6-1-1947

The Relations Between the English and the Scottish Reformations

Carl Napier Jr
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_napierc@csl.edu

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ENGLISH AND THE SCOTTISH REFORMATIONS

A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of Historical Theology

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

---

by

Carl Napier, Jr.

June 1947

Approved by: Theo. Hoyer
Arthur C. Repp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ENGLISH AND THE SCOTTISH REFORMATIONS

Introduction

The Reformation in England and Scotland was the greatest single factor in finally effecting the union of the two kingdoms. Both Smith and Froude take this view.

> . . .the great influence overcoming national sentiment was religion. The Reformation that brought not peace but a sword to so much of Europe in this case united instead of divided the nations.[1]

> It was not till a new power had been introduced, and a bond of concord had arisen between the two nations in a common Protestantism, that the inveterate antagonism consented at length to give way. Here too, by a mischievous fatality, the spirit of disagreement contrived to enter; but the uniting influence was stronger than the separative, and the work of fusion was accomplished at last, though painfully and arduously.[2]

But relations between England and Scotland do not begin with the Reformation. Already back in 603 A.D. England and Scotland were at war for in that year AEthelfrith, one of

---

1. Preserved Smith, The Age of the Reformation, p. 353.
2. James Anthony Froude, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, IV, p. 61.

the early English kings decisively defeated a body of Irish Scots invading England.[3] Then in 925 Kenneth MacAlpin had welded the Scots and Picts into one nation. In the same year together with other northern rulers he "chose Eadward 'to father and lord.'" Gardiner feels that this was probably some alliance between the English and Scottish king and some of the lesser rulers.[4] Finally on June 24, 1314, the Scots defeated the English in the Battle of Bannockburn to win their independence.[5]

But early relations were not always hostile. Many Scottish students attended Cambridge and Oxford University. Especially was this true from 1357 to 1389. Before 1364 Scottish students' passports allowed them to go either to Cambridge or to Oxford. For some reason, however, from 1364-1379 they were permitted to go to Oxford only. Thus Wycliff was able to influence many Scotch students for he taught at Oxford sometime during these years.[6]

Another early pre-Reformation influence was exerted by the Lollards who had apparently by 1398-1399 begun to escape from England to Scotland. The exact time of their arrival is not known, but Fleming feels that the ordinance against heretics issued at that time was directed against the Lollards.[7]

---

3. S. R. Gardiner, A Student's History of England from the Earliest Times to the Conclusion of the Great War, p. 43.
4. Ibid., p. 63.
5. Ibid., p. 226.
6. Thomas M. Lindsay, A History of the Reformation, The Reformation in Switzerland, France, Netherlands, Scotland. II, pp. 276-277.
7. David Hay Fleming, The Reformation in Scotland, p. 10.

However, these relations were of a peaceful nature. By themselves they would not have kept the nations apart. But the recurrent Border raids produced a hatred which was deep and bitter. People for twenty miles on either side of the Border lived in constant expectation and preparation for raids. Froude gives an excellent description of actual conditions.

> The scanty families in the fortified farms and granges in Roxburgh and Northumberland slept with their swords under their pillows, and their horses saddled in their stables. The blood of the children by the fireside was stirred by tales of wild adventure in song and story; and perhaps for two centuries no boy ever grew to man's estate, along a strip of land forty miles across and joining the two seas who had not known the midnight terror of a blazing homestead--who had not seen his father or brother ride out at dusk harnessed and belted for some night foray, to be brought back before morning gory and stark across his saddle, and been roused from his bed by his mother to swear with his child lips a vow of revenge over the corpse. And the fierce feuds of the moss-troopers were but an expression in its extreme form of the animosities between the two nations. The English hated Scotland because Scotland had successfully defied them: the Scots hated England as an enemy on the watch to make them slaves. The hereditary hostility strengthened with time, and each generation added fresh injuries to the accumulation of bitterness.[8]

Nevertheless, in spite of such conditions a pro-English party developed in Scotland. The chief reason for this is that the Tudors, of whom Henry VII was the first, brought to the problem a new policy of conciliation and friendship. Henry VII knew two nations on the same island must be friends or destroy each other. That's why he tried for more than

---

8. Froude, op. cit., IV pp. 16-17.

five years and finally succeeded in 1503 in arranging the marriage of his daughter Margaret and James IV, king of Scotland.

Henry VIII particularly won their friendship when he did not crush Scotland after the disastrous battle of Flodden on September 9, 1513, but followed a policy of conciliation instead.

James IV had left two small sons, James V, two years old and the other, an infant. In a Scottish Parliament held after the battle, Margaret was declared regent;

> . . .the government was reestablished without interference from England, yet indirectly under English influence, and, by a judicious temperance at a critical time, the nucleus of a Southern party was formed at the court which never after was wholly dissolved.[9]

Such a party could exist for two reasons, the first being the "feudal disorganization of Scottish society. Faction was so common and so bitter that it was possible to call in the national enemy without utterly discrediting itself." The other reason was "jealousy of France." The marriage of James V to Mary of Lorraine, "a sister of the Duke of Guise," and the marriage of Mary Queen of Scots to Francis II produced the fear that Scotland would be but a satellite of France. This fear plus "the licentiousness of French officers and French soldiers on Scottish soil made their nation least loved when it was most seen."[10]

---

9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 18.

The Reformation started in England gradually through the introduction of Lutheran teachings from the continent and through the spread of Lollardy. Constant believes for one thing that the Reformation took root in England because of the long-standing conflict between Church and State highlighted by the humiliation of John Lackland by Innocent III in the 13th century. Furthermore, the Avignon captivity of the papacy, plus Charles' imprisonment and control of the Pope in 1527 had lowered the Pope's prestige in England. Wolsey's failure to receive nomination as Pope, the fact that England had only one cardinal in the group of fifty to sixty, and that no Englishman had been a pope for more than four centuries, aroused resentment. When finally the papal legate was removed the last link between England and the papacy was gone. A great deal of anti-papal literature had also been circulated which aroused popular feeling.[11]

Henry's divorce fits into this whole picture, therefore, as the occasion rather than the cause for the break with Rome. According to Constant, the historical importance of the divorce was that "by converting into enmity a former friendship it alienated from Rome the only power capable of keeping together the forces that were working against the Church and tending to rend it asunder." [12]

---

11. G. Constant, The Reformation in England, The English Schism, Henry VIII (1509-1547), trans. by the Rev. R. E. Scantlebury with a preface by Hilaire Belloc, I, p. 8.
12. Ibid.

In Scotland the Reformation came as a result of the people's refusal under urging from Reformed preachers to tolerate any longer the greed and debauchery of the clergy. In 1555 Cardinal Sermonetta gave a shocking description of clerical depravity. It may be assumed that if conditions were this bad in 1555 after the Reformation had begun to take hold in Scotland, the situation must have been equally bad or worse in earlier days. Lang refers to Sermonetta's judgment of conditions who speaks of

> the nefarious lives of 'every kind of religious women' in Scotland. They go about with their illegal families and dower their daughters out of the revenues of the Church. The monks, too, have bloated wealth, while churches are allowed to fall into decay. 'The only hope is in the Holy Father,' who should appoint an episcopal mission of visitation. For about forty years prelates have been alienating Church lands illegally, and churches and monasteries, by the avarice of those placed in charge, are crumbling to decay. Bishops are the chief dealers in cattle, fish, and hides, though, we have, in fact, good evidence that their dealings were very limited, 'sma' sums.[13]

Smith describes the situation in a similar way.

> In no country was the corruption greater. The bishops and priests took concubines and ate and drank and were drunken and buffeted their fellow men. They exacted their fees to the last farthing, an especially odious one being the claim of the priest to the best cow on the death of a parishioner. As a consequence the parsons and monks were hated by the laity.[14]

---

13. Quoted by Andrew Lang, John Knox and the Reformation, p. 9.

14. Smith, op. cit., p. 354.

During all this time the Scottish rulers sided with the Church since it offered the strongest support. Therefore the Reformation had to be done by the people and Knox knew what he was doing when he and the congregation finally withdrew from the Church.[15] In England on the other hand, the Reformation was largely political and under the leadership of the Crown. Belloc feels it was "not an effort at doctrinal heresy but rather an effort to set up a National Church identical -- or virtually identical--in morals and doctrine with the universal Church and yet separated from the unity of the latter."[16]

The two Reformations (England's and Scotland's) began about the same time. Most writers place the beginning of the English Reformation in 1527 when Henry first asked the Pope for an annulment of his marriage to Catherine or 1529 when the refusal was given. The death of Patrick Hamilton in 1528 is usually given as the beginning of the Scottish Reformation.[17] Thus the Reformations grew and developed side by side with England proving most influential.

The purpose of the writer's original investigation was to find out what influences and connections existed between the two Reformations. The purpose of this study is to show that before Henry VIII English efforts at union were almost wholly political. At least there is no mention of religious-political

---

15. Froude, op. cit., pp. 108-109.
16. Constant. op. cit., p. vii.
17. Lars P. Qualben, A History of the Christian Church, p. 313.

parties. War and conciliation were the diplomatic weapons. After Henry's break with the Pope by the Act of Supremacy in 1534 and up to 1707 when the final union of the crowns took place, political and religious relations became closely entwined. Henry and his successors, particularly Elizabeth, used religion in fostering the political goal of union. Knox and the Scottish Protestant preachers also worked for a political union but they did so because they were convinced as Knox was convinced: "...humanly speaking, the fate of the whole Reformation movement was bound up with an alliance between a Protestant England and a Protestant Scotland."[18]

This study ends with Mary's flight to England in May, 1568. The author realizes that some authors speak of the Scottish Reformation ending with the restoration of the Presbytery in 1592 (Stanley);[19] with the repeal of the Black Acts in 1592 and the accession of James VI to the throne of England in 1603 (Smith).[20]

Yet by the Adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles in 1563 England became to all intents and purposes a Protestant nation. In 1571 a slight revision was made in the Articles. Otherwise England's chief Confession has remained unchanged to this day.

---

18. Lindsay, op. cit., p. 288.
19. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland, p. 205.
20. Smith, op. cit., pp. 369-370.

In 1560 under the guidance of John Knox the Scottish Estates adopted the Scottish Confession which made Scotland Protestant. Mary and Francis refused to ratify this treaty. In January, 1568, Mary's power had been so weakened, the Scottish Estates were able to ratify and adopt the Confession and Acts of Parliament of 1560. Then in May, 1568, Mary fled to England and Scotland became a Protestant nation.

Struggles over the question of an episcopal or a presbyterian form of church government in Scotland continued until 1707 when the union of the crowns was accomplished.

The study of relations between the two Reformations has been difficult because no single book deals exclusively with this subject. Furthermore, the intimate connection between political and religious affairs during all these years makes a sharp separation of the two impossible. For example, Smith offers this description of the Scotland situation:

> Under George Wishart, [died 1546] who translated the first Helvetic Confession, the Kirk began to assume its Calvinistic garb, and to take the aspect of a party with a definite political program.

He also states that ministers made propaganda for the movement through their sermons which were mostly "political and all of them controversial."[21]

Qualben has a similar statement: "After this date (Wishart's death in 1546) the progress of the Reformation was intimately bound up with the political fortunes of the land."[22]

---

21. Smith, op. cit., p. 356.
22. L. P. Qualben, A History of the Christian Church, p. 313.

For this reason writers have frequently included the Reformation along with a discussion of political relations between the two countries. It is certainly justified.

Yet because the Reformation was so definitely instrumental in the construction of the modern unified Britain, it has been deemed worth the difficulty and labor of trying to sift out from the political tangles of the age those events and personalities connected more accurately with the religious problems of that time. In short, the goal and purpose of this study is to highlight the relations between the two Reformations against the background of political intrigue which accompanied and assisted the progress of both Reformations.

Throughout this thesis the longer reigns of the English monarchs have been used as the basis for the chronological outline. Frequent changes of government heads in troubled Scotland made this choice both natural and desirable.

---

21. Smith, op. cit., p. 357.
22. Lars P. Qualben, A History of the Christian Church, p. 313.

I. Relations between the English and the Scottish Reformations during the Time of Henry VIII

In beginning the study of Henry's reign and its effect on Scotland it is important to note two facts mentioned in the introduction. First, the marriage of Margaret to James in 1503 placed a member of the English royal family on the Scottish throne. The other is the development of an English party in Scotland as the result of Henry's forbearance after the battle of Flodden, September 9, 1513. Both of these, the marriage and the English party, formed a funnel into Scottish politics through which English influence was constantly poured.

Mortally wounded at Flodden, James lingered a few days and then died, leaving Margaret the Queen Dowager. At this time Margaret favored England and on August 6, 1514, she married the Earl of Angus, a member of the Douglas family which had usually headed the English party. This marriage immediately brought her into conflict with the Hamiltons, the other great Scottish family, and the other Scottish lords. They refused to allow one of their own rank to be husband to the regent and deposed both Margaret and Angus. So the Scottish Estates called in the Duke of Albany from France, "who, in the event of the deaths of the two princes, stood next in blood to the crown." [1]

---

1. Froude, op. cit., p. 18.

Albany arrived in Scotland in 1514 and now began the great series of intrigues, plots, and counter-plots which marked Henry's relations with Scotland. Shortly after coming to Scotland Albany seized Margaret's two sons and forced her and the Earl to flee to England. Then, when one of the boys died, Albany was suspected of murder and Henry feared that Albany would murder the other prince and assume the Scottish throne. With this prospect, Henry objected so vigorously against him, Albany was forced to leave Scotland in 1515 although he nominally remained regent and French garrisons were maintained at Dunbar and Dumbarton.

In May, 1515, however, he returned just in time to break up a plot by Henry and Margaret to take the young king to England. In the summer of 1516 Henry was at it again, appealing to the Scottish Estates to dismiss Albany. The Estates curtly refused, reminding Henry that the Duke was doing a good job at much personal sacrifice and that they were determined to spend their lives in defending the king's person and his realm.[2] The Estates apparently were aware of Henry's intrigues in Scotland and a letter to Henry from Dacre, English Warden of the Marches, affords a basis for their resentment.

> I labor and studeis all that I can to make division and debate, and thentent that if the Duke woll not applye himself, that thenne debate may growe that it shall be impossible to do justice.[3]

---

2. Agnes Mure Mackenzie, The Scotland of Queen Mary and the Religious Wars, 1513-1638, p. 14.
3. Quoted by Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 15.

By June, 1517, Arran leader of the Hamilton family, had come to power and Albany was again forced to flee to France. But when Albany was gone Angus and Arran fought it out for the regency. Arran was defeated and now he too was forced to France where he lived on the Chatellerault estates and eventually became Earl of Chatellerault.

Then in 1519 Emperor Charles V and Henry VIII became allies and France sought to renew the Scottish alliance by sending Albany back to Scotland. Playing politics, Margaret now attached herself to the Duke and Angus fled to England. Again Henry denounced Albany, but the Scots stood firm in the face of Henry's ultimatum of war. Immediately Henry confiscated the goods of all Scots in England and forced them to walk to the frontier with a white cross pinned on their upper garments.[4] Next he ravaged the area around the Firth of Forth with a naval task force. But when Albany planned a counter-invasion Margaret changed sides and betrayed his plans to the English. Albany did attack at Carlisle, but since England and France were at war again, the English quickly signed a truce. Albany soon left for France to seek reenforcements and jealous of Albany's new mistress, Margaret offered Surrey a thousand pounds if he would capture Edinburg and the king. The plan failed, however, and in October, 1523 Albany returned with his French army. Since he feared

---

4. Ibid., p. 18.

Margaret would betray him, Albany attacked the English at Newark on the Tweed, but was repulsed. Henry then sent Surrey to the Border with 10,000 men but did not order an attack. Instead he again proposed a betrothal between Princess Mary and James V. He urged the betrothal as a way to end all differences and the uncertainties of the succession.

> Should the Princess Mary die, and the Scottish sovereign claim to inherit as a right, every English sword would be drawn to resist him; could the betrothal be arranged, he might come in peaceably, under a parliamentary sanction, and the enmity of centuries would terminate in the union of the crowns.[5]

Many thoughtful statesmen in Scotland recognized the value of such an alliance, but French money decided them against it. Now Surrey attacked and at the prospect of a larger action, Albany withdrew, to the great disgust of the harassed Scottish Borderers. "'By God's blood,' they cried, 'we will never serve you more. Would to God we were all sworn English.'" [6]

After this Albany's star fell steadily until May 20, 1524, when he left for France never to return.

Margaret and Henry had agreed sometime previously that James should be declared king when he reached the age of twelve. After Albany left, upon assurances of unlimited money, men, and advice she escaped from Stirling Castle and actively began to work for the betrothal of Mary and James.

---

5. Froude, op. cit., p. 22.
6. "Surrey to Wolsey: State Papers, IV, p. 52," quoted by Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 26.

But then she began intriguing with Henry Stewart, also known as Lord Methuen, who strongly favored Cardinal Beton and the French. By November, 1524, her hostility to England was evident. In November, 1524, Angus with Henry's permission had gone back to Scotland to work for the English cause. But Margaret's intrigues with Methuen only produced a struggle for possession of the young king. Finally she got an English army to cross the Border and had James declared of age. For a while, united with James, she was able to hold the power. But finally Margaret lost out playing both sides, the defeat of Pavia in 1525 hurt the French cause, and in 1526 James V was declared of age to rule without his mother.

Up to 1528 Angus was dominant in the Scottish government, but in July of 1528 James V escaped his Douglas captors, drove Angus out of Scotland, and took over the throne. His main diplomatic problems as they concerned England were "the maintenance of a firm front to the English menace, coupled with willing readiness for friendship as soon as England would lay aside aggression." [7] The other outstanding event in Scotland during the year was the preaching and subsequent execution of Patrick Hamilton. His death marked the real beginning of the Scottish Reformation.

The years 1529 and 1530 slipped quietly by except for the fact that by 1530 three editions of Tyndale's New Testament

---

7. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 37.

had already been sold.[8] Many of them probably found their way into Scotland.

By 1531, however, it was obvious that religion was beginning to play a larger and larger part in the politics of the day. James V growing to manhood inclined to the Papacy and the Emperor. The mutual friendship of James and the Catholic Church had its origin in these two facts. James from the moment of his accession was jealous of England's influence in Scotland through the marriage of Margaret to his father and through the formation of a pro-English party in Scotland. The Church which was his most trusted adviser feared the new changes across the Border.

England's resentment to James' rather hostile attitude would not have become serious had not Scottish pirates and certain rough Borderers committed acts of violence which they thought the Scottish court would condone. Therefore, when James reached his majority Henry wrote him reminding him of England's tolerance towards these acts of violence and asked whether James thought they were just. But James V listened to the Catholic clergy who wanted to perpetuate the quarrel for "The cause of nationality was identified with the cause of faith..." [9]

This statement is significant inasmuch as it indicates the time when religion began to be considered a political

---

8. Froude, op. cit., III, p. 82.
9. Ibid., IV p. 44.

force in relations between the two countries.

In 1532 with the support of the Catholic clergy James felt confident. Deliberately he insulted and irritated Henry by courting Spanish favor and encouraging the Border Scots to make raids into England. However, if James wanted war Henry was ready for it. He had a large force at Berwick while large numbers in Scotland were ready to attach themselves to the pro-English party. To the Earl of Angus, head of the Douglas clan, Henry had offered to pay a thousand pounds sterling for pledging his allegiance to Henry and the cause of England.[10] Finally in the winter of 1532-1533 Henry sent armies into Scotland. But because of other national and international problems, on May 11, 1534, the English gladly signed a treaty "which was to last so long as they both lived, and a year beyond the death of either."[11] After the treaty was signed Henry offered forgiveness to Margaret, denied that he was actively intrigueing against Scotland, and proposed an interview between himself and James. James seemed glad to accept. Sometime during the balance of the year 1534 Henry disgusted with the English bishops commissioned Coverdale to bring forth a new translation of the Bible.

By 1535 Henry became worried that the Pope would use Scotland as a base for launching a crusade against England in which France and the Scots might join. For that reason he

---

10. Froude, op. cit., I p. 362.
11. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 45.

urged James to follow his example in breaking with the Pope and to meet him (Henry) at York to discuss the details. But the Scottish Council said no. They didn't trust Henry.

In March, 1536, James still talked of attending such a meeting. But the Catholic clergy persuaded him with money and with talk to forget about it. They said he would be betraying the Church to the Reformation. Furthermore, James needed money very badly and he also feared Henry VIII would kidnap him as he plotted to kidnap Cardinal Beton. So he began to make excuses first about the time and then about the distance. Needless to say, the interview was never held. It is obvious now that James just didn't want to go to York. Time and distance had nothing to do with it, for in September, 1536 James sailed for France to pick a bride from England's enemy. On January 1, 1537, without giving any notice to the English court he married Magdalen de Valois.

Of particular importance to the future relations between England and Scotland was Henry's sanction of the Coverdale translation of the Bible in the summer of 1536. Later Henry prohibited the reading of the Bible, but at this time every parish was ordered to have a Bible and people were encouraged to read and study it. Tyndale's Bible had found a ready market in Scotland and now Coverdale's translation also became very popular. On this point Fleming has this to say:

> The Reformers of Scotland did not learn their doctrines from Henry VIII or his church. To the English, however, they were indebted, inexpressibly indebted,

for the translation of the Scriptures.[12]

Also in 1536 Henry VIII had suppressed three hundred seventy-six smaller monasteries and early in 1537 had caught and executed not only the leaders but many of the supporters of the opposition.[13] As a result, many Catholics fled to Scotland. Margaret was the next heir to the English throne after Edward, a sickly infant born October 12, 1537, and Elizabeth, born in 1534 but later bastardized by Parliament so that all Henry's children by Jane Seymour might be legitimate. As Margaret's son, James had some claim to the English throne. This explains why numerous pamphlets now appealed to James to help the English Catholics. James refused, and though Henry was infuriated that such an appeal had been made, he did nothing.

Magdalene had died in July, 1537, a little more than half a year after coming to Scotland but on June 16, 1538, James renewed the French alliance by marrying Marie Guise.[14]

In the winter of 1538-39 Francis of France sought James V's aid against England in an attack to begin May 15, 1539. Henry sent Norfolk with an army to the Scottish Border in case war should come and sent Sir Ralph Sadler to consult James. By pointing out to him the twenty-year peace which had existed between the two countries he got James to admit the papal

---

12. Fleming, op. cit., p. 37.
13. Gardiner, op. cit., p. 397.
14. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 58.

and French intrigues and to dissolve the coalition. Henry through Sadler now came forward once more with a proposal that James relinquish Beton and the papacy, if possible, and espouse the cause of England. But under the spell of the Cardinal and the queen James rejected the proposal and Sadler was insulted by the court. The Church and national pride were still too strong to permit a union of the countries. It remained for a common Protestantism to break down the walls of the ancient antagonism.

If England and Scotland could have been so isolated from the rest of the world that alliances of other nations could have had no effect on either country the problem would have been simpler. For example, Francis and Charles had made a treaty in 1538 which made Henry apprehensive about Scotland. Early in 1540, therefore, Henry sent Sadler "... to convert his nephew to his own religious practices, embroil him with France, the Emperor, and the Pope, and stir him to mistrust of Cardinal Beton." [15]

Again he failed to win James favor. Rather, the Scottish king set to work in the winter of 1540 to strengthen Scottish defenses. Edinburg's walls were strengthened, the artillery increased, and all men from 16-60 who were physically fit were to be ready on a 24-hour notice.

In the early summer of 1541 another meeting between James and Henry had been planned for September, but Cardinal

---

15. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 59.

Beton broke it up. Then in September, Beton went to the Continent to consult with the French ministers and the Pope. While he was gone, Kirkcaldy, Lord Treasurer of Scotland, sought once more to arrange the interview.

> But the clergy of Scotland, says John Knox, promised the king mountains of gold as Satan their father did to Christ Jesus if He would worship him. Rather they would have gone to hell or he should have met King Henry, for then they thought, Farewell, our kingdom! Farewell, thought the cardinal, his credit and glory in France.[16]

Apparently Henry had not been notified that James was not coming to York so that he was incensed when James failed to appear. The death of his fifth wife and Border raids had irritated him terribly so that when James did not arrive he began to think of invasion on the basis of the old claim of superiority.[17] Innes says there were also Border raids on orders from Henry.[18]

The year 1542 was to be one of the highspots in Anglo-Scottish relations during the reign of Henry VIII.

In January, 1542, Henry had proclaimed himself King of Ireland and Head of the Irish Church. The English kings had held it as the Pope's vassals under the title of Lord. But trouble started when some of the Irish chiefs offered the crown to James. Although James refused it, Henry's jealousy had been aroused.

---

16. "Knox's History of the Reformation, p. 26," quoted by Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 149.
17. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 61.
18. Arthur D. Innes, England under the Tudors, p. 154.

Then in August, 1542, Sir Robert Bowes and a few others pursued a band of Scottish Borderers across the Marches and were captured in an ambush at Halydon Rigg on August 24. James enthusiastic report to France swelled the number of prisoners to one thousand. France was sure this was her opportunity and promised help. The Scottish people were jubilant.

> All is ours, was the cry among them. The English are heretics. If we be a thousand, and they ten thousand, they dare not fight. France shall enter on one part, and we on the other; and so shall England be conquered within a year.[19]

Henry's answer came in October when he ordered the Duke of Norfolk to move forward from York and issued a manifesto to James. In it he pointed out how he had cared for him in his youth, how Margaret had married James IV to establish peace between the realms, but that James IV had invaded England and been punished by God in the defeat at Flodden. He regretted particularly the fact that James V had now used "fair words and speech" as a cloak of security for the invasion." England was now going to fight not for feudal superiority but for friendship and peace. In compliance with the manifesto's warning the Duke of Norfolk now crossed the Tweed river and for nine days burnt harvest, farms, villages, towns, and abbeys to a depth of fifteen miles inside the Scottish borders. Afterwards he withdrew to Berwick without interference from the fifteen thousand Scots who trailed him. Lack of provisions forced Norfolk to leave only a fifth of his army at Berwick.

---

19. "Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland," quoted by Froude, op. cit., IV p. 173.

The rest he sent home and he went to the Council at York.

The Scots would have pursued Norfolk but the Lords apparently were not sure of James' ability or they remembered Flodden. So they dispersed to their homes after refusing to fight.

James was definitely resentful of their action. Earlier Beton had set forth a plan for getting even with the more than a hundred earls, knights, and gentlemen who favored England's policy of absorbing the church lands. He described them as heretics planning to betray Scotland to England. The plan suggested to James involved their death and the confiscation of their estates which in turn would help replenish deficiencies in the royal treasury. James at first rejected the proposal, but after this action by the nobles he approved it.

> If the cardinal and the clergy would find him the means of making his raid into England without them, and revenge their backwardness by a separate victory, he would devote himself heart and soul to the Church's cause, and Beton should be his adviser for ever.[20]

Thus on the night of November 24, 1542, ten thousand men assembled at Lochmaben in answer to a secret letter sent out under the king's name. The recusant nobles had been secretly excluded. Plans called for an immediate attack on the English Borders where there was little or no defence and then a move southward. In order to keep as much glory for himself as possible James allowed the mob-like army to go forward with no nominal head. Lord Maxwell, Scottish Warden of the Marches

---

20. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 34.

was considered somewhat in this light but he had no authority from the king as commander. At first the attack was successful and the burning of crops and plunder was carried on without opposition. But the English Border farmers gathered all day long and in small bodies they cut off the stragglers as they moved to form an army of opposition. As the skirmishes grew hotter and the need for command became more obvious, Oliver Sinclair was proclaimed the commander. Soon after, however, the Scots became panic stricken when they mistook a troop of Cumberland horses for Norfolk's dreaded army of the Tweed, though Norfolk's army was in reality, thirty miles away. The men now began milling about in the darkness. Soon they had lost their way and were heading toward the sea. Finally they were driven into the swamp of Solway Moss and Wharton who knew the area killed or captured practically the whole army. All provisions, including food, tents, and cannon were taken.[21]

This was the most sudden and disgraceful defeat Scotland had suffered from England. Figures vary, but from a few hundred to a thousand farmers had routed an army of ten thousand. Innes points out that while a few hundred English farmers did manage to rout the Scots that Wharton operating on information received a few days before had collected 2000-3000 men and with this number cut the Scots to pieces in

---

21. Ibid., pp. 183-184.

in Solway Moss.[22] Knox had this to say about the victory:

> Worldly men say that all this came by misorder and fortune, but whoever has the least spunk of the knowledge of God, may as evidently see the work of his hand in this discomfiture as ever was seen in any of the battles left to us in register by the Holy Ghost.[23]

The shock of defeat and of Sinclair's flight was too much for James. Within less than three weeks he had sickened and on December 14, 1542, he died. Not even the birth of a daughter, Princess Mary Stuart, had been able to remove the king's feeling of chagrin and disappointment.

A few days after the battle Lisle, English Warden of the Marches, urged Henry to annex all of southern Scotland. But at the news of the king's death Henry decided on conciliation.

After the death of James V a Council of Regency had been appointed consisting of Cardinal Beton; Arran, who was James' cousin and heir to the Crown; Argyle, Arran's brother-in-law; Moray, half-brother to Mary Stuart; and Huntly, lay head of the Scottish Catholic party. But there was disunion within the group and finally Beton was chosen Chancellor. This angered Henry because Arran was for the English party while the Cardinal was for France and said to be the only man who could stand between Henry and the Crown of Scotland. Henry's anger united the group behind Beton. But Henry went to work with a fresh matrimonial proposal for uniting the crowns by

---

22. Innes, op. cit., p. 156.
23. Quoted by Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 184.

the marriage of Edward and Mary Stuart. However, his terms were: either accept or take the consequences. At the same time he ordered Lisle, English Warden of the Marches to kidnap the Queen and Cardinal and capture Scottish merchant ships from the port of Campvere.

At home he sought to win the Solway prisoners to his side by giving them the best of treatment. He secured their promise to advocate the betrothal once they were back in Scotland. But he also demanded certain securities for the treaty. The infant Queen should be brought to England to be educated; certain castles were to be occupied by English garrisons, he should have a voice in the nomination of a native council which should rule instead of the regency, and finally, Cardinal Beton should be imprisoned in England.[24]

The Scottish prisoners agreed to all these demands and after a big banquet the night before "they set out for the north, carrying back with them, as it seemed not only a desire for an alliance with the nation which they had entered as armed invaders, but the intention of introducing into Scotland the English Bible and the principles of the English Reformation."[25]

Things looked good for the English cause and the Reformation in Scotland at the beginning of 1543. On January 3, the Earl of Arran a Protestant, had been appointed Governor.

---

24. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 195.
25. Ibid., p. 196.

He had proven that Beton had obtained the regency by guiding the dying king's hand in signing his will to that effect. Arran also appointed John Rough for his chaplain and Thomas Williams for his preacher, both of whom were strong Reformers.[26]

Then in February, 1543, Henry made an alliance with Charles V to continue war in Burgundy and on the Channel. In this way Henry hoped to keep Francis busy at home and so lessen his influence in Scotland. Thus he also hoped to prevent any wrecking of his plans for the English-Scottish marriage.

In January or February, 1543, the Solway prisoners had been allowed to return to Scotland. But instead of working for the marriage, they had the Estates insert clauses which made the treaty impossible.

Among other restrictions they said: the queen must not be educated in England. Instead four Scottish noblemen should serve as hostages in England and the queen would remain in Scotland surrounded by "French ecclesiastics" whose influence Henry could counteract by sending up some of his own men. Furthermore, Scotland must ever remain separate and independent.[27] England regarded such conditions as impossible, and so rejected the treaty.

However, in this same meeting of the Scottish Parliament on March 12, 1543, a measure was passed which made possible the free use of the Bible. The Archbishop of Glasgow

---

26. Lindsay, op. cit., II p. 283.
27. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 203.

protested for Beton, but to no avail. The effect of this law Knox has described very vividly:

> Then might have been seen the Bible lying about upon every gentleman's table. The New Testament also was borne about in many men's hands. We grant that some, alas, profane that blessed word. Some, perhaps, that had never read ten sentences of it had it most common in their hands. They would chop their familiars in the cheek with it and say, this has lain under my bed-foot these ten years. Others would glory, how often have I been in danger for this book, how secretly have stolen away from my wife at midnight to read upon it. And this was done to make court thereby, for all men esteemed the governour to be the most fervent Protestant that was in Europe. Nevertheless . . . the knowledge spread.[28]

Beton's interdict had aroused great discontent among the people and Arran contrary to previous promises released Beton to the nominal custody of Lord Seton. Henry felt now that he could no longer rely on Arran and the Douglases and began to trust Mary of Guise and Beton. Beton invited Sadler to see him and Henry allowed the ambassador to say:

> . . .if the cardinal would at length honestly lend his help towards the settlement of the kingdom, he would gratefully accept his friendship; and should a change of sides entail the loss of the preferments in France, he would take care to see him substantially indemnified.[29]

Here it is obvious that all Henry's dealings with Scottish churchmen, be they Protestant or Catholic, aimed at the one goal of union.

Sadler doubted Beton's and Mary's sincerity but their audacious declarations of their friendliness for Henry

---

28. Quoted by Froude, op. cit., IV, pp. 204-205.
29. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 210.

finally convinced him otherwise. But despite the declared loyalty to England, Beton remained loyal to the Catholic church while Arran, the regent, continued to favor Protestantism. Arran had granted the free use of the Bible in answer to the repeated urgings of the English minister and he also apparently favored the suppression of the monasteries. But though Arran remained Protestant, he fell under the spell of the cardinal. Since Henry was not sure of either Arran or Beton, to end all lying and intrigue he offered certain counter-propositions in March- April, 1543.

> He relinquished his demand for the immediate delivery of the young queen. She might remain in her own country till she was ten years old; in the meantime, as pledges for the fulfillment of the contract, three Scottish earls and three bishops or barons must reside in the English court. Their places might be changed half-yearly, but the number should be kept complete. For the government, the Earl of Arran might remain in office during the minority, provided his conduct continued satisfactory, and provided the whole or a portion of the council might be nominated by the English crown. Lastly, the treaty of peace should be immediately drawn, and the Scots should relinquish the French alliance, and bind themselves to make no separate league with any foreign country except with Henry's consent.[30]

At first Arran and the other nobles determined to reject the proposals. But then a delegation was sent to London to investigate the matter more closely and reported back very favorably. The Catholics were not at this meeting of Parliament to which they reported back and so the English party made some slight progress. For instance, Lord Maxwell, the

---

30. Ibid., p. 215.

Earl of Angus and others of the Solway prisoners pledged themselves to oppose Beton, to work for Henry's cause, and to acknowledge no government which had not received his sanction. If the cardinal made trouble they would not obey him, and either see the treaty fulfilled or help Henry annex all of Scotland south of the Forth.[31]

But by June the Cardinal again had Arran in his power. The Reformed preachers were dismissed and on June 2, 1543, the Privy Council prohibited possession of heretical books and any criticism of the medieval doctrine of the Sacraments.

Nevertheless, a treaty of peace and a treaty for the marriage of the Prince of Wales and the Queen were drawn up. Henry signed them on July 1, 1543, at Greenwich while Sir George Douglas and the Earl of Glencairn signed for the Scots. All that needed to be done was to secure the ratification of the Scottish Parliament.

However, on June 30th while the treaties were on the verge of being signed Sadler reported fourteen French warships off the coast of Aberdeen waiting for orders from the Cardinal. Six days after Douglas and Glencairn returned, Beton held a conference with them and planned the attack on England. Fortunately six English cruisers caught the French and were able to either sink them or drive them back to France.

Henry sent to Arran a report of the naval action, a

---

31. Ibid., pp. 216-218.

thousand pounds, and a promise to help him with men and money whenever he needed them. He also urged him to imprison Beton and his party as traitors and move the Queen to a safer place than the palace of Linlithgow. But Arran failed to act, and Beton took the Queen to Stirling and there continued his plans for invasion.

Though he was greatly disappointed at the turn of events, Henry proposed to send more money and an army of five thousand into Scotland to make Arran "King of Scotland beyond the Forth."[32] But Sadler advised against wasting any more money on Arran or the Scots in general to whom a treaty meant nothing.

The English lords in Scotland now realized their mistake. Henry should have been encouraged to follow up the defeat at Solway Moss. But nothing could be done now but strengthen their defenses and wait.

In the latter part of August, 1543, Henry began readying an army for whatever occasion he might need it. Then on September 11, 1543, at Stirling Mary was crowned Queen. Although Angus was given a seat on the Council of State that was chosen, Beton held all real power. Insolently he now told Henry that the Solway prisoners now on parole might be taken as hostages. Froude describes the effect this had on on Henry:

---

32. Ibid., p. 225.

> His hopes, a few months before so sanguine, were gone like a dream. His forbearance had been scorned; his credulity had been trifled with. The intrigues of the Papacy, working on a misguided patriotism, had baffled a policy as farsighted as it was generous. Scotland was once more an enemy and as an enemy it must expect to be dealt with.[33]

Then in September Beton and Arran were reconciled and the government of Scotland was once more in Catholic hands.

In answer to these acts of opposition Henry first warned the citizens of Edinburg not to harm Sadler, his envoy, and then he ordered the English army of ten thousand to advance from Berwick. The autumn had been a wet one, however, and Henry decided to wait with the invasion till Spring.

Again Beton summoned Sadler and pretended friendship for Henry even though Henry's navy had recently fought naval battles with French ships manned by crews half French and half Scot. Henry therefore demanded that if the Scots wanted peace, they must get rid of Arran and Beton.

But instead of this from now till December, 1543, the Scottish nation came more and more under the French influence. Beton had summoned a Parliament which had granted an indemnity for the seizure of the Queen, had annulled all treaties with England, and renewed the French alliance. Arran was also forced to repeat in public the recantation he had made to the Cardinal, permission for the use of the Bible was withdrawn, and on December 15 it was resolved to persecute heretics.[34]

---

33. Ibid.. p. 227.
34. Ibid., p. 231.

Henry's immediate answer to these proceedings was to warn the Scottish Estates to state in four days whether they intended to observe the covenants which had been drawn up between the nations or whether they would stick with France and the Cardinal. No answer would mean war. The four days slipped by and Henry knew the Scots were willing to dare his might. In December the Scottish Parliament denounced England and Henry's recent attempts on Scottish shipping.[35]

Henry now instructed Hertford:

> Burne Edinborough towne, so rased and defaced when ye have sacked and gotten what ye can of it, as there may remayne forever a perpetual memory...Sack Holyrood house...Sack Lythe and burne and subvert it and all the rest, putting man, woman, and child to fuyre and swoord without exception when any resistance shal be made agaynst you.[36]

Fife was also to be sacked

> no creature in special to be left alive in the Cardinal's town of St. Andrew's, while on the Marches order was to be taken 'that the borderers in Scotland maybe still tormented and occupied as mocheas can be conveniently, now specially that it is sede tyme, from the which if they may be kept and not suffered to sowe theyr grownde they shall by the next yere be brought to such a penuyre as they shall not be able to lyve.[37]

Henry now asked the Emperor for a thousand Spanish troops, but the Emperor evaded the matter by asking Henry whether he was fighting a faction or the Scottish nation. Henry, however, did not persist because he had sufficient strength for the war and if he won a great advantage according to the treaty he

---

35. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 72.
36. Quoted by Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 73.
37. Ibid.

couldn't make peace except with the consent of the Emperor. Francis of France sought to send help to the Scots, but a storm prevented the troops from reaching Scotland. Since the Scots did not seem worried about any possible danger, Francis did not send the soldiers back.

Henry's plan was to transport ten thousand men in two hundred ships to Leith. Four thousand would at the same time advance from Berwick across the Border and eventually seize Edinburg Castle. Lennox had promised to give him Dumbarton Castle and with Angus' help he hoped to seize Tantallon. With these main fortresses in Scotland he would then be able to establish the English party and proceed to capture the opposing lords and churchmen.

An agreement was now drawn up between Henry VIII and the Earls of Lennox and Glencairn. The earls agreed that they would see that the Word of God was truly taught and preached as the source of all truth and honor; that they would remain loyal to England abjure any "friendship, alliance, or connexion with the French king." [38] They would do their best to prevent the queen being taken to France and if they captured her would send her to London to be educated; that when the English army approached they would unite with it and accept the king as"director and protector of the realm." [39]

On his part Henry agreed to spare the lands of the

---

38. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 290.
39. Ibid., p. 291.

assisting lords when the invasion came and upon general obedience to advice from England to give the regency to Lennox. Glencairn was also to be given a thousand pounds. There was also a provision that if the queen died, Lennox' claim to the succession should be recognized above that of Arran and that once he had proved his worth, he should be allowed to marry Lady Margaret if she were willing.

As the prospect of an invasion became more known in Scotland, messages were sent to Hertford telling him that leading members of the English party had deserted the cause. But plans went ahead steadily.

Now the Scottish Protestants began to look upon themselves as the remnant of the Old Testament. Beton was the oppressor of the people and they offered to kill him. This opportunity came in April, 1544, when a Scot by the name of Wishart came to Hertford bringing the offer of a number of Scottish nobles to join forces with Henry's invading army and seek either to capture of kill the Cardinal. They promised to do their best but wanted Henry's assurance of protection if they failed.

Hertford referred the matter to Henry who consented to the plan and promised them protection. He said that if they furnished hostages as proof of their intention he would supply them with a thousand pounds. However, the answer arrived too late and the lords remained passive. But the seed had been sown.

On Saturday morning May 3, 1544, the invasion was launched. Knox gives a most vivid description of the attack on Leith. The English drew up their fleet on Saturday evening and took soundings in the harbor of the Firth of Forth and anchored at Leith. Sunday morning they took over the town, raiding the warehouses and taking the meat which the housewives had saved for Sunday for their own dinner. In the afternoon they freed Sir George Douglas and Lord Angus from Blackness castle. The Cardinal and Arran had escaped from Leith. At Edinburg the populace gathered to a force of six thousand and came down to Leith asking for peace on the condition that those who wanted to leave their effects might do so. Hertford, however, said the Scots had broken their promises, he was sent for vengeance, and if they surrendered, he would promise them their lives. If not, they must take the consequences. Lord Evers now came up with four thousand horsemen but the Scots locked the city gates and decided to take their chances. The city gates were blown off by the English cannon and for two days the English went through sacking and burning the city. For seven miles around, Evers pillaged and burned. After sacking Edinburg he returned to Leith and destroyed the harbor installations and seized the ships loading them with spoil for England. Finally by May 15 the English army was back in England with a loss of only forty men. The main army was transported to Calais and a division was kept on the Border under Evers and Lord Wharton. Occasional forays were made through the summer

and autumn so that the July-November 1544, report listed one hundred ninety-two towns, towers, homesteads, barns, parish-churches, and fortified houses burnt and destroyed; four hundred Scots killed; eight hundred-sixteen prisoners taken; "ten thousand horned cattle; twelve thousand sheep; thirteen hundred horses, and eight hundred and fifty bolls of corn."[40] Mackenzie gives a more exact listing of the hideous damage. "In one raid, alone," she says, "10,386 cattle, 12,492 sheep, 1,296 horses were looted: another list gives seven religious houses, sixteen castles and towers, five market towns, two hundred forty-three villages, thirteen mills, and three hospitals destroyed or burnt." [41]

But such destruction didn't help a bit to break Scottish resistance. Rather it only hardened and embittered it. The indomitable spirit and courage of the Scots is best expressed by the statement of Lord Buccleugh to an English envoy: "'I shall be glad to serve the King of England with my honour, but I will not be constrainted thereto if all Teviotdale be burned to the bottom of hell.'"[42]

Over on the continent the Emperor made a separate treaty with the French which took him out of the French war. Henry protested that this was a violation of the treaty, but the emperor would not be dissuaded.

---

40. "Haines' State Papers, I," quoted by Froude, IV, op. cit., p. 303.
41. Mackenzie, op. cit., pp. 73-74.
42. Quoted by John Richard Green, History of the English People, II, p. 212.

All winter long Evers had kept up the savage Border raids and personal feuds had taken their toll of women and children so that the Scots were thirsting for revenge. Not having the forces of Evers, they decided to use deceit. Shortly after the middle of February, 1545, a party of Scots pretending to be friendly to the English cause came to Berwick with the information that Angus, the regent, was lying with a small force at Melrose and might be surprised. Evers believed them and with four to five thousand men started on February 25 to catch him. He didn't, but his men desecrated the Douglas tombs instead. Then, since it was all pre-arranged the regent retired as Evers advanced. This was kept up for a day and a night until on the morning of February 27 the English began to return to England Across Ancrum Muir. Here the Scots caught and surrounded the tired English soldiers. When the first body of Scots appeared the English attacked, but this was only the signal for a general attack by the Scots who killed more than hundred nobles and took more than a thousand prisoners and forced them to pay ransom.

According to Froude, however, this was "almost the last success which the Scots gained." The English came back with an army of thirty thousand whose devastations wiped out all resistance.

From July, 1545, to September of the same year the French and English fought a war which ended in the defeat of France, not so much by English arms as by weather and disease.

Somehow the plague started among the French soldiers and sailors during the month they were on the sea and men died by the thousands. Finally the French were forced to return home.

To secure Scottish support and worry England, France had sent the Comte de Montgomery into Scotland around July, 1545. From July to September he had accomplished very little. But in September Hertford went into Scotland when the harvest was ripe and under the eyes of Montgomery and the regent carried on a vicious program of destruction in revenge for Ancrum Muir. The report which he made for September 8-23, 1545, lists the following damage: seven monasteries and friars' houses; sixteen castles, towers, and piles; five market-towns; two hundred forty-three villages; thirteen mills; three hospitals.[44]

Froude remarks about this report:

> Barbarous and useless havoc! for the spirits of the proud Scots were tough and hard as steel. English conciliation had failed to bend them; and English ferocity could as little break their ineffectual but indomitable gallantry. Only God Almighty and the common cause of the Reformation could fuse at last the jarring elements, and undo the hatred which had been bred by human folly.[45]

In France the English still held Boulogne in the late summer of 1545. By the end of September, 1545, the French were forced to lift the siege of the city because the plague

---

44. Froude, op. cit., IV., p. 368.
45. Froude, op. cit., IV., p. 402.

perhaps brought by the returning French soldiers attacked them and killed them by the thousands. When later Hertford came over from England with an additional 30,000 men Boulogne was taken and the final treaty of peace between France and England was concluded on June 7, 1546.

The war had chiefly started with England's honor at stake. France was heavily in debt to England but refused to pay. Now that England had won, France offered to pay the various indemntiies. Scotland had also been one of the causes of the war. Henry had sought originally with Charles' help to keep Francis so occupied he could not meddle in Scotland. Finally, however, the difficulty was brought to an end with the death of Beton.

Beton had become the supreme power in Scotland but he wanted people to know it too. This was evidenced one day by an indecorous dispute between him and the Archbishop of Glasgow on the matter of precedence when going to mass in the cathedral. The affair hurt his cause and for this reason was soon settled. The occasion used was the execution of George Wishart on March 28, 1546, at St. Andrew's. Wishart was the most powerful Protestant preacher in Scotland at that time.

In December-January 1546, Knox had accompanied Wishart on his preaching tours. To ward off possible attacks Knox served as Wishart's bodyguard and carried a hugh two-handed sword. But finally Wishart was captured by the Earl of

Bothwell upon orders from the Cardinal. Upon his capture, Wishart urged Knox to escape and Knox did so. Wishart was imprisoned first at Edinburg, then in the Sea Tower at St. Andrew's in January , 1546, and finally he was executed on March 1, 1546. According to Knox he was "'put upon a gibbet and hanged, and then burnt to powder'"[46] in the presence of the archbishop and the cardinal.

Beton felt the resentment among the Scots at this act and so he began fortifying "the episcopal palace at St. Andrew's into an impregnable fortress."[47]

But though he had a hundred workmen working from sunrise to sunset throughout the Spring, Beton was murdered on May 29 by a revenging group of young Protestants. They had appeared at the palace gates early in the morning as a small group of curious citizens. Striking down the guard, they got the keys and made their way to the cardinal's room where they stabbed him to death. Then they hung him over the wall by one foot and one arm and "bade the people see there their god."[48]

The crowd who saw the corpse said no requiem aeternam or requiescat in pace. Because the weather was hot and he could not be suddenly prepared for burial Knox says, "'it was thought best to bestow enough of a great salt upon him, a coffin of

---

46. "Knox: Calderwood," quoted by Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 433n.
47. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 434.
48. "Lyndsay to Wharton: State Papers, V, p. 560: Buchanan; Calderwood: Knox." quoted by Froude, IV, p. 437.

lead, and a corner in the bottom of the Sea Tower, to await what exequies his brethren the bishops would bestow upon him.'" [49]

Thus Beton died and with him the cause of the papacy in Scotland. Although Mary of Guise continued to lean towards France the real strength of Romanism was gone in Scotland. Those who claimed to be friends of the church now helped to plunder the Church.

In contrast to Beton's death, Wishart's death had stimulated the Protestant party. Under Wishart, the Scottish Protestants had assumed the character of a definite political party with a definite political program.[50] After his death the future of the Scottish Reformation was intimately connected with the political fortunes of the land.[51]

Beton's death, though it was the death blow to the cause of papacy in Scotland did not dissolve the National Party. Queen Dowager, Marie of Guise, took up the fight and for the next twelve years continued the struggle.

To return to the band of Protestants in St. Andrew's. Ever since May 29, 1546, when they had entered the castle and assasinated Beton they had held the fortress. Not until July, 1546, were the defenders of St. Andrew's formally called upon to surrender, but they refused. Three hundred pounds a month were then voted to the Regent to lay siege to the castle.

---

49. Quoted by Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 437.
50. Smith, op. cit., p. 357.
51. Qualben, op. cit., p. 313.

In August Arran tried to take it but failed. The defenders had constructed a covered passage to the sea from where they could get supplies from English ships. In January the siege was lifted to allow time for the defenders to secure a papal absolution. During the meantime no life was to be taken and Arran's eldest son was to be held as hostage.

In January, 1547, Henry Balnavis, one of the defenders came to London seeking help for the pro-English defenders. He succeeded. Henry VIII got his Privy Council to vote 1189 L. 17s ed. to be paid to:

> . . .Sir Henry Balnavis for the affairs of Scotland, that is to say, for the wages of eighty men within the Castle of St. Andrew's at 6 d. by the day for six months, the sum of 336 L. sterling. For the wages of forty horse at 8 d. the day, appointed to keep abroad for the more surety of the said castle, for six months, 224 L. For the amity of the Master of Rothes, for one half year ending at Michaelmas last past, 125 L. For the like to the Laird of Grance, 100 L. For the like to David Moneypenny, 50 L. For the like to Mr. Henry Balnavis, of Halhill, 62 L. 10s. For the like to John Leslie of Parkhill, 82 L. 10s. James Leslie, of Abdour, 50 L. W. Kirkcaldy, son to the Laird of Grange, 50 L., which sums make on the whole 1060 L; and on the exchange 1189 L. 17s 3d. [52]

In return for this the defenders promised to help in the execution of the marriage treaty. Nowhere, however, did they compromise the free sovereignty of Scotland.

Now it became evident that Henry's days were numbered. February 27, 1547, Henry spent talking to Lord Hertford and Sir William Paget on the condition of the country. He urged

---

52. "Privy Council Records, Feb. 6, MS. Edward VI," quoted by Froude, op. cit., V. pp. 41-42.

them to carry out "the Scottish marriage to the union of the crowns, and by separate and earnest messages he commended Edward to the care both of Charles V and of Francis I." [53] Also on January 27 Henry had a message drawn up which asked that Edward be created Prince of Wales and crowned.

Then on January 28 between one and two o'clock in the morning Henry VIII passed to his fathers.[54] He had asked for Cranmer who was unable to arrive until the king though conscious was speechless. Froude gives the final scene: "Cranmer, 'speaking comfortably to him, desired him to give him some token that he put his trust in God through Jesus Christ; therewith the king wrung hard the archbishop's hand,' and expired."[55]

Conclusions

At this point the reader may wonder where are all the religious connections between England and Scotland during the reign of Henry VIII. The truth is that strictly religious connections, separate and distinct from politics, do not exist.

It is plain, however, that already under Henry the union of religion and politics into one force was gradually taking

---

53. Froude, op. cit., V, p. 16.
54. There seems to be some uncertainty as to the exact time of Henry's death. In volume IV p. 278 Froude sets the time at 1 a.m. while in volume V it is reported as 2 a.m. Therefore we have said between 1 and 2 a.m.
55. "Strype's Cranmer, I, pp. 199" quoted by Froude, IV, p. 478.

place. Slowly but surely the pro-English party was coming to be synonymous with the Protestant party. Certainly it is a fact that as Henry's aid to the insurgent Scottish Protestants became known the Protestant pro-English idea was further established. A clear realization of this development, however, seems to have come gradually rather than suddenly.

Finally, Henry VIII was interested in one thing above all others: the political union of England and Scotland. This interest shaped all his dealings with the religious parties in Scotland. This can be seen in his promise to Cardinal Beton in March, 1543, to indemnify him for any losses incurred in working for the settlement of the kingdoms. However, despite the Cardinal's protestations of loyalty to Henry, he continued to favor the French cause. Therefore, Henry was forced to ally himself with the Scottish Protestants and where possible advance their cause with diplomacy, money, and men. In doing so he cut the pattern which was eventually to lead to union.

It should also be noted that Henry VIII made the House of Commons the real power in Parliament. As Froude says: "By the Reformation, and by the power which he forced upon them, he had so interwoven the House of Commons with the highest business of the state, that the peers thenceforward sunk to be their shadow." [56] This fact became particularly significant once the House of Commons had become predominantly

---

56. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 491.

Protestant. The Protestant House of Commons, particularly under Elizabeth, was eager to and did support the Protestant party in Scotland.

II. The Relations between the English and the Scottish Reformation during the Time of Edward VI

Henry had died on January 28, 1547, between one and two o'clock in the morning. Later that same day Edward succeeded Henry and was crowned Head of the Church of England, and on February 20, 1547, he was crowned King of England in Westminster Abbey.[1]

Edward's succession was uncontested since already back in 1544 Parliament had given Henry the right to name his successors. At that time he had decreed that Edward should be his immediate successor. If he should die without an heir, Mary, daughter of Catherine of Aragon should be queen. If she died without issue, Elizabeth should have the crown. However, being empowered to make further provisions Henry had passed over the line of his sister Margaret in Scotland and named the daughters of his younger sister Mary by her marriage to Duke of Suffolk, Charles Brandon.

Knowing that the ten-year-old prince could not rule the kingdom Henry had also carefully chosen a council of regency. Cranmer, Hertford, and Lisle represented the Reformers; the Bishop of Durham, the Chancellor, and Sir Anthony Brown represented the Catholics. The rest represented various

---

1. "Edward VI," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1937, VIII, p. 9.

opinions "whose judgment had been formed by the king himself; and who, having been trusted with the secrets of his further intentions, might follow in the track which he had marked for them." [2] The object of such an arrangement was to have each group serve as a check on the other.

Soon, however, Hertford, uncle to Edward VI contrived with Paget's assistance to be chosen as the leader of the group on the promise that he do nothing without consulting the council first. The Council consisted of the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Lord St. John, John Lord Russell, King Edward, Paget, and others.[3]

Shortly thereafter Hertford had himself declared the Duke of Somerset. Then in February, 1547, he produced a new patent of Protectorate drawn out in the boy-king's name which gave him full power.[4] This latter act brought so much opposition Somerset was forced to ally himself with the Protestants who were out to change things.

It was yet February, 1547, when Somerset first made use of his new power against Scotland by setting up the old claim of feudal sovereignty which had originally been posed by Edward I. Somerset had his reasons for reviving this claim. Mary's marriage to the French Dauphin had tended to make Scotland a dependency of France and was a way by which

---

2. Froude, op. cit., IV, p. 484.
3. Froude, op. cit., V, p. 18.
4. Green, op. cit., II, pp. 224-225

French influence could be channeled into Scotland and into Ireland. To break this possible enemy encirclement Somerset sought to annex Scotland with this sovereignty claim. In addition he began raising a body of German troops for invading Scotland the next summer.[5]

But neither the Scots nor the French would accept any thing of the sort, France plainly stating she would not stand by and see the claim enforced.[6]

In January, 1547, Henry VIII had died and now in March, 1547, the French king, Francis I, also died. Mackenzie has this to say about the deaths of the two kings:

> The English change made small difference to Scotland, as Somerset shared the aims, and the methods, of his brother-in-law, but the French made much, for Francis' son Henri II was a friend of the Guises who urged him at once to help their sister and niece.[7]

This Henri did by sending French forces to besiege St. Andrew's Castle and its Protestant defenders. In April, 1547, the papal absolution arrived for the St. Andrew's men, but they rejected it. Shortly afterwards John Knox joined the group.

Then in July, 1547, after a six weeks siege by French forces and battering by French artillery the Castilians surrendered on the promise of life. Protestant preachers Rough and Knox (who had predicted that English aid would not be

---

5. Constant, op. cit., II, p. 101.
6. Froude, op. cit., V, pp. 42-43.
7. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 76.

sent and that the walls would not withstand the French cannonade) were also captured and sent to the galleys along with the rest.

The Scots had delivered England from their worst enemies, but in a slow deliberate siege the English who had access to the garrison from the sea allowed them to be conquered. This conduct definitely hurt the English party in Scotland and alienated the Scottish Protestants. As Froude says:

> The great families who had been gained over to the English interest, continued a pretended good feeling, but were alienated at heart; and no one any more would risk the odium of espousing so thankless a cause.[8]

Apparently Somerset had come to feel the marriage was no longer possible and so let the garrison at St. Andrew's perish. Then about mid-summer 1547 Somerset felt French influence had again become a threat to the English cause in Scotland. Against the advice of Gardiner and Paget, he therefore decided to invade Scotland with 18,000 men, waste the country as much as possible in three weeks to a month and then return. Huge stores of food were collected. But though Beton was gone, and the Regent feeble, the Scots forgot their feuds and rose to meet the invader.

On September 2 Somerset sent a proclamation to the Scots saying that he was not come to rob her independence, but to enforce the treaty of marriage agreed to by the Scottish Parliament. But the Scots refused. Before the battle

---

8. Froude, op. cit., p. 52.

Somerset offered up a prayer in which it was plain that his goal was to win Scottish friendship so that the nations might be knit together in union by the marriage of the English king and the Scottish queen.[9]

On Sunday, September 4, 1547, he invaded Scotland with 14,000 foot soldiers, 4000 cavalry, and fifteen cannon. Devastating the land as he went, he camped at Musselburgh on Thursday. While he was there the Earl of Huntly challenged Somerset to a duel but Somerset refused.

As the English had advanced the sea was to the right and a marsh to their left. Seeing the English ships off shore the Scots now figured the English were planning to flee and attacked to cut off their escape. But the English quickly changed positions and after numerous bloody skirmishes drove the Scots into a trap.

The ill-trained Scots broke and ran with the English in many instances giving no quarter. Ten to fourteen thousand Scots were killed while only about two hundred English died.

This battle, called the Battle of Pinkie Cleugh or Sleugh or Musselburgh was the last great battle of the Scots and English before the union of the crowns. For the present, however, it destroyed all chance of the marriage of Edward and Mary. Somerset got his glory but the Scots now hated England and eagerly turned to France. Even though the victory had

---

9. Constant, op. cit., II, pp. 96-97.

been great, the English stores were running out and the English army was forced to withdraw. As they returned Leith was burnt again, a number of islands in the Forth were fortified, a few castles dismantled, but these were the only gains from the invasion.

Just before Pinkie Cleugh Cranmer in England had been following a "welcome" policy to persecuted Protestants from all over Europe. Thus in 1547 Bucer and Fagius came to lecture at Cambridge and Peter Martyr taught Calvin's anti-Sacramentarian views at Oxford. Green seems to feel that since Protestantism was evidently growing in both England and Scotland at this time that union between the two countries would have gradually come about that way.[10] But Somerset did not want to wait that long and so he invaded Scotland in the war which resulted in the battle of Pinkie Cleugh.

After the return of the English army from the Battle of Pinkie Cleugh the Scots promised their young queen to the Dauphin. When Somerset learned this in November, 1547, he immediately made new peace proposals. He urged the marriage of Edward and Mary as obviously intended by Providence, that if the nations should unite in this way they would be strong in peace and war.

> The Scots and English being made one by amity, having the sea for a wall, mutual love for a garrison, and God for a defence, should make so noble and well agreeing a monarchy, that neither in peace need they

---

10. Green, op. cit., II, p. 229.

be ashamed, nor in war afraid of any worldly power.[11]

As usual he followed the proposal with the threat of fire and sword if it was refused. But the Scots went ahead with their plans and France espoused their cause accepting the plan of marriage for the Dauphin and Mary.

Upon his return Somerset had also run into some opposition from Gardiner who opposed Somerset's changes in religion on the ground that all ecclesiastical changes made while the king was a minor were illegal and invalid. Somerset imprisoned him, favored Protestant preachers and pamphleteers, and sought to buy the support of nobles and landowners by giving them much of the appropriated church lands. But the opposition and discontent continued to grow.

In February, 1548, the French were preparing for war against England particularly planning to capture Boulogne. Nevertheless Somerset confidently went ahead with plans for another war on Scotland and on April 18, 1548, invaded Scotland once more. Haddington was taken, a garrison of 2500 men was left in it, and after wasting the area around Edinburg the English returned to Berwick in June.

But on June 16 the French landed six thousand men at Leith and besieged Haddington. In an old monastery outside of the town but inside the French lines the Scots who had come up with six thousand men agreed with the French to form a

---

11. "Address of the Duke of Somerset to the Scottish Nation: Holinshed" quoted by Froude, op. cit., V, p. 81.

perpetual alliance between France and Scotland sealed by the marriage of the Dauphin and Mary.[12]

Now Somerset suggested the queen should remain with the Scots for ten years and then make her own choice as to husband. He would not interfere with Edward if the Scots would then not form a French alliance. Some Scots favored the English plan, but Marie Guise with the help of her party won out and Mary was shipped off to France to marry the Dauphin. Of the trip Knox said:

> So she was sold to go into France, to the end that in her youth she should drink of that liquor that should remain with her all her lifetime a plague to the realm, and for her own final destruction.[13]

In July under the terrific bombardment from the French the English at Haddington were practically beaten when Lord Grey by sacrificing a light cavalry group of eighteen hundred managed to get reinforcements of men, ammunition, and food to the garrison. When later the English came up with 15,000 the French commander d'Essy withdrew to Edinburg.

At Edinburg the French were forced by the English blockade of the port to forage for food and so molest the people. Then one morning a French soldier claimed a gun which a Scot was carrying and tried to take it. In the scuffle which followed sides quickly formed, shots were exchanged, and then the town provost arrested the Frenchman. As he was being taken off to jail the soldier's cry to his comrades brought a sharp skirmish

---

13. Quoted by Froude, op. cit., V, p. 86.

with the French firing on any Scot, man, woman, or child who stuck his head out of a house. Scottish resentment at this was fierce and they began to go through the town killing and cutting into pieces every French soldier they found. All night long the butchery continued and then came the message that d'Essy had taken Haddington. The news ended the massacre and the Regent rode out. The French had attacked Haddington seeking to recover the friendship of the Scots which had been lost by the Edinburg fracas. The English though surprised, rallied, and defeated the French.

Both the English and the Scots rejoiced at the news. Now if Somerset could have come in with a decent offer of peace he probably would have won the favor of the Scots. But he didn't and soon the French were back in the good graces of Scotch and drove the English out of all the islands of the Forth so that in the spring of 1549 the English held only Haddington.

Then in 1549 The Boke of the Common Praier and Administration of the Sacramentes and other Rites and Ceremonies after the use of the Churche of England was published.[14] Cranmer seems to have been the chief author although the origin of it is rather obscure. Conservative, it did away with transubstatiation and spoke of the bread as the communion of the body of Christ and the wine as the communion of the blood of Christ. A most important fact to note is that the Scottish Reformers made great use of it later on.

---

14. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 357.

Meanwhile Somerset was having his troubles. The opposition he had experienced after Pinkie Cleugh had grown until in 1549 people had grown so resentful of his ecclesiastical changes they revolted in Devonshire. They requested a restoration of the Six Articles and some of the suppressed monasteries. In January, 1549, Somerset had his brother executed on a charge of intrigue against the government. This fact plus Somerset's sanctioning evictions and foreclosures by those to whom he had given many of the appropriated church lands made him many enemies. Thus at the end of 1549 the council forced him to resign. Now Warwick took over. Unlike Somerset he did not concern himself with Scotland. Rather he established Protestantism in England by means of a reign of terror. Despite their dislike for Warwick, the people were helpless because he used the German and Italian mercenaries Cromwell had hired to support his government. Under Warwick Edward began to exercise a little more power. He tried to force his ecclesiastical ideas on Mary but she refused to accept them. However upon Edward's authorization Cranmer issued a new Catechism containing the doctrine of the Reformers; a book of Homilies to be read in the churches; and an order demanding the replacement of stone altars with wooden tables placed in the middle of the church.[15]

In 1550 internal troubles in England (Anglian explosion

---

15. Green, op. cit., II, p. 233.

and a riot of 10,000 peasants in the South-west) forced her to make peace with both France and Scotland. As a result she lost Boulogne in France and her foothold in southern Scotland. But when the English troops were withdrawn the Scottish Reformers went to work in the annual Provincial Council (the Parliament of the Church) to pass fifty-seven reformatory decrees against clerical corruption and ignorance.[16]

Interestingly enough, Mackenzie says Marie of Guise during the peace of 1550 went to France to seek French help. Yet when she passed through England under Edward's safe-conduct she was warmly received and Edward offered himself as husband to Mary.[17]

However, in the early 1550's under the guidance of Marie Scotland as a whole came to favor the French. It was not until Marie came to lean too heavily on France and her brothers in France that a reaction set in.

Now from 1550 till Edward's death in 1553 there seems to be very little between England and Scotland. But the Reformation was going ahead in England. Somerset was executed, January 22, 1552. In the same year the English Prayer Book was revised in a Calvinistic direction and imposed on all Englishmen through the Act of Uniformity. Because of Knox's objections the 1552 revision of the Prayer Book had the Black Rubric in it which enjoined kneeling at Holy Communion but

---

16. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 82.
17. Ibid., pp. 82-83.

stated that it did not imply any adoration of the elements or the real or essential presence of "'Christ's natural flesh and blood.'"[18]

In 1553 Edward was 15. In that year the Forty-two articles were introduced which Green says "marked the adhesion of England to the Protestant movement on the Continent."[19] Furthermore, the episcopal mode of church government was reduced in form. Bishops became royal officers called to their office by royal pleasure. Strict ecclesiastical laws against heresy, blasphemy, and adultery were promulgated. But the biggest reaction came to the attempted enforced use of vestments. Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, denounced them as "the livery of the 'harlot of Babylon.'"[20]

This section comes to a close with the death of Edward on July 6, 1553. As he died Northumberland with his candidate Lady Jane and Mary were fighting for the crown and control of the kingdom.

Conclusions

The relations between England and Scotland from 1553-1558 were primarily the relations between Somerset and Scotland. Although he was Regent only from 1547-1549 he had an active policy towards Scotland. On the other hand Warwick, Regent

---

18. Lindsay, op. cit., p. 362.
19. Green, op. cit., p. 234.
20. Quoted by Green, op. cit., p. 234.

from 1549-1553, seemed to concentrate more on domestic issues in England. He sought to make the English Protestant party so strong that Mary would be unable to overthrow it. Therefore these few remarks shall deal almost exclusively with Somerset's regency, 1547-1549.

Like the English kings before him, Somerset earnestly desired the union of England and Scotland and he was determined to bring it about. When diplomacy didn't work, he resorted to arms. Unfortunately his zeal seems to have blinded him to the disastrous effects of certain of his acts towards Scotland.

For example, the assertion of England' feudal ownership of Scotland only antagonized the fiercely independent Scots. His refusal to aid the defenders of St. Andrew's was particularly damaging to the growth of the English party and the favor of Scottish Protestants. Yet his action was typical of England's attitude in the future political and religious relations between the two countries. Somerset wanted to be absolutely sure of winning before pouring men and arms into Scotland. Since victory seemed extremely doubtful he left the Scotsmen to their fate. In later years Elizabeth was particularly guilty of doing this.

Pinkie Cleugh with its slaughter of 14,000 Scots only drove Scotland into the arms of France by marriage and by formal treaty.

Yet despite these mistakes the English cause and Protestantism were advanced in Scotland. Constant gives us part of the story.

> Although Somerset used political methods to win Scotland he also made good use of religion. The English party in Scotland had always been Protestant; the French party, Catholic. Somerset hoped to banish Catholicism from Scotland and so get rid of the French influence. "Abjurations were encouraged. The convert renounced the Bishop of Rome at the same time as he gave his support to the marriage between Mary Stuart and the English King. Wherever the English troops penetrated they were followed by the missionaries of the Reformation. The Bible was distributed among the people. The monasteries were dissolved and it was even proposed to distribute their goods among the nobles in order to eradicate Popery definitely from Scotland. Protestantism made slow and silent progress in the country, and along with it the English cause. In 1549 the partisans of England were reckoned at forty or even fifty thousand.[21]

Forty or fifty thousand people formed quite a nucleus for the English party. The cause of England and Protestantism in Scotland in the next years became still stronger so that not even the Marian reaction was able to prevent its advance and spread.

---

21. Constant, op. cit., II, pp. 99-100.

III. Relations between the English and the Scottish Reformations during the Time of Mary Tudor

Although Edward had died July 6, 1553, it was not until October 1, 1553, that Mary Tudor the rightful heir succeeded in fighting her way to the throne and crown of England. Chief reason for the delay was the famous Lady Jane conspiracy conceived and executed by the Protestant Regent, Warwick, newly created Duke of Northumberland.

Northumberland had devised the plan to save his life from the Catholic Mary and to advance himself politically as the power behind the throne. At the Regent's urging, Edward in his will had bequeathed the crown to Lady Jane who was strongly Protestant. This fact plus Jane's marriage to his son would have given Northumberland the power and influence which he wanted. On July 10 Lady Jane was actually crowned in London, but Northumberland was so hated his candidate had no chance for general support. In just a few days 30,000 men had flocked to Mary's side and after a few half-hearted counter-attacks by Northumberland's men, she was proclaimed queen in London on July 19.[1]

Reactions to her impending succession had been varied.

---

1. Gardiner, op. cit., p. 420.

The Protestant opinion was probably best expressed by Knox in a sermon July 16, 1553:

> Oh England! . . . now is God's wrath kindled against thee--now hath he begun to punish as he hath threatened by his true prophets and messengers. He hath taken from thee the crown of thy glory, and hath left thee without honour, and this appeareth to be only the beginning of sorrows. The heart, the tongue, the hand of one Englishman is bent against another, and division is in the realm, which is a sign of desolation to come. Oh, England, England! if thy mariners and thy governors shall consume one another, shalt not thou suffer shipwreck? Oh, England, alas! these plagues are poured upon thee because thou wouldst not know the time of thy most gentle visitation. 2

Yet when Mary was proclaimed Queen the crowds went wild with joy. Shouts of "God save the Queen" filled the air, church bells pealed all night, and crowds feasted in the streets. Much of this frenzied joy may be traced to the relief of the English that the succession had been preserved and a revolution thus averted.

In Scotland, Mackenzie points out, Mary's ascent to the throne meant "for the time an end to English support for the Protestants and hitherto pro-English party, though a number of English refugees fled north, and were allowed to find shelter in Scotland, for Mary at first was tolerant of religion so long as they did not disturb the peace." 3

On August 22, 1553, Mary executed Northumberland and

---

2. "Account of a Sermon at Amersham: Admonition to the Faithful in England," by John Knox," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VI, p. 38.

3. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 85.

two of his accomplices, Sir Henry Gates and Sir Thomas Palmer. All three of these men were leading Protestants and their recantations on the scaffold dealt Protestantism a severe blow. All of them confessed their error in revolting from the church and urged the people to return. Particularly of Northumberland's apostacy Froude says: "The shame of the apostacy shook down the frail edifice of the Protestant constitution, to be raised again in suffering, as the first foundations of it had been laid, by purer hands and nobler spirits."[4]

The mass of the people with no definite opinions saw in this defeat of Protestantism the judgment of God and turned once more to the Catholic Church.

Finally on October 1, 1553, Mary was officially crowned and her first Parliament met October 5 to December 6, 1553. It declared Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon was invalid and that Mary was the legitimate heir to the English throne. Other measures wiped out all religious legislation enacted under Edward and restored the church to what it was at Henry's death. The House of Commons, however, refused to rescind the anti-papal laws of Henry VIII. Thus says Lindsay,

> . . . Mary was left in the anomalous position of being the supreme head of the Church in England

---

4. Froude, op. cit., VI, p. 79.

> while she herself devoutly believed in the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. The title and powers it gave were useful to restore by royal proclamation the medieval ritual and worship, and Mass was re-introduced in this way in December. [5]

Mary had come to the throne with the idea that she was heaven-sent to restore England to Catholicism. As she said at a later time to her Parliament:

> . . . she had been predestined and preserved by God to the succession of the Crown for no other end save that He might make use of her above all else in the bringing back of the realm to the Catholic faith. [6]

All of her actions, her marriage, her legislative acts and decrees, were designed with this ultimate goal in view. But already her first Parliament offered objections to parts of her policy. They were willing enough to restore the Catholic practices, but they refused to return the appropriated church lands and advised against her marriage to Philip II. Rather than take their advice, she dissolved the Parliament.

But this did not settle the matter and from January 25 - February 8 or 9 occurred the famous Wyatt rebellion which was designed to put Elizabeth on the throne. The revolt was finally crushed but only after Wyatt had fought his way to the very palace in which the Queen was staying in London. As a result of the defeat, Lady Jane Grey, the Duke of Suf-

---

5. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 370.
6. Green, op. cit., II, p. 245.

folk, and Guilford Dudley husband to Lady Jane were executed. Elizabeth herself was sent to the Tower but Froude feels that the defeat was good for Protestantism.

> Had Wyatt succeeded, Mary would have lost her husband and her crown; and had the question been no more than a personal one, England could have well dispensed both with her and Philip. But Elizabeth would have ascended a throne under the shadow of treason. The Protestants would have come back to power in the thoughtless vindictiveness of exasperated and successful revolutionists; and the problem of the Reformation would have been more hard than ever of a reasonable solution. [7]

Up in Scotland in April, 1554, Marie of Scotland was having her troubles with the Scottish nobles and people. The Protestants were growing stronger and she felt she couldn't trust them. Frequently they had sought to sell her out to England. Moreover, the Catholic Primate in Scotland though loyal had no great influence politically or morally, while "Huntly, the lay head of the Catholic party, was neither strong nor very reliable." [8] By now, too, her obvious dependence on France had begun to draw resentment. Opposition to the taxes involved forced her to abandon the project of a standing army. But trouble did not really start until John Knox began to attack her, first in 1555 and the years following 1558.

In England Mary went ahead with her plans for a Catholic England by marrying Philip II, king of Spain, on July

---

7. Froude, op. cit., VI, p. 178.
8. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 86.

25, 1554. Then on November 30, 1554, Cardinal Pole, commissioned as Papal Legate in England by the Pope, received the supplication of Philip and Mary. While they knelt he "pronounced the absolution, and received the kingdom 'again into the unity of our Mother the Holy Church.'"[9] On December 15, 1554, the Heresy Acts were again revived under which laws Rogers and Bishop Hooper, Rowland Taylor, Ridley, and Latimer were burnt in 1555. Gardiner gives the scene at Oxford in front of Balliol College where Ridley and Latimer met their death. As the fire was lighted at his feet Latimer cried: "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man. . . . We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out."[10]

Latimer's words eventually proved to be true but three years of fire and sword were yet in store for England before Protestants were once more in power.

In 1556 Cranmer, after seven recantations, was also burned at the stake. His final confession of the Protestant faith made a tremendous impression on the people. For this reason Lindsay feels that while the death of Ridley and Latimer may have lighted the torch, Cranmer's death burnt up Romanism eventually in England to the extent that

---

9. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 373.
10. Quoted by Gardiner, op. cit., p. 425.

England eventually became a Protestant nation.[11]

About this time John Knox entered the pageant of the Reformations in England and Scotland. Smith offers this unflattering characterization of him: "A born partisan, a man of one idea who could see no evil on his own side and no good on the other, as a good fighter and a good hater he has had few equals."[12] Lindsay's opinion stands somewhat in contrast to Smith's attitude. Speaking of Knox's stay in Geneva he says: ". . . Knox's broad-minded toleration stands in noble contrast with the narrow-minded and crooked policy of his opponents."[13] Apparently Lindsay feels Knox picked up his later harshness from Genevan associates.

Knox after his capture by the French in July, 1547, and nineteen months in their fleet as a galley slave was released to England about February, 1549. There he spent five years serving as preacher at Berwick and Newcastle and was appointed as royal chaplain. He was also offered the bishopric of Rochester but declined because of troubles which he foresaw would come with Mary. In 1554 he fled to Frankfort, Germany and later to Geneva. From that time on until 1558, except for a brief visit to Scotland in August, 1555 Knox stayed on the continent.

---

11. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 382.
12. Smith, op. cit., p. 357.
13. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 388.

Knox's August, 1555, visit to Scotland was very important, however, for a number of reasons. First of all, his passionate preaching against the mass brought him to the attention of both English and Scottish Protestants, so much so that the Scots adopted him as their leader. During this visit also Knox and Marie came to hate one another with a hatred that deepened with the years. Marie hated Knox for his violent preaching against the mass and the rather slurring remarks he made in a letter to her. Knox hated Marie for her scornful treatment of his letter asking her to favor the Gospel and for burning him in effigy after his departure to Geneva. The most important result of his visit was his part in the formation of a confederacy of men who pledged their lives to

> . . . refuse all society with idolatry, and bind themselves to the uttermost of their power to maintain the true preaching of the Evangile, as God should offer to their preachers an opportunity. [14]

Many leading nobles joined the confederacy. Among their number were:

> . . . the Earl of Morton, the head of the house of Douglas, the Earl of Argyle, the greatest chieftain of the west, and above all, a bastard son of the late King, Lord James Stuart, who bore as yet the title of prior of St. Andrew's, but who was to be better known afterwards as the Earl of Murray. . . . [15]

---

14. Quoted by Green, op. cit., II, p. 272.
15. Green, op. cit., p. 272.

After Knox had returned to Geneva he used letters to direct the growth and development of the Scottish Protestant party. Also at Geneva he answered Marie's scorn for him with a pamphlet entitled, Appelation. In it he set forth his doctrine of the temporal power which allowed him with a clear conscience to incite riots against the government. Mackenzie describes this theory as follows:

> The secular power is not only bound to protect him against an unjust ecclesiastical sentence, but must instruct all its subjects in his religion, and remove from honour or punish with death all those who would turn the people away from it. If the sovereign fail to do so, the Estates are bound to these duties, and if the representative assembly should fail, the people, both as a body and as individuals, have not only a right but a duty to act in their place. [16]

But these were not the most important results of Knox's stay in Geneva. He certainly grew in the conviction of the truth of Calvinism. But more important, he saw that the hope of Protestantism in Scotland lay in political union with a Protestant England. Both of these convictions greatly influenced the course of the Scottish Reformation.

By 1557 the Scottish Protestants were begging Knox to come back to Scotland. He started out for Scotland, but by October, 1557, he had gotten only as far as Dieppe. From there he wrote fiery letters encouraging the Protestants

---

16. Mackenzie, op. cit., pp. 90-91.

in Scotland. It was also while he was at Dieppe that Knox wrote his famous "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women" which nearly ruined him with Elizabeth. He had written it against Marie of Scotland and Mary of England, but unfortunately Mary died before it was published and Knox refused to say that he had not written it against Elizabeth.

Despite Knox's absence, the Scottish Protestant party went ahead. In November, 1557, the Scottish Estates were discussing Marie's marriage to some French nobleman. In answer a group of Protestant nobles on December 3, 1557, formed the famous band later known as The Lords of the Congregation. They were so called because of their statement that they "bound themselves to maintain in and forward with all their might the most blessed word of God and His Congregations, renouncing the Congregation of Satan."[17]

Some of their demands were for public worship on Sunday's and festival days to be in the forms of the English Prayer Book and in the vernacular; that the Scriptures should be expounded in small groups and not to great crowds of people. They also set up an ecclesiastical organization of "exhorters, most of whom were laymen and a Court of Elders for disciplinary purposes, while the first definite congregation unit for regular public worship in

---

17. Ibid., p. 94.

the new forms was established in the burgh of Dundee."[18]

The new Congregation now became a threat to the Scottish crown. The Anglo-Spanish treaty meant hostility to France, Scotland's old ally, and if things did not go right, the Congregation threatened to turn to England. Then on April 24, 1558, Mary Queen of Scots was married to Francis II of France. Shortly thereafter, the fact was made known that Mary had promised to surrender Scotland and her rights to the English crown if she died childless. This report created a resentment against France which despite Marie's apparent triumph began to grow and eventually brought the end of the French alliance. The execution of Walter Milne "an aged priest of excellent character" who had begun to favor the Protestants only added to the growing popular dislike for the Catholic party.[19]

To return to England, the Protestant party had been severely tested by the Marian persecution which took nearly four hundred lives in three years' time. Mary's own desire to re-establish Catholicism, her unhappy marriage, her disappointment in supposing herself to be pregnant, her loss of Calais in January, 1558, and revenge for Protestant excesses under Edward VI were reasons why the persecution continued. But the English Protestants waited patiently for Mary's death. They had saved Elizabeth's life and felt

---

18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., p. 98

she would deliver them. Therefore, says Froude,

> . . . the Catholics . . . were permitted to continue their cruelties till the cup of iniquity was full; till they had taught the educated laity of England to regard them with horror; and till the Romanist superstition had died, amidst the execrations of the people, of its own excess. [20]

Finally on November 17, 1558, Mary Tudor did die and England was free from her terror.

Conclusions

Mary's reign in this story of two Reformations is interesting because of the growth of Protestantism despite her vicious program of suppression. Executions were able to hurt Protestantism in the cases of Northumberland, Gates, and Palmer who denied the Protestant faith. Yet the same tactics produced the opposite effect in the martyrdom of Ridley, Latimer, and Cranmer.

Eventually Mary was able to subject England once again to the rule of the Pope. Yet Mary's program for restoring Catholicism turned the Scots in favor of Protestantism. Green has analyzed it in this way. Under Henry and Edward Catholicism in Scotland had grown as a result of the opposition to Protestant England; but "now that Catholicism was again triumphant in England Protestantism became far less odious to the Scotch statesmen."[21] The final result was that

---

20. Froude, op. cit., VI, p. 495.
21. Green, op. cit., II, p. 271.

Mary's persecution " . . . failed to crush Protestantism in England," and ". . .gave a new impulse to it in the northern realm."[22]

Probably the most important development all future relations between the English and the Scottish Reformation was the formation on December 3, 1557, of the Lords of the Congregation. This band of nobles had dedicated their lives to the cause of Protestantism and were to be the chief contact point between Elizabeth and the Scottish Protestants from 1558-1603. Their insistence on the introduction of the English Prayer Book in place of the mass book proved their English sympathies, while the Prayer Book itself formed an eventual bond between English and Scottish Protestants.

---

22. Ibid., p. 270.

IV. Relations between the English and Scottish Reformation during the Time of Elizabeth

The accession of Elizabeth as Queen of England marks a new phase in relations between England and Scotland. Efforts at political union became more frequent as statesmen realized the growing possibility of union. Particularly outstanding is the constant intrigue and correspondence between Elizabeth and the Lords of the Congregation.

Elizabeth, daughter of Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII, came to the throne in November, 1558, and was crowned January 15, 1559. There were many problems facing the new Queen. Socially and economically England was in a serious condition. A few sentences from one of Elizabeth's early addresses to her Council definitely show this.

> The Queen poor; the realm exhausted; the nobility poor and decayed; good captains and soldiers wanting; the people out of order; justice not executed; all things dear; excesses in meat, diet, and apparel; division among ourselves; war with France; the French king bestriding the realm, having one foot in Calais and the other in Scotland; steadfast enemies, but not steadfast friends. [1]

One of her most important problems was to decide whether she should support the Catholics or the Protestants. In 1558 two-thirds to three-fourths of her people still professed to be Catholics. Yet the foreign policy of the Catholics, the terrific persecutions which they had sponsored, and the inspir-

---

1. "Address to the Council: Domestic MS.," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 8.

ing deaths of Protestant martyrs had served as Protestant leaven which slowly but surely was working its way through the land.

Thus while most of the English squires and peasantry remained Catholic, the more intelligent people, particularly in the large towns and seaports, had gradually been giving it up.

What principle should govern Elizabeth's choice in such a situation? Mackenzie says that Elizabeth had "to stay Protestant or be bastardized." [2] Yet there was more to the problem than just that. Elizabeth felt that she could not go back to Henry VIII's system of maintaining the Catholic system of doctrine while continually disregarding the threats or warnings of the Pope. She also knew that the Protestants were too active to be silenced or successfully suppressed. Mary had tried that and failed. But she had also seen during Edward's reign that "doctrinal immutability" was impossible without the Pope. Yet she refused to submit to the Pope.[3]

The explanation for this attitude must be found in Elizabeth's personal creed. Some have doubted whether she had any, but Froude says:

> For herself she would have been contented to accept the formulas which had been left by her father, with an English ritual, and the communion service of the first prayer-book of Edward the Sixth. . . . In her speculative theories she was nearer to Rome than to Calvinism. In her vital convictions she represented the free proud spirit of the educated laity, who would endure no dictation from priests of either

---

2. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 98
3. Gardiner, op. cit., p. 429.

> persuasion, and so far as lay in them, would permit no clergy any more to fetter the thoughts and paralyse the energies of England. [4]

Therefore, without being too obvious Elizabeth decided to work for a strong and prosperous England by establishing national unity in the Church, "a unity, which, as she was well aware, could only be attained if large advances were made in the direction of Protestantism." [5]

To this end she chose a completely Protestant Council which included Sir John Harrington, Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, Sir Peter Carew, Lord Bedford, and Sir William Cecil, her secretary. And so ended the year 1558.

The next eight years were to be tremendously important in the relation between the English and the Scottish Reformation. Lindsay offers a fine analysis of the problems involved.

As to the Reformation in general he says: "The years from 1559-1567 were the most critical in the whole history of the Reformation. The existence of the Protestantism of all Europe was involved in the struggle in Scotland . . . " [6]

The struggle in Scotland was between France and England. Its course and results Lindsay terms the birth-throes of the modern British nation.

---

4. Froude, op. cit., VI, pp. 12-13.
5. Gardiner, op. cit., p. 429.
6. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 295.

modern British nation.

> Two peoples, long hereditary foes, were coalescing; the Romanists in England recognized the Scottish Queen as their legitimate sovereign, and the Protestants in Scotland looked for aid to their brethren in England. The question was: Would the new nation accept the Reformed religion, or would the reaction triumph? If Knox and the Congregation gained the upper hand in Scotland, and if Cecil was able to guide England in the way he meant to lead it (and the two men were necessary to each other, and knew it), then the Reformation was safe. If Scotland could be kept for France and the Roman Church, and its Romanist Queen make good her claim to the English throne, then the Reformation would be crushed not merely within Great Britain, but in Germany and the Low Countries also. So thought the politicians, secular and ecclesiastical, in Rome and Geneva, in Paris, Madrid, and in London. The European situation had been summed up by Cecil: 'The Emperor is aiming at the sovereignty of Europe, which he cannot obtain without the suppression of the Reformed religion, and, unless he crushes England, he cannot crush the Reformation.' In this peril a Scotland controlled by the Guises would have been fatal to the existence of the Reformation.[7]

By March, 1559, it became evident that the fight against Protestants was getting under way. In that month in the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis France and Spain agreed to crush Protestantism in Europe. When the Prince of Orange heard of it he determined to drive the Spaniards out of the Netherlands. But on the continent under French leadership a general revolt against Protestantism seemed possible. Therefore Throgmorton wrote to Cecil from Paris urging him as strongly as he could to support the Lords of the Congregation in Scotland. He knew that France was seeking to de-

---

7. Ibid.

stroy the new Congregation in order to use Scotland as a base to attack England.

In Scotland Marie began the attack in March, 1559, with a law that imposed the death penalty on anyone doing unauthorized preaching. However, the effect of this law was only to stir up the Protestant preachers to revolt against Marie and her government.

Then in April, 1559, Elizabeth struck a counter-blow at the Catholics by securing the passage of the Supremacy Bill on April 3 and the Act of Uniformity a short time later. The Supremacy Act required bishops, persons holding office, or persons taking university degrees to acknowledge by oath that the Queen was head not only of all temporal but also all spiritual and ecclesiastical matters. The Act of Uniformity abolished the mass by forbidding the use of any prayer book but Edward's. However, certain sectarian elements were removed from the Prayer Book and large latitude was given in the use of ornaments and vestments. "In the communion service the words were restored which seemed to recognize the real presence, while the words also were not rejected which seemed equally to reduce the sacrament to a commemorative form."[8]

8. Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 82.

By May, 1559, the Prayer Book with its liturgy by Cranmer had been generally accepted without enthusiasm yet without opposition so that of 9400 persons "holding cures of souls in various forms, less than two hundred refused to the last to comply with the statute and resigned their livings."[9]

In the latter part of 1558 shortly after the execution of Walter Milne by Mary Tudor, the Scottish Protestants had petitioned Marie of Guise for a reformation, but she had refused. However, the lords were not to be put off for the sight of "the sleek and well-fed (Scottish) clergy" only incited to further action "the gaunt and hungry nobles of Scotland, careless of God or devil."[10] Then during the first days of May the lords had a conference with the Regent, but reached no agreement.

Immediately afterwards the citizens of Perth started a riot by taking possession of the churches and reading the service from the Prayer Book of Edward VI. The town provost, Lord Ruthven, refused to arrest them and so make them do something against their conscience. When similar riots broke out at Dundee and Montrose the Regent ordered the

9. Ibid., p. 90.
10. Ibid., p. 111.

preachers to come to Stirling which they planned to do but accompanied by five to six thousand armed men. She now refused to see them and declared the preachers to be outlaws. And now John Knox arrives upon the scene.

He had arrived in Scotland on May 2 after trying without success at various times during April to appease Elizabeth's wrath occasioned by his Trumpet Blast. He had come in answer to a previous call by the Lords of the Congregation. After hiding two days in Edinburg he hastened to Perth so that he might take his part in the battle against Catholicism which had begun there.

On Thursday, May 11, Knox preached at Perth. After the service the people were still standing around when a priest, knowing the preachers were outlawed, entered the church, and started to celebrate mass. A boy grew insolent, the priest struck him, the boy threw a stone which broke a crucifix on the altar and in a few moments the mob had wrecked the church. Next they went to Charterhouse and wrecked the home of the Grey Friars. Thus began those acts of violence which marked the course of the Scottish Reformation.

The Regent resolved to punish the rioters but the Lords

took to arms. Eventually the Regent promised to forgive the rioters, grant liberty of conscience to every Scot to profess what he pleased, and forbid the establishment of any French garrison. But the Regent only hoped to gain time until French reenforcements could arrive, and the Congregation thought of toleration as the right to prohibit saying of mass. Finally the Lords defeated the French forces in a number of engagements so that by the end of June ". . . the entire fabric of the Catholic Church over the whole Lowlands had fallen."[11]

In the closing days of June, 1559, Scottish Protestants had begun to appeal for English help. On June 23 Kirkcaldy wrote to Cecil:

> If ye suffer us to be overthrown, ye shall prepare a way for your own destruction; if you will advisedly and friendly look upon us, Scotland will in turn be faithful to England to defend the liberties of the same.[12]

On June 28 Knox sent Cecil a second apology for his book, expressed his desire for union of the two countries, urged

11. Ibid., p. 119.
12. "June 23: Scotch MSS. Rolls House," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 122.

Elizabeth to embrace the present opportunity, and asked for permission to visit the Queen.[13]

But there were difficulties in the way of sending English aid to Knox and the Scottish Protestants. To do so meant to aid rebels who were revolting against their sovereign. Such a policy for Elizabeth had its danger because the Catholics in England could not be trusted not to revolt. Furthermore, Elizabeth had just made peace with France. In addition, Elizabeth didn't like Calvin or his theology which seemed to appeal so to the oppressed. Knox and his Blast were unforgiven and the way in which he had incited riots against the established church in Scotland turned her against him. Dr. Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury under Elizabeth at one time had asked in a letter to Cecil that God would preserve England "from such visitations as Knockes hath attempted in Scotland; the people to be orderers of things!"[14]

Yet Cecil knew and Knox knew that Dr. Parker's mitre, Elizabeth's crown, and the hope of a Protestant England depended on Knox's victory in Scotland.

13. Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 123.
14. "Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1559-1560, p. 84," quoted by Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 297.

Therefore on July 4 Cecil answered through Sir Henry Percy that he had given their requests to the proper parties but that he was instructed to ask for more information on their plans, resources, the amount of help needed, what England could expect for the future from such agreements. They could reply when convenient and Percy was empowered to assure them that England would aid Scotland in repelling the invasion and oppression of any foreign power.

Four days later Cecil wrote to Sir James Crofts at Berwick, England that he had determined to aid the Scots first with promises, then with money, and finally with arms. In the same letter he urged Crofts to inform the Congregation that Arran was on his way to England, that the French king was planning to send an army to Scotland, but that assured of Scottish friendship, England would defend the Scots. In conclusion he urged Crofts to kindle this interest of the Protestants as an opportunity which might never come again.[15]

15. Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 124.

Then on July 11, 1559, news reached London that on the day before, Henry II of France had died from an injury received in a tournament and the Guises now ruled France through Mary and her sickly husband. The resentment at Mary's accession to the French throne caused the French nobles to stir up trouble about religion in France. Therefore Throgmorton again urged Cecil to use the opportunity to send aid to the Protestants in Scotland.

Sensing that trouble was on its way, the Lords of the Congregation met in Edinburg on July 13 to renew a covenant made on May 31, 1559. In it they agreed to devote their lives and means to defend the Congregation and to present a united front against any opposition.

On July 19 the Lords of the Congregation replied to Cecil's letter of the 8th by addressing letters to both Cecil and Elizabeth. In the open letter to Elizabeth they referred to the long hoped-for union of the crowns and urged her to seize the present opportunity. They were fighting against the devil and against the enemies of England and friends of

France.

> For the sake of Christ therefore and for the sake of His glorious Gospel, they implored the Queen and the English people to stand by them; 'and whatever conditions her Majesty's council could reasonably require should on their part not be denied.' [16]

Argyle, Ruthven, Lord James Stuart, Boyd, Ochiltree, and Glencairn signed the petition. In an accompanying letter to Cecil they declared their determination to "advance the Gospel," destroy clerical tyranny, defend Scotland's liberties, and remain loyal to England. Above all they desired the Anglo-Scottish union and ". . . 'prayed God . . . they might be the instruments by which the unnatural debate between them might be ended.'" [17]

In a letter dated July 20 Knox again sought to win Elizabeth's pardon and favor, but his remarks were more of a prophetic rebuke than an apology.

> Interpret my rude words as written by him who is no enemy to your Grace. By divers letters I have required letters to visit your realm; not to seek myself, neither yet my own ease or commodity--which if you now refuse or deny, I must remit myself unto God, adding this for conclusion: that such as re-

16. "The Lords of the Congregation to the Queen of England, July 19, Scotch MSS. Rolls House," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 125.

17. "The Lords of the Congregation to Sir Wm. Cecil," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 125.

fuse the counsel of the faithful, appear it ever so sharp, are compelled to follow the deceit of flatterers to their own perdition.[18]

On July 28 Cecil wrote another letter to the Lords of Congregation in which he recommended England's policy of taking the Church's ill-gotten lands and properties and using them for good purposes. He also declared that since the Scots were asking for help they ought to take measures to defend their coasts against the three thousand French who were on their way to Scotland. In conclusion he said England would try to help, but times were difficult and it was a serious thing to go to war again with France, especially since an Anglo-French war had just been concluded.[19]

On July 30 or 31 he wrote to Knox asking to meet him.

Again on August 1, 1559, the Lords of the Congregation met to make sure of the group's loyalty to its original cause. This time they agreed that no member of the Congregation would communicate in any way with the Regent, Marie of Guise, without consulting and receiving the agreement of the rest.[20]

When Henry II, king of France, had died on July 10, Francis II had come to the throne. On advice of his counsellors he did not style himself king of England. Mary alone retained any claim to England.

---

18. "John Knox to Queen Elizabeth, July 20: Scotch MSS. Rolls House," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, pp. 130-131
19. Froude, op. cit., VII, pp. 135ff.
20. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 298.

But the French had not given up their designs on England and now sometime during the first week or ten days of August, the Spanish ambassador wrote to Philip: "The army for Scotland is ready, and when Scotland is quieted will come England's turn."[21]

At this particular time Elizabeth was urged to marry either the Archduke Charles of Austria or the Earl of Arran in Scotland. With Charles she could be sure of Catholic and Spanish support. With Arran she had the opportunity to unite the two realms. Thus united England would be a formidable power. But she hesitated at both. Particularly with the Scots she wasn't sure just how steady they would be in their professed allegiance to her. Throgmorton noting the efforts of the Congregation warned her not to trust them too completely. For example, when the Congregation had d'Oysel trapped at Edinburg they allowed him to slip away because their army had been composed of volunteers with provisions for only a few days. Furthermore, many in the Congregation were not firm in the conviction that their cause was right. A few French crowns would therefore have a notable effect in persuading them to go over to the French side. Moreover, the Lords showed no real ability to drive

21. "De Quadra to Ferdinand, August, 1559: MSS. Simancas," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 127.

the French out of Scotland even though the French troops numbered but a few hundred. D'Oysel had been able to re-arm his men, take Leith, and with the aid of the governor of Edinburg to force the Congregation to sign a treaty. In it they agreed to get out of Edinburg providing that French troops would be sent out of the country.

Therefore Elizabeth was doubtful of the cause of the Congregation. Moreover, the correspondence she had permitted could be used by the French as a cause for war.

To help Elizabeth and himself in arriving at a decision, Cecil drew up a document on August 5 in which he listed the various reasons for and against helping Scotland. Finally, on the basis of self-defense--England's defence against France--he recommended immediate intervention.[22]

Knox had sensed Elizabeth's hesitation and not knowing of Cecil's decision, he wrote to Crofts on August 6. Froude gives the gist of the letter:

> If the Protestants could not have present support, they would not trifle, they would seek the next remedy to preserve their own bodies. He did not mean that they would return to France; but they would give up the struggle, leave the country to the enemy, and the English might make their account of what would ensue towards themselves.[23]

Meanwhile the French minister had complained to Elizabeth and reported to the Scottish Regent that there had been cor-

---

22. Froude, op. cit., VII, pp. 135ff.
23. "Knox to Sir James Crofts, August 6: Scotch MSS. Rolls House," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, pp. 133-134.

respondence between the Lords and Cecil. Now Elizabeth wrote on August 7 to Mary Guise stating that she could not imagine that any of her officers would without her permission go ahead with negotiations with the Scottish rebels. Therefore she asked for more definite charges from Mary and when better informed she would punish the guilty parties. She closed with the statement that she wanted to do the right thing in order to maintain the friendship between them.[24]

The next day she dispatched Sir Ralph Sadler to the northern Border with 3000 Ls. to deal secretly with anyone who might assist the union of the realms. Later he was to receive special instructions from Cecil. Sadler who had much experience with Scottish politics was also ordered to stir up strife between the Scots and the French so that England might benefit.

However, the marriage of Arran and Elizabeth which England and Scotland were hoping would bind the two countries together failed to materialize. Elizabeth saw Arran at Cecil's house in London and sensed him to be the half-crazy fool that he really was. Furthermore, though marriage to him would have given her a chance to head and control the Scottish Protestants, she feared to challenge France and to excite her own Catholic subjects.

By the middle of August Scotland was becoming somewhat

24. Froude, op. cit., p. 38.

wary of Elizabeth. The Protestants wanted more tangible signs of good will. Knox himself wrote to Cecil "that he would not answer for the consequences, unless the Congregation 'saw greater forwardness to their support' in the English Government."[25]

Since England could never be sure that France would not attack her for intriguing with the Scottish rebels Elizabeth pretended to have no knowledge of what was going on even while Cecil was at the Border encouraging the Congregation.

Then shortly after the middle of August French troops arrived in Scotland and were cantoned at Leith. But English aid was on its way. Knox was expecting it, but denied it and Elizabeth sought to keep it dark. She needed a Protestant Scotland as much at odds with Catholic France as possible, because the Guises ruled France through their niece, the Queen of Scotland, who in turn ruler her husband, King Francis II.

Queen Regent Marie apparently knew what was going on. When she offered to "proclaim liberty of cultus until the Estates should meet," she also charged that "the Congregation were seeking to bring England into the struggle."[26] Knox de-

25. "Knox to Cecil, August 15: Scotch MSS. Rolls House," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 141.
26. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 101.

nied it but at the same time he was urging Kirkcaldy that Scotland unite with England against France and promoting the Arran marriage. As autumn approached he wrote Cecil asking that English troops be sent to Scotland. Since this would have been an act of hostility to the Scottish government he suggested that England could avoid putting herself in the wrong by keeping the matter strictly unofficial.

> It is frie for your subjectis to serve in warr any prence or nation for thare wages, and yf ye fear that such excusses shall not prevaile, ye may declayr thame rebelles to your realme when ye shalbe assured that thei be in our companye. [27]

Then on September 1, 1559, the Earl of Arran returned from England to Scotland under an assumed name on his passport. So successfully was the matter kept secret it was October before the French ambassador learned of the matter. When Noailles, the French ambassador, questioned her again about dealings with the Congregation she admitted that some of her ministers might have been foolish enough to do that. She herself, she said, had made no promises and had no correspondence. Noailles believed her and on September 5 he assured the French king Elizabeth would do nothing in Scotland. On the 6th, unaware of Elizabeth's recent dealings with the Earl he spoke to her about Arran's escape from France and asked her to arrest him if he came to England and send him back to Paris. Elizabeth blandly told him she knew nothing of Arran's where-

27. Quoted by Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 101.

abouts, but if it was possible she would certainly do her best to help the French king. While Elizabeth did not wholly deceive the French ambassador she had him guessing badly and in fact kept more than half her council completely in the dark.

Cecil constantly denied Elizabeth's dealings with Scotland but as time went on this became more and more difficult. The Earl of Arran was met at Berwick by a delegation from the Congregation and was brought into Scotland by Sadler and Sir James Crofts. Spies discovered this and reported it to the Queen Regent and to French Ambassador Noailles. When approached, Elizabeth said she had forced Sadler "to confess on his allegiance whether he had or had not assisted the Earl of Arran."[28] When he denied it, Elizabeth declared she was so confident of his integrity she felt the Scottish Queen must have been misinformed.

The Congregation now rallied again under the personal exertions of Sadler, the English money, and the failure of French reinforcements to arrive. Arran had also brought more English money which helped many a waverer to decide. Arran's father now began to serve as a rallying point for the Congregation.

So cheered was the Congregation by this newest support from England they met on October 15 in Edinburg to declare the Regent deposed for "having conspired against the liberties of Scotland by the introduction of foreign troops."[29]

28. Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 154.
29. Ibid., p. 156.

For this she must forfeit the Regency.

The Congregation's next job was to take Leith which the Regent had been fortifying under French supervision. The Congregation felt unable to take it with their present strength and so appealed to the English at Berwick. In a letter to Crofts the Master of St. Clair had this to say:

> It is free for your subjects . . . to serve in war any prince or nation for their wages; and if ye fear that such excuses shall not prevail, ye may declare them rebels to your realm, when ye shall be assured that they be in our company.[30]

This business with Scotland had been carried on by Elizabeth without the support and perhaps even the knowledge of the Council. Cecil, who ciphered and deciphered the messages; Crofts at Berwick; and Throgmorton at Paris seemed to be the only ones beside the Queen who knew the secret.

Then on November 3, 1559 Cecil offered the Congregation all the money it wanted, even powder, but the sending of troops was a step which he did not as yet want to take. Also on November 3 Elizabeth had attended a tournament held at Greenwich where she met the French Ambassador, Noailles. In answer to her question for news about Scot-

---

30. "St. Clair to Sir James Crofts, Cotton MSS. Calig. B. 10," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 157. Apparently there is some mistake by either Mackenzie or Froude. It seems incredible that two men would make such identical statements. Froude gives his source for the quotation while Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 101 does not.

land he answered that France was sending an army there to quell a revolt. Then she suddenly became very bold stating that the French troops at Leith were enough for Scotland; that all the additional ones were meant for England; for that reason she was preparing for any eventuality of war. She overruled his protest by declaring her intention to go ahead with preparations anyway. However, she had already made preparations. Arms had been gotten from Antwerp, the appropriated church properties were used to get money for the empty treasury, a fleet of twenty ships were ready to sail at a moments notice, and other defensive and offensive measures had been taken. Lord Grey was now sent down to the Border with two thousand men presumably to strengthen the Berwick garrison but ready for any eventuality.[31]

The Scots had not been doing much, however. They had made some ladders in the churches of Edinburg for scaling the walls of Leith, but this sacrilege had so shocked the Calvinists that they were beaten before they started.

Then sometime during November 4-6 a near disaster came when 3000 Ls. sent by Elizabeth to the Congregation was intercepted by the Earl of Bothwell who was working for the Queen Regent. The next day four hundred horsemen tried to recover it, but the Earl was gone and the French sallied forth to capture two cannon from the Scots in Edinburg.

---

31. Froude, op. cit., VII, pp. 158-159.

After another battle in which three hundred Scots were killed and two hundred taken prisoner the supporters of the Protestants panicked and broke up, returning to their homes. The Regent also returned to Holyrood in Edinburg.

It was evident now that the Scottish Protestants could not do much by themselves. Elizabeth submitted the matter to her Council and debate began. It was resolved to send them more money to replace that lost to Bothwell. In addition the Protestants were encouraged to stand fast and given hope of help in case of extremity. But while the English were debating whether the marriage with Archduke Charles might not be the best plan (Norfolk favored it particularly) Maitland and Balnavis arrived from Scotland as representatives of Arran and the Congregation. Knox also sent a message urging the immediate sending of English aid. Such aid would not only prevent the French from getting a hold on Scotland but would convince the large number of waverers that England would protect and support them. Delay would be extremely harmful if not fatal to the cause.[32]

Through Maitland the Congregation proposed the union of the crowns. Under the name of Great Britain they would acknowledge Elizabeth as sovereign. France, Mary Stuart, and all old enmities should be forgotten. Although Arran

---

32. Ibid.

was not mentioned, his marriage to Elizabeth was implied as a condition of union. Elizabeth did not give an immediate answer because it was necessary to know whether the Spaniards would support England in a war with France.

On December 10 the French attacked Edinburg but were repulsed and Erskine in charge said that with 2000 Ls. to feed and pay the men he could hold out till Spring. Sadler sent the 2000 Ls., but the Scots would not definitely commit themselves until the English had sent men. Yet the English Council knowing the problems involved continued to debate. Some of these problems were the general poorness of England, the lack of men (the plague, the previous war, and the persecutions under Mary had taken many) and the people's general dislike of war.

Then on December 16 Admiral Winter was commissioned to patrol the channel and prevent any more French assistance to Scotland. If necessary and convenient he might sink the French ships but must say, if captured or challenged, that he was acting on his own responsibility. Thus Elizabeth sought to keep her hands clean. However, the Council continued to hesitate so that Winter did not actually leave until the end of the month.

Then on December 20 the Council urged Elizabeth to seek the glory of God not by encouraging the Protestant preachers, but by marrying the Archduke. She should also assure herself of Philip's friendship and seek a loan of

100,000 Ls. from Antwerp. Nicholas Bacon, Cecil's brother-in-law urged that England should wait until Scotland was definitely attacked, even overcome, and then fight. But Cecil felt and urged Elizabeth not to wait. Finally after much tortuous indecision Elizabeth sided with Cecil and ordered Gresham to borrow 200,000 Ls. Guns, pistols, and powder barrels were also to be secured as rapidly as possible.

A few days later Norfolk, having originally refused, consented to take command of the army and English privateers were given to understand that they would not be inquired after too closely if they preyed upon French shipping.

At the beginning of January, 1560, Elizabeth again had the capitals of Europe worried as to what her next step would be. Catholic countries and rulers feared the spiritual and temporal results from an English and Protestant victory in Scotland. Elizabeth herself was uncertain as to what to do. When England had invaded Scotland the Scots had buried all feuds and risen as one man to fight. Now, however, the Congregation was being beaten by the French and was offering no real resistance. Furthermore, the English were old enemies while France was the traditional ally. Thus it was difficult to tell which way the Scots would go. Nevertheless, Elizabeth ordered Sadler and

Randolph to arrange for the Congregation to meet the English army on January 10 "in Cockburn Path, between Dunbar and Berwick."[33]

But as soon as the orders were given Elizabeth rescinded them so that she might have more time to decide on the wisdom of her course. Norfolk too had hesitated, but now he told Elizabeth she was too involved to back out. "The Scots, he said, could not expel the French unassisted: if the Queen tried their patience too far, she would make the Scots her enemies also."[34] Yet Elizabeth had not really thought of deserting the Scots. She just didn't like the idea of spending the money and hoped to avoid war. The eventual importance of many of her decisions caused Elizabeth again and again to repeat this act of deciding a matter and then changing her mind. Froude offers a rather good explanation for this habit of Elizabeth.

> . . . she was one of those people who insist on quarreling with the course which notwithstanding they have resolved to follow, and who therefore halt and hesitate over each successive step which they are compelled to take.[35]

Then on January 20, 1560, Winter as head of the English fleet refused to show his colors as he sailed past the French fort on Burnt Island in the Forth. When the French

---

33. Ibid., p. 185.
34. Ibid., p. 186.
35. Ibid., p. 187.

fired their guns, Winter retaliated on the grounds that he had been attacked. Ordering every English ship that could maneuver into position to fire a broadside into the fort, he silenced the enemy guns. When he was questioned he gave the answer which Elizabeth had ordered, but the Queen Regent of Scotland did not believe him. The questioning, however, meant little to Winter for he had managed to cut off d'Oysel from new supplies. However, the Scots grew careless of their opponent and allowed d'Oysel to escape to Leith. Here he re-armed his men and soon was in a position to attack again.

Meanwhile on February 25-27 the English and Scots had a conference at Berwick. Elizabeth wanted to be sure what the Scots would do once she had driven the French out of Scotland, and how they proposed to make the alliance a durable one. Finally, on the 27th the treaty was concluded. England was to help Scotland drive out the French in return for which both promised to conclude no peace which was not satisfactory to both. Since the Scots were subjects of the French Queen they offered hostages for their fidelity and England promised to build no forts in Scotland unless requested to do so by the Congregation. The Scots also promised to raise and maintain their own army to assist Elizabeth if France invaded England. March 25 was the day set for the English to cross the Border.

The whole trouble was that the Congregation did not

have the full backing of the Scottish people and the force they could put into the field was too small to be of any real service. A letter from De Quadra to Feria on March 7 reveals the difficulties facing Elizabeth.

> The Scotch rebels distract the Queen. Instead of growing stronger their numbers diminish daily, and the people have neither like to help such a set of wretches, nor can venture to desert them--knowing that they are lost if the French become masters of Scotland. They would make peace, if they could tell how to make it with safety or with honour.[36]

In another letter to Philip, De Quadra had mentioned that Elizabeth had not antagonized him because if the plans for a Scottish victory and marriage failed to materialize Elizabeth planned to fall back on Philip.[37]

Sometime during February 27 - March 25 the English Council had another debate in which they decided that the Queen of Scots was and always would be an enemy of Elizabeth. Unless the French were driven out of Scotland, England could never feel secure and French offers and excuses had failed to satisfy or sound sincere. Moreover, the Guises in France were now beset with the after-effects of the Amboise conspiracy which under the instigation of Throgmorton had sought to kill the Duke of Guise. Therefore now was the time to invade.

---

36. "MS. Simancas," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 208.
37. Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 207.

Somewhat earlier Philip had indicated that he opposed Elizabeth's sending troops to Scotland. However, on March 27 word arrived from Spain that Philip would not oppose her invasion of Scotland, but if the French declared war he would not assist her.

Then on March 28 Grey entered Scotland with six thousand infantry and two thousand cavalry. By March 31 the English had run out of money and Sadler and Norfolk wrote to England for more. Sadler's statement is particularly striking: "What . . . is 20,000 Ls., more or less, in comparison with the enterprise in hand, and the union of the realms? What dishonour if the army return re infecta!"[38]

On April 4 the English joined the Congregation at Preston Pans only to find that their men had been engaged for but twenty days and that twelve of those days had already elapsed. Grey now proposed to take Edinburg Castle in which the Regent was living, but when Norfolk checked with London, orders came back not to do it. At the same time Elizabeth also threatened to recall Winter and the navy. The next day there was a skirmish at Leith with the French but after that, acting upon Elizabeth's last orders not to take the castle, the English agreed to Mary of Guise's plea for an armistice. During the eight days the Scots' term of ser-

---

38. "Sadler to Cecil, March 31: Sadler Papers, II," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 218.

vice expired and English soldiers with nothing to do began to pillage the countryside. Howard had been sent back to London to arrange terms.

Then it was that Maitland wrote to Cecil that he earnestly desired the union of the realms but that this delay if continued would make the Scots so uncertain their cause would be lost. In fact, if the Queen did not soon change her policy, he wished that she had never started the business.[39]

Norfolk also wrote Elizabeth that by delaying now to save one pound she would have to spend ten later on. The job had been begun and had to be finished.[40]

On May 15 the orders came from Elizabeth to proceed with the attack and the Congregation rejected Marie's last plea for conciliation. On the 16th six thousand additional English troops arrived to join in the attack on Edinburg. On April 27, 1560, the Congregation in a meeting had declared their determination to expel the French.[41] Yet all was not well. Heavy desertions had weakened the English army and Edinburg was strongly fortified by walls and deep trenches around the walls. Nevertheless, on the morning of May 6 Crofts led one thousand Scots in an effort to scale the walls. But a hail of shell, blazing pitch, and

---

39. Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 220.
40. Ibid., pp. 220-221.
41. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 299.

stone drove them back with a loss of eight hundred men. Only the immediate advance of ten days' pay and the arrival of two thousand more English troops from Newcastle allayed somewhat the Scots' panic and distrust of English arms.

Despite this defeat, representatives of England and the Congregation met at Berwick, England on May 10 and drew up the famous Berwick Treaty. In it England agreed to help drive the French out of Scotland.

By May 17 the French resistance had so visibly weakened, Elizabeth sent Cecil to Scotland to negotiate a treaty. In support of this move the English Council ordered the readying of naval reserves, the muster of an additional ten thousand men, and a stricter surveilance over all exbishops.

Then in the early hours of June 11 Marie of Guise died. Her death removed England's worst enemy in Scotland and the second great obstacle to the Scottish Reformation. (Beton had been the first one.) Whether her death had any effect on French resistance is difficult to determine, but by July 6, 1560, the French were beaten and peace was concluded in the Treaty of Edinburg.

For once the English were praised as they left Scotland instead of cursed. In gratitude the Scots inserted into their liturgy a prayer for their English deliverers.

The last petition was worded as follows:

> . . . Grant unto us, O Lord, that with such reverence we may remember thy benefits received that after this in our defaute we never enter into hostilitie against the Realme and nation of England. [42]

The provisions of the Treaty of Edinburg are important because in the future they form the basis for a continuing quarrel between England and Mary Stuart. Smith gives the provisions:

> (1) that all English and French troops be sent out of Scotland except 120 French; (2) that all warlike preparations cease; (3) that the Berwickshire citadel of the sea, Eyemouth, be dismantled; (4) that Mary and Francis should disuse the English title and arms; (5) that Philip of Spain should arbitrate certain points, if necessary; (6) that Elizabeth had not acted wrongfully in making a league with the Lords of the Congregation. [43]

Both Mary and Francis refused to ratify this treaty. Mary also made a special treaty with her own Scottish subjects. According to Smith the provisions of this treaty were the following:

> She promised to summon Parliament at once, to make neither war nor peace without the consent of the estates, and to govern according to the advice of a council of twelve chosen jointly by herself and the estates. She promised to give no high offices to strangers or to clergymen; and she extended to all a general amnesty. [44]

Mackenzie confuses these two treaties into one, but

---

42. Ibid.
43. Smith, op. cit., pp. 361-362.
44. Ibid., p. 362.

she correctly points out that with such an arrangement no one man was the sole head of the government. Moreover, the provision against clerics and foreigners expelled Mary's most trusted men. Thus the Congregation being an organized body was able to move into power and gradually become stronger and stronger.[45]

The results of the war and these treaties are noteworthy. For one thing, the going of the French largely removed the threat of a French invasion into England. Elizabeth's crown was secured and Spain and France had to acknowledge the strength of England. Furthermore, by siding with the Protestants Elizabeth took the long range view. "The Catholics were constitutionally intolerant," while the Protestants were constitutionally aggressive.[46] Real trouble would have developed if Elizabeth had married the Catholic Archduke Charles of Austria instead of remaining true to the Reformation to which she owed her birth and crown.

Another most important result of the English victory was that the Scottish Reformation was left free to develop. This it did in a most amazing way under the guiding hand of John Knox.

As was pointed out in a previous paragraph the organized Congregation moved into power as a result of the loose governmental set-up after the war.

---

45. Mackenzie, op. cit., pp. 107-108.
46. Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 268.

According to Mackenzie either the Edinburg Treaty or Mary's treaty with the Scots had a clause which ordered the submitting of the religious question by a commission to the King and Queen. Instead the Congregation on August 17 presented them with its own Confession drafted by Knox and five other preachers. As presented to Mary it had this title: "The Confessioun of Faith professit and belevit be the Protestantis within the Realme of Scotland, which was ratified and approved as 'hailsome and sound doctrine, groundit upon the infallible trewth of Godis Word.'"[47] The Confession indicated its Protestant character by binding the state to maintain the true religion and imposing severe penalties for supporting the pope's claims to jurisdiction and authority in Scotland.[48]

The Confession also included the Apostles and Nicene Creeds, and treated the inspiration of Scripture, election, the marks of the church, and the authority of Scripture. As originally drafted the Confession ordered Scottish subjects to disobey the magistrates when they commanded something which in the opinion of the ministers was contrary to God's Word. However, objections to this clause by members of the Estates forced its removal.

Outside of Scotland the Confession and Acts of the

---

47. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 300.
48. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 110.

Estates met opposition. Mary and Francis refused to ratify them and Elizabeth and Cecil also voiced objections. Cecil, particularly, objected to the Confession and Randolph sought to prevent its passage, but was unable to do so. However, in an effort to retain the English friendship, the Scots sent a copy of the Confession to Cecil on August 19. Maitland also added a note that if there was anything in the Confession which he disliked "It may eyther be changed (if the mater so permit) or at least in some thyng qualifeed."[49]

Continuing the program of Reformation the Estates on August 24 passed laws making it a crime to say, hear, or be present at Mass. The first offence brought "confiscation of goods and bodily punishment at the discretion of the magistrates," the second, banishment, and the third, death.[50]

Then on September 7 Randolph reported to Cecil that the Estates, after certain changes had been made, had unanimously adopted the Confession with great joy. Had Mary and Francis ratified the Confession and Acts of the Estates Scotland would at this time have officially become Protestant. Their refusal to do so postponed the completion of the Reformation until January, 1568, when the Estates finally adopted the 1560 arrangement.

---

49. "Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots, I. 467, Randolph to Cecil (August 19th)," quoted by Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 304.

50. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 301.

Yet the big goal of the Scots' relations with England at this time was the marriage of Elizabeth to the Earl of Arran. Despite the objections of Maitland who knew Elizabeth quite well, the Estates sent a formal proposal of marriage to Elizabeth. When she did not answer immediately they interpreted her silence as consent and drew up a formal address to the English Council. Though Arran was not a king, they said, he nevertheless brought with him "the hearts and good will of a whole nation, which could never by riches obtain." Through him Ireland might be reformed and so Elizabeth become the "strongest princess upon the seas . . . ."[51]

Still Elizabeth and Cecil said nothing. Cecil did not answer because he had been out of favor with Elizabeth since August 27. Then she had refused his suggestion to give monetary gifts to some of the Scottish nobles who had helped them. Elizabeth did not answer because of the problems involved. If she refused to marry Archduke Charles or admit the papal nuncio, Philip would turn against her. While she was thus debating the Arran petitioners came to London sometime during December 1-5. Just at this critical time, however, Francis II died on December 5.

Elizabeth now used this occasion to say that she ap-

---

51. "MS. Scotland, Rolls House," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, pp. 278-279.

preciated the honor of the offer of Arran and had appreciated Scottish services in the past war, but at the present she was indisposed to marry. Knox and all the Scots deeply resented the refusal. Randolph said that the resentment was so great ". . . the Scots hold themselves almost absolved from all their obligations."[52] Thus Arran lost his chance for marriage, and the union of the crowns was delayed for a half-century.

Now that Francis II was dead the Scots looked for Mary to return to Scotland as their queen. Her loyalty to the Catholic Church was well known and so Throgmorton urged Elizabeth to join England, France, and Germany in a Protestant General Council, but she declined to do so. The Scottish Protestants, according to Mackenzie, reacted to Mary's coming by assigning Knox and the preachers who had drafted the Confession to draw up a constitution for the new church. In this way they sought to build a Protestant Scotland as quickly as possible. The result was The First Book of Discipline[53], also known as The Policie and Disci-

---

52. Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 308.

53. The actual adoption of The First Book of Discipline seems to be in dispute. Mackenzie says the book was presented to the Estates on January 15, 1561, and after some discussion was passed (Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 115f.) Lindsay, however, maintains it was never legally sanctioned and accepted by the Estates because of the chapter on the patrimony of the Church which urged the keeping of monies by the Church for the support of education, maintenance of religion, etc. Too many lords had appropriated church lands and money. They did not want to condemn themselves by passing such an act. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 306.

pline of the Church, which designated the various officers, officials, and assemblies of the new church. Later other books were produced for the Reformed Church in Scotland. Among these were The Book of Common Order and The Order of Geneva, also known as Knox's Liturgy. Frequently connected with it is a metrical collection of psalms known as the Psalm Book.

But in spite of these efforts by the Congregation Mary began to make her influence felt in Scotland. On January 15, 1561, the Scottish Estates met to receive formally Elizabeth's rejection of Arran's proposal. While Mary could not be present, she sent three hundred letters to the various nobles and with gracious remarks was able to win their favor. But neither she nor Maitland, strange to say, understood the hold which the new religion had gotten on the Scots. This became dramatically evident in February, 1561, when Noailles, the French Ambassador, appeared before the Estates. Confident of the Scots' love for Roman Catholicism he demanded in Mary's name that the Catholic faith be re-established and "'the bishops and kirkmen' restored to the livings of which they had been deprived." In answer the Estates denounced the bishops, described the Catholic Church as the congregation of Satan, and declared "that after the services which they received from England the English alliance should be preferred to all others."[54]

---

54. Froude, op. cit., VII, pp. 331-332.

By March the Scots had begun dividing into two parties. The Catholics were headed by Huntly, Athol, Sutherland, Caithness, Bothwell, Seton, and the Archbishop of St. Andrew's. Among the Protestant leaders was Lord James Stuart. These parties became especially active after Mary's arrival in August, 1561.

During the months prior to her coming, however, there was much activity in Scotland. A fight developed between the new Kirk and the nobles for possession of the plundered Church lands. The nobles refused to surrender the properties they had seized so that the old and new clergy were starving. Upon an appeal from the clergy, the Privy Council allowed the nobles to retain two thirds of the spoils and ordered the remaining one third divided between the new Kirk and the Crown. This meant that the new Kirk got only 25,000 Ls. which was but an eighth of the income of the old church. Knox was indignant but he had no control over the nobles as he did over the masses.

In June or July, 1561, a Protestant and Catholic envoy were sent to France to consult Mary on her plans. On the way Lord James Stuart representing the Protestants stopped off in England to arrange for future collaboration with Cecil and thus allowed the Catholic envoy, Leslie, to reach Mary first. Leslie proposed a war against the Congregation with 20,000 Catholic troops, but Mary wanted a united Scot-

land and so declined. As to Stuart the writer was unable to find any information either on his arrival or the success or failure of his mission in France.

However, Mary had previously declared her loyalty to the French alliance and her desire for friendship with England. She now appointed commissioners from both the Protestant and Catholic party to call the Estates. Thus both English and Scots had some idea of what might be coming.

For these reasons in July, 1561, Throgmorton strongly demanded that Mary approve the Edinburg Treaty, but she refused. Elizabeth, fearing possible revolt or assasination by her Catholic subjects, refused to allow Mary to pass through England on her way to Scotland. At the same time of the refusal she sent a note to the Scottish Estates in which she said that if they thought it was all right for their queen to break her solemn promise contrary to the order of her princes, then England would not be too careful about maintaining peace.

By August 1 Maitland knew that Mary's coming was not far off and so he wrote to Cecil, that if Elizabeth would support them, they would boldly work for the English cause. His chief worries were that Mary would gradually win the people over to Catholicism and that the Congregation felt uncertain of Elizabeth. They knew Elizabeth hated Knox, but that the Protestants now held the upper hand. However,

they had no guaranty that this situation would continue. To prevent an all-out struggle between the Catholics and Protestants he recommended English recognition of Mary as successor to the English throne. He felt this proposal would satisfy the vanity of the Scottish nation and afford the peace which Scotland needed so badly if she were to recover from two generations of war. But no answer came.

Then on August 14 Mary sailed for Scotland and arrived on August 19 in the midst of a heavy sea-fog. Now begins the great period of intrigue between Elizabeth and the Congregation in an effort to defeat Mary's plans for Catholicizing Scotland. Moreover, since the success of the Protestant cause and the failure of the Catholic was dependent so completely on the actions of the two queens, an analysis of their respective characters is in place. Froude offers these pointed observations:

> In the deeper and nobler emotions she (Mary) had neither share nor sympathy. Here lay the vital difference of character between the Queen of Scots and her great rival, and here was the secret of the difference of their fortunes. In intellectual gifts Mary Stuart was at least Elizabeth's equal; and Anne Boleyn's daughter, as she said herself, was 'no angel.' But Elizabeth could feel like a man an unselfish interest in a great cause; Mary Stuart was ever her own centre of hope, fear, or interest; she thought of nothing, cared for nothing, except as linked with the gratification of some ambition, some desire, some humour of her own; and thus Elizabeth was able to overcome temptations before which Mary fell. [56]

---

55. Ibid., pp. 368-369.

Furthermore, the religious situation which faced Mary was a complicated one. The Catholics were out of power, the new minority church was dubious of Mary, hostile to France, and friendly toward England. Protestantism was the creed of the towns, the artisans, merchants, and traders. A real chasm lay between these people and the Queen. Only about six nobles, however, were sincerely Protestant and the others could yet be persuaded either way by the right approach. Still others followed the cause of the Congregation in order to get their hands on Church property. Thus while the situation looked unpromising, Mary made a fine beginning by accepting the status quo. She allowed the Congregation to continue in power rather than disrupt the country with a coup d'etat. Looking ahead, if Mary had used her charm, intelligence, and courage together with discretion and a good character, she might well have won over her opponents. But she did not. Instead she spun a network of vice about herself which finally choked her.

The first Sunday after her arrival Mary experienced her first opposition from the Protestants when she attempted to have mass said in the Royal Chapel for herself and her attendants. Only the drawn sword of her brother James Stuart prevented the lynching of the priests. On the next day the Privy Council granted her permission to exercise

her own faith. Mary, however, said she would call the Estates and so further alarmed the Protestants.

Shortly after this Mary interview John Knox, but the Reformer was not softened in any of the five interviews. Instead his words gave every indication of the struggle to come. Froude gives the discussion between them.

> '. . . let prince and subject both obey God. . . . Kings should be foster fathers of the Kirk and queens its nursing mothers.' 'You are not the kirk that I will nurse,' she said. 'I will defend the Kirk of Rome, for that I think is the Kirk of God.' 'Your will, madam,' Knox answered, 'is no reason, either does your thought make the Roman harlot the spouse of Jesus Christ.' 56

Again early in October Mary sought to introduce public Catholic services in the Royal Chapel but the immediate reaction was so intense the priest was driven out of the church with "'broken head and bloody ears.'" 57

The remainder of the winter of 1561 was marked by Mary's constant efforts to meet Elizabeth to discuss matters. Elizabeth, on the other hand, apparently feared such a meeting would give recognition to Mary's claim and the English Catholics might then combine with the Scots to arise and depose Elizabeth. For this reason she consistently dodged the interview.

---

56. Quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 377.
57. "Knox to Cecil, October 7: Scotch MSS. Rolls House," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 384.

In January, 1562, Mary sought to win Elizabeth's favor by taking lands from Huntly, lay head of the Catholic party and giving them to her brother, Lord James Stuart, a Protestant. Mary's Council also insisted on her sincerity and affection for England, but Knox was sure Mary meant no good to Elizabeth. By February Elizabeth was almost convinced of Mary's sincerity when she discovered Lady Lennox's plot to marry her son, Darnley, to Mary. Already in 1561, however, the Spanish ambassador had told Philip that Lady Lennox was hoping to marry her son to the Scottish Queen.[58] Now Elizabeth moved more cautiously in her relations with Mary.

Then on May 19 Maitland went to London to arrange for an interview between Mary and Elizabeth. But Mary gave him to understand that if the English insisted on the Edinburg Treaty he should cancel the interview. The English Council from the start opposed the interview. Mary Stuart was under control of the Guises who were fanatically Catholic while England was Protestant. Mary probably still remembered the affront of being refused permission to go through England and definitely opposed the Edinburg Treaty. Still Elizabeth persisted and resolved to meet Mary at Nottingham on September 3. News of such a meeting stirred English Catholics to action, but on hearing of their plots Elizabeth

---

58. Quoted by Froude, <u>Op. cit.</u>, VII, p. 336.

cancelled the interview. Elizabeth had also sided with the Huguenots in France against the Catholics and used this entanglement as an excuse for dropping the interview. Both Mary and Maitland were furious but they could do nothing. The summer of 1562 brought increased opposition from the Protestant preachers and Assembly to Mary's efforts in behalf of the mass. In October Mary attacked Huntly, lay head of the Scottish Catholic party, for an act of insubordination. By defeating Huntly Mary restored political equilibrium in Scotland but she lost Huntly's valuable support. By pointing to this attack on Catholics Mary tried in November to win English favor for her succession, but she failed.

The year 1563 is particularly significant and important in this study. Events cluster about the Convocation of 1563 and about Mary's marriage.

At the Convocation of 1563 changes were proposed in the Prayer Book and in the Act of Uniformity. Many favored the simplicity of the Swiss worship, while others pointed to Scotland for progress in true religion. Elizabeth, however, would not yield to demands for simplicity. She personally liked a great deal of ceremony, but particularly for nation and international political reasons, she vetoed drastic changes and retained the ceremonies. Her goal of a united England depended on capturing the mass

of the people who were either religiously neutral, leaned to Romanism, or favored the old medieval service. The Council of Trent was also in session and excommunication was a constant threat. Elizabeth needed Lutheran protection and sympathy. Therefore, says Lindsay,

> The ceremonies were retained, and crucifixes and lights on the altars were paraded in the chapel royal to show the Lutheran sympathies of the Queen and of the Church of England. The Reforming Bishops, with many an inward qualm, had to give way; and gradually, as the Queen had hoped, a strong Conservative instinct gathered round the Prayer-Book and its rubrics. [59]

The chief work of the Convocation, however, was the revision of the Forty-two Articles of religion promulgated by command of Edward VI in May, 1553. The revision reduced the number to Thirty-nine Articles. The adoption of these articles marks the time in England "'when the alteration of religion' was completed." [60] It is also known as the Elizabethan Settlement. Lindsay gives a detailed summary of the contents of the Articles. The writer has presented only those provisions which show how completely the Reformation had been established in England.

"All clergy and everyone holding office under the Crown" had to repudiate with an oath the authority of the Pope. Penalties ranging from loss of benefice or office to severe punishments were imposed for the refusal

---

59. Lindsay, op. cit., II, pp. 416-417.
60. Ibid., p. 418.

to do so. The sovereign was declared "supreme Governor of the Church of England," and given almost complete control of Convocation. All Englishmen were forced to attend public worship as conducted on Sunday according to the ritual of the Book of Common Prayer. Obstinate refusal to attend brought excommunication. Freedom of opinion was declared, but obstinate heretics might be brought to trial. Bishops were so weak, however, that there was little danger except to the most radical.[61]

There were additional reactions during the remainder of Elizabeth's reign and the reigns of James VI, Charles I, the Cromwell's, and Charles II. Yet England for all practical purposes had become and was to remain Protestant.

Already in 1560 Scotland had declared itself Protestant, but Mary Stuart had refused to ratify the Acts of the Estates of 1560. Thus she had prevented the establishment of a national Protestant church like England had just established with the promulgation of the Thirty-nine Articles. In December, 1567, however, Mary was deposed. A month later the Scottish Estates adopted and firmly established the Protestant religion.

The burden of the next pages therefore will be to show how aid from Protestant England during the years 1563-1567

---

61. Ibid., pp. 418-419.

was able to swing the balance of power in the Protestant-Catholic struggle in Scotland.

Elizabeth was tremendously interested in the Scottish marriage and its possible effect on the future of England. Mary's marriage with a powerful Catholic prince would immediately create or form the basis for an alliance against England. Such an alliance would jeopardize the cause of Protestantism in England and thereby also endanger Elizabeth's throne. Therefore in June, 1563, Elizabeth warned Mary that her marriage to an Austrian, French, or Spanish prince would be taken as "an act of war."[62] In August, 1563, she changed the appeal by threatening the loss of the English succession if Mary married anyone too powerful. Instead she offered her own particular favorite, Lord Robert Dudley. Dudley's family, however, had only recently entered the ranks of nobility and Dudley was not even a peer. Furthermore, his close relations with Elizabeth and the sudden death of his wife had given him a rather unsavory reputation. Knox liked him, but Mary resented the preposterous suggestion.

At this time Lord James Stuart, Mary's half brother, comes into prominence. Mary had given him the lands of the dead Huntly and had created him Earl of Moray. Now he urged her to induce the Estates to declare that only a Stu-

---

62. Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 536.

art could inherit the Crown. Next he requested her to name him or his heirs to succeed to the Scottish throne. When she refused, he broke with her. Eventually he became her enemy and one of the great supporters of Elizabeth and the English faction.

Then on August 20 through Randolph Elizabeth offered Mary the succession on condition. The condition was that she accept the Reformation by conviction, or at least, as the law of the land, and that she refuse to marry a Catholic. If she did marry a Catholic or seek to head the Catholic party Parliament would bar her from the succession and Elizabeth would no longer help her. England would not again submit to Pope or Inquisition.[63]

Knox also opposed Mary's marriage to a Catholic and told her so. Then in October, 1563, Knox heard that Mary intended to marry Don Carlos if Philip of Spain was willing. If not, she planned to marry the French king. Almost the entire Scottish Council had approved her plans. Murray, a Protestant, had not yet given his consent, but if he did, the English cause would surely be defeated. Writing this to Cecil Knox concluded:

> Thus, . . . you have the plainness of my troubled heart; use it as ye will answer to God and as ye tender the commonwealth; the Eternal assist you with His Spirit.[64]

---

63. Ibid., pp. 539-540.
64. "Knox to Cecil, October 5: Scotch MSS.," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VII, p. 545.

By Christmas, 1563, Mary had worried herself sick over the matter of her marriage. Still Elizabeth kept pushing the Dudley marriage with much vigor and little tact, even suggesting that Mary and Dudley live as husband and wife in her house at her expense. But Mary gave no definite answer to the Queen.

Elizabeth's position over against the Scottish succession was a realization that sanctioning Mary as her successor might bring her neglect, perhaps even assasination. But if Mary would marry some English nobleman whose loyalty Elizabeth could be sure of, she was willing to forget about her own unwillingness and do that which was best for her people. A moderate policy of religion would result in neutrality if not friendship and eventually the union of the crowns.[65] For these reasons she had offered Dudley.

However, early in 1564 Mary began to express an interest in the Earl of Bothwell. She pleaded with Elizabeth until she finally allowed him to return to Scotland. But shortly thereafter Mary thought of Darnley, leader of the English Catholics. With him she might gradually gain concessions from Elizabeth and at the right moment take over the throne. But Elizabeth offered Dudley again and so Mary thought of getting the Lennoxes into Scotland. She could then be closer to their son Darnley and eventu-

---

65. Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 73.

ally marry him. The Scottish Protestants were worried about this, but at the present time they could no nothing about it. They opposed the Darnley marriage because it probably meant a Catholic revolution. Darnley was not only a Catholic but also a Lennox and the Lennoxes were bitter enemies of the Hamiltons, leaders of the Protestant party.

In spite of this possibility, Elizabeth allowed Lennox to go to Scotland in September, 1564. Then on November 18 a group of English and Scottish commissioners met at Berwick to discuss the marriage. The result was the virtual rejection of the Dudley marriage and the demand that Mary be allowed to marry whom she will except in those royal houses of which Elizabeth disapproved. Elizabeth was also to pay a certain yearly sum to the Scottish Queen and bestow the succession upon Mary, if she died childless.

Immediately after the conclusion of the conference Mary asked that Darnley might be allowed to come to Scotland to help his father recover his lands and estates. In the letter of reply Cecil said England would offer Dudley and that was all. Yet Mary felt rather hopeful of the marriage and so in December, 1564, after a last attempt to get Elizabeth to commit herself on the succession, Mary rejected the Dudley offer.

In January, 1564, Elizabeth began strengthening her church in England. She insisted the bishops were commanded

to enforce the Act of Uniformity or suffer the penalties imposed for laxness in enforcement. The Protestants objected, Elizabeth ignored them. But everywhere the Reforming clergy refused to wear the surplice and other Romish clothing.

While this argument was going on Elizabeth suddenly decided to allow Darnley to go to Scotland. Mackenzie sees a sinister motive in this decision.

> As an impersonal factor in a political equation, he was obviously a prudent match for Mary: as a man, however, he was something else. To tie her brilliant rival, who had mocked her own lover, to an empty and brutal young degenerate, in a situation where personal qualities counted enormously, would probably be the ruin of her as queen. It was an audacious move, and it succeeded.[66]

After Darnley's arrival in Scotland on February 12, Mary tried to re-introduce the mass by opening the doors of her Royal Chapel at Holyrood to the general public. The Protestants again revolted and the Congregation told Mary that her marrying a Papist would not be tolerated.

Meanwhile opposition to Elizabeth's demands for uniformity had been steadily growing. On March 26 more than a hundred London clergy met at Berwick to discuss the matter. "Sixty-one promised conformity; a few hesitated; thirty-seven distinctly refused and were suspended for three months 'from all manner of ministry.'"[67]

---

66. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 146.
67. Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 142.

Riots in the churches also gave evidence of the Protestants' displeasure. To add to the excitement Elizabeth attended church on Good Friday in Chapel Royal where the Bishop of Rochester set forth the Catholic doctrine on the "Hoc est corpus meum." Then on Easter Tuesday, Elizabeth washed the feet of a poor woman and afterwards piously kissed a crucifix.

In Scotland such news served to substantiate Protestant doubts and fears about Elizabeth. They felt she was in league with Mary to enforce Catholicism on the two countries. A reaction against Catholics now set in. In Edinburg, for example, a priest was caught saying mass in a private house. Tied to the village cross, he was pelted from 2 - 4 p.m. with 10,000 eggs until senseless and covered with slime and filth he was taken into Edinburg's prison and there chained with two of his parishioners.

In April Mary made the final break with her brother Murray and sought Elizabeth's approval of the Darnley marriage. Instead Elizabeth pretended great indignation, threw Lady Lennox into the Tower, and offered Mary any other peer she wanted. Now the Hamiltons, Lennox, and Darnley became frightened. Lennox and Darnley stirred up their allies, the preachers, who in June demanded compulsory attendance at Protestant worship.

When Mary refused, they started the rumor that she was planning a Protestant persecution which caused much uneasiness and found many believers.

Perhaps to avoid Catholic repercussions in England, Elizabeth in June sent Randolph to Edinburg to demand that Darnley and Lennox return to England. The terms she offered were return or war. After he left the court, Randolph went to Argyle and Murray who assured him that a Catholic revolution was coming and that they had to move fast. Mary was determined to overthrow the Protestant religion and to oppose all who sought the friendship of England. On both these points they had resolved to oppose her. In this venture the Queen of England's future was as much at stake as was theirs. Therefore, while they did not ask for an army, they did ask for 3000 Ls. to collect and pay their followers. They also promised to seize Darnley and Lennox and deliver them in Berwick if Elizabeth would receive them. Randolph assured them that England would cooperate in every way possible. As to the capture of Lennox and Darnley he said the English Government "could not and would not refuse their own in what sort soever they came."[68]

---

68. "Randolph to Cecil, July 2 and July 4: Cotton MSS. Calig. B. 10: Printed in Keith," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 180.

Elizabeth was highly pleased with the letter of the Scottish Protestants and promised them her full cooperation,[69] asking only that they spend their money wisely. Thus Elizabeth declared her intention to support Murray and the Hamiltons in an armed revolt against the Scottish Crown.

A few days later the General Assembly, in cognizance of the action of the Congregation, passed a resolution "that the sovereign was not exempt from obedience to the law of the land, that the mass should be put utterly away, and the reformed service should take the place of it in the royal chapel."[70] In answer to this Mary attended a Protestant service in Edinburg and distributed circulars saying that she never had intended to interfere with her subjects' religion. But her actions failed to convince the Congregation. Therefore, Froude says, on July 18, 1565,

> . . . they despatched a messenger to Elizabeth with a bond, in which they pledged themselves to resist all attempts either to restore the Catholic ritual or to dissolve the English alliance. From their own sovereign they professed to hope for nothing but evil. They looked to the Queen of England 'as under God protectress most special of the professors of religion;' and they thanked her warmly for the promises of help on which it was evident that they entirely relied.[71]

---

69. Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 181.
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid., p. 183.

In answer Randolph had this to say:

> To give also declaration of the tender care and good consideration the Queen my sovereign has over all those of this nation that mind to keep the realm without alteration of the religion received and will not neglect her Majesty's friendship, I am commanded to assure all such as persist therein that it is fully resolved and determined to concur with them and assist them as either need or occasion shall press them. [72]

Then early on the morning of July 29, 1565, Mary married Darnley in a Catholic ceremony performed by a Catholic priest. Thus Mary had disobeyed Elizabeth and the Lords of the Congregation were anxiously waiting to see what Elizabeth would do. Encouraged by her promises, they were ready to rebel, but no orders came. Mary, however, was not hesitant. She dispatched letters to the noblemen she could trust asking them to meet her in arms at Edinburg on August 9, 1565.

Elizabeth now sent Tamworth to negotiate with Mary but Mary set up her own demands. Mary threatened Elizabeth with future intrigues if she did not by Act of Parliament declare her or Lady Margaret Lennox next in succession. She also demanded that Elizabeth cease all dealings with Scottish subjects. In return for these concessions she promised she would stop inciting English Catholics to revolt and encouraging France and Spain to attack England. [73]

---

72. Lansdowne MSS. 8, quoted by Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 186.
73. Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 183.

Elizabeth had sent money to Murray by Tamworth. However, the support which Murray, Argyle, and Chatellerault (Arran) expected from the Scottish Protestants failed to materialize. On August 19 Knox sought to create enthusiasm for the cause by preaching in Edinburg about the trouble which fell upon the people when they did not do away with the harlot Jezebel. Yet the sermon had little effect.

Then on August 24 Mary sought to trap the Lords of the Congregation by inviting them to assemble at Ayr. On the 25th she marched out of Edinburg with 5000 men to attack the Lords. First they retreated into Edinburg, but were forced to withdraw to the Border when Erskine fired on them with the city guns. Eventually Bedford secured Elizabeth's permission to cover the Lord's retreat into England. In addition, she gave him three thousand pounds with which to deal with the Lords. Yet when she was questioned about it, she denied all and blamed Bedford for acting unauthorized.[74] This authorizing and then denying policy of Elizabeth nearly drove the Lords mad with anxiety and aggravation during the next years.

In an effort to rally the Protestant forces Murray went to Edinburg on August 31. Yet his efforts to arouse the people to follow and fight "for the defence of the glory of God,"[75] as Knox put it, met with a cold reception.

---

74. Ibid., p. 201.
75. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 152.

Previously Murray had been able to gather a cavalary force of 1300, but few if any recruits were gotten in Edinburg.

In September, 1565, the English Council met in London to vote on the question of war and assistance to the Scottish Protestants. They finally decided that Mary was determined to overthrow the Reformed religion and take the English throne, that Elizabeth's title and legitimacy depended on the Reformation. Therefore they voted for intervention.

However, Elizabeth's vacillating policy in the face of Mary's continued military successes had definitely hurt the English cause in Scotland. Men began to make their peace with Mary and only Murray remained loyal to England.

Now Cecil pressed Elizabeth for a decision. The issues, he said, were "religion and the succession to the Crown." [76] Religion was a doubtful ground for invasion. If the Scottish Queen married, the problem of the succession would be solved. If she did not, England might use as causes for war Mary's intrigues with English Catholics and with Rome, and her continued refusal to ratify the Edinburg Treaty.

As a result of these discussions Elizabeth sent a letter to the Scots on October 1, 1565. In it she promised to protect them from Mary, to send an army to Scotland,

---

76. Froude, op. cit., VIII, p.206.

and to send an envoy to negotiate with Mary.[77] Acting on this information, the Lords broke off negotiations with Mary and prepared to continue resistance. But Elizabeth sent no army to help the Scots. Thus the insurrection failed and the Scots retreated into England.

When Murray appealed for more help, she told him that England would not invade without further provocation. Then when Murray came to her court, Elizabeth publicly denied that she had encouraged or given aid to the rebels and concluded the interview by declaring her statements to be the truth. Thus she hoped to justify herself before the world. Murray was completely surprised by such a denial and stated he knew of no reason for such treatment. Then Elizabeth sent an elaborate report of the interview to Randolph to present to Mary. Once more she expressed her friendship for Mary and wished Mary could have heard how she had addressed the rebel Murray.

Such action really hurt Elizabeth's cause with the Lords and Bedford feared "that the Scotch Protestants in their resentment would 'become the worst enemies that England ever had. . . .'"[78] Strangely enough, Murray could and did forgive his disgrace. But others did not. The Earl of Argyle gave Elizabeth ten days in which to state the

---

77. Ibid., p. 212.
78. Ibid., p. 228.

aid she would give the Congregation and when the answer did not come he left her cause to become her enemy until Mary was finally defeated at Langside. Sir James Melville and Throgmorton also left Elizabeth and sought their peace and future with Mary. As for Mary herself, she only increased her hatred for Elizabeth as her worst enemy.

The case looked bad for Elizabeth. Yet she acted as she had in fear of what the Spaniards and her own Catholics might do. The thing that saved Elizabeth was Mary's insatiable and impatient desire for the throne of England which would not let her heed the advice of Throgmorton to forgive Murray and restore him and so gain all Protestants. He also urged that since the Lords were unwilling again to be pawns of Elizabeth that she could win them and the English bishops by restoring their lands to them. But Ritzio and others influenced Mary to ignore this advice.

By the end of 1565 it was evident that the Darnley marriage was not going to be a happy one. Darnley had wanted the crown matrimonial but Mary had refused. She had appointed Bothwell as lieutenant-general rather than Lennox. Darnley's tendency to moral laxness and his jealousy of Mary's intimacy with Ritzio, her secretary, also marred their relationship. The result of this was to make Darnley turn to the Protestants for revenge against his Catholic wife. His Douglas kin engineered most of it, but Lething-

ton, Murray, Randolph, Cecil, and probably Elizabeth knew of the plot. Its purpose was to ruin or kill Mary and place Darnley on the throne for as long as convenient. The fact that France was reported to have gotten Mary to sign an anti-Protestant document helped rally Protestant support to the plot. Darnley now signed two bonds with the conspirators. The first was on February 25, 1566 with the Protestants in Scotland. In it he agreed "to support the Protestant religion and give the lords of that party remission of all crimes, while they agreed to take his part in all quarrels against whomsoever, and to maintain his right to the succession."[79] On March 6 Darnley signed another bond with the Protestant exiles at Newcastle. This bond while containing other provisions included the provision that if Darnley should be successful and become the king "Religion should be 'maintained and established as it was on the arrival of their sovereign lady in the realm.'"[80] Murray, Argyle, Ruthven, Morton, Glencairn, Boyd, and other noblemen signed it.

Shortly after this Mary dismissed Randolph on charges

---

79. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 156.

80. "Bond subscribed March 6, 1566: Scotch MSS. Rolls House, Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 250. Mackenzie and Froude disagree on the date of this second bond. Mackenzie dates it March 2, 1566 (Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 156) while Froude places it on March 6. (Cf. footnote above.) This writer feels that the date given by Froude is the more correct.

of conspiring with the rebels. Elizabeth had been growing bolder in her dealings with the Congregation and about the middle of February, 1566, had sent Murray a 1000 Ls.[81] Elizabeth now took exception to Randolph's dismissal and warned the Scottish Queen that she would protect the Earl of Murray if Mary did not remember his loyalty to Scotland.

Despite this warning on March 9 Mary secured the passage of a Bill of Attainder against Murray. Such a bill was "an act of Parliament pronouncing sentence of death against an accused person, with consequent extinction of civil rights."[82] That same night, however, under Darnley's leadership the conspirators dragged Ritzio from the Queen's room and murdered him. Despite this shock and her increased hatred for him, Mary pretended affection for Darnley until he lessened the guard and she escaped. Now the Lords were forced to flee to England where they wrote to Cecil on March 27 offering to prove Darnley's leadership in the whole affair.

Though letters dated February 13 and March 6 are strong proof that Elizabeth knew beforehand that Ritzio was to be murdered,[83] she now sought to keep face with Mary. In doing so she sought to shake loose from the Congregation by de-

---

81. Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 252.
82. "Attainder," Funk & Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary, p. 85.
83. Froude, op. cit., VIII, pp. 246 and 254.

scribing Argyle and Murray as "rebels pretending reformation of religion."[84] Such words certainly helped to alienate the Congregation from Elizabeth. Thus Argyle refused to be reconciled unless she " . . . would interfere in behalf of the banished Lords, and would undertake that in Scotland there should be no change of religion . . . "[85]

Then on June 19, 1566, between 9 - 10 a.m. James Stuart was born in Edinburg Castle. Here English politicans saw the answer to all their troubles and the beginning of a brighter future for a united Great Britain. By riding hard Melville arrived with the news in London on June 22 and had an audience with Elizabeth the next day. Again he urged her recognition of the Scottish succession but she gave him no definite answer.

Back in Scotland Mary had recently been paying a good deal of attention to the Earl of Bothwell. Melville warned her that thereby she stood to alienate the English Protestant friends of Lady Lennox. To retain their support, she pardoned Maitland and used him later to reconcile the factions in the Scottish Court.

On July 29, 1566, James VI was crowned king and from then on until December discussions in the English Parliament centered in Elizabeth's marriage and the Scottish suc-

---

84. Quoted by Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 281.
85. "Randolph to Cecil, June 13: Scotch MSS. Rolls House," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 286.

cession.

In December, 1566, the Protestant bishops tried unsuccessfully to pass a Bill of Religion in the English Parliament which would have established the Protestant religion as the state religion. Elizabeth opposed it partly at the suggestion of Catholics and partly because of her own feelings. The cause for such a bill lies in the fact that only the Convocation of 1563 had imposed the Thirty-nine Articles on England. The necessary Parliamentary sanction to make it law had not been given. But even so Protestants since 1563 had been steadily growing in numbers. On December 15, 1567, Mary was formally deposed. Immediately after this, the Lords of the Congregation agreed to do away with Darnley if Mary would pardon Morton and the others who had assisted in Ritzio's murder.

On December 24 she granted their request. In January, 1567 Bothwell proposed Darnley's murder and on the night of February 19 he was stabbed to death almost two years to the day since he arrived in Scotland. The significance of the murder was that with Darnley perished Mary Stuart's chances for the English succession, and thus "all serious prospect of a Catholic revolution."[86] De Silva writing to Philip had this comment: " . . . the spirits of the Catholics are broken; should it turn out that she is guilty,

---

86. Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 380.

her party in England is gone, and by her means there is no more chance of a restoration of religion."[87]

Little more than a year remained before that Sunday in May, 1567, when Mary sailed across the Forth to England. During that time the chief topics of interest and sources of trouble were the Darnley murder and Mary's marriage to Bothwell.

Bothwell was acquitted on April 12, 1567, in a mockery of a trial. Then on April 14-19 the Scottish Parliament met to attempt to silence talk about the murder. "To bribe the Protestants," says Froude, "an Act of Religion was passed, and the Queen for the first time formally recognized the Reformation."[88]

Up until May 15 the Scots constantly asked for Elizabeth's intervention in proving Mary guilty or not guilty. Elizabeth answered by saying that the trial should go forward and that the Queen should be prevented from the monstrous outrage of marrying Bothwell. But she did little in this direction and on May 15 Mary married Bothwell.

Once Bothwell was in Parliament he became a friend of the Protestants. Thus he pushed through "a revocation from her (Mary) of all licenses to use the Catholic services, and a declaration that for the future the Act of

---

87. "De Silva to Philip, March 1: MS. Simancas," quoted by Froude, op. cit., VIII, p. 381.
88. Froude, op. cit., IX, p. 51.

Religion of 1560, prohibiting the mass to everyone, should be strictly maintained."[89] Thus Mary herself was unwillingly helping to lay the foundation for a Protestant State Church in Scotland.

On June 10 the Congregation still sought to capture Bothwell, but failed and on June 11 the Queen also slipped away. On June 15 Mary's and Bothwell's men totaling 2200 and the Congregation's numbering 2000 were drawn up for battle but never fought. Bothwell's soldiers refused to fight and deserted in large numbers. Finally Bothwell was allowed to escape and the Queen was captured.

In July Elizabeth again wrote to Mary assuring her of her friendship and demanding from the Lords evidence against Bothwell so that his case could be rightly handled. She also informed them "that she expected the Act for the establishment of the Protestant religion to be at length formally ratified; and the constitution so established would then be upheld and guaranteed by the English Government."[90]

In July Elizabeth also began to deal more directly with the question of Mary's guilt. Apparently she did not know or refused to believe the full extent of Mary's guilt, while the Lords definitely knew the extent of her guilt. When therefore Elizabeth favored the Queen they felt she

---

89. Ibid., p. 75.
90. Ibid., pp. 110-11.

was working against them.

Then on July 24 Mary was summoned to appear before the Council and presented with three documents to sign: 1) her abdication; 2) "another naming the Earl of Murray Regent, or, if Murray should refuse the offer, vesting the government in a Council; a third empowering Lindsay and the Earl of Mar and Morton to proceed to the coronation of her son."[91] On July 28, 1567, James was crowned.

In August Murray was elected Regent and it is amazing that he remained loyal to England despite all the ill treatment he had received from Elizabeth. The other amazing thing is that in spite of all Murray had done for Elizabeth she refused to recognize his government. Instead she sought to organize a party for the Queen against Murray and offered money to the Hamiltons who had agreed to do this. But opposition to the Queen was so general, the formation of a pro-Queen party proved to be impossible. Froude feels that Elizabeth's constant idea of the sacredness of princes caused her to act toward Murray in the way she did.

Following a policy of expediency Elizabeth in September, 1567, threatened the Scottish Reformers in an effort to please Spain and her own Catholic subjects. Nevertheless, in November and December, 1567, it was evident that Protestantism had spread and was spreading among those Scots outside the circle of the Lords, who were rising into power.

---

91. Ibid., p. 140.

As Froude says,

> . . . there was a fervid and deep-toned religion --but it was Calvinism in its hardest form, --Calvinism moulded in the fiercest Israelitish pattern, fierce, ruthless, and unmanageable. The nobles themselves were, for the most part, without God, creed, or principle; while England and France -- keen observers of all that passed -- were ready, each or both of them, to step in on the first sign of internal confusion.[92]

Then in January, 1568, the Scottish Parliament met and re-enacted the law of 1560 which had established the Protestant Kirk. Reaction against papal influence was evident. Murray "insisted that the Catholic religion should be prohibited under pain of death in all parts of Scotland; and he carried his point, but at a heavy cost."[93] Caithness, Athol, and the Bishop of Murray particularly defended the rights of conscience and at the close of Parliament joined the opposition minority lead by the Hamiltons.

Ever since her capture Mary had been held prisoner in a castle at Lochleven under guard of the Douglases. On May 2, 1567, however, she managed to escape and within five days six thousand men had rallied to her cause. Unable to decide whom to support Elizabeth offered to mediate between the two. Murray and Mary, however, decided to fight it out. Unfortunately, the lords under Mary were

---

92. Ibid., p. 201
93. Ibid., p. 206.

out for their several purposes. Thus precious time was wasted in deciding on a commander so that on May 13 Murray easily defeated them.

In the midst of the rush and defeat of the last few days Mary decided to throw herself on the mercy of Elizabeth. Therefore on Sunday morning, May 16, without a change of clothes or the barest necessities of life, Mary Stuart sailed across the Solway and landed at Workington.

Mary's departure signalled the end of Catholic rulers in Scotland. Murray and subsequent Regents and kings in Scotland were all Protestants. James VI who came to the Scottish throne in 1578 and succeeded to the English throne in 1603 was raised a Presbyterian.

After the death of Elizabeth and beginning with James the struggles between England and Scotland were no longer struggles for the supremacy of Catholicism or Protestantism. Rather the struggle centered in the question of church government. Since the English Church had bishops, the question of an episcopal or presbyterian form of church government did not bother England.

Episcopacy, however, afforded the sovereign a greater control of the Church and the country. Thus beginning with James VI English kings sought whenever possible to force episcopacy on Scotland. James VI, Charles I, and Charles II all followed this policy. Only Cromwell in between

Charles I and Charles II followed a policy of religious freedom in Scotland. Finally in 1690 Scotland abolished episcopacy for the last time, re-established the Presbyterian Church, and re-affirmed the Westminster Confession.

Conclusions

Looking back at this point, it is plain that England's influence as an example and her material aid to Scottish Protestants made Scotland a Protestant nation. Had England failed to assist the Scots, France or Spain would have established the Catholic religion. The next step would have been the defeat of England and the re-establishment of papal power in England. For this reason England's interest in a Protestant Scotland was purely political. National security and the union of the two realms were the hubs around which all policy was made to revolve.

The chief instruments for accomplishing the work of the Reformation in Scotland were first, the English party and later, the Lords of the Congregation. Gradually the two parties merged as Catholicism became synonymous with France and Protestantism with England.

Henry's conciliatory policy after Flodden in 1513 created the English party in Scotland. In dealing with this English party Edward VI made some unfortunate mistakes. Yet the English party grew so that by 1549 there

were 40-50,000 partisans of England in Scotland.

Mary's program of persecution affected Scotland chiefly in arousing in the Scots a strong dislike for Catholicism. The most important event during Mary's reign, however, was the formation of the Lords of the Congregation. Through this organization and Elizabeth's help Protestantism became a power in Scotland.

Elizabeth's part in this whole story is particularly important. Her decision to sponsor the Protestant cause in England inevitably placed her on the side of the Scottish Protestants and the Lords of the Congregation. Together the Lords and Elizabeth made Scotland a Protestant nation.

Despite Elizabeth's double-dealing and her evident policy of expediency, the Congregation generally remained loyal to her. Only the realization that Scotland must eventually unite with England if she was to have a future kept them true to England.

But among all Elizabeth's decisions from 1558-1568 the Darnley decision remains one of the most important. By causing the eventual ruin and flight of the Scottish Queen, Darnley paved the way for the final triumph of Protestantism in Scotland.

John Knox built the structure of a sound but strongly Calvinistic Protestantism in Scotland. Therefore, he is

rightly called The Reformer of Scotland. However, it seems from the facts available that Knox was not quite so active in Anglo-Scottish relations as were Murray, Cecil, and Elizabeth. He seems to have concentrated more on establishing Protestantism in Scotland and only when he felt it was necessary did he appeal to Elizabeth or Cecil for help.

Finally, the Reformation is important to Anglo-Scottish history as an influence which eventually wiped out the struggles between England and Scotland. With the bonds of a common Protestantism the Reformation eventually welded the nations together in 1707 into the modern kingdom of Great Britain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CONSTANT, G., The Reformation in England. The English Schism, Henry VIII (1509-1547), trans. by The Rev. R. E. Scantlebury with a preface by Hilaire Belloc, New York, Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1935.

FLEMING, DAVID HAY, The Reformation in Scotland, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.

FROUDE, JAMES ANTHONY, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, New York, Scribner, Armstrong, and Co., 1875.

GARDINER, SAMUEL R., A Student's History of England from the Earliest Times to the Conclusion of the Great War, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1926.

GREEN, JOHN RICHARD, A History of the English People, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1882.

INNES, ARTHUR D., England under the Tudors, revised by J. M. Henderson, New York, Putnam's, 11th ed., 1937.

LANG, ANDREW, John Knox and the Reformation, New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1905.

LINDSAY, THOMAS M., A History of the Reformation: The Reformation in the Lands Beyond Germany, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

MACKENZIE, AGNES MURE, The Scotland of Queen Mary and the Religious Wars 1513-1638, London, Alexander Maclehose & Co., 1936.

QUALBEN, LARS P., A History of the Christian Church, New York, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1942.

SMITH, PRESERVED, The Age of the Reformation, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1920.

STANLEY, ARTHUR PENRHYN, Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland, New York, Scribner, Armstrong, & Co., 1877.

VEZETELLY, FRANK H., The Practical Standard Dictionary of the English Language, New York, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1927.