituted, and since by our Church continued, for wee may adore awhile we are sitting, as well as kneeling; yet the gesture which he becommeth adoration best is that of bowing of the knee, and the irreligion of these times craves that we should put men more vnto it then we doe.<sup>109</sup>

Returning to the general, Spottiswoode passionately opinioned

I see not with what conscience wee can refuse them, being vrged as they are by our Souereigne Lord and King - a King who is not a stranger to Divinitie, but hath such acquaintance with it as Rome never found in the confessions of all men a more potent adversary...<sup>110</sup>

He further stated that King James was "Defender of the Faith; and hath it by desert, as well as by inheritance". Moreover, Spottiswoode, adroitly appealing to national sentiment, reminded the assembly of how the king had leapt to the defence of his native kingdom when "that *Mischant*, sometimes one of your number, and vnworthy to be named, did vomit forth his spite, and vnnatural malice against the whole nation." The editor of the *Spottiswoode Miscellany* wrongly conjectured that the archbishop was referring to Calderwood, however, he was clearly referring to Thomas Ross, former minister of Cargill. Ross was subsequently tried and executed in Edinburgh on 2 September 1618 for composing and affixing a highly inflammatory anti-Scottish invective to the door of St Mary's church in Oxford.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. p.81.

<sup>110</sup>*Ibid.* p.81.

<sup>111</sup>See Pitcairn. *Criminal Trials*. Vol.III. pp.445-454.

It is, it should be said, possible to detect an element of the politic in Spottiswoode's entreaties on account of the mounting pressure he was placed under by King James. After all, he certainly took the view that he had little option but to deliver a resounding acceptance of James's reforms. The archbishop also sought to quash rumours that he and not the king was the true architect behind the five articles. Indeed, there is no evidence to suggest that Spottiswoode was anything other than sincere in his protestation that the reforms were proffered "without my knowledge, against my desire, and when I least expected".<sup>112</sup> As revealed in the previous two chapters, the archbishop had enough on his plate in combating Roman Catholic recusancy, in trying to win round or marginalise recalcitrant presbyterians, and in his endeavours to reimpose ecclesiastical discipline. "[L]et no man deceive himselfe; these things proceede from his Majestie, and are his owne motions, not any others." Spottiswoode countered accusations that acceptance of the articles would ultimately lead to wholesale uniformity with the Church of England by warning that on the contrary their rejection would more likely induce fuller integration through a crown imposed settlement. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that Spottiswoode, not surprisingly, tended to stress the harmony which existed between the Scottish church and its southern neighbour, and indeed at one point went as far as to tell the assembled that "we should conforme with them in every outward rite observed not only by them, but by the whole Church of Christ, long before it was so infected with Poperie."<sup>113</sup> He asked "if our opposition did ever gayne vs any thing? If experience will not make vs wise, what can?" Spottiswoode appealing to the Scriptures, urged the assembly to follow the example of Paul who in contravention of his own repeated denunciations against the retention of Jewish ceremonials and rites had found it expedient to have Timothy circumcised and continued to perform certain Jewish customs.<sup>114</sup> The reason behind Paul's evident volte face, he stressed, was that he "saw

---

<sup>112</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. p.82.

<sup>113</sup>*Ibid.* p.86.

<sup>114</sup>See Acts 16:1-5.



no other way to redeeme the libertie of his ministrie, further the gospel, and increase the churches".<sup>115</sup> In effect Spottiswoode most certainly shared in the apostle's pragmatic conviction. The fundamental difference was that the archbishop was concerned to conciliate and retain the support of the crown as opposed to Judaising tendencies within the Church. Spottiswoode concluded his sermon with the following supplication:

Brethren, we have made too much businesse about these matters. The Kingdome of God consists not in them, but in righteousness, and peace, and ioy of the Holy Ghost... Remember the worke wee are sent for is to build the Church of God, and not to destroy it; to call men to faith and repentance; to stirre them vp to works of true pietie and love, and not to make them thinke they have religion enough, when they have talked against Bishops and Ceremonies.<sup>116</sup>

While it would be extremely naive to suggest that Spottiswoode's words were efficacious, they may, nevertheless, have swayed some waverers. In the end, notwithstanding the efforts to pack the assembly, the articles were passed by a majority of only some two to one.<sup>117</sup> Moreover, it was quite evident that those who voted for their acceptance did so to appease the king. There was little enthusiasm within the church, and still a great deal of opposition, to these innovations. In light of the occasion and the heavy pressure brought to bear on the metropolitan to deliver the assembly's ringing endorsement at Perth, the cynic would be right to question whether the above sermon offered a true reflection of Spottiswoode's own doctrinal leanings. Nevertheless, from an analysis and assessment of the archbishop's extant manuscript sermons it is quite evident that his position remained consistent.

Commenting on the eighth verse of St Jude's epistle, Spottiswoode expostulated

---

<sup>115</sup>*Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. p.83.

<sup>116</sup>*Ibid.* p.87.

<sup>117</sup>See Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.538-539. Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. pp.304-332. for a full account of the proceedings.

ye power of ye prince in causis ecclesiastical as ye ap[ostle] tellis us in ye 13 to ye Rom[ans] that he is minister of God for o[u]r good: and ye good of ye subiect standis not only in civil good, to provide y[a]t justice may flourische in ye commonwealth, but mekil more in spiritual good, y[a]t true religioun may be maintayned, the word of God sincerely taught, ye sacraments rightly administered, the censure of ye kirk effectually vsed and according to ye worde, blasphemies, heresies, Idolatry, sacriledge and ye lyk crymes punischit, kirks furnischit w[i]t[h] able ministers, and maintenance sufficient appointed for yem.<sup>118</sup>

While the archbishop's detractors would have whole-heartedly concurred with his exposition, they nevertheless repugned the notion that the crown had the right to impose novations which they believed disregarded the divine commands laid down in the Bible.<sup>119</sup> Although the archbishop would have preferred not to have had the five articles pressed upon the church, especially the injunctions on kneeling and holy days, the fact that it was the king who was insisting on their implementation, coupled to his personal belief that they were adiaphoristic, left him with little option but to accept their inclusion. Indeed, as the above makes clear, the church's welfare and standing in the kingdom, Spottiswoode proffered, were largely dependant upon the maintenance of harmonious relations with the supreme magistrate in the person of the king. "Dominion is despysed", he argued, "qhen ye lawes and constitutions of princes in things good and lawful, ar wilfully resisted and transgressit."<sup>120</sup> He, moreover, condemned outright armed resistance against constituted authority. Spottiswoode implored the recipients of his sermon,

[b]e not deceaved, ze that read ye books of som of o[u]r new wryters, vpon yis head of ye magistrate. Som of yem wryt dangerously, som very erroneously. In al ye book of God, ze wil not find one example of subiects aiming against y[ai]r prince, tho[ug]h he wer wicket. To ye contrary we haif dyverse examples on q[hi]che I

---

<sup>118</sup>*Ms. 2934. f.53.r.*

<sup>119</sup>See *Second Book of Discipline*. (ed) Kirk. Cap.10. Of the Office of a Christiane Magistrat in the Kirk. pp.213-216.

<sup>120</sup>*Ms. 2934. f.53r.*

wil not now stand. These doctrines and opinions we wold leave to ye jesuits, t[a]t maintain ye deposing and murthering of princes. [Y]ei oght not to be heard of among us.<sup>121</sup>

On another occasion, while expositing on the tenth verse of the same epistle, Spottiswoode was adamant that

Chryst wil haif us to be subiect and obedient to princes, wil haif us by al meanis procure thair hono[u]r and pryde, that his kirk which is a gathering in ye world, may find a safe and peaceable harbour thairin...<sup>122</sup>

On the very next occasion, continuing his verse by verse exposition on the *Epistle of St Jude*, the archbishop made clear that "he y[a]t is a traytor to the kirk is a traytor to the kinge."<sup>123</sup> Evidently, the reverse equally held true in his opinion.

Not surprisingly, the archbishop believed that those called to the ministry and magistracy were "servants of special trust, and held by [H]im in greatest regard".<sup>124</sup> Nevertheless, Spottiswoode left his congregation in no doubt which of the two vocations was the more important. To be a servant of the "King of kings" was evidently "more honor[a]bl[e] than to goe befor al the kings of ye earth".<sup>125</sup> It was particularly telling that Spottiswoode should remind his audience that "No man can serve two masters, sayes o[u]r savio[u]r, much less two masters of contrary wills."<sup>126</sup> Although the archbishop's derogators would have accused him of doing just that, he very obviously thought differently. Indeed, the statement was probably targeted against those ministers who sacrificed the church's patrimony in dilapidating their benefices to the financial benefit of their seigneurial patrons.

For Spottiswoode church polity and rites were not of the essence of Christianity. As intimated above, the archbishop concluded that these were matters which the

---

<sup>121</sup>*Ms. 2934. f.53.*

<sup>122</sup>*Ibid. f.56.*

<sup>123</sup>*Ibid. f.58.*

<sup>124</sup>*Ibid. f.35r.*

<sup>125</sup>*Ibid. f.34v.*

<sup>126</sup>*Ibid. f.34v.* See Matthew 6:24; Luke 16:13.

magistracy in the person of the king could determine in consultation with the church. The metropolitan placed much greater stress on the church's mission to preach and teach the Gospel and to emphasise the importance of individual piety. The nature and power of piety he informed his parishioners were

faith effectual, diligent love, patient hope, reverend feare, pure conscience, sound repentence, assured confidence, holy affections, divin meditations, godly resolution, earnest petitions, devout gestures, vnstrained profession, religiouse speech, and vnblamaeable conversation.<sup>127</sup>

Conflict and acrimony with the king, in his opinion could only hamper and jeopardise the church's mission of saving souls for Christ.

The lord o[u]r God firstly aquitteth us of o[u]r sinnis and so accounts us just in his sight by the free and gloriouse imputation of Chryst's righteousnes vnto us; then o[u]r sinnis being pardoned, and o[u]r persons resavit into favo[u]r, he changes o[u]r condition and qhole nature, restoring it according to his own image, and making us after a sort partakers, as St Peter speakes, of ye divin nature.<sup>128</sup>

The acquisition of this divine nature was a prominent theme of Spottiswoode's sermons. He earnestly reminded and reassured those in his direct charge that effectual calling was proper and particular only to God's elect. Accordingly he implored his hearers

never to rest in an outward and general calling, and knowledge, but strive and labour for y[a]t effectual calling, q[hi]ch hathe fayth and obedience joyned w[i]t[h] it... qhen togethir w[i]t[h] ye outward preaching of ye worde, we find the inward working of ye spirit, to bring vnto faithe in o[u]r hearts, and a willing and ready mynd to obey that w[hi]ch we ar taught, this may assure us bothe of o[u]r predestination past, and of o[u]r glorification to come.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup>*Ms. 2934. f.44v.*

<sup>128</sup>*Ibid. f.36r.*

<sup>129</sup>*Ibid. f.42v.*

In spite of incessant resistance to King James's controversial five articles they received parliamentary ratification in August 1621. Archbishop Spottiswoode, not unexpectedly, was heavily involved in steering the articles through the parliament in the face of fierce opposition.<sup>130</sup> They were passed by a majority of twenty-seven. Tellingly, parliamentary opposition to the articles was significantly confined to those Lowland regions which exhibited a distinctive preference for a presbyterian ecclesiology and forms of worship. Consequently, having examined Spottiswoode's role in the implementation of religious change in the church, and having determined his mind on these alterations, it is now necessary to assess the metropolitan's response to the opposition within his archiepiscopal dioceses.

---

<sup>130</sup>See *APS*. Vol.IV. pp.596-597. Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.541-542. Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.485-501. Goodare. The Scottish Parliament of 1621 in *The Historical Journal*. 38, 1. (1995). pp.29-51.

## ARCHBISHOP SPOTTISWOODE AND THE FIVE ARTICLES OF PERTH. PART II.

### CHAPTER NINE.

*...Sik a spirit should al Christians bring to ye  
admonishing of y[ai]r brethren, especially ye ministers  
of Chryst: a spirit ful of gentlenes and love, but  
warmed and heated w[i]t[h] zeal.<sup>1</sup>*

As previously stated, opposition to erastian episcopacy throughout the metropolitan province was not contingent upon the introduction of the king's infamous *Five Articles of Perth*. Instead, *jure divino* presbyterians were already systematically organised and coherently operating somewhat akin to a separate church within the confines of the established ecclesiastical super-structure. Thus previous to the introduction of the highly controversial innovations, a significant minority of ministers wilfully evaded official presbytery and synod meetings, preferring to surreptitiously cabal among themselves. Nevertheless, the pace and cumulative impact of change within the Church of Scotland, coupled to the manner in which the five articles, especially the articles on kneeling and holy days, were imposed and enforced, significantly swelled the ranks of discordant ministers. Moreover, it was the enforcement of kneeling to partake in the Lord's Supper and the keeping of holy days which alienated a substantial proportion of the laity and galvanised them into defiance of the church and civil authorities. Although presbyterians, and those committed to a presbyterian ethos in worship, retained a firm commitment to the Reformed doctrine of the visible church, it would appear that the imposition of erastian episcopacy followed as it was by the introduction of the five articles precipitated an intra-ecclesiastical schism within the Church of Scotland. This final chapter then needs to assess the extent of opposition to the five articles, or to be more precise the injunctions on kneeling and holy days, within the archiepiscopal dioceses, determine Spottiswoode's attitude to the resultant problem created for him by the very tangible

---

<sup>1</sup>NLS. Ms.2934. f.27. See Spottiswoode's exegesis of 2 Thessalonians 2:1-2.

non-conformity to the innovations and weigh up the effectiveness of his response to the crisis.

In Archbishop Spottiswoode's considered opinion it was of paramount importance that all ministers of the Word "must love ye kirk, in q[hi]che yei ar placed to serve, and give al diligence to further ye salvation of yese y[a]t pertain thairto."<sup>2</sup> Division and contention which were an all too visible reality in the Church of Scotland had to stop forthwith. Spottiswoode was in no doubt that it was the devil himself that was "ye author of division". Moreover, while expositing on 2 Thessalonians 1:1-2 he postulated the view that

qhair men ar conceated and trust thair own wits too muche, al ages haif proved this to be ye very mother of schism and heresies... qhat hathe bro[ugh]t forthe separatists and other troublers of ye kirk; a conceat of y[ai]r own worthe, a magnifying of y[ai]r own opinions and desyris...<sup>3</sup>

Although increasing in England, there is little direct evidence to suggest that there was support for anabaptism, separatism or independency in Scotland prior to the Cromwellian Interregnum.<sup>4</sup> Therefore the archbishop's intended target was probably those presbyterians who were meeting outside the official confines of the church.<sup>5</sup> If confirmation was needed, Spottiswoode further warned his audience

to beware of being deceavit and misled by strange doctrine. {F}or it is some of ye devil's policies to distract and disturbe ye myndes of men with fantastical conceits, and by that means to mak yem fit instruments for his self. {F}or qhen he hathe once driven yem beyond the bounds of truthe, he possessis yem w[i]t[h] sent delusions at his pleasure, as hathe been seen in ye

---

<sup>2</sup>Ms. 2934. f.42r. Exposition on Jude 3-4.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.* f.21r.

<sup>4</sup>See B.R. White. *The English Separatist Tradition: From the Marian Martyrs to the Pilgrim Fathers*. (1971). pp.c.116-159. P.Milward. *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age. A Survey of Printed Sources*. (1978). pp.48-64.

<sup>5</sup>Spottiswoode and Law called David Dickson a "Schismatick" and "Anabaptist, one that had misled [his parishioners] and filled them with fantasies" during his trial before the high commission in January 1622. See Scot. *Apologetical Narration*. p.300.

doctrine and practise of ye familists, anabaptists, and other lyk enthusiasts of o[u]r times.<sup>6</sup>

The metropolitan's warnings and actions, however, failed to halt the growing tendency towards conventicling. Nevertheless, his inclination for compromise and irenicism with his co-religionists would suggest that rigid observance of the articles was low on his list of priorities.

On 8 August 1615, shortly after entering the metropolitan see, Archbishop Spottiswoode prosecuted the incumbent minister of Perth, John Malcolm, through the court of high commission.<sup>7</sup> Malcolm, a former signatory to the presbyterian *Protestation* of 1606 and a vocal opponent of Spottiswoode's archiepiscopal predecessor,<sup>8</sup> had antagonised the king by the strident comments made in his "Epistle Dedicatorie to the King's Majestie", which he had prefixed to his commentary on the *Acts of the Apostles*. The minister from Perth pleaded the case of his presbyterian brethren banished for their part in the Aberdeen assembly of 1605, and inadvertently caustically mocked those appointed to "great benefices" by King James. That he was referring to the bishops there could be no doubt. He accused them of corrupting the church for they were "unlearned and unsanctified men". Although both Calderwood and Row were silent as to the outcome of the trial, other than to record that Malcolm was instructed to await the king's decision, it would appear that he was released with little more than a caution. This case is worth highlighting for in many ways it appears to have established a precedent or standard which set the tone for future archiepiscopal confrontations with non-conformist ministers. For while it probably heralded a determined effort by the archdiocese to crack down on non-conformity, it also suggested that those prosecuted would be dealt with sympathetically and with leniency.

---

<sup>6</sup>*Ms. 2934*. f.28r. It should be noted that Spottiswoode eschewed apocalypticism and extra-biblical revelations in his sermons. See ff.27, 44, 52.

<sup>7</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.201. Row. *Historie*. p.305.

<sup>8</sup>See Row. *Historie*. pp.430, 290-291.



In November of that same year, Spottiswoode temporarily deposed another outspoken veteran in the fight against erastian episcopacy, the minister of Dunfermline, formerly of Leith, John Murray.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, King James's letter to the archbishop dated 22 June 1616 ostensibly demonstrated the ephemeral nature of the sentence pronounced against Murray and raised a number of salient questions.

The king wrote,

whereas ye desire the declaration of Our pleasure concerning Mr John Murray: Seing be his conformity he has given you satisfaction, We are well pleased that ye place him in Dunfermling, or elsewhere, as ye shall think most fitt.<sup>10</sup>

Bearing in mind Murray's impeccable presbyterian credentials, coupled to the fact that he was subsequently deprived from the ministry by the high commission in January 1621 for his continued firm refusal to conform to the five articles,<sup>11</sup> it seems most unlikely that he genuinely capitulated in the face of archiepiscopal and royal threats. Moreover, it is equally hard to believe that such an astute and politic archbishop as Spottiswoode was altogether duped by a simple promise of conformity to the episcopal ecclesiology and the changes introduced at the king's and hierarchy's bidding by such a stalwart defender of presbyterian principles. Instead, it would seem more likely that the archbishop pragmatically reached some sort of accommodation with Murray to the effect that if the minister would refrain from such confrontational polemics in future, Spottiswoode, while only too conscious of the unlikelihood of gaining the minister's total compliance and support, would tolerate his presence in Dunfermline. Of course, the fact that Murray was a kinsman of Chancellor Dunfermline likely had a significant bearing on the outcome.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, this chapter aims to demonstrate that Spottiswoode, like his contemporary English

---

<sup>9</sup>Row. *Historie*. pp.305-306.

<sup>10</sup>*OLEAS*. II. p.472.

<sup>11</sup>See *Ibid.* pp.252-254, 440, 475-476. Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.413-414, 517, 519. *Fasti*. Vol.V. p.28. Murray was the author of *A Dialogue betwixt Cosmophilus and Theophilus anent the Urging of new ceremonies upon the Kirk of Scotland*. (1620).

<sup>12</sup>Lee Jnr. *Government by Pen*. p.69.

metropolitan counterpart George Abbot, commonly turned a blind eye to presbyterian/puritan non-conformity within his province, and when compelled to act was more often than not lenient with offenders.<sup>13</sup> This is not to suggest that Archbishop Spottiswoode continuously sought to avoid confrontation with his co-religionists but rather to argue that he favoured a policy of gradual uniformity through example, gentle persuasion, educational reform and the imposition of diocesan discipline. Thus, notwithstanding King James's repeated demand that non-conformists be rigorously tried and punished, as will be shown, archiepiscopal tolerance when added to administrative incompetence, laxity and indifference meant that the prosecution and suppression of non-conformity was less rigorous and efficacious than it might have been.

In the interests of administrative and procedural efficiency, the two provincial courts of high commission were amalgamated in December 1615. This move in effect made the court peripatetic and was designed to allow either archbishop to convene the court in the other's province in his absence. However, Archbishop Law of Glasgow's initial reluctance to prosecute Henry Blyth and David Forrester, the ministers of the Canongate and Leith respectively, who had failed to celebrate the sacrament of Communion in the newly prescribed manner, provides a strong indication that the latter development was regarded unfavourably by at least one archbishop. Law made it clear that he

was not willing to meddle with them, not so much for any respect he carried to them, as because they were not within his diocese or province, and he would not seeme to be a depute to the Bishop of St Andrews...<sup>14</sup>

Changing tack slightly, Calderwood, not unexpectedly, was highly critical not only of the court *per se*, but also bemoaned its constitution which concentrated power in the

---

<sup>13</sup>See Holland. *Archbishop Abbot and the Problem of Puritanism*. pp.23-43.

<sup>14</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.379-380.

hands of Spottiswoode and Law. "The two archbishops", the presbyterian historiographer sarcastically noted, had been

some tyme ministers within the presbyterie of Linlithgow, two prettie football men, have now, as we use to say, the ball at their foote. They were both neere the point of suspension in the purer tymes for the profanation of the Sabbath: now they have power to suspend, deprive, imprisone, fyne, or confyne, anie minister in Scotland.<sup>15</sup>

It is worth restating that the main motivation behind the renewal of the court's commission and its unification in 1615 lay in the church's endeavour to effectively combat Roman Catholic recusancy.<sup>16</sup> However, if Calderwood's documented cases of those brought before the court offer a true reflection of the high commission's activities then it was primarily invoked to try Protestant non-conformists. Indeed, the renewal of the court's commission in July 1619 made explicit the high commission's strategic place in the battle to suppress opposition to the Perth articles.<sup>17</sup> The court's authority was also embellished by the incorporation of an order proscribing the right of the privy council and court of session to repeal or counter-act sentences pronounced by the high commission. Foster recorded that between 1610 and 1625 forty-eight ministers were tried by the court. Of those, twenty-seven were either acquitted or dismissed with a warning. Two were confined to their own parishes, five temporarily suspended from the ministry, and seven altogether deposed from their callings.<sup>18</sup> Most importantly, although the south-west increasingly gained notoriety, the overwhelming majority of ministers called to compear before the high commission resided in Fife and the Lothians - the centres of Spottiswoode's archdiocese north and south of the river Forth.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.210. See pp.204-210 for the king's warrant for the unification of the high commission and its renewed constitution.

<sup>16</sup>McMahon. *The Scottish Courts of High Commission 1610-1638*. p.197.

<sup>17</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.384-388. McMahon. *The Scottish Court of High Commission*. p.197.

<sup>18</sup>Foster. *The Church Before The Covenants*. p.48. See also McMahon. *Scottish Court of High Commission*. p.200.

<sup>19</sup>See Wells. *The Origins of Covenanting Thought and Resistance: c.1580-1638*. Table 7. Wells has

Beginning north of the river Forth, at the meeting of his diocesan synod in April 1618, the archbishop intimated that all those who had as yet failed to

celbrat ye holy communion this zeir on Pasche day  
according to ye ordour, and ordinance their anent, ar  
commandit expresslie in al tymes hierafter to celebrat ye  
sam in yeir awin parochie kirks upon ye pasche day  
precieslie vnder ye pain of deprivation from ye  
ministrie.<sup>20</sup>

Spottiswoode had personally taken the lead in communicating at Easter in St Andrews cathedral where he administered the sacrament "to manie of the people kneeling".<sup>21</sup> Although his command was directed in the first instance towards the presbytery of Cupar, it nevertheless had a universal resonance and application. This would appear to find confirmation in the later injunction that any person found communicating in any church outwith their own parish without a written testimonial from their minister "salbe reput non-communicants and punished accordingle".<sup>22</sup> The extent of the opposition to kneeling at the reception of the Communion elements within the archbishop's diocese north of the river Forth, after the practice was given statutory approval by the general assembly in August 1618, became manifest at the synodal meeting on 6 April the following year. Moreover, the minutes from the meeting reveal a very noticeable regional divide in conformity to the new directive on kneeling to partake in the celebration of communion at Easter. Calderwood made the claim that Spottiswoode exercised extreme caution for the duration of this synodal engagement after receiving news that King James was gravely ill. However after being notified that the king was on the road to recovery prior to convening his southern diocesan synod later that same month, he apparently threatened non-conformist ministers there with banishment "to the New Found Lands, and loss of their

---

shown in tabulated form that between 1617 and 1624 of the 107 presbyterian non-conformists prosecuted by the high commission in the respective dioceses of Glasgow and St Andrews, 93 of the cases belonged to the metropolitan dioceses north and south of the river Forth.

<sup>20</sup>CH2/154/1. F.217.

<sup>21</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.297.

<sup>22</sup>CH2/154/1. f.218.

stipends."<sup>23</sup> There is little reason to question Calderwood's assertion that Spottiswoode was more severe in this instance with those non-conformists in Edinburgh and its hinterlands. However, bearing in mind that the archbishop personally was the recipient of much of the king's indignation and anger, that the king was threatening to replace non-conformists - even with compliant ministers from south of the border if necessary, and that the capital was of such exemplary and tactical importance to the success or otherwise of the crown's religious policy, a fleeting bout of despondency and exasperation probably better explains the archbishop's harsh threats.

Those ministers within the jurisdictional bounds of the exercises of Brechin, Arbroath and Dundee had uniformly obeyed the injunction.<sup>24</sup> Of Forfar, Meigle and Perth only John Lindsay, James Auchinleck and William Black respectively "hes not as zet celebrat the Communion".<sup>25</sup> Both Lindsay and Auchineck had, however, given assurance of conformity, while Black was "admonished to studie to conformitie." By contrast a significantly high proportion of the brethren within the exercises of St Andrews, Cupar, Kirkaldy, Dunfermline and the Mearns evinced a marked disinclination to accept a new ordinance which they evidently regarded as a abnegation of the divine institution set forth in Scripture. Of the exercise of St Andrews, the depositions recorded in the synod register have it that William Erskine, William Murray, Alexander Henderson and Dr David Barclay were "exhorted to stryve to obedience and conformitie".<sup>26</sup> Erskine was further accused of administering communion, presumably in the old manner, to folk outwith his parish who clearly had similar reservations about the new mode of practice. Likewise, Barclay, as minister of the prestigious incumbency of St Andrews, was given ten days in which to appear before Spottiswoode and explain not only his failure to celebrate Holy Communion

---

<sup>23</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.364.

<sup>24</sup>CH2/154/1. f.224.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.* f.224.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.* f.221.

but to account for a lengthy absence from his charge. John Forret excused his failure to comply with the ordinance on the grounds that he could not "have his people commodiously examined because the grytest part ar traders be sea."<sup>27</sup>

Notwithstanding the somewhat specious nature of his makeshift response, the minister was commanded to catechise on a weekly basis in order to forestall him proffering a similar excuse in future. Samuel Cunningham had as yet to commemorate the sacrament, but gave assurance that he would do so on the approaching Lord's Day. David Mearns excused his failure on the grounds that "he culd not have the elements".<sup>28</sup> Drs Alexander Gladstones and Peter Bruce along with George Martin, John Rutherford, Simeon Durrie and Daniel Wilkie had fully complied with the new ordinance.

Of Cupar, James Bennat, John Mackgil and Thomas Baxter were exhorted to conform.<sup>29</sup> David Kinnear and James Pitcairn offered the excuse that they had been unable to celebrate the sacrament because their respective churches of Ceres and Falkland of Old Kilgour were in need of repair. Andrew Bennat, elder, argued that he had eschewed the new ordinance after his parishioners made clear their enmity towards kneeling. Similarly, Thomas Douglas "reported that he gave the elements with his awin hands to al the people, bot not kneeling, because he perceived the people vtherwyse inclyned".<sup>30</sup> Andrew Bennat, younger, when pressed, forwarded the tenuous excuse that his flock had not been sufficiently examined to determine their suitability for admittance to the Lord's Table. The moderator, John Caldercleuch, was commanded by Archbishop Spottiswoode to urge James Thomson "and al vthers... quha aither have not as zet celebrat the Communion, or have not keipit ye prescryved ordour", to fall into line. In the exercise of Kirkaldy; James Simson, John Tullis, John Gillespie, David Andersone and James Wilson were instructed to "studie to

---

<sup>27</sup> CH2/154/1. f.221.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* f.221.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* f.222.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* f.222.

conformitie with diligence".<sup>31</sup> William Nairn firmly placed the blame on his failure to comply on his wilfully obstructive fellow minister in the joint charge of Dysart, Thomas Hogg.<sup>32</sup> Of Dunfermline; Edmond Miles, John Canding and Robert Thomson all promised to labour diligently to give obedience. Patrick Geddie, it was revealed, had personally distributed the Communion elements out of his hands but had refused to kneel. He likewise agreed to wrestle with his conscience to find authoritative justification for kneeling.<sup>33</sup> Lastly, of the Mearns; James Sibbald, James Bedie, James Raitt, Alexander Simson, David Mitchell, William Wishart were all urged to give obedience. Andrew Milne, Andrew Collace, Adam Walker and John Keith having fully complied with the order.<sup>34</sup>

Intriguingly, no mention was made of prominent non-conformists like William Scott, John Carmichael, Thomas Hogg, John Row and John Scrimgeor. Did the archbishop consider unreconstructed and unreconcilable presbyterians such as these beyond the pale? Their exclusion from the synod register insinuates that this was indeed the case. Furthermore, it provides weight to the argument that Spottiswoode, in spite of the king's insistence on instant and complete conformity to the articles of Perth, expediently favoured and quietly promoted a more gradual or organic approach in the erroneous belief that these aged presbyterians would be succeeded by a new generation of compliant ministers. William Scot and John Carmichael, nevertheless, were called before the high commission in St Andrews on 20 August 1619. However, they were not queried as to their obedience to the new ordinances but to whether they had taken a hand in the compilation or distribution of Calderwood's rebuttal of the articles entitled "Perth Assemblie".<sup>35</sup> When pressed to state on oath what they knew both men refused to answer, and allegedly turned the tables on Spottiswoode by asking the provocative and supposedly highly embarrassing question "if anie man

---

<sup>31</sup>CH2/154/1. f.222.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.* f.223.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.* f.223.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.* f.223.

<sup>35</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.392.

would urge the Bishop of St Andrews to give his oath whether he committed adulterie or not, would he purge himself by oath?" Both men were dismissed with a warning to conform to established church practice.<sup>36</sup> Scot, on the contrary, disobediently wrote a bitter invective against conformity to erastian episcopacy and the idolatrous articles shortly afterwards which was published in Amsterdam.<sup>37</sup>

In a similar vein, a week after the meeting of his diocesan synod in April 1619, Spottiswoode summoned Andrew Duncan and Thomas Hogg, the incumbents of Ceres and Dysart receptively, to compear before the high commission in St Andrews.<sup>38</sup> Spottiswoode ineffectually implored the two men to conform and give obedience. Hogg, however, appears to have spoken for Duncan as well as himself when he "impugned the Five Articles... as swerving altogether from the true paterne of wholesome doctrine" set down in Scripture.<sup>39</sup> The archbishop dutifully warned Hogg that he was putting his freedom in jeopardy "for in declyning the king's authoritie, ye perill your craige. Remember what befell your brethren at Linlithgow".<sup>40</sup> The archbishop's warning to Hogg would suggest the two men were tried independently, for Duncan, as one of the ministers prosecuted at Linlithgow in January 1606, would have needed no reminding of the occasion. Nevertheless, the minister of Dysart steadfastly refused to even recognise the authority of the high commission, although Hogg avowedly affirmed that he had publicly condemned the Perth Acts and erastian episcopacy, and in so doing had inadvertently incited his parishioners to defy the laws of the kingdom. He confidently cited the *Book of Discipline* in defence of his actions and current stance to which Spottiswoode reputedly retorted that in a

---

<sup>36</sup>Scot himself composed an anti-erastian episcopal piece entitled "*The course of conformity*", which was probably published in Holland in 1622. See Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. p.141.

<sup>37</sup>William Scot. *The Course of Conformitie, as it hath proceeded, is concluded, should be refused*. (Amsterdam, 1622).

<sup>38</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.364-369. Scot. *Apologetical Narration*. pp.269-270.

<sup>39</sup>Calderwood's account of the trial was taken from Hogg's written testimonial and this likely explains why the record concentrates on Hogg's prosecution. *Ibid*. p.377.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid*. p.367.



short space that Booke of Discipline sall be discharged;  
and ministers sall be tyed to sett prayers, and sall not be  
suffered to conceive prayers as they please themselves.<sup>41</sup>

The two recalcitrant ministers were called to re-compear before the commission on the 22nd of that same month.<sup>42</sup>

The high commission was re-convened in the archbishop's lodging in the capital where Spottiswoode presided over the proceedings. He reminded the court that he had confronted Hogg on a number of occasions "in time past both by promises and threatenings, but in vain, for he will not be perswadit to conforme". The minister of Dysart, Spottiswoode adjudged was

one of the great adversaries to our course that is in the ministrie of the Kirk of Scotland; for in pulpit; he inveighes and prayes against us. And where ever he is at table, he takes occasion to dispute, and reason against our estate, as unlawful, and pernicious to the estate of Christ's kirk, and so perverts simple persons that are unlearned.<sup>43</sup>

Hogg, the archbishop further explained had in his note to the exercise compared kneeling at the reception of the sacrament to bowing the knee to Baal, and likened the Church of Scotland to the badly injured man in the Gospel parable of the good Samaritan. Spottiswoode elaborated:

he made us that are bishops to be robbers, and murtherers of the Kirk of Scotland; and he compared the wise and modest brethren of the ministrie, who are peaceable men, to the preist and Levite that passed by that woundit man, and supported him not, because these brethren inveighes not against our estate and course, as he himself uses to doe. And he compared preacheors and professours of his owne humour unto the Samaritane. Yea, albeit that I dealt verie gentlie with him at St Androes, in his last compeirance, yit he came not to me, efter that I had risen from the Hie Commisssion. And so soone as he returned to the pulpit

---

<sup>41</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.369.

<sup>42</sup>See *Ibid.* pp.370-377.

<sup>43</sup>*Ibid.* p.370.

of Dysert, being Fryday thereafter, he fell in upon our estate, and inveighed against it with noe lesse vehemencie that he had used in tyme past. And since he came to Edinburgh at this time, he reseasoned at table against kneeling... affirming that it was idolatrie.<sup>44</sup>

The archbishop was particularly aggrieved that so much of the minister's invective had been directed at him personally and his fellow minister John Mitchelson. Indeed even at this stage, Spottiswoode eschewed the role of tyrant or grand inquisitor commonly assigned him by his presbyterian detractors. Instead, he endeavoured to assure the defiant cleric that

I have noe malice in my heart against you; and in testimonie thereof, I am content to pas from all that ye have spoken against us hitherto, and it sall be reputed as not spoken, providing that ye will not speake against our course heirefter. If ye will not medle with us, we sall not medle with you...<sup>45</sup>

According to Hogg's testimony, as an inducement to conform, the archbishop promised him first pick of any vacant charges to emerge within his diocese where he might find better remuneration for his labours. To which Hogg replied that his

practices were repugnant to his protestations, seing that he was not singulare in his judgement anent the estate and course of bishops. But there were manie pastors in the said archbishop's diocie who had spoken als meikle (if not more) against the Articles of Perth... yit had not beene conveyened before the Hie Commission.<sup>46</sup>

Notwithstanding the private admonitions and reassurances of Archbishop Law of Glasgow, Hogg not unexpectedly remained totally defiant and was sentenced to banishment on Orkney within forty days. Nevertheless, in direct contravention of the sentence pronounced against him Hogg remained in Dysart.<sup>47</sup>

Andrew Duncan similarly resisted all attempts to have him recant and conform, and on 10 May was deprived from the ministry and commanded to enter into ward in

---

<sup>44</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.370-371.

<sup>45</sup>*Ibid.* p.372.

<sup>46</sup>*Ibid.* p.373.

<sup>47</sup>Row. *Historie*. pp.322-323.

Dundee.<sup>48</sup> Like Hogg, Duncan refused to recognise the authority of the commission. Shortly after hearing of his fate he wrote to Spottiswoode protesting his innocence and warning the archbishop that God would avenge him. According to Row, he was subsequently banished from the kingdom, residing in France until after the death of King James. However, Calderwood's evidence suggests otherwise. For on his own admission, Duncan broke ward from Dundee and returned home by the onset of winter.<sup>49</sup> Moreover, he was apprehended along with Alexander Simson in Edinburgh in July 1621 for stirring up opposition to the king and the episcopate. Brought before the privy council, where Archbishop Spottiswoode informed his fellow councillors of the clergyman's past record of active resistance to the episcopate and the king's religious innovations, he was sentenced to be held in captivity in Dumbarton Castle where he remained until his release on 2 October.<sup>50</sup> In spite of his obduracy, the privy council instructed him "to make choise of ane parochie of Scotland to be confined in except his owne and Edinburgh. He choised Kilrinnie which nixt adjacent to his owne."<sup>51</sup> Thus it has to be presumed that Duncan continued to be a thorn in the flesh of the church authorities within the environs of Fife. Indeed, he wrote to the archbishop from Anstruther on 23 October 1622.<sup>52</sup> Although the letter was ostensibly a plea for clemency and for the lifting of all ecclesiastical restrictions placed against him, Duncan's vituperative and threatening tone could hardly be regarded as the supplication of the penitent. Drawing biblical analogies between the Israelite routing of the Canaanites and Perizzites in the first chapter of the Book of Judges, he warned Spottiswoode that

King Adonibezekis judgement sould affray merciles  
sawllis. Hall binkis ar slidderie, ye knaw, and earthlie  
courtis ar kitill, and kingis minions ar sett vp on heigh  
skelffis, bot slipperie and dangerous. I haue sein one  
richt high mounted in your rouse and cours, that gatt a

---

<sup>48</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.377.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.* p.470.

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid.* pp.470, 511.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.* p.511.

<sup>52</sup>*OLEAS*. II. pp.698-699.

foull and schamefull fall. Pittie your poore saull, and  
luik vp to Him that can doe this; the Michtiest. I beseik  
yow to remember ye haue ouerthrawn my pure estait;  
bot quhat rek of that? Ye haue hinderit Godis wark to  
be done in many and many places. The Lord of Heaven  
giue yow remors. I beseik yow, as ye tender your awin  
sauatioun, play no more the burrio vpoun your  
Brethrene: that is the Devilis part. Returne, amend, and  
disappoint many.<sup>53</sup>

Not surprisingly, the former minister of Crail's appeal fell on deaf ears.<sup>54</sup>

When the diocesan synod convened again in October 1619 Spottiswoode once more

did very earnestlie and gravelie intreat ye brethren  
p[rese]nt to studie to conformitie in yeis things q[ui]lk  
were recommendit be his ma[jes]tie and concludit be ye  
g[e]n[er]al assembly haldin at Perth.<sup>55</sup>

Although the combined weight of the king's, the archbishop's, his synod's and the high commission's threats, entreaties, prosecutions and penalties may have persuaded many of the non-conformist brethren to abandon their resistance to the articles, there still remained a not insubstantial number of defiant malcontents. With this in mind, Spottiswoode announced his intention of holding a special conference in St Andrews from 23 to 25 November 1619 in the hope that it might diffuse the growing enmity between the two groups and finally lead to universal acceptance of the new modes of worship.<sup>56</sup> Like the overwhelming majority of his contemporary churchmen, the archbishop *publicly* rejected the notion of religious plurality of practice as a dereliction of ecclesiastical authority. "Either we sall put them out of Scotland, or they sall put us out. It were better that both they and we were hangit, ...or the Gospell decayed", he reportedly told the ministers who composed his southern diocesan synod in October 1619. Citing the example of the well respected Huguenot divine, Pierre du Moulin, who knelt at the sacrament while in England, Spottiswoode stated "[w]e

---

<sup>53</sup>OLEAS. II. p.699.

<sup>54</sup>See the archbishop's reply, *ibid.* p.700.

<sup>55</sup>CH2/154/1. f.230.

<sup>56</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.395. For Calderwood's summary of the conference see pp.395-408. Scot. *Apologetical Narration*. pp.271-272.

must all goe one way".<sup>57</sup> The archbishop chaired the conference, inviting the opinions of fellow bishops and non-conformist clergy alike. However, he made it abundantly clear from the outset that this was not a disputation between equals as to the rectitude of accepting the five articles, for he explained that "seing his Majestie doth vrge them, and that without his displeasour we cannot tolerate your refusall anie longer".<sup>58</sup>

Moreover, the king's instructions communicated to the assembled clerics by Lord Scone insisted that all non-conformists be deposed forthwith, even if that meant that Scottish ministers would have to be replaced with Englishmen. However, the rather repititious arguments and pleas of the episcopate to the effect that the innovations were matters indifferent and should be accepted for the preservation of unity in the Scottish church, and in the interest of appeasing the king and upholding the royal supremacy went unheeded. John Carmichael, the first of an undisclosed number of non-conformists to speak, on the contrary was unwilling to compromise his deeply held presbyterian principles. He proffered the solution that

we live together, promoting the caus of the Gospel in the faithfull discharge of our places, not irritating or provoking one another. And this may the peace of the kirk be weill procured, for unitie of religion may weill consist in diversitie of ceremonies.<sup>59</sup>

After some initial hesitancy and prompting by Spottiswoode, William Scot similarly intimated that after a lifetime of fruitful service in the Lord's vineyard he was prepared to suffer deposition rather than conform to the new practices. Robert Balcanquall, to the archbishop's displeasure, argued that the opinion of other Reformed churches should be sought. To this suggestion Spottiswoode curtly responded that

[o]ur kingdome is a monarchie, and monarchs are jealous to admitt other nations to medle in their effairs. Our king is wise enough to govern his kingdom, without advise of other nations.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> *Calderwood. History. Vol.VII. p.395.*

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid. p.397.*

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid. p.400.*

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid. p.400.*

Further debate on this issue was given short shrift by the metropolitan. On the second day, after strenuous deliberations, an attempt was made to broker a compromise. The bishops urged the non-conformist clergy to at least undertake a promise that "everie communicant may receive from the minister's owne hand the elements, and not divide them amongst them".<sup>61</sup> However, after the ministers sought a guarantee that no more would be demanded of them, the bishops retired with Lord Scone to consider their reply. After a lengthy consultation, the delegation returned and Spottiswoode addressed the dissident clergy in attendance. He told them that

seing the things required are indifferent, and seing we have used all meanes to bring you to conformitie, but you make your owne excuses; some pretend one thing, some another, but no wayes giving a sufficient reason... Therefore I must tell you, he that will not conforme himself in these things indifferent, must seeke his ministrie in another kingdome...<sup>62</sup>

The archbishop closed the day's proceedings with a sermon and a request that they reconvene in the morning at nine o'clock to enable the non-conformist clerics the opportunity to state on record whether or not they would pledge their obedience to the new ordinances.

With the sole exception of Alexander Henrisone none of the other ministers called to give their response appeared as requested. Lord Scone who had registered his concern the previous day that such an outcome was likely threatened serious repercussions against the recalcitrant and anxiously asked Spottiswoode what he should say to the king to explain and excuse such an outcome. The archbishop's reply bore testimony to his tolerant and sympathetic response to the problem. Spottiswoode informed the king's emissary that the

brethren conveened were quyet, honest, modest men,  
the like I may say of all the rest of this part of the

---

<sup>61</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.405.

<sup>62</sup>*Ibid.* pp.405-406.

countrie, except the Presbyterie of Dunfermline, and Mr  
Johne Scrimgeour.<sup>63</sup>

While Spottiswoode's analysis was probably purposefully designed to conceal the true extent of active opposition, the bishops collectively gave the aristocrat their assurance that they would write to the king in defence of his labours, signifying their optimism that opposition would be gradually repressed. Calderwood later contended that the conference was an elaborate conspiracy arranged by Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops to allow them to single out the most fractious and vociferous of the non-conformists for prosecution by the high commission.<sup>64</sup> While prosecutions quickly followed, it is difficult to believe that the archbishop required a conference to identify the leading opponents of the Perth articles or to justify later invoking the high commission against such individuals. It seems more likely that Spottiswoode mistakenly thought that some might be persuaded to conform or at a minimum concede ground. This conclusion is given credence by the letter sent to the king by Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops on the closing day of the conference.<sup>65</sup> While they assured the king of their resolve to eject all non-conformists from their respective benefices, they, nevertheless, supplicated King James to give his consent to delay the crackdown until after the winter season.

Immediately after the close of the conference, the archbishop summoned the ministers of Edinburgh, Henry Blyth and David Forrester, to compear before his episcopal colleagues and himself. Blyth being absent was excused but Forrester was urged to answer whether he was willing to conform or face the consequences. He replied that he was

brought up under that reverend man, Mr Patrick  
Simson, from whom I sucked the contrarie from my  
childhood. I was taught by him that sitting was a

---

<sup>63</sup>Calderwood. *Histroy*. VII. p.407.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.* p.408.

<sup>65</sup>BL. *Add.Ms.* 19,402. f.66. The letter was signed by Spottiswoode; James Nicolson, the Bishop of Dunked; James Law, Archbishop of Glasgow; Patrick Lindsay, Bishop of Ross; Alexander Forbes, Bishop of Aberdeen; Andrew Knox, Bishop of the Isles; Andrew Lamb, Bishop of Galloway; David Lindsay, Bishop of Brechin; and Andrew Boyd, the Bishop of Argyll.

sacramentall ceremonie, signifying our spiritual familiaritie with Christ our Heade; which I hold agreeable to the Scripture and therfor not to be altered.<sup>66</sup>

Such a reply was demonstrative of the difficulty that the metropolitan and those charged with enforcing the practice faced in convincing conscientious ministers like Forrester that they should abandon their principles on the whim of the head of state. Nevertheless, the fact that Christmas was widely kept and celebrated throughout the country, including the metropolitan dioceses, must have been an encouraging sign for Spottiswoode and others charged with its enforcement.<sup>67</sup>

In an attempt to prevent any repetition of the widespread flouting or disregard of the injunction on kneeling at Easter 1619, in January 1620 the archbishop summoned John Weymss, John Scrimgeour, John Gillespie, James Howie, George Grier and James Porteous to compear before the high commission for their failure to preach on the prescribed holy days nor kneel at the Lord's Supper. However, the archbishop was forced to postpone their trial to 1 March when not enough commissioners assembled to form a quorum.<sup>68</sup> On 14 February John Chalmers, John Murray of Strathmiglo, William Erskine, James Wilson, William Murray, James Bennet and "some other ministers in Fife" were called before the commission for the same offence. They were duly admonished by the archbishop and threatened with deposition if they did not conform by Easter of that very year. Nevertheless, Spottiswoode rarely carried through to fruition his threatened course of action. This was amply illustrated in the archbishop's prosecutions of non-conformist ministers on 1 and 2 March. Of those clerics previously called to compear before the commission back in January George Grier's name was allegedly removed from the summons at the instigation of the earl of Melrose.<sup>69</sup> James Porteous, minister of Laswade, was temporarily suspended. James Howie, the minister of Dunbar, was given a reprieve after answering a number of

---

<sup>66</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.407-408.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.* p.410.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.* p.411.

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.* p.424.



questions to Spottiswoode's satisfaction, "but his answers were so frivolous, that Mr James was confirmed in the truth."<sup>70</sup> John Weymss was tried the following day but escaped with a warning. No mention was made of the zealous presbyterian, John Gillespie, the father of the famed covenanters George and Patrick who was later esteemed by John Livingstone as a "thundering preacher".<sup>71</sup> In the end only the courageously outspoken minister of Kinghorn, John Scrimgeour, whom the archbishop had previously identified as a thorn in his flesh, was censured. However, in that particular instance, Spottiswoode, in order to retain some semblance of archiepiscopal authority and respectability, was left with little alternative but to banish him from his current parish and depose him from the ministry.<sup>72</sup>

Scrimgeour, like Hogg, refused to recognise episcopal authority and renounced the keeping of holy days and kneeling at communion. In particular, Spottiswoode's ingenuous and untenable appeal to Knox's *History* as grounds for suggesting that the great reformer sanctioned and recommended kneeling at communion was smartly and swiftly rebutted.<sup>73</sup> Similarly, the Bishop of Dunblane's assertion that most of the Reformed churches knelt at the reception of the elements was easily disproved. "None but England, and Papists and Lutheranes", the minister declared favoured the practice. "France and Holland is against it, as in the Confession, *Genuflexionem, propter suspicionem idolatria adversarium*."<sup>74</sup> Spottiswoode, however, was on surer ground when he accused Scrimgeour of encouraging lay non-conformists "as from Edinburgh, St Andrews, James Traill from the north of Fife, the Laird of Halhill", to gather under his ministry at Kinghorn to receive the Lord's Supper in the traditional manner.<sup>75</sup> Indeed, it was probably for this reason that the minister was officially deprived from the ministry and confined outwith his own locality. Nevertheless, even after

---

<sup>70</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.424.

<sup>71</sup>See W.M.Campbell. *The Triumph of Presbyterianism*. p.51.

<sup>72</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.414-424. Scot. *Apologetical Narration*. pp.273-278.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.* pp.415-416.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.* p.416.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.* p.416.

Scrimgeour made a bitter attack on erastian episcopacy and the apparent conformity to anglican practice, the archbishop graciously relented on confining him in Dundee on questionable health grounds. Instead Spottiswoode permitted the minister to take up residence at Bowhill in his neighbouring parish of Auchterdeer where his fellow non-conforming minister John Chalmers was the incumbent. "Mr Johne Scrimgeour continued teaching at Kinghorne, notwithstanding the sentence of the Hie Commission".<sup>76</sup> It was probably on account of Scrimgeour's continued presence, influence and legacy in Kinghorn and its vicinity that induced Spottiswoode to make a visitation there on 6 August 1622 to ensure that Alexander Scrimgeour was safely installed as pastor in the vacant charge.<sup>77</sup> It was during the above encounter with John Scrimgeour that Spottiswoode reputedly made the infamous remark that "the king is Pope now". While it would be impossible to discount the plausibility that the archbishop did indeed utter the remark in the heat of verbal battle, as stated in the previous chapter, it could hardly be said to reflect his understanding of the royal supremacy in relation to the spiritual affairs of the Church of Scotland.

Four days prior to the synod meeting of 25 April 1620, Spottiswoode with the assistance of John Weymss, the commissar of St Andrews who was appointed a senator of the court of justice and justice of the peace for the shire of Edinburgh through the archbishop's patronage,<sup>78</sup> Alexander Gladstanes and doctors; Robert Howie, Peter Bruce and James Blair convened the court of high commission in St Andrews in an attempt "to terrifie" members of the synod.<sup>79</sup> Shortly before the commission met Alexander Gladstane had returned from court with letters from the king addressed to the two Scottish archbishops "commanding them to goe forward in deposing of disobedient ministers, and threatening to punishe them civilie, that were deposed for non-conformity."<sup>80</sup> Dr David Barclay, evidently having failed to heed the

---

<sup>76</sup>*Calderwood. History.* VII. p.424.

<sup>77</sup>*Ibid.* p.562.

<sup>78</sup>*Ibid.* p.390. *RPCS.* Vol.XII. pp.36, 489n, 769.

<sup>79</sup>*Ibid.* p.442.

<sup>80</sup>*Ibid.* p.442.

admonitions and commands of the previous synod meeting of April past, was prohibited from preaching within the archiepiscopal diocese of St Andrews. David Mearns was confined to his own parish and banned from celebrating the Lord's Supper. He was given until Martinmas (11 November) to conform under the threat of deprivation from the ministry. William Erskine was ordered to remove himself to Angus. When the synod assembled it was disclosed that William Wishart, David Mitchell, John Forret, David Andersone, John Chalmer, Robert Roch, William Nairn, Robert Murray and John Gillespie

have not given obedience to the acts of the ye  
g[e]n[er]al assemblie at Perth, nor as zet declair  
themselves fullie purposed and resolved to become  
conforme theirvnto.<sup>81</sup>

Consequently the above ministers were given until the approaching holy-day of Whitsunday to fully pledge their obedience to the articles of the Perth assembly on the pain of deprivation from the ministry. A commission comprising the Bishop of Brechin, David Lindsay, the rector of the university, Dr Alexander Gladstones, Drs Robert Howie and Henry Philip, John Guthrie, John Strang, Ninian Drummond, James Elliot, Archibald Moncreif, Henry Futhie and James Guthrie was ordered to convene with Spottiswoode on his notification to "receive their last and resolute answeir twitching their conformitie and obedience, and incaice of contumacie and refusal to depose them from their ministrie".<sup>82</sup>

The commission duly met on 7 July in the castle at St Andrews. Of the ministers called to compear, William Wishart appears to have satisfied the archbishop and the other members of the court after he "faithfully promised to give obedience and conforme himself in al poynts".<sup>83</sup> David Mitchell "deponed that he wald most willinglie conforme himself bot that he remaines as zet of sum doubts anent the things

---

<sup>81</sup>*CH2/154/1. f.232.*

<sup>82</sup>*Ibid. f.232.*

<sup>83</sup>*Ibid. f.236.*

prescryved".<sup>84</sup> He successfully pleaded with the commission to permit him a little longer to reconcile the religious changes with his own understanding of Scripture and doctrinal convictions. Subsequently in a letter he wrote to Spottiswoode on 1 October 1620, requesting to be excused from the forthcoming synod meeting on the pretext that his house was in danger of collapsing if he failed to make swift repairs, he reluctantly pledged his obedience and conformity. Mitchell explained to the archbishop that he had

taken pains be reading and conference with learned men to find reasons and warrant for conformitie, bot so sal this one seiketh deepest with me, that I must els suffer my mouth to be shutt from preaching ye gospel, wheirunto I find my self in conscience to be called and must give accompts of my travails theirin, being assured of that woe, if I defect my chaarge rashlie and without a weightie and violent cause.<sup>85</sup>

Although the minister made clear he regarded the articles as "vnexpedient", he, nevertheless, also concluded that they were not of such import to warrant deposition from the ministry for his continued opposition to them. The synod register makes no mention of the other non-conformists, other than recording that "certain brethren remain as zet vnconforme". The commission established by the previous synod was renewed and strengthened by the inclusion of Drs Peter Bruce and James Blair, and John Caldercleuch. However, by April 1621 the commission had as yet failed to convene or initiate proceedings against any of the dissidents.<sup>86</sup> Although the members thereof claimed mitigating circumstances had hampered prosecutions, namely Spottiswoode's absence in England and severe weather conditions, it would appear highly plausible that they were reluctant or balked at prosecuting friends and colleagues over such a controversial and untimely measure. Moreover, while the commission was once again renewed, there was no more mention of it or the dissidents by name during the remaining years of King James VI's reign. Indeed, on 22

---

<sup>84</sup>CH2/154/1. f.236.

<sup>85</sup>*Ibid.* f.237.

<sup>86</sup>*Ibid.* f.242.

April 1623, it was reported that the "Communion is fund to have been celebrat be the haill brethren almost at the ordinary prescryved tym", although no mention was made of kneeling.<sup>87</sup> Reports in April 1622 to the effect that Spottiswoode had been urged by the Archbishop of Canterbury to temporarily leave off enforcing the new ceremonies and instead concentrate on "weightier effairs" cannot be verified.<sup>88</sup> However, it should be noted that the archbishop shared Abbot's concerns and priorities, and would have needed little excuse or justification for calling a cessation to a witch hunt which seemed to be playing into their Roman adversaries hands. Thus in the year that the committed presbyterian minister John Carmichael died, his proposal of November 1619 that for the sake of peace and unity the church authorities should turn a blind eye to all those who retained an entrenched preference and commitment to the ideals of the Scottish Reformation was quietly adopted as unofficial church policy. While King James remained committed to the imposition of the articles, it would seem that the collapse of his pro-Spanish policy and war in Europe helped divert his attention from ministerial non-conformity in Scotland.

The absence of a corresponding extant diocesan synod register makes it near impossible to accurately gauge the extent of opposition south of the river Forth.<sup>89</sup> Nevertheless, all indications purport to show that the situation there was very similar to the one Spottiswoode encountered in his northern diocese. Although it is quite evident from the names of those called to appear before the high commission that opposition was fairly evenly spread throughout his archiepiscopal territory, Edinburgh as might be expected became the focus and fulcrum of the conflict.<sup>90</sup> As noted above, this was largely the result of King James's resolution to pursue a policy of thorough in the Scottish capital.

---

<sup>87</sup>CH2/154/1. f.255.

<sup>88</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.547.

<sup>89</sup>The surviving presbytery registers of Haddington and Linlithgow not unexpectedly throw no light on the issue of non-conformity to the Perth articles.

<sup>90</sup>See D.Stevenson. *Conventicles in the Kirk, 1619-37. The Emergence of a Radical Party*, in *RSCHS*. 18. (1972). pp.101-105. Wells. *The Origins of Covenanting Thought and Resistance: 1580-1638*. See in particular chapter 2 pp.60-98.

On 5 January 1619, William Struthers bitterly denounced the presence of many clerics from outwith Edinburgh, who had been active in the capital for over a month "feasting from house to house, seducing the people [and] speaking against bishops".<sup>91</sup> He accused such ministers of acting like "popes" and likened their behaviour and activities to those of the anabaptists. That there was a ready audience for such non-conformist divines would appear to be beyond dispute. After all, in spite of the proclamations and efforts of both the civil and church authorities, the Christmas service in St Giles was poorly attended. Likewise Calderwood satirically noted that "dogges were playing in the midst of the flure of the Litle Kirk, for raritie of people".<sup>92</sup> Such an inauspicious reception to the re-introduction of one of the principal designated holy days, however, only stiffened the king's resolve to have his will obeyed. A month later, presumably after an investigation of sorts, Robert Lawson, James Cathkin, John Mean and Patrick Henrisone were singled out and admonished by the high commission. They had defiantly ignored the injunction on keeping Christmas day and had opened their shops for business.<sup>93</sup> However, it seems reasonable to conjecture that they were called before the commission mainly because they had enthusiastically encouraged others to emulate their actions. The threats of the high commission, however, proved a totally ineffective deterrent. Cathkin, in particular, was a bookseller and veteran opponent of the royal supremacy and episcopacy having been forced to flee Scotland with the ministers persecuted for their resistance to the Black Acts in 1584. In his account of the above affair, he intriguingly intimated that Spottiswoode had informed him that he had ordered the ministry of Edinburgh to "urge no mann to kneele, bot to give it to everie mann according as he desired to tak it".<sup>94</sup> While the truthfulness of such a statement cannot be verified,

---

<sup>91</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.344.

<sup>92</sup>*Ibid.* p.341.

<sup>93</sup>*Ibid.* pp.348-349.

<sup>94</sup>See J.Cathkin. A Relation of James Cathkin his imprisonment and examination about printing of the Nullitie of the Perth Assemblie by himself: c.1619 in *Bannatyne Miscellany: containing original papers and tracts chiefly relating to the history and literature of Scotland*. Vol.I. (Edinburgh, 1827). p.202.

Cathkin's assertion probably reflected the archbishop's genuine feelings on the question of kneeling at Communion. That this became accepted policy from around 1622, provides further confirmation that it was the king who was insisting on absolute obedience to the five articles. Again at Easter the communion services in the capital were not well attended, and probably a majority of those who did attend disobeyed the injunction on kneeling.<sup>95</sup>

On 12 March, Richard Dickson, the minister of the West Church or St Cuthbert's, lying adjacent to Edinburgh, was deprived by Spottiswoode and his fellow archbishop and ordered to enter ward in Dumbarton Castle for celebrating the sacrament of Communion the previous week "according to the laudable and ancient form".<sup>96</sup> Nevertheless, Dickson was not punished for simply shunning the new ordinance. His main crime would appear to have been his willingness to administer the elements to many of the inhabitants of Edinburgh who "fearing the Communion wold not be ministered in their owne kirks in that puritie" had not scrupled to seek the services of a known non-conformist. Two days after prosecuting Dickson, Spottiswoode took to the pulpit of St Giles and with the key governmental officials and the town magistracy in attendance "threatened all estates, from the highest to the lowest, with the king's wrath and authoritie" with giving absolute obedience to the five articles.<sup>97</sup> In particular, he urged those in authority to set a good example to their social inferiors. And where good example and gentle persuasion failed to produce the requisite results more forceful means had to be deployed. The archbishop's vocal exertions, however, appear to have generally fallen on deaf ears. Indeed, acrimony and opposition were only too visible at a meeting hastily arranged by the ministers of Edinburgh and their respective parishioners on 23 March.<sup>98</sup> The meeting had been called in a somewhat desperate attempt to forestall a significant exodus of non-conformists at the fast

---

<sup>95</sup>Calderwood. *Histry*. VII. pp.359-360. *Melrose Papers*. II. pp.637-638.

<sup>96</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.352-355. Row. *Historie*. p.320.

<sup>97</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.355.

<sup>98</sup>*Ibid.* pp.355-357.

approaching Easter Communion service. Nevertheless, as at Christmas, worship on Easter day was sparsely attended with many parishioners travelling outwith the capital to receive the Communion elements sitting from those committed to the retention of the quintessential Reformed practice. Neither King James's epistolary interdicts insisting on government reprisals against non-conformists, nor his determination to sacrifice Henry Blyth and David Forrester, who for all intents and purposes had conformed and administered the sacrament kneeling, did much to arrest the situation.

Archbishop Spottiswoode, unlike the king, however, adopted a longer term strategy. This involved playing the conciliator or mediator in public, while using the official organs of government and church to cajole and impress upon the recalcitrant the need for reform. Thus after his return from court in July 1619 the archbishop adjudicated in the ongoing controversy between the town of Edinburgh and its ministers.<sup>99</sup> Moreover, Spottiswoode later intervened and pleaded the case of Lawson, Cathkin *et al* censured for their disobedience on the orders of the king. In October Spottiswoode preached to his diocesan synod in Edinburgh on the aptly chosen text of Hebrews 13:17.<sup>100</sup> He told his audience that pastors

were to be revered and obeyed, howbeit they were traitours as Judas, licentious as the sones of Eli, and profane as Arius; and their flocks ought to submitt themselves to their judgements in maters spirituall, where the Word of God is not express in the contrarie, otherwise there wold be no order in the kirk, but great confusion, and all authoritie wold be condemned.<sup>101</sup>

The archbishop further warned of the dire consequences facing the national church if disobedience and division were not swiftly extinguished. It was ironic then that the well being and reputation of the Church of Scotland should have been preserved within a few years through the tacit acceptance by the church authorities of

---

<sup>99</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.389-390.

<sup>100</sup>Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.(AV).

<sup>101</sup>Calderwood. *History*. Vol.VII. p.395.



disobedience and division within its ranks. It practically goes without saying that Spottiswoode's words and deeds dismally failed to end the glaring animosity and disagreement over the acceptance of holy days and kneeling within the capital and its hinterland. The above divergent response to the keeping of Christmas, and to the celebration of the Eucharist at Easter, was repeated in the immediate years following.<sup>102</sup> The contemporary dissident divine John Row noted that throughout 1620

there were sundrie privie meetings of ministers and other good christians in Edinburgh, setting apart dayes for fasting, praying, and humiliation, crying to God for help in such a needful tyme.<sup>103</sup>

With scriptural exposition and ministerial exhortations, the discussion of difficult and contentious questions, and mutual edification, these unofficial exercises were analogous to the meetings of the privy kirks in the immediate pre-Reformation period.<sup>104</sup> Not surprisingly, Row berated the bishops and ministers whose task it was to abolish what were judged unlawful conventicles and candle-light congregations - for they were often forced to meet in the dead of night. The minister of Carnock's contention that those who regularly trysted in that fashion were unfairly labelled as "Puritans, Separatists, Brounists, &c" would seem to confirm the point made earlier that when Archbishop Spottiswoode inveighed against anabaptists, brownists *et al* in his sermons he was really making a veiled attack on such individuals. These clandestine gatherings continued unabated, not simply in the capital but in rural areas where they manifest themselves in the popular sacramental gatherings which became a ubiquitous feature of the non-conformist calendar from the early 1620s onwards.<sup>105</sup> Interestingly they remained a real bone of contention amongst the presbyterian

---

<sup>102</sup>See *Melrose Papers*. II. pp.638-647. Spottiswoode. *History*. pp.540, 545.

<sup>103</sup>Row. *Historie*. p.328.

<sup>104</sup>See Kirk. *Patterns of Change*. pp.1-15.

<sup>105</sup>For the continuation of conventicling in Edinburgh and the particularly acrimonious case against William Rigg, John Hamilton, John Dickson, William Thomson, John Meene and some others see Spottiswoode. *History*. p.545. Stevenson. *Conventicles in the Kirk, 1619-37*. pp.101-105. *Melrose Papers*. Vol.II. pp.639-647. On the sacramental gatherings see *Holy Fairs*. pp.21-28.

establishment after the Covenanting Revolution of 1638. One of the most vociferous opponents was David Calderwood himself, who apparently traced his opposition to private gatherings to his exile on the continent where he had witnessed the "wild follies of the English Brownists in Arnheim and Amsterdam".<sup>106</sup>

Before reflecting on Archbishop Spottiswoode's contribution to Jacobean Scotland, no study of presbyterian non-conformity and Spottiswoode's response to it would be complete without mention of the confessional clash between the metropolitan and his arch-critic, David Calderwood. The minister had fallen victim to the king and the high commission during James's sojourn to his native kingdom in the summer of 1617. Calderwood, along with Archibald Simson and William Ewart, appeared before the king and Spottiswoode in the high commission at St Andrews on 12 July. His refusal to recognise the spiritual authority of his judges or the justness of the case against him when taken in conjunction with his strident tone earned him temporary incarceration in the tolbooth of the city and subsequent banishment to the continent of Europe.<sup>107</sup> In the context of the present subject, Calderwood, like the Covenanters some two decades later, found it politically expedient to shift the blame for his situation onto the shoulders of the archbishop rather than accuse the king directly. Thus writing retrospectively in his *History*, notwithstanding the fact that he had quite blatantly antagonised and angered the king by his recalcitrance, it was Spottiswoode who emerged as his cardinal adversary and persecutor. It was the metropolitan who told him at the conclusion of his trial that he deserved to hang like the jesuit John Ogilvie.<sup>108</sup> Moreover, he accused the archbishop of intervening to prevent his release from ward and of undermining the pleas of clemency made on his behalf by William, Lord Cranston and his son John.<sup>109</sup> Nevertheless, the minister of Crailing spent little time in ward. He was transferred from St Andrews to Edinburgh but was released

---

<sup>106</sup>Guthry. *Memoirs*. pp.78-79.

<sup>107</sup>See Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.259-271. Row. *Historie*. pp.312-313. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.534.

<sup>108</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.270.

<sup>109</sup>*Ibid*. pp.273-283.

*circa* 27 July after Lord Cranston's son provided surety that the minister would depart for Europe before Michaelmas to come on the pain of five hundred merks.<sup>110</sup> However, he remained at large in Edinburgh and on Lord Cranston's estates until forced to flee on 27 August 1619.<sup>111</sup> The extent of Spottiswoode's involvement in Calderwood's trial, detention and banishment must remain unknown. Nevertheless, even Row, whom Mullan accurately described as the most acerbic of the anti-episcopal polemicists,<sup>112</sup> conceded that it was the king, who had returned to England blaming Calderwood in particular for his failure to win widespread acceptance of the five articles, and not the metropolitan who was behind his enforced exile.<sup>113</sup> Calderwood's influence, however, remained a potent force in Scotland through the dissemination of his works, published in Holland, attacking erastian episcopacy and the innovations introduced by the Perth assembly.<sup>114</sup>

Prior to fleeing abroad, Calderwood's *De regimine ecclesiae scoticae brevis relatio* and his critique of the five articles entitled *Perth Assembly* were readily circulated and avidly digested by the non-conforming community. Moreover, the controversy over ceremonies in Scotland sparked a similar war of words between the bishops and their puritan detractors in England which probably suggested that Calderwood's influence transcended Scotland.<sup>115</sup> The king, the Archbishop of St Andrews, and the authorities generally, not unexpectedly took particular umbrage and sought to prohibit, confiscate and destroy his highly critical and scathing works. The former attempted to provide a spirited historical defence of presbyterianism, by tracing its origins right back to the Scottish Reformation, and solicited an equally spirited rejoinder by Spottiswoode which was published in London under the title *Refutatio Libelli De Regimine Ecclesiae Scoticae* in 1620.<sup>116</sup> The metropolitan,

---

<sup>110</sup>*RPCS*. Vol.XI. p.208.

<sup>111</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. pp.382-383.

<sup>112</sup>Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. p.143.

<sup>113</sup>Row. *Historie*. p.312.

<sup>114</sup>See Milward. *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age*. pp.28-32.

<sup>115</sup>*Ibid.* pp.24-27.

<sup>116</sup>See *The Spottiswoode Miscellany*. Vol.I. pp.31-62.

echoing the sentiments expressed by Tilenus, the professor of theology at the University of Sedan, who had produced a pamphlet while visiting England that same year entitled *Paraeinsis ad Scotos Genevensis disciplinae zelotas*,<sup>117</sup> poured scorn on the notion that a presbyterian ecclesiology was planted in 1560. Instead, anticipating the later argument enunciated in his *History*, Spottiswoode contended that the origins of presbyterianism were directly attributable to the arrival in Scotland of Andrew Melville fresh from Geneva during the mid-1570s.<sup>118</sup> In total contrast to Calderwood, the archbishop rather unconvincingly sought to claim the historiographical highground for the Reformed episcopate.<sup>119</sup> However, the fact that the *Refutatio*, like Calderwood's *De regimine* was printed outwith Scotland and in Latin would tend to confirm that the fight for the heart and soul of the Reformed tradition far transcended the Scottish borders. Considering the indomitable character which the minister of Crailing seems to have possessed, Spottiswoode likely anticipated that his reply would produce a vehement rebuttal and denunciation. The resultant *Vindiciae contra calumnias Johannis Spotswodi Fani Andreae pseudo-archiepiscopi* strove to demolish the archbishop's contentions one by one.<sup>120</sup> Intriguingly a forged recantation allegedly written by Patrick Scot, a young gentleman from Falkland who had fallen on hard times, professedly penned by Calderwood in Amsterdam and dated November 1622 was published and distributed in Britain to discredit his reputation and nullify the propaganda which had flowed from his pen.<sup>121</sup> Was Spottiswoode privy to such subterfuge? Had he commissioned Scot to write the recantation? Although Calderwood later noted that the impecunious young gentleman sought his livelihood at court, which might suggest that someone there had put the idea in his head, he, nevertheless, later accused the archbishop of using Scot to spread disinformation to the effect that he had defected to the Brownist or separatist cause. Prefixed to the

---

<sup>117</sup>Calderwood. *History*. VII. p.450.

<sup>118</sup>Spottiswoode *Miscellany*. I. p.44. Spottiswoode. *History*. p.275.

<sup>119</sup>See Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland*. pp.137-141. For an account of the epistolary clash between Calderwood and Spottiswoode.

<sup>120</sup>See *Ibid.* p.139.

<sup>121</sup>See *Letters and State Papers*.pp.385-386n.

English version of *Altare Damascenum* which was produced in response to news of his supposed recantation, Calderwood forcefully noted that "Bishop Spotswood hath spread a rumour, that Mr David Calderwood is turned Brownist". He categorically denied the reports, claiming "[t]hat old impudent lyar hath, together his supposed author, a young man, trimmed up a tale with many circumstances, to make misreport the more credible." He concluded by threatening "[i]f either Spotswood, or his supposed author, persist in their calumnie after this declaration, I shall try if there be any blood in their foreheads."<sup>122</sup>

It may have been partly in response to Calderwood's irreverent threat that Scot was dispatched to Holland to locate and apprehend the outspoken presbyterian and to put a stop to the composition, publication and distribution of his works which were all too easily finding their way back to Scotland.<sup>123</sup> It probably speaks volumes for the earnestness of his mission that his search for Calderwood took him to Rotterdam, The Hague, Campvere, Dortrecht, Leyden, Utrecht and Amsterdam. However, although he discovered that one John Hamilton, a merchant from Edinburgh was implicated in the trade of puritan works destined for Scotland, his mission to discover the whereabouts of the minister ended in complete failure. Scot concluded the account of his efforts by drawing three salient observations. Firstly he noted that "the correspondens betwix the Puritans of Scotland and those of the Low Cuntries, dothe rather increase than diminishe". Secondly he discovered that "the contempt of bishops, and the wrytinge bothe against their persons and gouernment, is much applauded in the Vnited Provinces". And finally and most crucially he found that

the cause of the communitie of forbidden bookes, both  
heare and in the Lowe Cuntreyes, proceedeth from the  
correspondens that is kept betwix the printers and

---

<sup>122</sup>*Letters and State Papers*. p.391n.

<sup>123</sup>For the full account of Scot's labours see *Ibid.* pp.385-391. See also *Vox Vera: or, Observations from Amsterdam. Examining The late Insolencies of some Pseudo-Puritans, separatists, from the Church of Great Brittain. And closed up with a serious three-fold Advertisement for the generall use of every good Subject within his Maiesties Dominions, but more especially of those in the Kingdome of Scotland. By Patricke Scot, North-Brittain. 1625.*

stationers in England, Scotland and there. If there be  
heare a copy that cannot be printed without danger, it is  
conueyed to Amsterdam, where it is saiflie printed,  
returned, and sould at a tenn-fould deerer rate then anie  
other booke whatsoever.<sup>124</sup>

While it cannot be determined with certainty that Archbishop Spottiswoode was the authority behind Scot's traverse of the United Provinces in search of the illusive Calderwood, the episode was demonstrative of the difficulty and magnitude of the task facing those charged with enforcing the suppression and prohibition of anti-erastian episcopal libels. Whether or not Charles I, in consultation with the metropolitan, concluded that it was prudent to allow Calderwood to return to Scotland where his activities could be better monitored remains conjectural. Nevertheless, he was permitted home shortly after the death of James VI.

Although it would have to be concluded that the archbishop's endeavours to marginalise and subdue presbyterian non-conformity largely failed, it would be wrong to entirely blame Spottiswoode for their failure. His policy of evolutionary change through example, gentle persuasion and the enforcement of diocesan discipline was probably the most appropriate course of action open to him. After all there was very little enthusiasm in Scotland for the king's five articles which made even supporters of the episcopal regime reluctant to impose such an untimely and unwanted religious policy on a sceptical nation. The strong arm tactics insisted on by the crown only led to the creation of martyrs and made it near on impossible to bridge or diffuse the palpable doctrinal divisions which existed within the Church of Scotland. While by the end of James VI's reign it would appear that Spottiswoode's approach had gained general if tacit acceptance, the lessons of the Jacobean period went unheeded by Charles I with such devastating results for Archbishop Spottiswoode and his sons,

---

<sup>124</sup>*Letters and State Papers*, pp.390-391. For more on this subject see K.L. Sprunger. *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. (Leiden, 1982). *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands 1600-1640*. (1994).

who like King James's own, would subsequently be executed for the part each played in defence of the crown during the civil wars.

## CONCLUSION.

Shortly after the death of James VI, Archbishop Spottiswoode reminiscently told his flock that “posteritie wil admire bothe ye workes and ye persone, and looking back into ages past for ye lyk pattern, sal not be able to find any thing to be compared with it.”<sup>1</sup>

He continued

if I culd restrain my passions but a litle space, I wold by this occasioun tel zow qhat a lamentable loss we, and not only, but ye qhole Christian world hath sustained in his death. But that is not possible for me to doe,... he has left us a sonne of most excellent hope, fit bothe for his zeirs and judgement to govern, quhiche is a singular great blessing upon this Isle. Let vs turn to God, and pray fervently in privat and publick, that yese kingdoms may longe enioye him, and be happie in his governement as yei haif bein in his father’s.

Notwithstanding his archiepiscopal duty and responsibility to extol the virtues of his royal master, there can be little doubt that Spottiswoode’s pathos and hope for the future of the crown throughout the British Isles was genuine. Nevertheless, it must be recognised that there was likely an element of gratitude and self-interest in the archbishop’s lament and exhortation. King James’s memorable and widely quoted dictum “no bishop, no king”, targeted against the proponents of presbyterianism at the Hampton Court conference of 1604, should more accurately have read no king, no bishops. While one of the principal objectives of this thesis has been to shed greater light on the characteristics and qualities that made John Spottiswoode the most authoritative and influential of Scotland’s Jacobean churchmen, his ascendancy in both church and state had been largely dependent on his standing and relationship with the king.

---

<sup>1</sup>NLS. Ms. 2934. See Spottiswoode’s sermon on 2 Thessalonians f.28.



At the outset, one of the stated aims of this study was to show that the somewhat desultory labels of “obscure” and “uninspiring” could not be attached to John Spottiswoode’s archiepiscopate. Of course, it must be acknowledged that he was in many ways unique amongst Jacobean ecclesiastics. None of his fellow bishops possessed the range of offices or commanded the widespread respect of friend and foe alike that Spottiswoode did. It has been argued that one of James VI’s key attributes was his impressive ability to fill his Scottish administration with particularly gifted individuals suited to the task of government.<sup>2</sup> Although this observation was primarily made in relation to the period prior to the regal union, it is equally true after 1603, and Spottiswoode falls into such a categorisation. In the first instance, the king’s chief churchman in Scotland had to be a judicious and skilful politician, not a theologian. It was for this very reason that Spottiswoode made such an impact on the Jacobean stage, firstly at Glasgow where his rise to prominence was swift and dramatic and later in St Andrews.

Additionally, it has been the contention of this thesis to demonstrate that Archbishop Spottiswoode was no divine right episcopalian, nor was he an enthusiast for the creation of a British church conforming to the anglican *via media*. Instead, he saw in the restitution of erastian bishops an opportunity to manipulate the organs of Scottish secular government in order to bring to fruition the goals set down by the reformers in and around 1560. Thus Spottiswoode was able to use, not only his ecclesiastical powers, but his authority as a privy councillor and prominent member of parliament to advance and consolidate the Reformed Faith in the peripheral parts of the kingdom. Moreover, his continual denunciations and strenuous attempts to eliminate Roman Catholicism in Scotland were no mere ruse calculated to appease presbyterian

---

<sup>2</sup>Zulager. *A Study of the Middle Rank Administration in the Government of King James VI of Scotland, 1580-1603*.

detractors, but sprang from deeply held doctrinal convictions. Last but not least, his determination to secure for the church adequate financial and material provision again sprang from a deeply rooted belief that without such provision the church was prevented from operating effectively throughout the localities. Although the church had made significant progress in the years since the Reformation, the unsavoury but indisputable fact remained that still too many parishes were left bereft of a minister of their own. Moreover, many of the ministry were left too reliant on their seigneurial patrons and what they considered to be an adequate remuneration. It was for this reason that Spottiswoode fought to establish an independent commission to apportion a minimum stipend in those churches affected by the erections of 1606. As shown, he also regularly intervened and used his authority to secure provision for individual ministers within his jurisdictional area. That it was Spottiswoode's intention to reverse and overturn the asset stripping of the church which had taken place in the wake of the Reformation there can be little doubt. Importantly, secular political opposition to the archbishop and the episcopate more generally, in the first instance, came not from confessional allegiance to Roman Catholicism or a presbyterian ecclesiology, but from the fact that Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops were now directly competing for governmental offices and the king's largesse.

Turning to the question of the consensus in Jacobean ecclesiastical history that until recently has largely gone unchallenged,<sup>3</sup> that the constitutional and structural transformation of the Church of Scotland made little difference to how the church operated within the localities, with presbyteries continuing to function as they had done prior to the wholesale alterations, could not be further from the truth. While the limited evidence would suggest that Spottiswoode resolutely nipped all opposition in the bud at

---

<sup>3</sup>See Wells. *The Origins of Covenanting Thought and Resistance: c.1580-1638*.

the outset of his archiepiscopal tenure in Glasgow, without surviving synod registers this cannot be determined with absolute certainty. However, there was very definite and widespread resistance to episcopacy in the archdiocese of St Andrews. Not surprisingly, there was no hint of such resistance in the extant presbytery registers. After 1610 presbyteries were stripped of real authority and were strategically retained to function as exercises and the conduits through which episcopal orders and instructions could be channelled. That a continuously significant proportion of the ministry evaded both presbytery and synod meetings altogether, while all too often those who did assemble omitted the exercise, was symptomatic of the limitations of archiepiscopal authority within the metropolitan see. Moreover, there is a telling amount of circumstantial evidence to support the view that known presbyterians were operating something akin to an independent church within the confines of the national church. While such resistance was exacerbated by the introduction of the five articles of 1618, they were not its primary cause. While presbyterians found no scriptural warrant for the hierarchy and opposed bishops as a result, the fundamental reason for the very tangible schism within the church centred on the question of the royal supremacy. Such a development was anathema to committed presbyterians who considered the spiritual autonomy of the church as sacrosanct. The king's dictatorial imposition of the five articles only demonstrated the apparent verity of presbyterian claims that the purity of the Church of Scotland would be inexorably contaminated by a king who outwardly professed to be a Calvinist but who in practice promoted arminianism within the Church of England, actively discouraged preaching on the subject of predestination, and who persistently promoted Roman Catholics to positions of temporal authority throughout the British Isles. Spottiswoode's view that conformity was achievable through time was seriously jeopardised by repeated crown interference. It is quite clear that Charles I was not the cause of the serious divisions within the church which disturbed his personal reign in Scotland: his father was.

This study of John Spottiswoode's career as Jacobean archbishop and statesman has also challenged the view that a royal absolutism was operative in Scotland during the Jacobean era. The limitations of combined state and church power were most clearly displayed in connection with the attempted suppression of Roman Catholic and presbyterian non-conformity. While Spottiswoode often deliberately turned a blind eye to Protestant recusancy, in the erroneous belief that in the long term such opposition would naturally wither away, it needs to be recognised that presbyterian non-conformist clerics were often shielded by powerful lay patrons and supporters which probably ruled out a systematic crackdown against such ministers. Spottiswoode, moreover, could little afford to alienate the social and political elites in both town and country, whose support was essential to the material and spiritual well-being of the church. More obviously, the analysis of the archbishop's endeavour to extirpate Roman Catholic recusancy has revealed that while Spottiswoode and other governmental and church officials could efficiently pass anti-recusancy legislation and ratify Acts of Parliament at the centre, they encountered much greater difficulty ensuring that such measures were implemented and enforced within the localities, where traditional loyalties to family and friends very often took precedence over those to church and state. That prominent and notorious Roman Catholics like the marquis of Huntly and Lord Gray, as heritable sheriffs for their respective localities, were permitted and indeed relied upon to enforce anti-Catholic enactments was indicative of the problems Spottiswoode and his fellow bishops encountered and had to combat. The innovative introduction of justices of the peace from 1609 made little difference to the exercise of justice within the localities since heritable jurisdictions remained unaffected. Therefore real power and authority were retained in the hands of the traditional elites. Since it has been argued that King James, unlike Spottiswoode, never whole-heartedly supported a repressive policy against Roman Catholics *per se*, it could conceivably be argued by proponents of the absolutist state that the above example is not a good one. Nevertheless, the only partial success of

royal policy in the Highlands and in the area of religious reform adds ballast to the contention. Moreover, although Spottiswoode and his fellow lords of the articles often worked diligently to secure the consent of the political nation to the raising of a royal taxation, it was probably symptomatic of the government's weakness in Scotland that it rarely secured the designated sum from the respective localities. Although, King James unquestionably entertained absolutist aspirations, Scotland remained, by and large, politically de-centralised.

Archbishop Spottiswoode continued his loyal service to church and state after the death of James VI in March 1625. Indeed it was surely testimony to Spottiswoode's loyalty and to his in-depth knowledge and experience of the Scottish state that he was finally made chancellor in his seventieth year in 1635, thus combining the two most powerful positions in the Scottish church and state in his person. Sadly, however, his career ended in failure and ignominy after the Covenanting Revolution of 1637-8 forced him into exile in England, where he died in November 1639. Had Charles I heeded the lessons from his father's reign or accepted the ageing archbishop's advice then things might very well have turned out differently for Spottiswoode and his family, episcopacy, and the fortunes of the king himself. Instead, James VI's infamous dictum "no bishops, no king", was transformed into prophetic reality when his son was executed in January 1649 in England by the anti-episcopal regime of the Commonwealth.

## ***BIBLIOGRAPHY.***

### ***Manuscript Sources.***

#### **The British Library.**

Add. MSS. 19,402.

Burney MSS 366.

#### ***Central Region Archives.***

Stirling Presbytery Records 1604-1612. CH2/722/3. 1612-1617. CH2/722/4.

#### **Mitchell Library, Glasgow.**

Glasgow Presbytery Records. CH2/171/1C. CH2/171/2A.

T-PM113/5.

Mitchell. TD200/115.

#### **National Library of Scotland.**

Advocates Ms.2934: 5960-5996.

Adv.MSS.80.1.1.

Denmilne MSS. 33.1.3.

Wodrow Collection LXXVI, No.2. The Confutatioun of ye dikaiologie, 1614.

Wodrow MSS. Quarto XVIII. No.4.

#### **Scottish Record Office.**

Calendar of Charters 1587-1591. Vol.XIII. RH6/3073.

CH8/59. A single folio from the synod of Clydesdale relating to Spottiswoode induction as constant moderator of the synod in 1607.

Gifts and Deposits. GD124/15. GD124/15/27. GD124/15/46.

Inventory of Torphin Writs, bundle IV.

Records from the court of session relating to the trial of John Ogilvie. JC26/7/59. JC26/7/63. JC26/7/66.

Records of the diocesan synod of St Andrews, 1610-1636. CH2/154/1.

Records of the presbytery of Haddington, 1613-1627. CH2/185/3.

Records of the presbytery of Linlithgow, 1610-1617. CH2/242/1.

Records of the privy seal of Scotland. PS1/74.

Register of the Commissariat of Edinburgh, Register of Testaments. CC8/8/20

Register of Presentations to Benefices. 1595-1607. CH4/1/3. 1578-1587. CH4/1/2. CH4/1/4, 1607-1617.

**Printed Primary Sources.**

*Acts of the Parliament of Scotland.* (Edinburgh, 1844-1875) 12 vols. Vol.IV, 1593-1625.

*Ancient Criminal Trials in Scotland 1488-1624.* (ed). R.Pitcairn. 4 vols. (1829-1833).

*A Breefe Memoriall of Dr James Spottiswood.* (ed). Sir A.Boswell. (1811).

*The Booke of the Universall Kirk, Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland.* 3 Vols. (Edinburgh, 1839).

*The Booke of the Universall Kirk.* (ed). A.Peterkin. (1839).

D.Calderwood. *History of the Kirk of Scotland.* 8 vols. (Wodrow society, 1842-49).

D.Calderwood. *Perth Assemblie. Containing I: The Proceedings thereof II: The Proofof the Nullitie thereof.* (Leiden, 1619).

*Calendar of State Papers.* Domestic. (1858-).

*Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland, 1547-1603.* (ed).J.Bain et al. 13 Vols. (Edinburgh, 1898-1969).

*Calendar of State Papers: Venetian.* (1864-).

J.Calvin. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* 2 vols. (ed.Beveridge, 1949).

*Calvin's New Testament Commentaries.* The Epistle of Paul to the Romans and Thessalonians. (ed). D.W.Torrance and T.F.Torrance. (1960).

J.Cathkin. A Relation of James Cathkin his imprisonment and examination about printing of the Nullitie of the Perth Assemblie by himself: c.1619 in *Bannatyne Miscellany: containing original papers and tracts chiefly relating to the history and literature of Scotland.* Vol.I. (Edinburgh, 1827).

*Charters and other Documents relating to the City of Glasgow, AD 1175-1649.* (ed.)J.D.Marwick. (1894).

*Complete Collection of State-Trials.* (London, 1776).

Courtney Reformation Classics. *Martin Bucer.* Vol.IV.

J.Davidson. D. Bancrofts Rashnes in Rayling Against the Chvrch of Scotland [1590] in *Miscellany of the Wodrow Society.* (1844).

*Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Glasgow AD 1573-1642.* Vol.I. (1876).

*The First Book of Discipline.* (ed.)J.K.Cameron. (1972).

J.Forbes. Certaine Records touching the Estate of the Church of Scotland in W.Scot. *Apologetical Narration.* (Wodrow Society, 1846). pp.343-558.

The Forme and Maner of Ordaining Ministers: and Consecrating of Arch-Bishops and Bishops Used in the Church of Scotland, 1620 in *The Miscellany of the Wodrow Society.* Vol.I. (1844). pp.597-615.

Sir Robert Gordon. *A Genealogical History of the Earldom of Sutherland.* (1813).

H.Guthry. *The Memoirs of Henry Guthry, Late Bishop of Dunkeld.* (2nd ed. 1747).

*Historical Manuscripts Commission.* 72. Laing MSS.I. (1914).

*Historical Manuscripts Commission.* Mar and Kellie. 60. Vol.I. (1904).

*Historical Manuscripts Commission.* Salisbury (Cecil) Manuscripts. 1607. Vol.XIX. (1965). Vol.17. (1938).

A.Hume. Ane Afold Admonitioun to the Ministrie of Scotland. [1609] in *The Miscellany of the Wodrow Society.* (1844). pp569-590.

*The Jacobean Union 1604.* (eds). B.Galloway and B.P.Levack. (Scottish History Society, 1985).

Q. Kennedy. Ane Compendious Reasonyng in *The Works of John Knox.* (ed). D.Laing. 6 vols. (1846-1864). Vol.VI.

*King James VI & I. Political Writings.* (ed). J.P.Sommerville. (1994).

J.Knox. *History of the Reformation.* (ed).W.C.Dickinson. 2 vols. (1949). Vol.I.

*Letters of King James VI & I.* (ed). G.P.V.Akrigg.(1984).

*Letters and State Papers During the Reign of King James VI.* (Abbotsford Club, 1838).



D.Lindsay. *The Reasons of a Pastor's resolution, touching the communion.* (London, 1619).

J.Melville. *Autobiography and Diary of Mr James Melvill.* (ed).R.Pitcairn. (Edinburgh, 1842).

*Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis.*(ed). C.Innes. 4 Vols. (Glasgow,1854). Vol.II.

J.Murray. *A Dialogue betwixt Cosmophilus and Theophilus anent the Urging of new ceremonies upon the Kirk of Scotland.* (1620).

*Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI.* (ed). W.Forbes-Leith. (Edinburgh, 1885).

*Original Letters on Ecclesiastical Affairs in Scotland.* 2 Vols. (Bannatyne Club, 1851).

*Practicks of the Laws of Scotland. Observed and Collected by Sir Robert Spottiswoode of Pentland.* (Edinburgh, 1706).

*Records of Aboyne MCCXXX-MDCLXXXI.* (New Spalding Club, 1894).

*The Records of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, 1589-1596, 1640-1649.* (ed). J.Kirk. (Stair Society, 1977).

*Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum.* (ed). J.M.Thomson. (Edinburgh, 1882-1914).

*Registrum Secreti Sigilli Regum Scotorum.* (ed) M.Livingston et al. (Edinburgh, 1908-1966).

*Register of the Privy Council of Scotland.* (ed). J.H.Burton et al. (1877-1889).

*Relatio Incarcerationes et Martyrii, P.Ioannis Ogilbei, Natione Scoti, e Societate Iesv Presbyteri, 1615.*

J.Row. *Historie of the Kirk of Scotland from this year 1558 to August 1637.* (ed). D.Laing. (Wodrow Society, 1842).

*Royal Letters and Instructions and other documents from the archive of the Earl of Wigton MDXX-MDCL.* (Maitland Club, 1840).

W.Scot. *A Apologetical Narration of the State and Government of the Kirk of Scotland since the Reformation.* (Wodrow Society, 1846).

*W.Scot. The Course of Conformity, as it hath proceeded, is concluded, should be refused. (Amsterdam, 1622).*

*The Second Book of Discipline.* (ed). J.Kirk. (1980).

J.Spottiswoode. *History of the Church of Scotland.* (1655). & 3 Vols. (ed). M.Napier and M.Russell. (Edinburgh, 1847-51).

*Spottiswoode Miscellany.* 2 Volumes. (Edinburgh, 1844). Vol.I.

*State Papers and Miscellaneous Correspondence of Thomas, Earl of Melros.* 2 vols. (Abbotsford Club, 1837).

*Stirling Presbytery Records 1581-1587.* (ed). J.Kirk. (Scottish History Society,1981).

*A Trve Relation of the Proceedings Against John Ogilvie, a Jesuit, Executed at Glasgow, the last of Februarie, anno 1615.*

*Vox Vera: or, Observations from Amsterdam. Examining The late Insolencies of some Pseudo-Puritans, separatists, from the Church of Great Brittain. And closed up with a serious three-fold Advertisement for the Generall use of every good Subiect within his Maiesties Dominions, but more especially of those in the Kingdome of Scotland. By Patricke Scot, North-Brittain. 1625.*

### ***Secondary Sources.***

W.J.Anderson. A Jesuit that calls himself Ogilvie in *Innes Review.* Vol.15. (1964). pp.56-65.

P.F.Anson. *Underground Catholicism in Scotland.* (1970).

Anon. Presbytery and Popery in the Sixteenth Century in *Scottish Historical Review.* Vol.III. (October, 1905)

M.Ash. Dairsie and Archbishop Spottiswoode in *Records of Scottish Church History Society.* Vol.XIX. (1976). pp.125-133.

A.L.Birchler. Archbishop John Spottiswoode: Chancellor of Scotland, 1635-1638 in *Church History.* Vol.39. (1970). pp.317-326.

K.M.Brown. *Bloodfeud in Scotland 1573-1625.* (1986).

K.M.Brown. Burghs, Lords and Feuds in Jacobean Scotland in (ed). M.Lynch. *The Early Modern Town in Scotland.* (1987).

K.M.Brown. In Search of the Godly Magistrate in (ed). N.Macdougall. *Reformation Scotland in Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929.* (1983).

K.M.Brown. *Kingdom or Province. Scotland and the Regal Union 1603-1715.* (1994).

K.M.Brown. The vanishing emperor: British kingship and its decline in R.Mason. (ed). *Scots and Britons. Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*. (1994).

G.Brunton and D.Craig. *An Historical Account of the Senators of the College of Justice*. (Edinburgh, 1832).

E.Cameron. *The European Reformation*. (1991).

J.K.Cameron. Humanism and Religious Life in (ed). J.MacQueen. *Humanism in Renaissance Scotland*. (1994).

J.L.Campbell. The Macneils of Barra and the Irish Franciscans in *Innes Review*. Vol.5. (1954). pp. 33-38.

W.M.Campbell. *The Triumph of Presbyterianism*. (1958).

R.G.Cant. *The University of St Andrews: A Short History*. (1970).

R.Clifton. Fear of Popery in (ed). C.Russell. *The Origins of the English Civil War*. (1973). pp.144-167.

T.Cogswell. England and the Spanish Match in (ed). R.Cust and A.Hughes. *Conflict in Early Stuart England*. (1989). pp.107-133.

*Collections upon the lives of the reformers and most eminent ministers of the Church of Scotland*. (ed).W.J.Duncan. 2 vols. (Maitland Club, 1834-48).

Collections upon the Life of Patrick Forbes, Baron of Oreil and Laird of Corse, Minister of Keith and Bishop of Aberdeen in *Wodrow Biographical Collections: Divines of the North-East*. (New Spalding Club, 1890). pp.245-269.

T.Collins. *Martyr in Scotland*. (1955).

J.Cooper. Archbishop Spottiswoode, 1565-1639 in *Transactions of the Glasgow Archaeological Society*. New Series 7. (1924). pp.79-104.

I.B.Cowan. The Five Articles of Perth in (ed). D.Shaw. *Reformation and Revolution*. (1967). pp.160-177.

I.B.Cowan. The Marian Civil War, 1567-1573 in N.Macdougall (ed). *Scotland and War AD79-1918*. (1991).

I.B.Cowan. *The Scottish Reformation: Church and Society in sixteenth-century Scotland*. (1982)

B.Coward. *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714*. (1994).

- D.Cressy. *Bonfires and bells: national memory and the Protestant calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England*. (1989).
- N.Cuddy. Anglo-Scottish Union and the Court of James I, 1603-1625 in *Transactions of the Royal History Society*. No.39. (1989)
- W.Cunningham. *Historical Theology: A review of the principal doctrinal discussions in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age*. 2 vols. (First published 1882, 1991 re-print).
- N.Davies. *Europe: A History*. (1996).
- J.Dawson. Calvinism in the Gaidhealtachd in Scotland in (ed). A.Pettegree et al. *Calvinism in Europe 1540-1620*. (1994)
- P.Y.De Jong. *Crisis in the Reformed Churches: Essays in Commemoration of the Great Synod of Dort, 1618-1619*. (1968).
- A.G.Dickens. *The Counter-Reformation*. (re-print, 1992).
- A.G.Dickens. *The English Reformation*. (1964).
- M.Dilworth. Abbott Gilbert Brown: a sketch of his career in *Innes Review*. Vol.40. (1989). pp. 153-158.
- M.Dilworth. Three documents relating to St John Ogilvie in *Innes Review*. Vol.34. (1983). pp.51-65.
- G.Donaldson. *James V - James VII*. (1965).
- G.Donaldson. *The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637*. (1954).
- G.Donaldson. A Scottish Liturgy of the reign of James VI in *Miscellany X*. Scottish History Society. (1965).
- G.Donaldson. *The Scottish Reformation*. (1960).
- A.L.Drummond. *The Kirk and the Continent*. (1956).
- J.A.Duke. *History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation*. (1937).
- A.I.Dunlop. John Spottiswoode, 1565-1639 in (ed). R.S.Wright. *Fathers of the Kirk*. (1960). pp. 48-61.
- J.Durkan. Education: The Laying of Fresh Foundations in (ed). J.Macqueen. *Humanism in Renaissance Scotland*. (1994).
- J.Durkan. Two Jesuits: Patrick Anderson and John Ogilvie in *Innes Review*. Vol.21. (1970). pp.157-161.

- J.Durkan and J.Kirk. *The University of Glasgow 1451-1577*. (1977).
- J.Durkan. William Murdoch and the early Jesuit Mission in Scotland in *Innes Review*. Vol.35. (1984). pp.3-11.
- Rev.A.Edgar. *Old Church Life: Lectures on Kirk Session and Presbytery Records*. (1885).
- J.Fielding. Arminianism in the Localities: Peterborough Diocese, 1603-1642 in (ed). K.Fincham. *The Early Stuart Church*. (1993). pp.93-113.
- K.Fincham and P.Lake. The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I in *Journal of British Studies*. 24. (April, 1985)
- A.Ford. *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590-1641*. (Frankfurt, 1985).
- J.Ford. The Lawful Bonds of Scottish Society: The Five Articles, The Negative Confession and the National Covenant in *The Historical Journal*. Vol.37. (1994). pp.45-64.
- W.R.Foster. *The Church Before the Covenants: The Church of Scotland 1596-1638*. (1975).
- B.Galloway. *The Union of England and Scotland 1603-1608*. (1986)
- C.Geertz. *Centres, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power in Culture and its Creators. Essays in Honour of Edward Shils*. (1977).
- Rev.C.Giblin. Some notes on the Irish Franciscan Mission to Scotland in *Innes Review*. Vol.4. (1953). pp.42-48.
- R.Gillespie. *Colonial Ulster: The Settlement of East Ulster 1600-1641*. (1985).
- J.Goodare. The Emergence of the Absolutist State, a paper given to the Association of Scottish Historical Studies annual conference at Perth in May 1996. pp.12-23.
- J.Goodare. The nobility and the absolutist state in Scotland, 1584-1638 in *History*. Vol.LXXVIII. (1993). pp.161-182.
- J.Goodare. Scotland in (ed). B.Scribner et al. *The Reformation in National Context*. (1994). pp.95-110.
- J.Goodare. The Scottish Parliament of 1621 in *The Historical Journal*. 38. 1. (1995).
- J.Goodare. The Statutes of Iona in Context in *The Scottish Historical Review*. Vol.LXXVII. 1: No.203: (April, 1998). pp.31-57.
- J.F.S.Gordon. *Scotichronicon*. 3Vols. (1867)

- M.F.Graham. *The Uses of Reform. Godly Discipline and Popular Behaviour in Scotland and Beyond, 1560-1610*. (1996).
- M.Greengrass. France in (ed). B.Scribner. *The Reformation in National Context*. (1994). pp.47-66.
- J.Guy. *Tudor England*. (1992).
- J.Hale. *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance*. (1993).
- G.Hay. *Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches*. (1957).
- K.Hewat. *Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation*. (1920).
- S.Holland. Archbishop Abbot and the Problem of Puritanism in *The Historical Journal*. 37. 1. (1994). pp.23-43.
- The House of Gordon*. Vol.I. (New Spalding Club, 1903).
- S.J.Houston. *James I*. (re-print, 1986).
- R.T.Kendall. *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*. (1979).
- J.Kirk. Melvillian Reform in the Scottish Universities in (ed). A.A.MacDonald et al. *The Renaissance in Scotland: Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture*. (1994).
- J.Kirk. *Patterns of Reform: Continuity and Change in the Reformation Kirk*. (1989).
- J.Kirk. The Religion of Early Scottish Protestants in *Humanism and Reform: The Church in Europe, England and Scotland 1400-1643*. (ed). J.Kirk. (Ecclesiastical History Society, 1991)
- R.J.Knecht. *The French Wars of Religion 1559-1598*. (1996).
- P.Lake. Anti-Popery: the Structure of a Prejudice in (ed). R.Cust and A.Hughes. *Conflict in Early Stuart England. Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*. (1989). pp.72-106.
- M.Lee Jnr. Archbishop Spottiswoode as Historian in *The Journal of British Studies*. Vol.13. (1973-4). pp.138-150.
- M.Lee Jnr. *Government By Pen: Scotland under James VI & I*. (1980).
- M.Lee Jnr. *Great Britain's Soloman: James VI and I and His Three Kingdoms*. (1990).

- M.Lee Jnr. James VI's Government of Scotland after 1603 in *Scottish Historical Review*. Vol.15. (1976).
- M.Lee Jnr. James VI and the Revival of episcopacy in Scotland, 1596-1600 in *Church History*. No.43. (1974)
- M.Lee Jnr. *James Stewart, Earl of Moray*. (1953).
- M.Lee Jnr. King James's Popish Chancellor in (ed). I.B.Cowan and D.Shaw. *The Renaissance and Reformation in Scotland*. (1983).
- B.P.Levack. *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union 1603-1707*. (1987).
- D.M.Loades. *Politics and the Nation: 1450-1660*. (1992).
- R.Lockyer. *James VI & I*. (1998).
- N.Lossky. *Lancelot Andrewes: the preacher 1555-1626*. (1991).
- M.Lynch. Preaching to the Controverted in (ed).A.A.MacDonald et al. *The Renaissance in Scotland. Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture*. (1994).
- M.Lynch. *Scotland, A New History*. (1991).
- A.I.MacInnes. *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641*. (1991).
- A.I.MacInnes. *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stewart, 1603-1788*. (1996).
- A.I.MacInnes. Crown, Clans and Fine: Scottish Gaeldom, 1587-1638 in *Northern Scot*. Vol.13. (1993).
- J.D.Mackie. *The University of Glasgow 1451-1951*. (1954).
- D.MacLean. Catholicism in the Highlands and Island, 1560-1680 in *Innes Review*. Vol.3. (1952). pp.5-13.
- (ed).R.A.Mason. *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*. (1994).
- R.A.Mason. George Buchanan, James VI and the presbyterians in R.A.Mason. *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*. (1994).
- W.D.Maxwell. *A History of Worship in the Scottish Church*. (1955).
- G.I.R.McMahon. The Scottish Courts of High Commission 1610-1638 in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*. 15. (1966)

- T.M'Crie. *The Life of Andrew Melville*. 2 Vols. (1819).
- A.E.McGrath. *A Life of John Calvin*. (1990).
- W.A.McNeill and P.G.B.McNeill. The Scottish Progress of James VI, 1617 in *The Scottish Historical Review*. Vol.LXXV. 1 No.199. (April, 1996). pp.38-51.
- D.McRoberts. Was blessed John Ogilvie a Highlander? in *Innes Review*. Vol.15. (1964). pp.183-185.
- Memoir of Alexander Seton, Earl of Dunfermline*. (Edinburgh, 1882).
- P.Milward. *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources*. (1978).
- R.Mitchison. *Lordship to Patronage. Scotland 1603-1707*. (1983).
- (ed). J.Morrill. *The Illustrated History of Tudor & Stuart Britain*. (1996).
- D.G.Mullan. *Episcopacy in Scotland: The History of an Idea, 1560-1638*. (1986).
- D.G.Mullan. Theology in the Church of Scotland 1618-c1640: A Calvinist Concensus? in *Sixteenth Century Journal*. Vol.XXVI. No.3. (1995). pp.595-617.
- A.Murray. Sir John Skene and the Exchequer, 1594-1612 in *Miscellany One*. (Stair Society, 1971).
- D.C.Nicol. *Master Robert Bruce*. (1907).
- J.Nicols. *The Progresses of King James the First*. 3 vols. (1828).
- W.B.Patterson. *King James VI & I and the reunion of Christendom*. (1997).
- W.Pearce. The Stirling Presbytery, 1604-1612: and the re-imposition of an erastian episcopacy in *Forth Naturalist and Historian*. Vol.19. (1996). pp.
- M.Perceval-Maxwell. *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the reign of James I*. (1973)
- J.O.Ranelagh. *A Short History of Ireland*. (1995).
- B.M.Reardon. *Religious Thought In The Reformation*. (1981).
- H.M.B.Reid. *The Divinity Principals in the University of Glasgow*. (1917).
- J.Reid. *Memoirs of the Westminster Divines*. (re-print, 1982).



- C.Russell. The Problem of Multiple Kingdoms c.1580-1630 in C.Russell. *The Causes of the English Civil War*. (1990).
- L.E.Schmidt. *Holy Fairs. Scottish Communion and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period*. (1989).
- M.H.Sanderson. Catholic Recusancy in Scotland in the Sixteenth Century in *Innes Review*. Vol.21. (1970). pp.87-107.
- Select Biographies*. 2 Vols. (ed). W.K.Tweedie. (Edinburgh, 1845-47). Vol.I.
- F.Shearman. The Spanish Blanks in *Innes Review*. Vol.3. (1952). pp.81-103.
- L.F.Solt. *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509-1640*. (1990)
- J.P.Sommerville. The Royal Supremacy and Episcopacy Jure Divino, 1603-1640 in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. vol.34. No.4. (October, 1983).
- G.W.Sprott. *Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI*. (1871).
- K.L.Sprunger. *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. (Leiden, 1982).
- K.L.Sprunger. *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands 1600-1640*. (1994).
- P.Stanford. *The She-Pope: A Quest for the Truth Behind the Mystery of Pope Joan*. (1998).
- D.Stevenson. Conventicles in the Kirk, 1619-37: The Emergence of a Radical Party in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*. Vol.18. (1972). pp.99-114.
- D.Stevenson. *Highland Warrior: Alasdair MacColla and the Civil Wars*. (1980).
- J.B.Torrance. The Covenant Concept in Scottish Theology and Politics and its Legacy in *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Vol.34. (1981). pp.225-243.
- J.B.Torrance. Covenant or Contract? A study of the theological background of worship in seventeenth-century Scotland in *Scottish Journal of Theology*. Vol.23. (1970). pp.51-76.
- N.Tyacke. *Anti-Calvinists. The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640*. (1987).
- A.M.Williamson. *Scottish National Consciousness in the age of James VI*. (1979).
- B.R.White. *The English Separatist Tradition: From the Marian Martyrs to the Pilgrim Fathers*. (1971).

P.White. The via media in the early Stuart Church in (ed). K.Fincham. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. (1993). pp.211-230.

I.D.Whyte. *Scotland Before the Industrial Revolution. An Economic and Social History, c1050-1750*. (1995).

D.H.Willson. *King James VI & I*. (1956).

J.Wormald. *Court, Kirk and Community: Scotland 1470-1625*. (1981).

J.Wormald. The Creation of Britain: Multiple Kingdoms or Core and Colonies? in *Transactions of the Royal History Society*. 6th series, no.2. (1992) pp.175-194.

J.Wormald. Gunpowder, Treason and Scots in *Journal of British Studies*. Vol.24. No.2. (April, 1985).

J.Wormald. No Bishop, no King: The Scottish Jacobean Episcopate, 1600-1625 in *Bibliothèque de la Revue d' Histoire Ecclesiastique: Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae VIII*. (ed). E.Vogler. (Louvain, 1987). pp.259-267.

#### ***Reference Works and Unpublished PhD Theses.***

*Dictionary of National Biography*. (1900-).

*Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology*. (1993).

*Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae*. 4 Vols. (ed). H.Cotton. (Dublin, 1847-50).

*Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae*. (ed). H.Scott. 8 Vols. (Edinburgh, 1915-1950)

B.McLennan. *Presbyterianism Challenged: A Study of Catholicism and Episcopacy in the North-East of Scotland, 1560-1650*. (University of Aberdeen, 1977).

J.Perry. *John Spottiswoode, Archbishop and Chancellor*. (Edinburgh, 1954).

*The Scots Peerage*. (ed). J.B.Paul. 9 vols. (1904-1914).

*The Statistical Account of Scotland 1791-1799*. (ed). Sir J.Sinclair. Vol.II. The Lothians. (1975).

V.Wells. *The Origins of Covenanting Thought and Resistance: c.1580-1638*. (University of Stirling, 1997).

R.R.Zulager. *A Study of the Middle-Rank Administrators in the Government of King James VI of Scotland, 1580-1603*. (University of Aberdeen, 1991).