

Essay submitted for the Hume Brown Prize in Scottish History.

by Rev. D. S. Eason, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.

31 March. 1938

Award the Prize.

Senatus, 11 May. 1938.

"GAVIN DUNBAR, ARCHBISHOP OF GLASGOW AND CHANCELLOR OF SCOTLAND".

"Suaviter in Modo".



The circumstances in which James V succeeded to the throne of Scotland gave rise to problems which were to persist during his reign. James became king at the age of one year and five months in September, 1513; and the royal minority, then as at other times in the history of Scotland, was marked by the strife of contending factions among the magnates of the land and a struggle for power which brought the country at times to the verge of anarchy. The aftermath of Flodden, likewise, was haunted by apprehensions regarding the safety of the realm. In what orientation of policy was the impoverished and leaderless kingdom of Scotland to find this safety - in a perpetuation of the traditional alliance with France or in a new attempt to cultivate the goodwill of England? The two problems, indeed, coalesced for the main division between the factions of the period was between a "pro-French" party and a "pro-English". In the shifting membership of these factions perhaps the most inconstant figure was the Queen-Mother, Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII of England, more at the mercy of her matrimonial caprices than at the direction of any settled policy. In accordance with the will of her husband, James IV, Margaret appears to have become regent in the autumn of 1513. Her second marriage, to Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus, followed in August, 1514. On 16 May, 1515, there landed in Scotland the heir-presumptive to the throne, John, Duke of Albany, who had been born and educated in France and who was acknowledged as Governor of Scotland and Guardian of the Princes by Parliament on 12 July of the same year. Angus and Albany were to figure, in the earlier years of James's reign, as the outstanding representatives of the two contending factions - the "English" and the "French" respectively - into which the magnates of Scotland were divided. It is during the first visit of Albany, which lasted till 8 June, 1517, that there occurs the first undoubted mention of Gavin Dunbar, the king's schoolmaster, later Archbishop of Glasgow and Chancellor of Scotland.

Until his promotion to the archiepiscopal see of Glasgow in 1524, the career of Dunbar is wrapped in a good deal of obscurity. "The bishops during the reign of James V", it has been observed, "were usually nominated by the king from the sons of the lesser barons"¹. The future archbishop was the younger son of Sir John Dunbar of Mochrum, by his second wife, Janet Stewart, daughter of Sir William Stewart of Garlies or Dalswinton²; and nephew and namesake of Gavin Dunbar, dean of Moray, archdeacon of St. Andrews and, in 1518, Bishop of Aberdeen³. The date of his birth is unknown but was probably in the last decade of the fifteenth

1. Mathieson, *Politics and Religion*, I., p. 30.

2. Macfarlane's *Genealogical Collins.*, II., p. 528.

3. The two namesakes are sometimes confused, e.g. by Bapst. Both held the deanery of Moray.

century¹. It is said that

"he studied at the University of Glasgow and greatly distinguished himself by his acquirements in classical learning and philosophy and afterwards betook himself to the study of theology and canon law"².

But of his alleged attendance at the University of Glasgow no evidence is forthcoming. There is a slender probability that if he studied at a Scottish university - and he does not appear to have gone abroad e.g. to Orleans, frequented by many Scotsmen of the period, among whom was David Beaton - that university was St. Andrews, in whose records more than one "Gavin Dunbar" is mentioned and at which his uncle seems to have been a student. It is tempting to see in him the student who was a "determinant" in 1516³, but in the following February, he is elsewhere described as "Master" Gavin Dunbar; and if we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that he had by then taken his Master's degree at St. Andrews (which, if the rule that obtained at Paris held good in Scotland, would imply that he had reached his twentieth year), the difficulties of admitting it are considerable, if not insuperable. Be this as it may, Dunbar had some repute both as an example and as a patron of learning. Lesley speaks of him on his appointment to the see of Glasgow as "ane young clerk weill lerned"⁴; and Buchanan describes him as "vir bonus et doctus"⁵. At a later time, James V praises him to the Pope "ob insignem probitatem cum ob singularem eruditionem"⁶; while David Panter, in 1541, declares in a letter to the Archbishop:

"In the judgement of all men you have always been distinguished by what is just and good....and lastly, by what is added as a crown to your other virtues....an incredible affection towards the votaries of learning"⁷.

It was not, however, for his academic repute that Dunbar was

1. Allowing for the comparatively short life-span of the Middle Ages - he died in 1547. Also, as appears *supra*, he is described as "young" in 1524. 2. Brunton and Haig, Senators of the College of Justice, p. 1. 3. Recs. St. And. Univ., p. 106. He is not "Gawinus Dunbar", treasurer of Ross, incorporated in 1509 (*Ibid.*, p. 204), for Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow, witnesses a royal charter at Edinburgh, 4 Sept., 1529, while Gavin Dunbar, Treasurer of Ross, witnesses a notarial instrument at St. Andrews, 10 Sept., 1529 (*Reg. Ep. Morav.*, 443, 444); nor was he Master Gavin Dunbar, prebendary of Crimond, incorporated in 1515 (*Recs. St. And. Univ.*, p. 210), who witnesses a charter at Aberdeen, 1 April, 1497 (*Reg. Ep. Aberd.*, I., p. 337) and is mentioned in connection with the vicarage of Crimond, 15 Nov., 1505 (*Ibid.*, p. 351); this second Gavin Dunbar was probably the uncle of Gavin, the future Archbishop. 4. *Historie*, p. 118. 5. Quoted Dowden, *Bishops*, p. 344. 6. *Epp. Reg. Scot.*, II., XXVII (*Jac. V*). 7. *Ibid.*, XCIX.

appointed preceptor to the young king not long before 16 February, 1516/17, when he is first mentioned in that capacity¹. James, at that date, was barely five years old²; and Dunbar was to continue as the king's master for some time after his appointment in 1524 to the see of Glasgow³. That he was given this post during Albany's first visit to Scotland is something more than a coincidence. There can be little doubt that Albany, as Guardian of the Princes, was responsible for the appointment and was actuated by the knowledge that Dunbar's sympathies were with a "French" policy and by the desire that James's mind should be moulded into adherence to the "Auld Alliance" and the "old religion".

The probability that Albany was concerned in this significant appointment is strengthened when Dunbar's early ecclesiastical career is taken into account. The first benefice recorded as held by him was the deanery of Moray, which had previously been in the tenure of his uncle and namesake⁴. No information is available regarding the date of his provision, but it was as dean of Moray that he was recommended by Albany to Pope Leo X for the priory of Whithorn in 1518⁵. The Cardinal of Cortona, it is stated, had been endeavouring to obtain this priory for himself and carrying on a suit against Alexander Stewart, Albany's brother, who apparently claimed it. But, on 12 Dec., 1518, there is a record whereby the Cardinal agrees to resign the monastery of Whithorn to Dunbar, at the instance of Albany, reserving a yearly pension of 250 gold ducats to be paid to him by Dunbar and his successors, while bulls are to be sent in favour of Alexander Stewart's promotion to Scone⁶. Dunbar, however, is found writing to the Cardinal, on 28 May, 1519, in terms which indicate that the agreement had not matured - he had heard that the Cardinal, on the death of the late prior Henry, had obtained the priory, which was given to the writer in commendam by the Three Estates of Scotland and confirmed by the Governor; and he will now abide by whatever the Governor has agreed to⁷. Albany had clinched the matter by 12 August, 1520, when the Cardinal of Cortona wrote him to the effect that the arrangement

1. L.H.T. Accts., V., p. 111: "Item xvj Februarij, gevin to Maister Gawin Dunbar, the kingis maister, to by necessar thingis for the kingis chamir....ix l. Cf. the further grant, 28 Aug., 1517, to Dunbar of iii l. "fo^r expensis maid be him in reparaling of the chamir in the quhilk the king levis now in the castell" (Ibid., p. 129). Exch. Rolls, XIV., p. 462 indicates that Dunbar's stipend as the king's tutor was 100 l. 2. He was born on 10 April, 1512. 3. See *infra*. 4. Cf. Reg. Ep. Morav., 207 (23 Oct., 1487), 209 (4 Nov., 1488), 200 (30 April, 1492), 210 (8 May, 1492). 5. Letters and Papers, Henry VIII, II., 4645 (12 Dec.), 4646 (Dec.) - Epp. Reg. Scot., I., 282 (anno 1518). 6. L. & P. H.VIII, II., 4647. 7. L. & P. H.VIII, III., Pt. I., 270. Brewer (Henry VIII, I., p. 516) *sub anno* 1520, speaks of Albany having the disposal of all the ecclesiastical benefices in Scotland.

which would be necessary

was as much to his advantage as Dunbar's; and although he had not meant to give up the priory without a sufficient recompense or at least a pension of a thousand ducats from it, Albany's kindness had compelled him to acquiesce in a pension of 250 ducats, on surety given in the Camera by Dunbar and four prelates; he insists that Albany, by his influence with the French king, will procure him benefices in Lombardy of much greater value than Whithorn¹. Dunbar is called prior of Whithorn and postulate of Glasgow on 22 November, 1524²; and a decret-arbitral of 6 March, 1524/5, between Dunbar and Malcolm, Lord Fleming, in name of his brother, is to the effect that all teinds and fruits of Whithorn, before the publication of the bulls promoting Dunbar to Glasgow (21 December), should pertain to him as prior³. He appears to have held the deanery of Moray along with the priory of Whithorn (in commendam) until his appointment to the see of Glasgow⁴.

In 1524, by his nomination to that archbishopric, Dunbar attained a position of eminence in the Scottish Church second only to that of the Archbishop of St. Andrews and made his entry into the sphere of public affairs. His advancement was rapid, considering that it came so early in his ecclesiastical career and that he had hitherto played no conspicuous part in Church or State. There was considerable delay in filling the vacancy in the see of Glasgow, consequent on the translation of James Beaton to St. Andrews in October, 1522; and although a letter from Surrey to Wolsey, on 15 August, 1523, mentions ships coming from France with the elect of Glasgow, it is not till 8 July, 1524, that the papal provision of Dunbar to the vacant see, with reservation of a pension of 200 ducats from its fruits to Thomas Hay, is recorded⁵. On 29 (or 27) July, the pallium was sent to him⁷; and, on 18 September, John Thornton, Dunbar's agent, paid 2500 florins on his behalf at the Vatican⁸. A precept under the Privy Seal, admitting him to the temporality of the see, was issued on 27 September⁹. He had already appeared among the Lords of Council as postulate of Glasgow, on 1 and 3 August, 1524¹⁰ and, as postulate, witnesses charters under the Great Seal from 9 August, 1524¹¹. On 22 November, as prior of Whithorn and postulate of Glasgow, he was empowered to make presentations to vacant benefices within the diocese¹²; and, acting on this faculty, appoints a vicar of Houston, on 4 December, 1524¹³. His consecration took place at Edinburgh on 5 February,

-
1. L. & P. H.VIII, III., Pt. I., 949. 2. R.S.S., I., 3322.
 3. A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 217. 4. Archbps. of St. Ands., III., p. 268.
 5. L. & P. H.VIII, III., pt. II., 3241. 6. Brady, Episc. Succ., I., p. 155. 7. Ibid. 8. Ibid. 9. R.S.S., I., 3298.
 10. A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 205. 11. R.M.S., III., 271 etc.; G.R.H. Charters, 961a. 12. R.S.S., I., 3322. 13. Ibid., 3330.

in Crown Patronage Sede Vacante

1524/5¹.

Although Queen Margaret, writing to Wolsey on 19 February, 1524/5, declared that she and the king "haz vrytin in specyal" to the Pope for the provision of Glasgow "tyl hyz master that leid him; vylke promocyon is sped at owr request"², it is clear that Albany was once more the prime mover in the transaction and Pinkerton is evidently right in stating that

"one of the last acts of his (Albany's) power was to procure the papal bulls for the promotion of Gavin Dunbar...to the see of Glasgow"³.

Doubtless, Dunbar's visit to France in 1523 had involved some negotiation with the Governor; and Magnus had no doubt of the agency of Dunbar's advancement. Writing to Wolsey on 31 May, 1525, he referred to

"the saide Archebusshop of Glasco, albe it prively for his promotion he leaneth with his favour towards the Duke of Albeny"; and he reports again, on 9 September:

"Albe it the yong King shewed unto me...that tharchebusshop of Glasco is hoolly geven in favour to the Duke of Albeny, as I have written and thought never the contrary, remembering his comyng and promotion to the Archebusshopriche of Glasco"⁴.

Not only did Albany further at the Curia the candidature of Dunbar as a supporter of a "French" policy⁵. It was through him that the exemption of the see of Glasgow from the jurisdiction of St. Andrews - that source of bitter controversy - was obtained⁶. Albany, however, was not above securing at the expense of Dunbar the interests of his secretary⁷, Thomas Hay, canon of Aberdeen, to whose pension of 400 merks Scots from the fruits of Glasgow, imposed by the Pope at Albany's request, Gavin was fain to consent⁸; but, by 1539, the Archbishop, seeking to get rid of Hay, had found it necessary to invoke the good offices of the king, who writes to the Pope, on 1 February, 1539/40, justifying the appointment to a vacant prebend of Glasgow of another than Hay⁹.

Dunbar appears in Parliament as Archbishop on 22 February, 1524/5 and again on 6 July, 1525¹⁰. On 29 April, 1525, he confirmed all the rights and privileges of the dean, chapter and individual canons of the metropolitan church of Glasgow granted by popes and especially

1. Dioc. Reg. Glasg., II., 431. 2. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 1103.
 3. History, II., p. 233. 4. H.VIII State Papers, IV., pp. 374, 401.
 5. Cf. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 273 (22 Dec., 1524): "The Lordes attending mooste upon the King and Her Grace, that is to say, thErle of Murray, tharchebusshop of Glasco and the Busshop of Rosse, all of the Frenshe faction and the persons that mooste were famylier and of counsaill with the Duke of Albeny"; Ibid., p. 306 (24 Jan., 1524/5): "The Erle of Murray, tharchebusshop of Glasco and the Busshop of Rosse...whom the Quenes Grace of late hath called Frenshe men to thair faces". 6. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 1012, 1034. 7. Ibid., III., pt. I., 949. 8. Archbps. of St. And., III., p. 268. 9. Epp. Reg. Scot., II., pp. 38-42. 10. A.P.S., II., pp. 288, 291.

by Pope Alexander VI and by his own predecessors in the see¹; and on the same date he consented to the foundation of Our Lady College². Numerous writs testify to his activity during the earlier years of his episcopate in the routine duties of the diocese. On 1 March, 1524/5, he grants collation of John Clerk, canon of Cambuskenneth, to the vicarage of Lenzie³ and of Master Alexander Annande to the same vicarage on 22 September, 1530⁴. Likewise, he collates Master Robert Grahame to the vicarage of Kilmaronock, on 2 July, 1527 and Maurice Clerk to that vicarage on the 25th of the same month⁵. On 19 November, 1526, he protested in Parliament that "quhat was done to the...lard of Keir suld turn the sait of Glasgow to na prejudice anent the ward of Cadder"⁶.

The career of Dunbar as Archbishop of Glasgow is significant for the history of the Church in Scotland as illustrating the problems which agitated the Church during the period immediately preceding the Reformation: the tension between the sees of St. Andrews and Glasgow, a problem of internal government inherited from the previous century, which had seen the innovation of an Archbishop and Metropolitan in Ecclesia Scoticana, in place of the parity of bishops presided over in Council by a Conservator; the attitude of Church in view of the growth of heresy and the allied question of Reform, a question made the more urgent by the action which was to be taken by Henry VIII in the neighbouring kingdom; and the relation of the Church, which still acknowledged the headship of Rome, to the State and especially to the Crown. The first of these problems came to light ere Dunbar was yet consecrated Archbishop of Glasgow.

The contentions which followed the erection of St. Andrews into an archiepiscopal and metropolitan see by the papal bull of 17 August, 1472, culminated in the erection of Glasgow, during the episcopate of Robert Blacader, to the dignity of an archbishopric. Pope Innocent VIII, by his bull of 9 January, 1491/2, not only gave Glasgow this status, with exemption from the jurisdiction of St. Andrews, but made the Bishops of Dunkeld, Dunblane, Candida Casa and Lismore suffragans of the new archbishop, during whose lifetime they also were to be exempt, and disjoined Glasgow and its suffragans from St. Andrews⁷. On the same date, by another bull, the Pope exhorted the Bishops of Dunkeld, Dunblane, Candida Casa and Lismore to give due obedience to the Archbishop of Glasgow⁸. Dunblane was restored to St. Andrews by a bull of Pope Alexander VI on 28 January, 1499/1500⁹ and Dunkeld before the death of Archbishop Forman (c. 12 March, 1520/1)¹⁰, by whose instrumentality

1. R.E.G., II., 496. 2. Glasgow B.R., II., xix. 3. Cambuskenneth, 140. 4. Ibid., 143. 5. Ibid., 155. 6. A.P.S., II., p. 311.
7. R.E.G., II., 457. 8. Ibid., 458. 9. Dowden, Bishops, p. 333.
10. Statuta, I., p. cxxviii.

the exemption of Glasgow was limited to the lifetime of the archbishop who then held the see¹.

On the promotion of James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, to the primatial see of St. Andrews-the bull was issued on 10 October, 1522, although Beaton is not styled Archbishop of St. Andrews till June, 1523² - that prelate made some attempt to anticipate that his successor in the Glasgow see would not escape his new primatial and legatine jurisdiction. During 1523, he had written to the Cardinal of St. Eusebius, "the Protector of the Scots",

"ne Primatus aut Legationis auctoritas primarie sedis Divi Andree in perfectione Glasguensis Archiepiscopi, seu aliorum quorumcunque, pacto ullo ledetur aut superioritate ejusdem provincialis sedis quovismodo derogetur",

and praying the Cardinal

"ut...superioritatem sedis Divi Andree integram et ratam manere procuret; contra rebelles (si qui forsan fuerint) et contumaces Suffraganeos nostros, presertim futurum Glasguensem Archiepiscopum et Jacobum Moraviensem Episcopum, Apostolica Brevia sub censuris et penis pro obedientia solita nobis prestanda impetret"³.

Nevertheless on 8 July, 1524, Pope Clement VII, after reciting that Robert, Bishop of Glasgow and his church, diocese, etc., were taken under the protection of the Pope and exempted from the legatine and primatial jurisdiction of William, then Archbishop of St. Andrews, and that, later, when Glasgow was erected into a metropolitan see, with Dunkeld, Dunblane, Candida Casa and Lismore as its suffragans, the see and its suffragans received a similar exemption, likewise that Leo X had exempted James, Archbishop of Glasgow and the Bishops of Candida Casa and Lismore from the jurisdiction of Andrew, Archbishop of St. Andrews, grants Gavin, elect of Glasgow, confirmation of this exemption⁴.

As the controversy between the Archbishops over the exemption of Glasgow took place against a political background, a review of the affairs of State during the period is relevant. In 1517, Albany had negotiated a treaty at Rouen which renewed the alliance between France and Scotland and by which the two realms took bonds of mutual aid against all enemies and especially against England. During the interval which elapsed before Albany's second visit to Scotland in 1521, Angus, whom Margaret was now seeking to divorce, might have emerged more prominently as a partizan of

1. Statuta, I., p. cxxvii. Herkless and Hannay (Archbps. of St. And., II., pp. 169-170) say that Forman attempted to annul the exemption of Glasgow but there is no indication that he succeeded.

2. Dowden, Bishops, p. 340. 3. Epp. Reg. Scot., I., pp. 342-343 (No. LXXXV). 4. R.E.G., II., 494.

England, but for the strife between the Douglasses and the Hamiltons in which he was involved. Margaret, meanwhile, was intriguing for the return of Albany, perhaps because, as Brewer suggests, the Duke's influence at the Vatican might further her suit for a divorce from Angus¹, while Henry VIII was taking counter-measures to have Albany detained in France. Albany, however, succeeded in reaching the Gareloch in November, 1521, and during Angus's absence in France, was able to proceed with measures against English influence in Scotland. He dismissed the officers of Angus's appointment and summoned a Parliament; and in pursuit of his object of causing a diversion in favour of France, projected an invasion of England. But although he was able to lead an army towards the western Border, the Scottish lords held back from carrying war into England and Albany himself entered into a truce with Dacre on 11 September, 1522² and disbanded his army. On the 27th of the next month, having lost something of his prestige and having vainly endeavoured to have France included in the truce with England, the Duke returned to France, after appointing a Council of regency. Henry VIII, who had sought to extend his influence in Scotland by peaceful measures, now, in 1523, prepared for armed conflict and a certain amount of Border warfare followed. On Albany's third visit, accompanied by troops and supplies from France, in September, 1523³, the Duke led an imposing army to the eastern Border; but, after the ineffective siege of Wark Castle, the Scots retreated. In November, the Estates decreed that the French troops should be sent home; and after some further and fruitless negotiations with England, Albany finally left Scotland on 20 May, 1524. The chief representative of the "French" party was now James Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews and Chancellor of the realm. But it was not given to Beaton to carry out the policy of Albany. The Regent's departure from Scotland and his subsequent deposition from the Governorship did not mean the end of his influence in Scottish affairs, although he was never again to set foot in Scotland. The paradoxical fact is that although Beaton was Albany's most steadfast adherent, the Duke was responsible for the emergence into public life of one who was to eclipse the Archbishop of St. Andrews - Gavin Dunbar; and although Beaton and Dunbar were fundamentally of the same mind in matters of Church and State, their differences over the question of the exemption of Glasgow as well as, at a somewhat later point, the king's preference for Dunbar made it impossible that they should work in harmony.

Ere, however, Dunbar had been provided to the archbishopric of Glasgow on 8 July, 1524, the aims of Albany seemed to have been largely reversed. In the absence of Angus as well as Albany,

1. Brewer, Henry VIII, I., p. 516.

2. Ibid., p. 533.

3. Dunbar was sent for early in this month. "Item, vij Septembris, deliverit to Johnne Adamson, lettres ane to the Maister of Flemyng and that uthir to the Kingis Maister to haist them to Edinburgh.... vij s" (L.H.T. Accts., V., p. 219).

the Earl of Arran, who, after Albany, was heir to the throne and had been, a few years previously, a prominent member of the "French" party, now took the centre of the stage and entered into a confederacy with the Queen-mother to form a "Queen's" party, pursuing a new line of policy - the "erection" of the young king - which was but a pretext for the exercise of rule by Margaret. On 26 July, 1524, James was taken by Margaret and Arran from Stirling to Edinburgh and proclaimed King of Scots, Dunbar being of the company¹; and, on 30 July, certain of the lords spiritual and temporal engaged themselves to be loyal to James as sovereign notwithstanding their promises to Albany, which promises they renounced, as they would also revoke Albany's authority in the next Parliament. The signatories, along with the Queen-mother, are Arran, Lennox, Crawford and "G. Postularius Glascuen."² Dunbar had thus attached himself to the lords supporting the young king. Beaton, however, adhered to his former allegiance; and after James, at Lammas, had demanded the renunciation by his officials of their offices and seals³, the Chancellor and Gavin Dunbar, Bishop of Aberdeen, were confined in Edinburgh Castle, because they would not give up their seals nor their allegiance to the Duke of Albany⁴.

Beaton was released in October; and, shortly afterwards, Angus reappeared in Scotland⁵ with the connivance and support of England and, as the articles agreed between Wolsey and him make manifest, for the furtherance of English designs in Scotland. Angus is to

"serve, ayde, supporte, mayteyn and defende the yonge King of Scottes...aswel against the Frenche King or any his adherentes, as against the Duke of Albany and his partakers"⁶, to secure Arran's adherence to the English cause, to persuade Beaton to go to England or at least to draw him from his attachment to Albany and "the Frenche partie" and to have ambassadors sent to England "for conclusion of final peax"⁷. These were Wolsey's designs; Angus also had his own game to play. On 14 November, Albany was finally deposed from the Governorship by Parliament on the ground that he had not returned to Scotland by 1 September; and Angus's first step towards asserting his power in the realm took the form of an abortive attempt to gain possession of the king by a raid on Edinburgh, in concert with Lennox, when the Estates were in session⁸. Meanwhile, Beaton had a personal reason

1. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 9. 2. Pinkerton, History, II., p. 473.
 3. Diurnal, p. 9. 4. Ibid. 5. Diurnal, loc. cit., says that in or about August, "the erle of Angus came quietlie out of France to Scotland". This date is too early. Vide Archbps. of St. Andrs., III., p. 132. 6. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 160. 7. Ibid., p. 164.
 8. Ibid., p. 189.

for making an approach to Wolsey. On 2 November, he was writing to the English Cardinal reminding him of his (Beaton's) former letters regarding the revocation of the exemption granted by the Pope to the Archbishop of Glasgow, contrary to the honour and liberty of St. Andrews¹. If, however, Beaton, playing his lone hand, was prepared to invoke Wolsey's good offices in the matter of the exemption without committing himself too deeply in matters less personal, the Cardinal was not likely to act unwarily, for, on 19 November, Wolsey mentions the report that had reached him from Magnus -

"the Archebishop of Seint Andrews maketh outward demonstracioun to be veray wel inclined unto the amytie of England, shewing some towardnes that he coulde be contente to come in the ambassiate. Howe be it diverse persones have infourmed you that he wol change and vary"²

While Beaton's political attachments were undecided, Dunbar's position was clear enough. Magnus, writing to Wolsey on 22 December, mentions

"the Lordes attending mooste upon the King and her Grace, that is to say, thErl of Murray, tharchbusshop of Glasco and the Busshop of Rosse, all of the French faction"³;

and, again, on 9 January, 1524/5, he comments on the party-spirit of the times:

"The realm is marvelously devided, soe as harde it is to knowe to whom the Kingges Highnes and your Grace shulde mooste assuredly trust. The quene is counsailed by such as ar moore inclyned to the devotion of Fraunce than of Einglande....The Archebusshop of Saint Andrewes with his bande is not a litle suspecte, by reason of the reparing of the Frensche men unto hym and for thair long contynuyng at Saint Andrewes⁴...And as to the Lordes temporall, there is myche devision amongges thaim"⁵.

Meanwhile, James, or, at least, someone writing in James's name, wrote to Pope Clement VII, on 13 January, thanking the pontiff for the promotion of Dunbar, his tutor, to the see of Glasgow, with exemption from the primatial and legatine jurisdiction of St. Andrews, and begging him to leave untouched those privileges, granted by desire of the Duke of Albany, and not to allow James, Archbishop of St. Andrews, to infringe them⁶. Beaton, on the other hand, was writing, on the 26th of the month, to the Abbot of Cambuskenneth to the effect that the Archbishop (elect) of Glasgow had obtained an exemption from the jurisdiction of St. Andrews, some say by the influence of England, others of Albany, and begging the Abbot to obtain Wolsey's interposition to have the exemption annulled⁷. But within a few weeks' time, his opponents were also making approaches to the Cardinal. Queen

1. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 798. 2. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 250.
 3. Ibid., p. 273. 4. Vide Archbps. of St. Ands., III., p. 145.
 5. H.VIII S.P., IV., pp. 288-289. 6. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 1012.
 7. Ibid., 1034.

Margaret herself wrote to Wolsey, on 19 February, the letter previously quoted, in which she declares that along with the king she has written to the Pope for the promotion of the king's Master to Glasgow,

"vylke promocyon is sped at our request; and haz obtyned a perpetwal exsempcyon for hym, his dyosy and provence".

She now desires Wolsey to use his influence with the Pope to ensure that any solicitations of the Archbishop of St. Andrews are dealt with by the Pope himself¹. A letter from Dunbar himself follows next day, declaring that he was "techor and eruditor" to the King of Scots and that he knows Wolsey's friendly disposition. Having been provided by the Pope to the archbishopric of Glasgow, of which he is in possession, he craves Wolsey's interposition at the Vatican in defence of his perpetual exemption from the primacy of St. Andrews². On 22 February, Magnus informed Wolsey that

"my saide Lorde (of St. Andrews) fyndeth hym greved that the Archebusshop of Glasco hath doone hym self to be exempt from the see of Saint Andrewes"

and passed on Beaton's suggestion that the English king's procurator at Rome might act in the matter³; and, on 9 March, Magnus was once more urging Beaton's case:

"His Lordship besecheth your Grace to have in remembraunce his matier for the reformation of the exemption of Glasco from the see of Saint Andrewes. A remedy to be opteyned in this matier shulde be right pleasaunt to my saide Lorde and myche to the contentation of his mynde"⁴.

The scene now shifts to Rome from which, on 19 March, Clerk writes to Wolsey that the letters regarding the Scottish prelates have arrived and he will speak about them to the Pope. There are many Scotsmen at the Curia, but none with commission from the Archbishop of St. Andrews - they favour rather his adversary, the Bishop of Glasgow⁵. Margaret, writing to Henry VIII, on 22 March, intimated that it was understood in Scotland that the English king had been solicited by some great personage of the realm to revoke the exemption of the Bishop of Glasgow, who had been her son's master,

"and therefor belyvez erar that Your Grace suld stand for hyz prevelaige and exsempcyon, than revok or annull it, as he vylke is and haz bene ay trw to the kyng my son and me, and gat the Archbyschopryke tyl his revard at owr request".

She accordingly asks Henry to instruct his agent, the Bishop of Bath not to oppose Dunbar's interests at Rome⁶. The Pope, however, according to Clerk's report (6 April, 1525) was loth to revoke

1. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 1103. 2. Ibid., 1104. 3. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 331. 4. Ibid., p. 338. 5. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 1197. 6. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 343.

the exemption, for which King James had written; and the Scots had said that Beaton was engaged in a new conspiracy against the king and queen¹, an aspersion which was, no doubt, inspired by Margaret.

The matter enters upon another phase with a letter of Magnus to Wolsey, on 31 May, 1525. The writer indicates that both archbishops have approached him with a view to securing the mediation of the English Cardinal:

"At this tyme he (the Archbishop of St. Andrews) mentioneth that fayn he wolde, by the Kingges gracious favour and youres, have the exempcioun of Glasco remedied and reformed which he accompteth to be a thing myche to his comforte and pleasure... Howe be it, the saide matier of exemption wolde be well seen unto, by cause thArchebusshop of Glasco seweth booth to the Kingges Highnes and to your Grace for the same, and the yong King favoureth his oppynnyon and party, and at this tyme hath written with his oune hande to the Kinges Highnes for the same matier; and dailly the said Archebusshop of Glasco calleth upon me to be meanes for hym to your said Grace. And therefore your Grace must devise some remedy, wherby thay booth owe of reason to hold thaym content, and also the yong King muste have some aunsuer; whiche may be geven prively, but it muste be in suche maner, that the said Archebusshop of Glasco may not knowe it; for the King favoureth hym myche better thenne the Archebusshop of Saint Andrewes. These twoe Archebusshops sing not oone song."

Magnus goes on to make a suggestion which shows that Dunbar was reckoned worth cultivating:

"Yf conveniently it couth or mought be, good it were, that the saide Archebusshop of Glasco, albe it prively for his promotion he leaneth with his favour towards the Duke of Albeny, as for like causes doe other, shulde have some occasion from the Kingges Highnes, or your Grace, to traine with his good woordes the yong King, at some tymes, to the devotion of Einglande; for the said Archebusshop for the mooste parte is contynually attending upon the said yong Kinges person"².

Each prelate had his own method of making a bid for English support. The Archbishop of St. Andrews, says Magnus, is desirous of a "good peas" being concluded between the king of England and the king of Scotland. Dunbar, on the other hand, had shown himself ready to act, in his ecclesiastical capacity, against the raiders who kept the Borders in a state of simmering disorder.

1. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 1245. 2. H.VIII S.P., IV., pp. 373-374. Magnus writes to Wolsey in similar terms on 9 Sept., making a plea for "the reasonable contentation of thaym booth touching the exemption of Glasco" (Ibid., p. 401).

"Over this", Magnus writes, "I have procured the Archebusshop of Glasco, forsome as I am infourmed...that the theves of Tyndail stande to be accursed and declared rebelles both to God and man and to the Kinges Highnes...which the said Archebusshop hath doone and is and wolbe redy to make further aggravation...at the pleasure and commaundement of your Grace"¹.

This was undoubtedly the occasion of Dunbar's famous "cursing" against the Border reivers, which is tentatively assigned by Pinkerton to the time of the ratification of the treaty of peace with England in July, 1534². But we are justified in assigning it to the year 1525, for, on 28 October, Magnus sends to Wolsey a copy of a terrible cursing which he has had executed along the Borders in consequence of Wolsey's letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow³. It was an attempt at securing the interest of Wolsey and his master, which involved no sacrifice, on Dunbar's part, of party-allegiance.

Meanwhile, the contention of factions in Scotland was centred in the question of the custody of the king. James, on 14 January, 1524/5, had written to Henry VIII enlisting his support against the return of Albany and in furtherance of his desire to have the castle of Dunbar, held by the supporters of Albany, returned to him⁴. But if this letter was written at the instigation of Queen Margaret, who wished to have no rival near the throne, control over her son was soon to be taken out of her hands. In the Parliament of February, 1524/5, where party-spirit showed itself in the choice of the Lords of the Articles, and where Dunbar was still of the queen's faction, Angus, who was now acting in concert with the Archbishop of St. Andrews and the Bishop of Aberdeen, as well as Lennox and Argyle⁵ - which meant a coalition of the pro-Albany group with the English faction - succeeded in giving effect to his contention that the king should be released from the custody of his mother and given over to a Council chosen by the Estates. An agreement whereby the government of the country was to be entrusted to a Secret Council whose eight members were the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow, the Bishops of Aberdeen and Dunblane, the Earls of Angus, Argyle and Lennox, was confirmed between the queen and the Lords. According to Lesley, who gives the constitution of the Council thus,

"the queen wes adjonit unto thame as ane principalle and that naething suld be done but hir advyse"⁶.

The custody of the king was to be given to the lords in rotation.

1. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 371. 2. History, II., p. 325, footnote.
3. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 1725. Typical passages of Dunbar's "cursing" are given, Hay Fleming, Reformation, pp. 622-624. 4. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 290. 5. Diurnal, p. 9. 6. Historie, p. 132.

In terms of the Act of Parliament, he was to remain with the Archbishop of Glasgow till November, 1525¹. But the Diurnal of Occurrents does not mention the Archbishop.

"Thre erllis", it declares, "(were) to have his body in keping thair quarter about, quhilkis wer the erllis of Angus, Argyle and Arroll. And first the erle of Angus begane and vald on na wayis pairt with him, quhilk causit greit discord"². Be this as it may, in September, 1525, Dunbar still appears as the king's preceptor "contynually attending upon his person"³.

On 14 June, 1526, it was declared by parliament that James V having now attained his fourteenth year, the whole royal power was vested in his hands and all other authority formerly exercised in his name had now terminated⁴. By this Act, the whole authority of State fell into the hands of Angus, who, however, had yet to overcome one notable opponent. John, Earl of Lennox, had been a supporter of Albany, although he had held back from joining the Duke in the intended invasion of England in 1523⁵, had encouraged Queen Margaret's project of a divorce from Angus and strongly opposed her reconciliation with him⁶. He had, in fact, been for a short time a member of the queen's faction and had signed the engagement, on 31 July, 1524, to support the assumption of power by the king. Soon afterwards, alienated from Margaret by her marriage to Henry Stewart and her imprisonment of Scott of Buccleuch, Lennox veered to the English side. Acting with Angus, he was one of the Lords appointed to the Council set up for the government of the realm in the Parliament of 23 February, 1524/5. But although, on 31 May, 1525, Magnus mentions him to Wolsey as a most powerful lord who was well-inclined to England⁷, Lennox was shortly to signify another change of front by entering into a compact with Archbishop Dunbar. On 4 February, 1525/6, Dunbar made a bond with John, Earl of Lennox, for payment to him of £40 during the Archbishop's lifetime and by a mutual agreement they bound themselves to maintain and defend each other in their causes and quarrels⁸. Lennox, who was named, on 21 June, 1526, a member of the Privy Council (which included in its membership Dunbar and Angus)⁹, now assumed the rôle of the young king's champion and set about James's deliverance from the virtual captivity in which Angus held him. On 26 June, the king entered into a bond with Lennox, whereby, of his own free will, he engaged to use the counsel of that earl in preference to that of all others and to do nothing without his advice¹⁰. According to Buchanan,

"the king, although he was treated with greater indulgence than was proper, that his tender mind might be retained by such licentiousness, yet began, by degrees, to be tired of the authority of the Douglasses and...to consult secretly with his

1. A.P.S., II., p. 294. 2. Diurnal, p. 10. 3. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 401. 4. A.P.S., II., p. 301. 5. Lennox, I., pp. 348-349. 6. Ibid., p. 349. 7. Ibid., p. 354. 8. Ibid., p. 356. 9. A.P.S., II., p. 304. 10. Lennox, I., p. 357.

intimate friends about asserting his liberty. Of all the nobles, John, Earl of Lennox, was the only one to whom he could unbosom himself freely and without fear...Him therefore he made his confident and while they were deliberating about the time and place of effecting his design, Douglas...about the end of July, determined to carry the king into Teviotdale..."¹
 A plan for rescue on that occasion having miscarried, Lennox now accused Angus before the Lords of Council of holding the king in captivity, a charge which Arran disclaimed (2 August, 1526):

"Sen he remanit allanerlie with the kingis grace of his command and to do his grace service and gif sa war that his hienes war in captivite, thar suld be na baroune of his realme of better will to put his grace to liberte..."²

Beaton was now once more ranged against Angus and one of his chaplains carried a letter from King James to Henry VIII complaining that

"the said yong king, contrary his will and mynde, is kept in thraldom and captivite with Archebalde Erle of Anguisshe"³.

The climax came with the Battle of Linlithgow, where, on 4 September, Lennox was killed and Angus crushed his enemies and consolidated his power. It is noteworthy that, on his own showing, there were arrayed against him among the associates of Lennox the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow⁴.

One consequence, personal to Dunbar, of the ascendancy of Angus and his retention of the young king was, it would appear, that the Archbishop's tutorship ceased. Magnus mentions him as the king's Master on 22 February, 1524/5⁵; on 22 March, Queen Margaret speaks of "the Byschop of Glasgo, wylke haz bene mastar to the Kyng my son"⁶; and, on 1 January, 1525/6, Magnus still describes Dunbar as "contymually attending upon the yong king"⁷. But it is incredible that Angus should have allowed one who was his consistent opponent to continue in this office, with its opportunities of influencing the king. Dunbar, however, was to serve King James in other ways; and the royal pupil did not forget his preceptor.

It is pertinent, at this point, to discuss certain criticisms of James's early education which reflect upon his clerical tutor. Pinkerton, who is alone in upholding the good effects of Dunbar's preceptorship, declares of James:

"His conversation did honour to his preceptor, Gavin Dunbar, a man of science replete with masculine sense and information"⁸
 But the letter from Magnus to Wolsey, of 15 November, 1524, on

1. Buchanan, History (trans. Aikman), II., p. 291 seq.
 2. A.D.C., 1504-54, pp. 250-1. 3. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 455 (30 Aug.). This letter from Magnus to Wolsey credits Margaret with the desire of regaining, by Beaton's assistance, "the rule and governaunce of the yong King her sonne" and Beaton with the desire of regaining the Chancellorship. 4. Douglas Book, II., p. 228, footnote. 5. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 329. 6. Ibid., p. 343.
 7. Ibid., p. 429. 8. History, II., p. 239.

on which this statement purports to be founded, does not quite bear it out. It praises the young king's deportment rather than his conversation:

"Also by the Quenes procuring, we have seen His saide Grace use hym self otherwise pleasauntely, booth in singging and daunsing, and shewing familiaritye amongges his Lordes. All whiche his princely actes and doingges be soe excellent for his age, not yet of 13 yeres till Eister next, that in our oppynnyins it is not possible thay shulde be amended"¹.

On the other hand, such statements as these are found:

"Owing to the conditions of his upbringing, (James) was almost illiterate. It is said that at the age of twelve, he could not write an English letter without assistance and even in manhood, he could speak very little French"².

"The young king, indeed, seems to have been unhappy in his early training. His mother, although her affection was undoubted, had failings which certainly did not lean to virtue's side and the distractions which her inconsistency evoked appear to have aided in exercising an untoward influence upon the youthful monarch's education. He had as his tutor, Gavin Dunbar, who had recently been made Archbishop of Glasgow, but the king, though in his fourteenth year, could not read an English letter without help. The lords of Council deemed the queen mother's influence pernicious, with a tendency to produce a disposition to cruelty in the king...They therefore thought he should be "otherwise educate and brought up thenne yet his grace is"³.

Finally, Bapst speaks of "la mauvaise éducation que lui avait été donnée"⁴.

What then of the defects in the young king's education? The allegations of his illiteracy are founded on a letter of Magnus to Wolsey (31 May, 1525):

"I deliverde to the yong King here the Kingges mooste honourable letters, which the said King received mooste thankfully, and in mooste loving maner, and at this tyme sendeth unto the Kingges Highnes his letters of aunsuer to the same. But as yet the said yong King canne not by hym self rede an Einglisshe letter, but by the helpe of some oone of his Counsaill; naither can devise, but as is assinged and instructe by the same Counsell; speciallye nowe in the absence of the Quenes Grace his moder"⁵.

This statement, however, does not give sufficient reason for

1. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 243. 2. Hume Brown, History of Scotland, I., p. 374. 3. Douglas Book, II., p. 218, footnote. The context of this quotation, which is from a letter of Magnus to Wolsey (31 May, 1525), shows that it refers entirely to the influence of Margaret (H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 349). 4. Les mariages de Jacques V, p. 134. 5. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 368.

asserting that the king was illiterate. English to a boy accustomed to speak Scots and who had been taught in Latin may well have been an unfamiliar language. James was probably as well educated, in the formal sense and according to the medieval curriculum, and as fortunate in his tutor as any of his predecessors. If the defects of his character were due, in no small measure, to the vicissitudes of his upbringing in an entourage where he made an early acquaintance with intrigue and if, in particular, Angus's methods of reconciling the young king to his virtual captivity were apparently of a type calculated to foster self-indulgence¹, we may at least believe that Dunbar merited Margaret's eulogium that he "haz bene ay trw to the Kyng my son and me"² and credit him with winning from his royal pupil by his fidelity more respect and trust than James was wont to bestow on those by whom he was surrounded. It has already been suggested that Dunbar's appointment was due to Albany and actuated by the desire that the king should be reared in sympathy with France and the Roman faith; and if it be true that a man never quite forsakes his first beliefs, we may detect amid the complexities of James's adult policy something of the early influence of his preceptor.

In the Parliament of 31 July, 1525, which decided on negotiations with England with a view to a three years' peace, Dunbar, on behalf of the spirituality, supported the cautious protest of Argyle, that as they were assembled for defence of the realm and other lords who were sent for would not come, the absentees should be held responsible for "what ruin happened to the kingdom by war with England; or if peace be made and they lost their allies, it should be imputed to them for withholding their counsel"³. On 3 August, one of the Scots commissioners appointed to treat with the commissioners of England was the Archbishop of Glasgow⁴. But Dunbar was reported by Magnus, on 9 September, as not only in Scotland but as having in his possession a letter from Albany to King James, delivered by an ambassador lately arrived from France; and the Archbishop is described as "hoolly geven to the favour and devotion of the said Duke"⁵. Beaton, on this occasion, had declared to Magnus that he would have no dealings with the ambassador "till our matiers shalbe concluded"⁶; and the English agent, considering the advisability of retaining Beaton and, at the same time, noting that the king "favoureth myche moore" the Archbishop of Glasgow "thenne the Chancellor"⁷, urges upon Wolsey

1. Cardinal Wolsey told Cardinal Campeggio that the King of Scots asked in marriage the daughter of Henry VIII, "to which proposal", says Campeggio, "they do not seem to be much inclined, because it is said that the king is very badly brought up" (9 Jan., 1528/9) (Brewer, Henry VIII, II., p. 489). 2. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 243. 3. A.P.S., II., p. 291. 4. Ibid., p. 297. 5. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 395. 6. Ibid., p. 399. 7. Beaton was still Chancellor, but the Great Seal was taken from him in the following July (H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 451, footnote).

that some steps be taken for the "reasonable contentation of thaim booth touching the exemption of Glasco"¹. It was no new suggestion. But, on 1 January, 1525/6, Magnus reports that King James had informed him of letters from Rome which state that the English representatives at the Vatican were opposing strongly the suit of the Archbishop of Glasgow². To oppose Dunbar, who had once more been revealed as a partizan of Albany, must have seemed to Henry preferable to a dubious attempt at conciliating him, as one who had the ear of the king, by some diplomatic compromise. Yet Albany himself is not above the suspicion of double-dealing; for, on 12 April, 1527, the Archbishop of St. Andrews sent him a letter of thanks for writing to the Pope and the King of France on behalf of the privileges of his see, despite the opposition of the Bishops of Glasgow and Moray³; and it would seem, from the statement of the papal bull of 21 September, 1531, that Beaton at this time succeeded in gaining a modification of the exemption of Glasgow, whereby that see was released from the metropolitan but subjected to the primatial and legatine jurisdiction of St. Andrews⁴.

The question of the exemption, which concerned the government of the Church in Scotland, was the first of the problems that agitated the Church to appear during the episcopate of Dunbar. The second problem, which concerned the doctrine of the Church, was now to arise - the question of heresy. A letter, in the name of James V, dated 1 January, 1526/7, assures the Pope of his determination to resist the encroachments of Lutheranism and all heresy and to maintain the Catholic religion undisturbed and uncontaminated in his realm⁵. The author of this letter may have been the Archbishop of Glasgow, who was certainly no sympathizer with the new doctrines. Dunbar was present at the reading of the sentence on Patrick Hamilton on 28 February, 1527/8⁶; but some time was to elapse before he acted, on his own initiative, against heretics.

In February, 1526/7, Magnus had, as he informed Wolsey, expressed to the Archbishop of St. Andrews the pious hope that by the queen's good counsel and the faithful assistance of that prelate

"good liklihood is that the grete discoordes, debates, dissencions and variaunces, that of late have bene amongges the Lordes in thoo parties, shalbe repressed appesed and reduced to good unitye and concoorde."⁷

He hoped in vain. For although Angus was said, on 26 March, 1527,

1. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 401. 2. Ibid., p. 429. 3. Inventaire Chronologique, p. 76. 4. R.E.G., II., 499. 5. Theiner, Vet. Mon., p. 552. Clement VII writes to James on 11 January, "ut regnum suum a labe et haeresi Lutherana immune conservet" (Ibid., p. 553). 6. Calderwood, History, I., p. 80. 7. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 465.

to have "the hooll rule and autorite aboute...the yong King"¹ and was shortly to reach the summit of his power by his formal appointment as Chancellor on 6 August², "soe that it appereth the said Erle contynuethe in good autoritye"³; and although he could write complacently to Wolsey, on 29 December, that his intention had ever been to promote peace between the two realms and to do what might be acceptable to the King of England, that he "set at litill" the favours of France and that he would resist Albany, whose return had been rumoured⁴, the days of his power were numbered and were destined to come to a sudden end. In June, 1528, James escaped from Falkland to Stirling, where he was joined by certain of the leading nobles and churchmen. Angus and his brother, George, were forbidden to come within twelve miles of the court⁵; and, on 2 July, Angus and his friends departed from Edinburgh⁶. The king now entered the capital on the 6th of the month, accompanied by the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Bishops of Aberdeen, Dunkeld, Galloway and Brechin and the Earls of Argyle, Arran, Eglinton, Rothes and Bothwell and other lords with their servants to the number of 300 spears⁷; and, on 9 July, a royal proclamation forbade the king's subjects to have intercourse with Angus or his kin⁸. The Diurnal of Occurrents declares that Angus was ordered to be confined beyond Spey and his brother, George, and his uncle, Archibald, were to be warded in the Castle of Edinburgh; and, on their refusal of these conditions, were summoned to appear at a Parliament to be held at Edinburgh on 3 September⁹. Sentences of forfeiture was passed on all three by Parliament on 5 September¹⁰.

During the deliberations that followed the king's arrival in Edinburgh, Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow, was appointed Chancellor of the realm¹¹. The Great Seal had been taken from Archbishop Beaton in July, 1526; and it was probably in the custody of Angus before he became Chancellor on 6 August of the following year¹². Whatever hopes Beaton may have had of regaining the office were set at naught by the selection of his rival; and this was not calculated to sweeten their relationship. The date of Dunbar's appointment is given in Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis¹³ as 21 August, 1528; and this is also mentioned by Brunton and Haig¹⁴ as the date on which the Great Seal was delivered to him. But Dunbar is designed as holding the office

1. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 465. 2. A.D.C., 1501-54, Introd., p. xxii; H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 451, footnote, says 8 Aug. 3. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 476. 4. Ibid., pp. 484-485. 5. Diurnal, p. 11. 6. Ibid. 7. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 501. 8. Ibid. 9. Diurnal, p. 11, followed by Calderwood, History, I., p. 98. 10. A.P.S., II., pp. 324-326. 11. Diurnal, p. 11. 12. Vide supra. 13. I., pp. li-lii. 14. Senators of the College of Justice, p. 2.

on 8 July¹; and on 18 July, Dacre was able to report to Wolsey:

"Thaye have auctorized the Busshop of Glaskew, late the Kinges Scoolmaister, to be Chaunceller of Scotland"².

Buchanan, commenting on Dunbar's appointment, declares of the new Chancellor that "he was upright and learned, but rather deficient in political knowledge"³. This is the verdict of one who was a professed admirer of the Archbishop; but, if anything, it errs on the side of severity. If Dunbar did not have the length and variety of experience which Beaton, whom he superseded, possessed, he was no neophyte in statecraft. He had served on the Privy Council, to which he was appointed on 15 February, 1524/5⁴; he had been chosen as a commissioner for peace with England in August, 1525⁵, had been one of the Lords of the Articles in 1526⁶ and, on 13 March, 1526/7, was ordained to be President of the Council and to act as one of the judges sitting daily for the administration of justice during the time of the Session⁷. The choice of Dunbar, however, was made not so much for his political acumen; it was made because he was trusted by King James, who was now about to embark on the perilous venture - for a lad of sixteen - of ruling in person. Yet, apart from Beaton, it is difficult to believe that at this juncture a better choice than Dunbar could have been made; and it is significant that at this point in the reign of James V a Churchman was once more made Chancellor.

At the outset, Dunbar and his royal master showed themselves of one mind in the matter of their attitude to Angus. Henry VIII, on several occasions, interceded with James on Angus's behalf and interceded in vain; and, on 13 September, the Archbishop of Glasgow is mentioned as one of that earl's great enemies⁸. On 13 February following, Magnus speaks of Dunbar as one of the Scottish prelates and lords among whom "by all the wayes and meanes I couth devise or persuade" he could find no remedy for the cause of Angus⁹; and, towards the end of 1529 (2 December), Dunbar intimated to Henry VIII the aversion of the Lords of Council to a reconciliation between Angus and the king¹⁰. So strong, indeed, was the antagonism to Angus that, if we may credit Buchanan, Robert Cairncross, appointed Treasurer at the

1. A.D.C., 1501-54, Introd., p. xxii. 2. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 501.
 3. History of Scotland (tr. Aikman), II., p. 299. 4. A.P.S., II., p. 287. 5. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., Pt. I., 1545. 6. A.P.S., II., p. 307. 7. A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 256. 8. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 4728. James's replies to Henry's letters are in H.VIII S.P., IV. 9. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 558. 10. L. & P. H.VIII, IV., 6078.

same time as Dunbar was made Chancellor, was deposed from office after a short time, on suspicion of favouring the Douglasses¹; and Magnus's repeated attempts to persuade Dunbar and others to relent² proved fruitless. Nevertheless, in spite of the intransigent attitude of the Scottish King and Chancellor in this matter and the reports, inspired by Angus, of a projected league between the King of Scots and the Emperor³, a treaty of peace for a period of five years was concluded, on 14 December, between Scottish and English commissioners⁴; and Wolsey was able to inform Campeggio soon after that the affairs of Scotland were settled and the truce proclaimed and professed unconcern regarding the Duke of Albany⁵.

Peace with England being for the time secured, James and his Chancellor were free to turn their attention to matters of domestic policy; and the most clamant of these would appear to have been the question of restoring order and promoting the effective administration of law within the realm. This, indeed, was a corollary of the peace with England; for the disturbed state of the Marches had long been a potential source of friction between the two realms; and Scotland, in which the relaxed state of internal administration had given disturbers of the peace on the Borders their opportunity, was under obligation to play her part in bringing this lawless area to order. The reports that reached England from Scotland dwell on the disorder that characterized the period of faction-strife.

"Here is noe justice in this realme", writes Magnus to Wolsey on 9 January, 1524/5, "but contynual murdours, thefte and robry"⁶;

and again, on 2 December, 1526, the report reaches Dacre:

"As for thordouring of good justice there is noone done in all Scotland; for the Larde of Laughenbarre, who slewe the Larde of Brombye in Sancte Guyles Kirke dore, does go up and downe all this Parliament tyme at his pleasure in Edinburghe, without any maner of correction or punishment"⁷.

But it was specially the Border thieves that King James had in mind when, according to another report from Magnus, on 13 February, 1528/9, he imputed the growth of theft to the malpractices of the Earl of Angus, who would do nothing to amend the situation;

"Soe that therby, the said yong King affermeth, his subjectes were soe farre and yet ar oute of drede of Hym as thaire Soveraine Lorde, that it is not possible, without helpe of his dereste uncle to see reformation in that behalve. Howe be it, His Grace and his Counsaill shewe thaym selves clerely determynd to have better ordour..."⁸

1. Buchanan, History, II., p. 302. 2. E.g. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 537.
 3. Ibid., p. 532. 4. Ibid., p. 545, footnote. 5. Brewer, Henry VIII, II., p. 487. 6. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 289.
 7. Ibid., p. 461. 8. Ibid., p. 556.

It is tempting, in view of the subsequent foundation of the College of Justice, to argue that James was as good as his word; but it is impossible to accept this simple sequence of cause and effect as a true account of the rise of this (as it proved) highly controversial institution, the idea of which has been credited to Gavin Dunbar, the Chancellor.

In order to form some conjecture of the part played by Dunbar in the foundation of the College, it is necessary, at the outset, to remove one source of confusion. The foundation of the College of Justice has been taken to be identical with the foundation of the Court of Session. Mackay, for instance, writes:

"The Court of Session, the Supreme Civil Court in Scotland, was founded by an Act of the Parliament of Scotland, on 17 March, 1532....The supposition that (Beaton) was the king's adviser in the institution of this court appears erroneous and the credit of originating it was probably due to the Duke of Albany, who, though absent in France, was still frequently consulted by the King and to Gavin Dunbar, who besides being, as Chancellor, the highest officer of the law at the date of its institution, served as one of the Lords of the Articles in the successive Parliaments of 1528, 1531 and 1532"¹.

This statement is quite misleading. The Act of 1532 did not found the Court of Session, which, in essentials, was already and had been long in being, but was a temporary measure which authorized certain persons to sit and administer justice until the College of Justice was instituted². Dunbar's part in the foundation of the College, properly so-called, was incidental. On the other hand, he was probably, in the main, responsible for the emergence of the "Session" as a specialized branch of the Council, a development with which he had been associated even before he was appointed Chancellor and which was urgently desirable as a measure of judicial reform, in order to remedy the congestion of processes and somewhat haphazard administration of justice in civil causes, as well as to secure greater competence and more constant attendance on the part of the judges.

It has been observed that

"though sessions of council for civil causes...began at least as early as 1478 and in the reign of James III, it is probably correct to say that under James IV the Court of Session became a definite institution"³.

The differentiation of the function of the Session, as that part of the Council specially entrusted with judicial business, had no opportunity, however, to become clear during the troubled years that followed Flodden; and the congestion of civil actions

1. Mackay, Practice of the Court of Session, I., p. 1.

2. A.P.S., II., pp. 235-236.

3. Hannay, College of Justice, p. 22.

through the accumulation of privileged cases and the irregularity of attendance on the part of the lords remained unremedied. It is not till the Spring of 1526 that eight men are named

"to be adjonit with the lordis of secrete counsale and ministeris of court to sitt upon this nixt Sessioun"¹.

On 13 March of the following year, ordinances under the king's signature

"haiffing consideratioun that justice and administratioun thairoff is the principalle uphald and sustentatioun of his grace realme and liegis",

directed the "Cessione upon civile caus" which had been continued to 11 March to sit and administer justice under the presidency of Archbishop Dunbar, its membership and procedure being specified. About thirty persons, with an almost equal representation of the spiritual and temporal estates, were appointed and were ordained to make a roll of cases so that they could be carried through expeditiously. The judges were enjoined to ignore letters granted under the king's hand - James had now entered upon the exercise of his royal authority - tending "to stop or hynder justice" and to admit no such writings unless they came by way of the king's secretary and submitted reasonable causes for intervention². The list of judges, it has been noted, seems to suggest an attempt to prefer professional competence to feudal or ecclesiastical standing. Another ordinance of November, 1527, or 1528, which may be due to Dunbar, goes further to specialize the Session's activities and lays down more precise rules for the conduct of business³; and, early in 1531, the Chancellor introduced a new set of rules, under the king's signature, "anentis the ordouring of the sessione and lordis that suld have voit tharin". The Chancellor is made responsible for the observance of these "premissis", a provision which may be taken as a mark of confidence in Dunbar rather than a safeguard against his negligence. Fifteen representatives of the spiritual estate (besides the Chancellor) and thirteen of the temporal estate were to be members of the Court⁴, which had thus a preponderance of clergy in its membership.

The scheme, contemplated by Dunbar⁵, whereby the Session was to become a specialized department of the Council for the administration of civil law, had so far matured; and as a project for the more efficient working of the machinery of justice it does

1. A.D.C., 1501-54, p. xxxiii. 2. Hannay, College of Justice, pp. 31-32; A.D.C., 1501-54, pp. xxxiii-xxxiv. 3. Hannay, op. cit., p. 33. 4. Ibid., p. 34. 5. Who, as Chancellor, was in charge of the arrangements for hearing civil causes.

credit to Dunbar as a good servant of the State; nor is that credit diminished by the fact that the project lent itself to exploitation. The Court of Session was largely of Dunbar's creating; but at this stage, it was plain that if the attendance of the qualified persons who were to form the body of judges was to be secured, salaries must be found for them. Dunbar could not have anticipated that this désideratum was to be used by the Crown as a pretext for obtaining, by the spoliation of the Church, revenues for other ends. The scheme for a College of Justice, which was eventually promulgated, was an afterthought, an improvization of the royal policy with which Dunbar was associated, although it is difficult to believe that he was admitted to full knowledge of its intrigues nor fully understood its implications.

On 9 July, 1531, James's guile came to light when Pope Clement VIII communicated to the Scottish prelates, for their opinion, a proposal that 10000 ducats should be contributed yearly from ecclesiastical benefices in Scotland to the Crown for the protection and defence of the realm¹ - which was officially at peace with England; and on 17 July, in view of the menacing aspect of the times, the lack of resources and the need of help from the spiritual estate, he imposed upon the Scottish Church a charge of three-tenths of the fruits of benefices, payable at the end of three years, Dunbar being named as one of the executors². Finally, on 13 September, another bull was issued relating that Albany had urged the king's desire to establish a college of justice for the decision of civil causes, half of its members to be Churchmen, and that as there were no available resources, the Pope had been asked to impose a subsidy on the prelates, whose interest in civil order was not less than that of others. He accordingly ordained the prelates to contribute yearly a sum of 10000 gold ducats, so long as the king and his successors should be faithful to the apostolic see. Dunbar is once more named as one of the three executors³. Here the object of the subsidy is for the first time indicated as the College of Justice; and the importation of the College as a pretext for the tax on benefices was clearly in the nature of an afterthought. The needs of the Session were adroitly used as a means of obtaining income for the depleted royal treasury.

James had seized an opportune moment for making an approach to the Pope. Financial resources were urgently needed by the Crown; and he could count on the support of the Emperor Charles V, whose sister had been proposed as a possible bride for the

1. Theiner, Vet. Mon., p. 597.
p. 52.

2. Hannay, College of Justice,
3. Ibid., p. 53.

Scottish king and in whose eyes, as well as the Pope's, the protection of the realm against Henry of England (despite the five years' truce) would at least appear plausible. From the point of view of Clement, objections to the daring proposal for raiding the wealth of the Church were outweighed by the necessity of retaining the allegiance of the King of Scots to the Holy See; and, in 1532, on the strength of the concession made to James, he was to send Silvester Darius to stimulate the king's action against heresy¹. The College of Justice, which is latterly mentioned as the destination of the subsidy, was probably adduced, it has been suggested, as an institution intelligible to Italians, through the ingenuity of Erskine of Halton, the king's secretary and agent at Rome²; and it is at least unlikely that a churchman would, in the first instance, be involved in the tortuous negotiations for the achievement of the king's plan.

That James's plan for relieving his financial stringency at the expense of the Church was premeditated seems more than probable; his correspondence indicates that he was preparing the way for its execution by adroit manoeuvres to secure the support of the Pope and the leading Scottish churchmen and that only the pretext, which, as we have seen, was first the defence of the realm and then the College of Justice, was for some time in doubt. Beaton had been brought back to the Council towards the end of 1528³; but James, writing on 29 May, 1529 to Pope Clement VII on the exemption question, gave an unflattering account of the Archbishop of St. Andrews and committed himself strongly to the support of his rival of Glasgow. The Archbishop of St. Andrews, he declared, does not desist from raising fresh litigation against Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, his Chancellor, who increasingly commends himself by his personal qualities, while Beaton is proportionately difficult to deal with. By the stratagems of Beaton, who tries to ensnare a man devoid of guile, Dunbar has become involved in toils from which he cannot extricate himself without great labour and expense. It is the king's duty to defend his Chancellor. In spite of the persistent attempt to reduce the exemption of Glasgow, which was granted at the king's request, James professes himself resolved that Beaton shall not have his will of the gentlest of men and has sought⁴ the support of Albany. The exemption, he urges, should remain. James, however, seems to have realized that it might be well to avoid the complete alienation of the Archbishop of St. Andrews and the rhetoric which had been devoted to the portrayal of the injured innocence of Dunbar was now utilized

1. Archbps. of St. Ands., III., p. 219. 2. Vide Hannay, College of Justice, p. 54. 3. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 540.
4. Tynningham Letter Book, G.R.H.

in making to Beaton amends which might be regarded as handsome if we could believe them sincere. On 18 January, 1529/30, James wrote to the Pope in the Primate's favour, deploring rumours that the Archbishop of St. Andrews is the object of his enmity. Such is not that prelate's desert for his service to the Crown. Now the Archbishop's constancy becomes conspicuous and his vigorous counsel, which James values and would always have used but for the malice of others who administered his affairs and were more responsible than the king for injuries for which he desires to see compensation made to the Archbishop. James therefore commends him and the privileges and liberties of his see to the Pope, with the desire that unjust treatment may be rectified; desiring also, if that cannot conveniently be done, that the Pope will grant him other privileges and treat him with the favour he deserves¹. On the same date, writing in similar terms to the Cardinal of Ancona, the Scottish king admits that a few years ago, when the Archbishop was Chancellor, the faction opposed to him prevailed and he was deposed from office. Having lost heavily in consequence and having become for a time a private rather than a public person, his personal affairs and the privileges of his see suffered. James could not consider the case till he was old enough to be a judge of character. He testifies to the constancy and courageous counsel of a man whom he has not treated with the malevolence attributed to him by enemies; and he wishes that neither the Archbishop, his cause nor the rights of his see should be injured². Yet if James was prepared to make these disarming admissions of Beaton's grievances, he made no explicit mention of the Archbishop's chief grievance; and if he did not hesitate to recommend, in general terms, the Archbishop and the privileges and liberties of his see to the favourable consideration of the Pope, he carefully refrained from the mention, among these privileges, of the primatial jurisdiction over the see of Glasgow. The Scottish king, in fact, was attempting something akin to the policy recommended by Magnus to Wolsey five years previously, except that while Magnus had proposed that some attempt be made to placate Dunbar, James now sought that Beaton might be cajoled in similar fashion by some trivial concession. That James, however, was intent to humour rather than to satisfy Beaton was soon to be evident; for not only did he withhold encouragement from the Archbishop's primatial claims; he obstructed his ambition after legatine authority. On 6 April, 1530, James dispatched a letter to Albany, in which the Duke was instructed to show the Pope that the Churchmen were out of

1. Tynningham Letter Book, G.R.H.

2. Ibid.

hand and to ask him for the appointment of an upright God-fearing Scot, to be selected by the king, with advice of his Council, as legate a latere and, if the Pope pleases, to be raised to the cardinalate. In a more explicit communication to the Pope (2 November), in which James proclaims himself a champion of the reform of the Church, he proposes for the legatine office - which is not for the ambitious, proud or wealthy, but for one conspicuous by his life, character and ability - Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, his Chancellor and former preceptor, who will not know that he has been proposed until he has letters to that effect from the Pope¹. On the 30th of the same month, King James now exerted himself definitely to debar Beaton from the legateship. The king, his letter to the Pope declares, learns that Beaton would have claimed the office of legate, with power a latere throughout the whole realm, had the matter not been impeded by Albany. The Archbishop frequently asked James's support to obtain the faculty, but the king was unmoved until at last he consented that Beaton should exercise the office in his own diocese. Beaton, on the strength of the royal signature, now seeks the extensive commission against the king's will and his judgement that the Archbishop is unworthy of the dignity. James requests the Pope to withhold this concession; and Albany, he declares, will state his attitude more explicitly².

It may have been the knowledge that his authority was confirmed by royal support that prompted Dunbar, about this time, to take action against his suffragan, Henry Wemyss, Bishop of Candida Casa, who, in some unexplained fashion, had utilized his privileges as Bishop of the Chapel Royal, a dignity conjoined to the see of Candida Casa, to evade Dunbar's metropolitan jurisdiction. On 7 February, 1530/1, an instrument records that Henry, Bishop of Candida Casa, having received absolution and remission of certain sentences of the Archbishop and having made protestation that he would keep the rules of the Chapel Royal, made profession of obedience to Dunbar as his metropolitan³. Dunbar's position was now consolidated by a bull of 21 September, 1531, which, after reciting the vicissitudes of the case - it states that, according to the account of King James and Albany, Beaton, who during James's minority had governed the realm as he pleased, contrived, by letters extorted from the young king, the modification of the original exemption whereby Glasgow was freed from metropolitan but subject to primatial and legatine authority and involved Dunbar in litigation and expense - exempts the Archbishop and province of Glasgow from the primatial

1. Tynningham Letter Book, G.R.H. 2. Ibid. = Theiner, Vet. Mon., p. 594. 3. R.E.G., II., 498.

and legatine authority of St. Andrews¹. A further snub to Beaton was given by James in a letter of 9 March, 1531/2 to the Cardinal of Ravenna, regarding the Archbishop's suit at the Vatican concerning the teinds and fruits of Stow - the Cardinal should make every effort, James declares, to prevent such evils and direct the paternal rage of the Pope to the case so that he may suffer not the subtle devices of men to change immemorial Scottish practice for the convenience or rather the passion for victory of the Archbishop².

That Dunbar's support was secured by James is shown by a letter in which Northumberland informs Henry VIII, on 3 September, 1532, that all the Scottish prelates were hostile to the king, except the Archbishop of Glasgow and the Bishops of Dunkeld and Aberdeen³. The same communication declares that the Archbishop of St. Andrews and all the spirituality of Scotland, except those three prelates, had been informed by the Pope that the king had now restricted his demand to a sum of £4000 sterling, to be paid in four years. The implications of this statement are supported by other evidence. Beaton, it has been said, "led a large majority in opposition to the ecclesiastical contribution which the king sought to impose"⁴; and the king showed himself prepared to make still further abatement of his demands. By March, 1535, when the papal bull of foundation was granted, the sum had been reduced from £10000 to £1400⁵; and when Beaton was imprisoned in 1533 and made the subject of a lengthy complaint to the Pope which ended with a request that the process against the Archbishop of St. Andrews might be conducted in Scotland by commission granted to Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, George, Bishop of Dunkeld, William, Bishop of Aberdeen or others⁶, the charge of treason made against him was founded on his attitude to the French-English question⁷ rather than to the subsidy. The king found it advisable to make some compromise with the Church, which (following, perhaps, the precedent of Henry VIII's "Amicable Loan") he was ready to exploit but could not afford to alienate. The circumstances of his assumption of the royal authority had inevitably evoked the enmity of a considerable section of the nobility; and the tension between the Crown and the nobles, among whom there were none to rival the Churchmen in ability, tended steadily to increase. Angus had been banished, Crawford deprived of a large part of his inheritance, Murray and Maxwell were disconsidered⁸. Pinkerton is justified in declaring that "the Church afforded

1. R.E.G., II., 499. 2. Tynningham Letter Book, G.R.H.
 3. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 617. 4. Archbps. of St. Ands., III., p. 220. 5. Hannay, College of Justice, p. 66. 6. Archbps. of St. Ands., III., p. 230. 7. This transpires in the letter to the Pope. 8. Pinkerton, History, II., p. 311.

the only men in his kingdom capable of political discussion and decision"¹; and the renewed danger of war with England made "the protection and defence of the realm" a plausible enough reason for looking to the financial resources of the Church. On the other hand, it was in the interests of the prelates that, being largely represented on the court, they should play a preponderating part in the administration of civil justice; and the obligation of the king to the Church might be expected to stiffen his attitude towards the growing menace of heresy. Organized and outright opposition on the part of the Church was, in any case, made difficult by the antagonism of St. Andrews and Glasgow, which delayed the summoning of a Provincial Council.

If Archbishop Dunbar, as Chancellor, was committed to keep pace with the opportunism of James V, there is at the same time reason to believe that he took the project of the College of Justice seriously; and evidence is forthcoming that, before the arrival of the 1535 bull, he had taken steps, with the concurrence of the king, to increase the efficiency of the session. On 13 February, 1532/3, the Chancellor

"exponit that it was the kingis mynd that (na) man beand apoun the seite of sessioun suld pas to ony oistis or weiris, bot remane and vaikie upon the sessioun and consale, and that thai suld incur na dangeir in thair persouns, landis nor gudis for remaning fra the saidis oistis, raidis, armyis or weiris; and commandit to insert the samin in the bukis of consale"².

On 27 May following, the Chancellor and the Abbot of Cambuskenneth, president of the court, had been given power by the king to receive the oaths of absentees and the king's command to the Chancellor, president and lords of session to make rules, statutes and ordinances "to be observit and kept in thar manner and ordour of proceeding at all tymes" is recorded³. In 1532/3, seven members of the session, the president and six lords, received salaries from the Crown⁴. But it was not till 1541 that the institution of the College in 1532 was confirmed and the bull of Paul III ratified⁵. The work of judicial reform with which Dunbar had been associated, however much side-tracked and delayed, at length achieved permanent results. It is perhaps an implicit indication of the part played by the Archbishop of Glasgow in the establishment of the College that the Beatons withheld payment

1. Pinkerton, History, II., p. 311. 2. A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 397.
3. Ibid. 4. Hannay, College of Justice, p. 57. 5. Ibid., p. 73.

of their quotas due from the Archbishopric of St. Andrews and the Abbey of Arbroath for 1536 and succeeding years until proceedings were taken against them in 1541¹. But, on the other hand, it must be admitted that in 1540-41, Dunbar's own payments were in arrears to the extent of £666-13-4².

James's letter to the Pope, on 2 November, 1530, had declared he had often purposed, when the country was quieter and faction pacified, that the various abuses in the Church should be removed and that the Pope should be asked to appoint a good man with a faculty a latere, not only to remedy these abuses but also to extirpate new errors. He has, so he informs the Pope, made so strong a stand that his laws have prevented anyone educated in the Lutheran fold daring to hold these views in Scotland. But, owing to the carelessness of the prelates, they crop up. He goes on to nominate Gavin Dunbar for the legateship³. If this was at least as much a bid for the Pope's favour as the expression of a genuine desire on the part of the king to purify and strengthen the Church - it is at least probable that the king's concern for "abuses" was influenced by the English bill of 1529 which dealt with such matters - the Act of Parliament of 1532 which preceded the Act generally taken as inaugurating the College of Justice was concerned with the defence of the Church's freedom and the annulment of anything done to the contrary⁴ and was evidently an acknowledgement of favours received from the Pope. The papal nuncio, who was present during this year in Scotland, strove to obtain from the Scots king proof of his professed championship of the Church by action against heresy; and there is evidence of repressive measures against anonymous Lutherans⁵. Calderwood relates that, in March, 1533, Walter Stewart, brother of Lord Ochiltree, was accused before Archbishop Dunbar of casting down an image in the kirk of Ayr. It is perhaps characteristic of the absence of fanaticism in the Archbishop of Glasgow that Stewart was persuaded "after long dealing with him" to recant⁶.

On 8 May, 1534, the Lords of Council, with whom were associated the Provincial of the Blackfriars and the Warden of the Greyfriars, considered measures proposed by the king for putting down Lutheranism. These were concerned with the importation of Lutheran books, the arrival and harbouring of Lutheran agents and apostate friars and the preaching of heresy. Dunbar,

1. Hannay, College of Justice, pp. 72-73. 2. MS. Master of Works Accounts, G.R.H., Vol. VII, f. 1. 3. Tynningham Letter Book, G.R.H. 4. A.P.S., II., p. 335. 5. Archbps. of St. Ands., III., pp. 206, 220. 6. History, I., p. 104.

as Chancellor, proposed

"gif the kingis grace mycht put his act of parliament maid aganis the hame bringaris and withhaldaris of the bukis and opinionis of the heretice luther and his discipulis without dirogatioun (to the) liberte and jurisdiction of halykirk"; and the Lords assented¹. Likewise, on 22 August of the same year, the Chancellor brought before the Lords of Council the case of James Melville, an apostate Observant, who "past furth of his religion", has been apostate for many years "and is now laittlie returnit in this realme, takin and apprehendit in seculer habite as ane man of weir". The friar, it is recommended to the king, is to be handed over to the religious "that he past fra" and to be retained by them pending the instructions of the Pope². It is significant that the leading Churchman of the realm, who was also Chancellor, associated himself with and probably gave a lead to a policy of repression by the imposition of a ban on the entry of Lutheran publications and preachers rather than a policy of repression by extermination at the stake. Heresy, in other words, was to be attacked by the repression of opinions rather than of persons; and although both James V and his Chancellor were present at Holyrood on 24 September, 1534, when sentence of excommunication was passed on James Hamilton of Kincavill, Sheriff of Linlithgow, as a relapsed heretic and protector of heretics, for possessing forbidden books, denying Purgatory and the invocation of the saints and using the Lord's Prayer in the vernacular, and Hamilton, for his non-compearance, was declared contumacious and handed over to the secular arm³, there is good reason for emphasizing, with Pinkerton⁴, that the number of executions in James's reign on account of religion - as compared with one year of Henry VIII's régime in England - were few; and good reason also for the view that Dunbar, like his royal master, was intent enough on destroying heresy, but averse to the bloody methods, e.g. of David Beaton.

In the Diary of Peter Suavenius, there appears an illuminating entry recording an interview with Archbishop Dunbar which took place sometime between February and July, 1535:

"He said I had written well about democracy - that it was the worst form of government...He said he had read the speech of the Lubeckers. (I) asked him how he liked it. He said it seemed to him very heretical, because it tried to weaken the authority of the Church and therefore he thought that whatever the English are now doing against the Church was done by their persuasion"⁵.

1. A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 423. 2. Ibid., p. 426. 3. L. & P. H.VIII, VII., 1184. 4. History, II., pp. 326-327. 5. L. & P. H.VIII, VIII., p. 470.

The views expressed by the Archbishop are those of a firm supporter of the "old religion"; but they suggest that Dunbar's, and perhaps James's, antagonism to Lutheranism was intensified by the English Reformation, then in progress, and that, in their eyes, the religious developments in the neighbouring kingdom might be fraught with political danger. Dunbar's attitude to England ere now had been duly reported to Henry VIII. On 27 December, 1531, Northumberland informed the English king of a conversation between James and his Chancellor, after an interview between the King of Scots and an ambassador from the Emperor:

"Howe much are we bounden (said King James) unto the Emperour, that in the mater concernyng our style, which so long he hath set about for our honour, that shalbe by Hym discussed on Ester day and that we may lauffully wryte Our selff Prince of England and Duke of York. To which the Chaunceler said: I pray God I may see the day the Pope conferme the same"¹.

Again, on 23 August of the following year, it was reported from the same source that four thousand Scots were with "Machonell" in Ireland, the secret of whose business there was known only to the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Bishop of Aberdeen, Harry Kemp and Davy Wod².

Dunbar appears, on 22 July, 1534, as proposing to the Council an ordinance regarding "Clanquhattane callit McKintosche", guilty of great crimes and cruelty and "nevir profittable to the kingis grace nor realme in weir nor pece"; and charging that none of the king's lieges obey McIntosh as chief and that none be named captain of Clan Chattan, as the king, with advice of the Lords of Council, has

"dischargit and cryit doun perpetually the said capitane and clane and naime of McIntosche and all uthir maner of heid or chiftane of that sort of the Clanquhattan"³.

A letter of somewhat uncertain date⁴ sent by Angus to his brother reports that the clergy are met in General Council in Edinburgh on certain articles that the king has put to them. There is some reason for supposing that this report of the convocation of a Council was premature; but the articles, as given by Angus, may be taken as indication the "abuses" which the king proposed to reform in 1530:

"This was the pwnctis of the Kyngis charg and command, as I was adwertesit; bydand the Clarge gyff ovr the cros presandes and the owmest claycht throw all Schotland, that thai sowld be na mayr tayne, and at ewere man swld haif his awn teynd,

1. H.VIII S.P., IV., pp. 598-599. 2. L. & P. H.VIII, V., 1246. A letter of Henry VIII, of 1534, refers to support given by Scots to the Irish rebels (H.VIII S.P., V., p. 4). 3. A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 425. 4. In H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 667, it is dated 24 March, 1534 (1533/4), but it probably belongs to 1535 or later.

*It must be
March 35/6 as it refers expressly to the
Ear. Council.*

payand tharfor for his teyndis syklyk as he payis to his landis lord of his malys and na meyr for all his hayll tendes... The kyrkmen of Schotland was newer sa ewyll content"¹.

Whether these "reforms" were indeed submitted to a General Council cannot be said; but it is clear that after the bull erecting the College of Justice had been granted on 10 March, 1534/5, the Provincial Council was revived, at the instigation of the king, for its acceptance. That body had not met since 1470, owing to the strife between St. Andrews and Glasgow; and in connection with the calling of the proposed Council, the tension between the rival archbishops was to come, once more, to light. An Act of Parliament of 12 June, 1535, had decreed that

"the Archibischop of Sanctandris (who was not present) be requirit be the Kingis Grace to sett and halde the said Counsale at the said day (1 March, 1535/6), the hale clergy beand lauchfullie warnit therto as efferis".

Following on this act,

"My Lord Archibischop of Glasgw, Chancellor, askit instrumentis that forsamekle as thare is on article deuisit and concludit that ane General Provinciale Counsale be haldin...and that my Lord of Sanctandris be warnit and requirit be the Kingis Grace to halde the samyn, that my said Lord Chancellor for the commone wele of this realme consentis that the said Archibischop of Sanctandris hald the samyn, without preiudice off his Archibishoprie of Glasgw, priuelege and jurisdictione grantit to him or his successouris"².

The summons to the Council issued by Beaton to Dunbar is couched in terms which are far from conciliatory. After referring to Dunbar's assent to the holding of the Council, it proceeds:

"To our paternity as archbishop-metropolitan...of the Church of St. Andrews, the chief and foremost and patronal church of his kingdom...and as primate of the whole kingdom and legatus natus of the Holy See,...the most splendid piety and prudence of the royal majesty by his letters, full of comfort and conceived with all the sagacity of his mind... has signified that all these things should be done..."³.

On the other hand, Dunbar's summons to the Bishop of Lismore, his suffragan, merely invites him to the Council, to which, the Archbishop declares, he has given his consent, but without prejudice to himself or to his church⁴.

That the contention of the Archbishops was not a mere ecclesiastical squabble and that lay partizans were active in it

1. H.VIII S.P., IV., p. 667. 2. A.P.S., II., p. 342.
3. Patrick, Statutes, p. 239. 4. Ibid., p. 241.

is demonstrated by a letter of uncertain date, but perhaps of 15 August, c. 1535, written by Matthew, Earl of Lennox, requesting his brother, John Stewart, Lord D'Aubigny, to expedite at Rome the cause of Dunbar

"twichand the prewileig and fredom of the Kyrk of Glasgw, to the quhylkis 3e and I, and all our hows, ar bowndyn to defent, as we ar natyf born servandis to sent Mungow and to that kirk"¹.

It is possible that some unrecorded negotiations regarding the exemption had been going on about this time and there is mention in a record which will presently be noted of a compact between the two prelates. But whatever the nature of that compact was, it was not enough to restrain Beaton from taking a step which, as he must have known, was provocative of ill-feeling and from setting a precedent which his successor was only too faithfully - one would add, only too willingly - to follow. If the struggle between the Archbishops had hitherto been waged mainly by diplomacy or intrigue at the Vatican, its complexion was changed when Beaton carried the war into his enemy's country.

On 22 November, 1535, John Turner, rector of Annan and official of Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, protested in the presence of James, Archbishop of St. Andrews, who was visiting Dumfries, that he (Beaton) elevated and bore his cross and gave blessings to the people of that town within the diocese of Glasgow in token of preeminence and authority, although he had none there and contravened the apostolic indult and privilege granted to the archbishop and his metropolitan church of Glasgow. Beaton replied that he was primate of the realm of Scotland and legatus natus, that there was a compact between the two archbishops and that he would raise and carry his cross were the Archbishop of Glasgow himself present. The official then protested that the incident should not prejudice the indults and privileges of the archbishop and metropolitan church of Glasgow and took instruments to that effect². This, as it proved, was to be the last bout between Dunbar and James Beaton.

Meanwhile, there was every appearance of a continuance of peaceful relations with England. In 1534, a letter of Henry VIII to Sir William Howard instructs the English representative to press James to attend a meeting of the French and English sovereigns and to offer the Scots king the Order of the Garter³; and, on 21 February, 1534/5, James was invested with the Order

1. Lennox, II., p. 192. Cf. p. 14 supra. 2. R.E.G., II., 500.
3. Dunbar, Scottish Kings, p. 233.

at Holyroodhouse¹. Henry, at this time, was pressing on his work of Reformation and had, by the Act of Supremacy (1534), been declared Head of the Church of England, while Cromwell was made Vicar General in 1535. We may take it that Otterburn's statement of the attitude of the King of Scots to England in 1535 (the letter is dated 12 December) is not, however, much wide of the mark:

"And quhowbeit we can nocht agre in the opiniois concerning the auctorite of the Paipe and kirkmen, 3eit nochttheles I knaw perfytle that the Kingis Hienes my Souerane will keip his kyndnes and trefy of peax, contractit be ws in the name and behalff of our Soueranis, without any inclinacione to the contrar"¹.

On 18 July, 1536, an Act of the English Parliament, extinguishing the authority of the Bishop of Rome, received the royal assent². Meanwhile, although the question of a meeting of the two kings continued to be mentioned, James was reported to Henry VIII, on 13 May, as very unsteadfast and was stated to have applied to the Pope for a prohibition against meeting the English king³; and in September, 1536, after a first attempt in July, James sailed for France, there to marry Madeleine de Valois, eldest daughter of Francis I, on 1 January, 1536/7. James was to remain out of Scotland for eight months and a half, but a record under the Great Seal, of 29 August, 1536, shows that James, Archbishop of St. Andrews, primate of the whole realm and *legatus natus*, Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, Chancellor, the Earls of Huntly, Montrose and Eglinton and Lord Maxwell were appointed a council of regency, the Chancellor always to be present at its meetings⁴. As Chancellor, Dunbar signs the letter, of 26 February, 1536/7, directed by the regents to Henry VIII in reply to his demand, to which they return a temporizing answer, for giving up fugitive rebels in Scotland (evidently English monks who had found refuge in the Abbey of Jedburgh)⁵. On 11 April, 1537, he communicates with Norfolk on the same subject, declaring "thar salbe na thing ondone for our part that belangis to the conservatioun of the peax"⁶; and, again, on 25 April, he assures Norfolk, regarding his complaint of the harbouring of rebels at Jedburgh, that justice will be strictly administered⁷.

Although James had not consulted Henry VIII on the matter of his marriage, as the queen-mother had not failed to inform the English king⁸, Henry's first approach to James, in May, 1537, after the return of the King of Scots from France, was made by Sadler, who came to Scotland, armed with elaborate instructions -

1. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 14. 2. Dunbar, *Scottish Kings*, p. 233.
 3. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 46. 4. R.M.S., III., 1618.
 5. Hamilton Papers, I., 38. 6. *Ibid.*, 40. 7. L. & P. H.VIII, XII., 1043. 8. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 65.

he was to assure King James that Henry's recent warlike measures in England were for defence not offence and to make profession of Henry's amicable attitude towards his nephew. But, above all, Sadler was to put forward an array of arguments in an attempt to shake James's allegiance to the Roman Church¹. James did not waver; but his attitude to the Church was cynical enough and is well described by Pinkerton, who speaks of James as "being far from bigotted and only protecting the clergy because their opulence could best pay for his favour"².

In the following year, James was to make almost his last recognition of Dunbar's fidelity; for, on 29 July, 1538, the Archbishop of Glasgow was granted by the Pope the Abbey of Inchaffray in commendam, at the king's request³. Unlike many other prelates of the period, Dunbar appears to have held only this one benefice in addition to the archbishopric. It remained in his possession till his death.

The position of Gavin Dunbar, both in Church and State, was now to be profoundly affected by the emergence into the centre of affairs of one who had hitherto shown himself an able and active Churchman and diplomat and who, once established in the seat of authority, was to prove himself a formidable and successful rival of the Archbishop of Glasgow to the extent of ousting him from his place of preeminence in the realm. James Beaton was now incapacitated for the duties of the archbishopric of St. Andrews; on 5 December, 1538, David Beaton, Abbot of Arbroath, was appointed his coadjutor; and, on 20 December, raised to the rank of Cardinal. The death of James Beaton, on 14 February, 1538/9, made way for his succession as Archbishop and Primate.

In an incredibly short time, David Beaton was able to make his influence felt; and, first, as a relentless foe of heretics. James Beaton had not displayed against heresy a fierce persecuting zeal. It was to be supplied by his successor. According to the account of Knox⁴, the burning of Friar Keillor, Friar Beveridge, Sir Duncan Symson, Robert Frostar and Thomas Forret, vicar of Dollar, who were put to death simultaneously as heretics in February, 1538/9, was witnessed by the Archbishop of Glasgow as well as the Cardinal. Thereafter, Knox declares,

"To the effect that the rest of the Bischoppes mycht schaw thame selfis no less fervent to suppress the light of God than hie of Sanctandrose was, war apprehended two (Russell and Kennedy) in the Diosey of Glasgw".

Dunbar is not mentioned as having caused their apprehension; but to carry through the trial and "to caus him dippe his handis

1. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 81 seq. 2. History, II., p. 352.
 3. L. & P. H.VIII, XIII., 1494; Chs. of Inchaffray, p. 256.
 Dunbar appears as Commendator of Inchaffray, 10 Dec., 1540 (R.M.S., III., 2232, 2233) and 28 Feb., 1542 (Ibid., 2993). 4. Works, I., pp. 62-63.

in the blood of the Sanctes of God", three commissaries, Lauder, Oliphant and Maltman, were sent by Beaton. At the trial, in contrast to Beaton's emissaries, the Archbishop showed a disposition to mercy:

"I think it better to spayr these men nor to putt thame to death. Wharat the idiot Doctouris offended said, What will ye do, my Lord? Will ye condempne all that my Lord Cardinall and the other Bischoppes and we have done? Yf so ye do, ye schaw your self ennemye to the kirk and as and so will we repute yow, be ye assured. At which wordis, the faythless man effrayed, adjudgeed the innocentis to dye, according to the desyre of the wicked"¹.

Again, Beaton made his influence felt in the question of the exemption of the see of Glasgow. On his succession to the primacy, one of his first steps was, in terms of an alleged agreement with Dunbar, to obtain a bull from Pope Paul III (14 May, 1539), limiting the exemption of Glasgow to the period of the present archbishop's tenure of office². But somewhat later in the same year, (viz. on 16 November), he showed that James Beaton's precedent at Dumfries in 1535 had not been lost on his successor and the question of his right to carry his cross in the province of Glasgow was mooted in a communication addressed to Andrew Oliphant, vicar of Foulis, his agent at the Vatican, who was instructed to obtain from the Pope a brief to the effect that he, as Primate, might have his cross carried before him

"per totum regnum Scotiae et in diocesi et provincia Glasguensi et aliis locis qualitercunque exemptis absque tamen praejudicio exceptionum earundem"³;

and, immediately after, the Cardinal repeated the challenge of his predecessor to the rights of Glasgow by elevating his cross at Dumfries. A protest of 27 November, 1539, by John Turner, rector of Annan, Dunbar's commissary, who, as Official, had protested against the like action of James Beaton in 1535, declared that the raising and carrying of the Cardinal's cross publicly in the burgh of Dumfries should not prejudice the exemption of the Archbishop of Glasgow. The Cardinal, in reply, admitted and approved the exemption and affirmed that the carrying of his cross in the diocese of Glasgow would in no wise prejudice Dunbar nor his exemption. The cross was borne before him as Primate of Scotland, as former Archbishops of St. Andrews had done in the diocese of Glasgow, even when the Archbishop of that diocese was exempt, and now without prejudice to Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow⁴. A little later (10 December), we find Beaton

1. Knox, Works, I., pp. 63-66. 2. Statuta, I., p. cxxx.
3. Sadler's State Papers, I., 14. 4. R.E.G., II., 502.

instructing Oliphant to "speed the bulls" concerning the exemption of Glasgow "conform to the supplication and mandate that we and the Archbishop of Glasgow consented to"¹. It appears that at this time the attempt on Beaton's part to obtain authority from Rome for the bearing of his cross in Dunbar's diocese was unsuccessful²; but, as will transpire, the Cardinal did not allow the matter to lapse. Meanwhile King James had been petitioning the Pope to grant legatine authority to the Cardinal (10 August, 1539; 31 July, 1540)³; and at the trial of Sir John Borthwick for heresy, while the Archbishop of Glasgow was president of the court, judgement was pronounced by Beaton⁴.

On 15 September, 1537, Norfolk had given an unflattering account of James's unpopularity with his people:

"So sore a dred king and so ill beloved of his subjectes was never in that londe; every man that hath any substance fearyng to have a quarrel made to hym therefore"⁵;

and Buchanan thus describes the situation:

"As the king was both covetous and needy, the priests and nobles were equally afraid and each endeavoured to avert the tempest from themselves...The different factions pointed out the riches of his opponents as a booty ready for him whenever he chose; and he, by agreeing alternately with either, kept both in a state of suspense...wherefore when ambassadors from the King of England came at that time to court, desiring that he would meet his uncle at York and promising him great advantages if he would comply, the party that opposed the clergy used every endeavour to persuade the king to attend...the conference. When the priests understood this...the readiest method of providing a remedy for the present evil...was to operate upon the king's fondness for money by offering an immense subsidy...They first promised they would themselves contribute yearly 30000 gold crowns...Besides from the confiscation of their estates who rebelled against the Pope and the majesty of the king, who troubled the Church by new and execrable errors...there might be raised upwards of 100000 gold crowns more annually if the king would only allow them to name a lord chief justice, as they could not sit in criminal cases; and in managing the process and procuring judgement, there could neither be difficulty nor delay, since so many thousand men did not hesitate to peruse the books of the Old and New Testament, to discuss the power of the Pope, to despise

1. Sadler's State Papers, I., p. 16. 2. Rentale S. Andree, pp. xlvi-xlviii. 3. Archbps. of St. And's., IV., pp. 40-41, 53-54. 4. Ibid., p. 52. 5. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 109.

the ancient rites of the Church and to deny all obedience and reverence to churchmen¹..²

That this account is substantially correct will appear in the subsequent narrative.

The Church was not only prepared "to pay for the king's favour" and to stimulate his zeal against heresy. Under the tutelage of Beaton, it was now fostering an attitude of hostility to England. Norfolk reported to Cromwell, on 29 March, 1539, two facts not unrelated to each other: that the Scots had been summoned to take arms; and that a friar had preached a sermon at Linlithgow before the young queen³ extolling the Bishop of Rome's authority, the Bishops of Glasgow, Galloway and Aberdeen being present but no temporal lords. Friends of his had been told that "as France doth with you, so will we do". The clergy of Scotland desire war as they are afraid that James may follow Henry's example; but a great part of the temporality wish that he would. Beaton has gone to France to discover what help the Scots king can expect of the King of France and the Pope if he should break with England.

"I think", says Norfolk, "that he will provoke all the hurt he can against this realme: for England hath no gretter enemye to his power".

The young queen is an ardent Papist; and the queen-mother not much less. He has encountered many who are in flight from Scotland for reading the Scriptures in English and who anticipate that if they are taken, they will be executed⁴. Wharton likewise informs Cromwell (5 September, 1539) that the King of Scots fears war being made by England against his realm. "He inclynthe daylye", says Wharton, "more and more to covitousse..."⁵

On 10 August, 1539, James had requested the Pope to confer legatine powers on the Cardinal; but on 7 November, Beaton was reminding the pontiff that the king was eager for the grant of legatine powers⁶. But the Scots king, although prepared thus to use his influence on behalf of the leading ecclesiastic of the realm, gave evidence of a petulant attitude towards the clergy, which testified perhaps to the unacknowledged influence of the

1. Aikman translates "the religious", but "churchmen" is obviously what Buchanan meant. 2. History of Scotland, IV., pp. 318-319. Buchanan goes on to say (p. 319) that "when the clergy vehemently urged these considerations upon the king, he gave them a judge according to their desire, James Hamilton, bastard brother of..Arran, attached to them by huge gifts and who was desirous of being reconciled to the king, whom he had lately incensed". It may be noted that Dunbar had given Hamilton a tack of the teindsheaves and fruits of the kirk of Cambusnethane and of the mansion and mains of Carstairs, which were escheat after Hamilton's execution for treason in 1540 (R.S.S., II., 3775, 3803). 3. Mary of Guise, whom James had married in 1538. 4. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 154. 5. Ibid., p. 160. 6. Archbps. of St. And's., IV., pp. 40-41, 44-45.

action of his uncle of England. Thus, a communication to Cromwell, on 25 January, 1539/40, declared that James was set upon the "reformatioun of the mysdemeanours of Busshops, religious persounes and preistes within the realme"; and that after witnessing a performance of Lindsay's "Satire of the Three Estates" at Linlithgow at Epiphany, the king

"dide call upon the Buschope of Glascoe, being Chancelour and diverse other Bushops, exorting thaym to reforme thair facions and maners of lyving, saying that onles thay did soe, He wolde send sex of the proudeste of thaym unto his uncle of England...and therunto the Chancelour shulde aunsuer... that one worde of His graces mouthe shulde suffice thayme to be at commaundement; and the king haistily and angrely aunsuered that He wold gladely bestowe any wordes of his mouthe that could amend thaym".

The king, it is said, is also minded to expel spiritual men from the offices they hold¹. That James, however, was moved by a gust of passing temper rather than by animus against Dunbar, would seem to be indicated by his letter to the Pope, of 1 February, 1539/40, on the Archbishop's behalf, when Thomas Hay had given Dunbar trouble regarding a prebend of Glasgow. The king commends his former tutor and present Chancellor as one who has never abandoned the office of a true bishop nor his constant zeal for the Holy See, of which the evidence is his consummate efforts against the Lutheran heresy, undertaken for the true faith². In the same month, Sadler was sent to James by Henry VIII to prevent, if possible, the Scottish king from joining the Catholic League, to stir up suspicion against Beaton and to persuade James to abjure the authority of Rome and to seize the monasteries. James refused to comply with the suggestion that he should seize the possessions of the Church, as the clergy were always ready to meet his wants and any abuses could easily be reformed; and when Sadler pointed out the useless and wicked lives of the monks, the king replied: "By God, they that be naught/ye shall hear that I shall redress and make them religious men according to their professions"³. Sadler also avers that the clergy had presented to the king a list of three hundred and fifty chief nobles and barons, whose estates might be confiscated for heresy⁴ and that James had

1. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 170. 2. Epp. Reg. Scot., II., p. 38.
 3. Pinkerton, History, II., pp. 358-359. Sadler's own account of the saying (State Papers, I., p. 48) is: "Oh, quoth he, know ye not our priests? A mischief on them all. I trust, quoth he, the world will amend them once". 4. It is to this incident, which he places in July, 1540, that Knox refers and declares that the king dismissed them with the reprimand: "Pack, ye jugglers, get ye to your charges and reform your lives; be not instruments of discord between my nobility and me, or I vow to God I shall reform you; not as the king of Denmark by imprisonment nor as he of England by hanging and beheading but yet by most severe punishment, if ever such motion proceed from you again" (Quoted, Pinkerton, History, II., p. 419).

said that the clergy dreaded him but praised the Cardinal as devoted to his interest. The king, said Sadler, was well-inclined, but forced to use the counsel of the clergy, as none among the nobles and gentleman, many of whom were favourable to the Reformation,

"hath any such agility of wit, gravity, learning or experience to set forth the same or to take in hand the direction of things"¹.

The bishops and priests "nor any of their kind, which is yet too strong for the other side" bore the English emissary (he declares) no good-will. Yet the churchmen were unpopular, especially Beaton, who had recently issued a proclamation ordaining the death of a heretic to any person who should eat an egg on forbidden days, as well as the confiscation of his goods to the king². James, however, despite his outbursts against the clergy, was more and more placed in dependence on them. A revocation of grants made during the king's minority, confirmed by Parliament in December, 1540, was calculated to increase lay antagonism to the king; the death of his two sons fostered his morbid suspicions of the nobility; and after the parliament of March, 1540/1, which ratified the foundation of the College of Justice, James is found writing to the Pope, on 11 April, applying for the ratification of a further annual subsidy granted by the clergy, a subsidy estimated in an English report (and by Buchanan) at 10000 crowns³.

That the churchmen's desire for war with England had any likelihood of fulfilment was at this time by no means clear. Henry, in February, 1540/1, intimated to the Gentlemen of the Border that he had appointed Norfolk his Lieutenant and gave them warning to join him on his summons with men, horses and arms⁴. James, on the other hand, was not prepared to accede to Henry's request that English churchmen who were fugitives in Scotland should be given up⁵; and, according to Wriothsley's report in July, had offended the English king by adopting the title of Defender of the Faith⁶. Yet the King of Scots, on the tenth day of that month, professed himself desirous of peace and while (and, perhaps, because) Beaton was abroad, Scottish ambassadors came to England⁷ and the question of a meeting between the two monarchs was once more mooted, James professing his desire to obtain the consent of the French king either to such a conference or to a conference between the kings of the three realms⁸. These overtures, however, were doomed to failure. In

1. Sadler's State Papers, I., p. 47. 2. Ibid., pp. 47-48.
 3. Archbps. of St. And's., IV., pp. 57-59; Epp. Reg. Scot., II., 109.
 4. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 184. 5. Ibid., p. 188. 6. Ibid., p. 191.
 7. Ibid., p. 200 seq. 8. Ibid., pp. 199-201.

February, 1541/2, James was commending emissaries of the Pope to the chieftains of Ireland¹; and, in the following summer, on Henry's initiative, the first overt act of war took place. In August, 1542, a body of English troops, which had advanced into Teviotdale, was successfully attacked by Huntly, in what was still no more than an act of Border warfare, at Haddonrig. Although, on 18 September, James had professed to Henry his desire for peace², the Archbishop of York received instructions, on 3 October, to search his registers for information in support of the king's title to the realm of Scotland³; and, on 3 November, Norfolk, who had been given charge of an army for the expedition against Scotland and was to make an abortive, if destructive, invasion of the Borders, informed the English Privy Council that the Scottish army was dispersed⁴; the nobles had indeed refused to pursue Norfolk across the Border. The force which King James succeeded in raising, with the aid of his clerical counsellors, was soon after on its way, once more, to the Border; but the disgraceful episode of Solway Moss, on 23 November, consequent on dissensions over the leadership of the Scots army, ended the campaign. Three weeks later, James V was dead. The ecclesiastics who had, with an infatuated desire to divert the king's attention from "reformation" after the manner of Henry VIII, brought the realm to this pass, did not, however, include among their number the Archbishop of Glasgow. A striking testimony to the attitude of Dunbar is preserved in a statement of 19 November, 1542, by the servant of Sir Cuthbert Ratcliffe, one of the English Wardens of the Marches and a prisoner at Haddonrig:

"He saithe as his maister shewed hym, the Bisshop of Glasco chauncelor of Scotlande, in whose keping his saide master is at Glasco, tolde hym that he the saide chauncellor wolde be glad of peace and doubtid not but the king and the lordes wolde agre to any reasounable thing to opteyn it, if it were not for the Cardynall and som certayn bisshops that take his part"⁵.

If this was indeed Dunbar's point of view, it is a tribute to the Chancellor's sagacity, to which the king would have done well to have trusted.

Beaton, on returning from France in 1542, had shown signs of turning his attention to the vexed question of the exemption of Glasgow; and it is recorded that, in September of that year, he dispatched Master Andrew Oliphant to Dunkeld to obtain a transumpt of the bull of 14 May, 1539, which limited the

1. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 202. 2. Ibid., p. 210. 3. Ibid., p. 212.
 4. Ibid., p. 215. 5. Hamilton Papers, I., p. lxxiii; L. & P. H.VIII, XVII., 1100.

exemption to the period of Dunbar's tenure of the seal. But ere the Cardinal took further action towards establishing ascendancy over Dunbar in the ecclesiastical sphere, he succeeded in displacing his rival, first, temporarily and, then, permanently, from his position of political preeminence. On 1 January, 1542/3, Beaton had suffered a set-back by the appointment of Arran as Protector and Governor². But whatever differences may have existed between the Cardinal and Arran, they were sufficiently reconciled by 10 January, on which date the Great Seal was taken from Dunbar and given to Beaton³. It did not, however, remain in his possession, for in a very short time Dunbar had resumed his former office - he witnesses a charter as Chancellor on 15 February, 1542/3⁴.

In the following month, the Archbishop of Glasgow was to make a last stand for the policy he favoured against heresy - the repression of opinion. On 15 March, 1542/3, the Scots Parliament passed an epoch-making Act permitting the reading of Scripture in English. Calderwood declares - and there is no reason to doubt his statement - that it was passed despite the strenuous opposition of the clergy, at the instigation of the commissioners of burghs and part of the nobility, i.e. by a majority of two of the Estates⁵. Dunbar now entered his dissent, for himself and all the prelates of the realm, and intimated their opposition to the measure until such time as a Provincial Council of all the clergy might be held to decide whether this concession was necessary or otherwise⁶. The Archbishop's protest, however, was of no avail; and, on 21 March, forty shillings was paid to a messenger

"passand witht letters to proclame the Act anent the having of the New Testament in Inglis in the westland"⁷, i.e. in Dunbar's own diocese. The tide of the Reformation was swiftly rising and would not be stayed. Yet there is reason to believe that while Dunbar's ecclesiastical sympathies were entirely out of accord with those who had secured the passing of this Act, his political sympathies were with them.

Although it is difficult to believe that the Archbishop of Glasgow would have identified himself definitely with a

1. Rentale S. Andree, pp. xlvi, 143. 2. Archbps. of St. And's., IV., p. 82. 3. Ibid., p. 82. On 15 Jan., the Cardinal sat as Chancellor and the Archbishop with him (Acts and Decrees, quoted loc. cit.). On 2 Feb., it was reported by Lisle to Suffolk that the Cardinal was now Chancellor, as he had caused the Governor to take the Great Seal from the Archbishop of Glasgow and deliver it to him (H.VIII S.P., V., p. 250). 4. G.R.H. Chs., 1309. 5. Historie of the Kirk of Scotland, I., pp. 156-157. 6. R.E.G., II., 506. 7. L.H.T. Accts., VIII., p. 178.

pro-English policy, there is little doubt that he was still apprehensive of war between the two realms and there is no doubt that, as he had every reason to suspect and even detest Beaton, he was in contact with those who were opposed to the Archbishop of St. Andrews. Sadler wrote to Henry VIII, on 20 March, 1542/3, that when he delivered the English king's letters to the Governor of Scotland, he was cordially welcomed by the noblemen - Angus, Huntly, Glencairn, Cassilis, Marischal and others - and the Chancellor "being the bishop of Glasgow"¹; the English ambassador likewise told Parr, on 27 March, that while the nobles and the whole temporality of Scotland desire the proposed marriage of Mary and Prince Edward and friendship with England,

"the kyrkmen labor, by all the meanes they can, to empeche the unities and establishment of these two realmes (by the marriage)",

but there are reasons for supposing that whatever his views on the proposed marriage may have been, Dunbar was at least not inimically disposed towards England. Now, on 13 May, 1543, Sadler received important news from the English Privy Council. A papal legate, Marco Gremayne, sent at the "speciall sollicitation and procurement" of the French king, was on his way to Scotland to assist Beaton, Lennox and all the Governor's adversaries to accomplish the undoing of Arran; while Lennox is being sent by the King of France to win as many as possible to the "French" party and to seize as many strongholds as he can³. Both of these missions were to have consequences for Dunbar. Meanwhile, the Archbishop of Glasgow was appointed, on 19 June, one of the Commissioners and Auditors of Exchequer⁴; and, on 15 September, it was reported to England that a Council of State to direct the Governor had been appointed, the Queen-mother to "be reputed principall" and the Cardinal and the Archbishop of Glasgow, who is Chancellor, being members⁵. But, on 13 December, Dunbar finally relinquished the office he had held so long; and Beaton accepted the chancellorship at the desire of the Governor and the Lords of the Articles⁶.

According to Buchanan, Lennox, who, although he had made peace with the Regent, was apprehensive of treachery, withdrew by stealth to Glasgow, where he fortified the Bishop's Castle and proceeded thereafter to Dumbarton⁷. It is impossible to take this statement simpliciter as indicating connivance with

1. Sadler's State Papers, I., pp. 66-67. 2. H.VIII S.P., V., p. 271. 3. Ibid., pp. 286-287. 4. G.R.H. Chs., 1319. 5. L. & P. H.VIII, XVIII., 104; Hamilton Papers, II., 33. 6. A.P.S., II., p. 442. One of the Lords of the Articles at this date was Dunbar himself (A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 536). 7. History of Scotland, IV., p. 337.

Dunbar. But in the following year, the Archbishop of Glasgow undoubtedly was ranged, if not with Lennox, whose plot with Glencairn against Arran miscarried, at least with others who schemed for the removal of Arran and Beaton. The support of the queen-mother was secured and a bond drawn up by the nobles to put the authority of government in her hands. On 10 June, 1544, the conspirators suspended Arran from office, on the ground that he had upset, by the Cardinal's counsel, the peace and marriage with England, and appointed the Dowager in his stead. Among the signatories of the deed of suspension were the queen-mother, the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Bishops of Moray, Dunblane and Orkney, as well as Angus, Bothwell, Montrose, Huntly, Cassilis, Moray and Argyle¹. The relations of Dunbar and Beaton had doubtless been exacerbated by recent events in Glasgow. The opposition of Dunbar to Arran was to have a bearing on an event of the following year.

The policy of intrusion or aggression, which David Beaton had inherited from his predecessor as a method of countering the claims of the Archbishop of Glasgow, reappears in the episode of 1544 and the controversy regarding the exemption moved towards its climax. On Palm Sunday (5 April), "in the choir of the metropolitan church of Glasgow, in the seat (*sede*) beside the high altar", Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, came to the personal presence of David, Cardinal and Archbishop of St. Andrews, primate and *legatus natus* of the apostolic see, and protested that the carrying of the Cardinal's cross within the metropolitan church and province of Glasgow should not tend to the prejudice of his (Dunbar's) exemption. The Cardinal, it is recorded, courteously (*humaniter*) replied that he was not carrying his cross nor giving blessings within that church to the prejudice of the exemption but only by the goodwill and kindness of the Archbishop of Glasgow and that he would not infringe the previous truce between them regarding the exemption². Beaton's conduct and especially his professions of amity and of mutual accommodation were disingenuous, as the event was to prove. Whatever were the terms of the compact to which he referred - we have seen that James Beaton mentioned such a compact and that the Cardinal, on an earlier occasion, cited an agreement made with Dunbar in 1539³ - the aggressive attitude of Beaton made goodwill between the prelates impossible and brought open strife out of latent antagonism.

This antagonism, which infected the adherents of the two archbishops and was symptomatic of differences in other matters

1. Archbps. of St. Ands., IV., pp. 153-154. 2. R.E.G., II., 504.

3. Cf. pp. 34, 37 supra.

than the government of the Church, came to a head in 1545 with the unseemly fracas at Glasgow Cathedral of which Knox has given a well-known and entertaining account¹. The cause of the affray, it seems clear, was an aggravated instance of the policy of intrusion which Beaton had exemplified at Dumfries, in 1539, and at Glasgow Cathedral, in 1544. But the time of the incident and the circumstances leading up to it are somewhat difficult to determine. The occasion of the riot, according to Lesley, was the arrival of the Patriarch of Venice (recte Aquileia), the papal legate, at Glasgow, in (October) 1543²; and Knox's statement that the incident occurred "in the end of harvest" - he mentions no year - accords with this. The accounts given by Lesley and Knox can, in fact, be reconciled.

"Bot to returne to the foirsaid patriarche of Venice", writes the Bishop of Ross, "quha wes send expreslie be the Paip: at his first cumming to Glasgw, the Cardinal and the principall Bischoppes come thair and ressaved him with gret honour. Bot in the meintyme, thair happined ane suddane discord within the kirk of Glasgw, betuix the Cardinalle and Bischoppe of Glasgw, for thair preheminance of the bering of the Cardinallis croce within the kirk, quhair baith the Archebischoppes crosses wes brokin and diverse of thair gentill men and servandis wes hurt".

Knox's version may be regarded as a more farcical rendering of the same story. Further, both Lesley and Knox declare that the incident was followed by a reconciliation between the two prelates. According to the former, "the mater was sone aggreit be the Governour and his counsell", which conflicts with Dunbar's attitude in 1544 and Arran's in 1545; while, according to Knox, the two prelates were reconciled when

"the blood of the innocent servand of God (George Wishart) buried in oblivoun all that braggine and boast. For the Archibischope of Glasgw was the first unto whom the Cardinale wraitt...earnestly craving of him that he wold assist with his presence and counsell how that such ane enemye unto thare estate mycht be suppressed",

which could not have happened before the Spring of 1545/6.

It is tempting to suppose that there may have been two incidents - the first in 1543, followed by a reconciliation. Of this, however, there is no documentary evidence. But it is quite certain, from the record of Palm Sunday, 1544, (~~that Beaton~~)

1. Works, I., pp. 145-148. Cf. Calderwood, *Historie*, I., pp. 198-199. 2. *Historie*, p. 178.

than the government of the Church, came to a head in 1545 with the unseemly fracas at Glasgow Cathedral of which Knox has given a well-known and entertaining account¹. The cause of the affray, it seems clear, was an aggravated instance of the policy of intrusion which Beaton had exemplified at Dumfries, in 1539, and at Glasgow Cathedral, in 1544. But the time of the incident and the circumstances leading up to it are somewhat difficult to determine. The occasion of the riot, according to Lesley, was the arrival of the Patriarch of Venice (recte Aquileia), the papal legate, at Glasgow, in (October) 1543²; and Knox's statement that the incident occurred "in the end of harvest" - he mentions no year - accords with this. The accounts given by Lesley and Knox can, in fact, be reconciled.

"Bot to returne to the foirsaid patriarche of Venice", writes the Bishop of Ross, "quha wes send expreslie be the paip: at his first cumming to Glasgw, the Cardinal and the principall Bischoppes come thair and ressaved him with gret honour. Bot in the meintyme, thair happined ane suddane discord within the kirk of Glasgw, betuix the Cardinalle and Bischoppe of Glasgw, for thair preheminance of the bering of the Cardinallis croce within the kirk, quhair baith the Archebischoppes crosses wes brokin and diverse of thair gentill men and servandis wes hurt".

Knox's version may be regarded as a more farcical rendering of the same story. Further, both Lesley and Knox declare that the incident was followed by a reconciliation between the two prelates. According to the former, "the mater was sone aggreit be the Governour and his counsell", which conflicts with Dunbar's attitude in 1544 and Arran's in 1545; while, according to Knox, the two prelates were reconciled when

"the blood of the innocent servand of God (George Wishart) buried in oblivoun all that braggine and boast. For the Archibischope of Glasgw was the first unto whom the Cardinale wraitt...earnestly craving of him that he wold assist with his presence and counsell how that such ane enemye unto thare estate mycht be suppressed", which could not have happened before the Spring of 1545/6.

It is tempting to suppose that there may have been two incidents - the first in 1543, followed by a reconciliation. Of this, however, there is no documentary evidence. But it is quite certain, from the record of Palm Sunday, 1544, ~~(that Beaton)~~

1. Works, I., pp. 145-148. Cf. Calderwood, *Historie*, I., pp. 198-199. 2. *Historie*, p. 178.

that Beaton had elevated his cross in the Cathedral Church of Glasgow before 1545; and if there was a riot, occasioned by antagonism among the Archbishops' attendants, then or at an earlier date, the prelates themselves may have taken steps to hush up the occurrence. Be that as it may, that there was a fracas in the early summer of 1545 and that it was characterized by scenes of violence and disorder in the Cathedral seems to be beyond question. The Diurnal of Occurrents declares that, on 4 June, 1545, the day when M. Lorge de Montgomery arrived from France with auxiliary troops,

"the bischope of Glasgow pleit with the cardinall about the bering of his croce in his dyocie and baith thair croceis was brokin in the kirk of Glasgow throw thair stryving for the samin"¹.

On the other hand, Arran, as Governor, wrote to Pope Paul III, either on 20 May or 1 June², stating that lately when he held assemblies (comitia) in the archiepiscopal city of Glasgow, Gavin Dunbar, the Archbishop of that see, caused such tumults in his church that the Governor and many princes, when they were attending divine service (sacro), had their lives endangered, as the Archbishop's following began to mob, in the church, the cross carried before the Cardinal-legate. The writer, had he not been restrained by respect for the ecclesiastical order, would have inflicted severe punishment. He holds the dignity of that order in such esteem that he has communicated the whole matter to the Pope, who will learn more of it from the Cardinal's letter. Beaton's letter duly followed on 6 July, 1545. Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, it runs, has created a scandal by having his cross borne and blessing the people when the Cardinal was present in Glasgow, having gone there with the queen and the Governor. To avoid a tumult, he refrained from punishing the audacity, but admonished the Archbishop to desist; who, however, did not observe his promise to the Governor not to bear his cross, but made an attack with armed soldiers upon the Cardinal in the church of Glasgow. For this and former misdeeds, the Governor would have punished the Archbishop then and there but that the writer persuaded him to refer the matter to the Pope. The Bishop of Orkney and the Abbot of Dunfermline were appointed to examine witnesses of the crime alleged against the Archbishop and the depositions were sent so that the Pope might provide a remedy³.

1. Op. cit., p. 39. 2. The date is uncertain. Theiner, Vet. Mon., 616, which is followed by L. & P. H.VIII, XX., 781, the date is given as 20 May. But in MS. Epp. Reg. Scot., ff. 58-59, which is the source of the letter as printed in Statuta, I., p. xxxii, footnote, the date appears as 1 June. 3. Theiner, Vet. Mon., p. 617; L. & P. H.VIII, XX., 1127; Archbps. of St. Ands., IV., pp. 171-172.

The fact of the prelates' contention, if not the details of it, must have had some notoreity, for news of it was sent abroad. On 10 July, Van der Delft wrote to the Emperor Charles V that a feud between a Scottish archbishop and the Cardinal was causing much trouble¹. It would appear that no disciplinary action was taken against Dunbar²; and, as Professor Hannay has observed,

"the outburst of 1545 cannot have been due entirely to ecclesiastical jealousies; or to the "glorious folly" of the Archbishop of Glasgow"; it is evident that he differed from Arran and Beaton on questions of policy, and if he disapproved of an attack on England at this juncture, he was fully justified by the event"³.

It is at least probable that Lesley's suggestion⁴ applies not to 1543 but to 1545 and has some foundation in fact. The Governor and his council may have succeeded in allaying the strife between the prelates; and it is not altogether unlikely that a transaction which took place during 1545 may belong to the latter part of that year and imply a reconciliation of Arran and Dunbar. On 10 March, 1543/4, Dunbar claimed before the Lords of Council, in virtue of his barony and regality, "the decisioune of all actionis tuiching violence and violent ejectioun and occupatioun of any landis lyand within the said barony" pertained by law and practice to him and his bailies. Two persons, complaining of violent ejection by a third individual from lands within the barony, had purchased letters of deliverance from the lords to the Sheriff of Lanark, although they had the same action before the Archbishop's bailies. The lords remitted the action to the Archbishop and his bailies⁵. In view of this case, which reveals Dunbar's jealous maintenance of his secular jurisdiction, it is all the more significant that during 1545 - the exact date is not given - the Archbishop of Glasgow, with the consent of his chapter, appointed James, Earl of Arran, Protector and Governor of Scotland, and his heirs, to act as bailies and justices of all the lands of the barony and regality of Glasgow for a period of nineteen years⁶.

Some time after 1 May, 1545, Beaton sent to Dunbar a missive intimating and convoking by his metropolitan, primatial and legatine authority a General Council of the Scottish Church⁷. The

1. L. & P. H.VIII, XX., 1154. 2. If the incident had taken place in the presence of the papal legate, Beaton would have had a case against Dunbar, as Robertson has shown. The canonists held that neither Archbishop nor Patriarch could display his cross in the presence of a legate a latere (Statuta, I., p. cxxxii, footnote). 3. Rentale S. Andree, p. xlvi. 4. Vide p. 46 supra. 5. A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 525. 6. Glasgow Recs., I., Pt. I., p. dxxxix. 7. Statutes, p. 252 seq.

terms in which this document is couched - it threatens the Archbishop of Glasgow with interdict in the event of refusal to compare, suspension in the event of contumacy and thereafter excommunication - can scarcely be deemed conciliatory. The Council, however, was not held till 1549, when both Dunbar and Beaton were dead; and the uneasy relationship of the two archiepiscopal sees, which had done so much to prevent conciliar action, and the effective restraint of heresy were problems that remained unsolved.

It is impossible, considering Knox's bias against Dunbar, to assess the extent to which the Reformer's macabre picture of the rival ecclesiastics of St. Andrews and Glasgow reconciled in compassing and witnessing the death of George Wishart bears the stamp of truth. According to the historian and protagonist of the Reformation, the Archbishop of Glasgow, by instigation of the Cardinal (a statement which we may reasonably question) came to Ayr to counteract the activities of Wishart and occupied the church in that town. When the Earl of Glencairn with his followers and certain gentlemen of Kyle would have seized the kirk,

"Maister George utterlye repugned, saying: "Lett him allone; his sermon will not much hurte; let us go to the Merkatte Croce"; and so thei did, whare he made so notable a sermon that the verray enemies thamselves wer confounded. The Bischope preached to his jackmen and to some old bosses of the toune. The surme of all his sermon was: "Thei say that we shuld preach; why nott? Bettir late thrive then never thrive; had us still for your Bisshop and we shall provid better for the next tyme". This was the begynnyng and the end of the Bischoppis sermon, who with haist departed the toune butt returned nott agane to fulfill his promisse"¹.

Knox, as we have seen, further avers that the complete reconciliation of Beaton and Dunbar was brought about when the Archbishop, in response to the Cardinal's request, took part in Wishart's trial and condemnation and

"lay ower the east blokhuse with the said Cardinall till the martyre of God was consumed by fyre"².

Pitscottie, in the same strain, likens the Cardinal and the Archbishop, who were "great that day at that poore mans bloode scheduling" to Pilate and Caiaphas at the death of Christ³. Against this grim portrayal of the Archbishop of Glasgow we must however set the statement that Dunbar advised the Cardinal to request the Governor to appoint some member of the nobility commissioner

1. Knox, Works, I., pp. 126-127. 2. Ibid., p. 148; cf. Calderwood, History, I., p. 199. 3. Cronicles of Scotland, XXII., cap. xii.

for the carrying out of the sentence on Wishart, that the odium of the murder might not rest entirely with the clergy. The Governor, it is said, also desired Beaton to postpone the trial, but he refused¹.

Wishart met his death on 1 March, 1545/6. On 29 May, 1546, Cardinal Beaton was murdered in St. Andrews Castle; and the last public act recorded of his rival of Glasgow is in the Parliament of 9 August, when Dunbar, in name and on behalf of the Spiritual Estate, asked instruments that they consented to the remission granted to Norman Leslie and his colleagues for the Cardinal's murder, provided they obtained the Pope's absolution and not otherwise².

Dunbar himself died on 30 April of the following year³ and was buried in the choir of Glasgow Cathedral⁴. If he was indeed "a young clerk" on his appointment to the see of Glasgow in 1524, we are probably entitled to suppose that he had not much exceeded his fiftieth year. The Lords of Council, on 23 May, assigned 25 May for the production by the Archbishop's executors of his will, with a view to determining what remained due to the collectors for the College of Justice⁵; and, on that date (25 May), it transpired that £180 was owing to the College⁶. The copy of the will confirmed on 31 May and printed among the charters of the Abbey of Crosraguel, the abbot of which was one of the Archbishop's executors, only admits a debt to the College of £130⁷. By his will, Dunbar provided for the erection by the dean and chapter of a bronze tomb⁸, but, if it was erected, there is now no trace of it remaining. He also left legacies to Arran, "*sperantes indubie quod idem dominus Gubernator assistat et adjuvet dictos nostros executores*"⁹, to a large number of friends and relations, including his sister, a nun of North Berwick, to John Dunbar, rector of Castlemilk and John Dunbar, parish clerk of Mochrum and others to pray for his soul. One notable feature is that he bequeathed sums of money to no less than fifteen houses of friars, Franciscan, Dominican and Carmelite, as well as a legacy to the Dominican nunnery of Sciennes at Edinburgh¹⁰. His books, of which only four are mentioned, are mainly left to the disposition of his relative, the dean of Moray¹¹. Dunbar was well supplied with this world's goods and his estate was valued at £3815-1-4¹². Three years after his death, viz. on 26 April, 1550, Julius III gave mandate to the Bishops of Aberdeen and Dunblane and the Chancellor of

1. Brunton and Haig, Senators of the College of Justice, p. 4.
 2. A.P.S., II., p. 469. 3. R.S.S., III., 2261; A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 592. 4. Crosraguel, I., p. 108, footnote. 5. A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 566. 6. Ibid; vide also pp. 567, 575. 7. Crosraguel, I., p. 109. 8. Ibid., p. 110. 9. Ibid., p. 111. 10. Ibid., p. 114.
 11. Ibid., p. 115. 12. Ibid., p. 116.

Moray for the recovery of teinds and other revenues and properties of the church of Glasgow leased and rented, to the huge loss of the church and episcopal mensa of Glasgow, during the lifetime of Archbishop Gavin¹. This, however, is not a reflection on Dunbar's maladministration of the temporalities of his see, but on the practice of alienating ecclesiastical revenues and property, which had been rife for a long period throughout the Scottish Church.

Archbishop Dunbar was the typical statesman-ecclesiastic of the Middle Ages and one of the last of that type to figure in the pre-Reformation annals of Scotland. If he was not perhaps one of the greatest of these churchmen who played a conspicuous part in the affairs of State, he has hardly received the recognition that is his due, as his career has been overshadowed by the more prominent and more spectacular careers of his contemporaries, the Beaton, with whose character and achievements those of Dunbar inevitably invite comparison. The two estimates of the Archbishop which are best known and which are the verdicts of contemporaries are supplied by men whose sympathies, unlike Dunbar's, were strongly with the Reformation; and yet these estimates are widely different. Knox, who declared à propos of the brawl at Glasgow Cathedral that

"Dumbare, Archibischope of Glasgw, was knowin a glorious foole"²; and that

"Good Gukstoun Glaikstour, the foirsaid Archibischope, lacked no reasonis, as he thought, for the maintenance of his glorie"³, loses no opportunity of ridiculing Dunbar and covers him with contempt. On the other hand, Buchanan, who knew Dunbar personally, makes no secret of his admiration for the Archbishop. Not only does he describe him as "upright and learned"⁴ but he makes the Archbishop the subject of the eulogy in verse - "Coena Gavini Archiepiscopi Glascuensis" - which begins

"Praesulis accubui postquam conviva Gavini

Dis non invideo nectar et ambrosiam";

and, after describing Dunbar's dissertation at table, declares

"Quisquis adest dubitas scholane immigrarit in aulam

An magis in mediam venerit aula scholam.

Iupiter Aethiopum convivia solus habeto

Dum mihi concedas praesulis ore frui"⁵.

Knox's description of Dunbar, it may be said with certainty, is unjust, both in regard to the occasion on which the Archbishop is represented as actuated by his "glorious folly" and as a general characteristic of the prelate of Glasgow; it passes beyond caricature and becomes misrepresentation. A "glorious (i.e. vain-glorious) fool", intent merely on asserting his own

1. R.E.G., II., 510. 2. Works, I., p. 145. 3. Ibid., p. 146.
4. History (tr. Aikman), II., p. 299. 5. Epigrammatum Lib. I.



importance, could hardly have shown the sober sagacity which led to the development and greater efficiency of the judicial body which became the College of Justice. On the other hand, while we cannot counter Buchanan's testimony to the culture of the Archbishop - and it is supported, as we have seen, by the praise of James V and David Panter¹ - it is difficult to find more specific evidence than panegyric affords of the extent of the Archbishop's learning. One remarks, for instance, that he appears to have shown no interest in the University of his cathedral city; and the Beaton, in this respect, far outshone him. Dunbar's mind, however well-informed, was that of the old-fashioned conservative churchman, not, in his case, unduly bigoted, without fanaticism and with a capacity both for justice and mercy; not, however, highly originaive nor wont to display intellectual independence and initiative; not tinged with spiritual fervour but devoted to the Church as an institution; the practical, efficient, methodical but limited mind, well furnished with precedents but unadventurous, of the permanent official or the prominent ecclesiastic. His ability, perhaps, fell short of that of James Beaton; his outlook was more provincial than the Cardinal's and he lacked David Beaton's fierce energy and will to power. Yet in the matter of personal morals, he compares more than favourably with his contemporaries of the Church and we can concede to the Archbishop the attribute of "uprightness" which Buchanan ascribes to him. If Dunbar was a pluralist, it is somewhat significant that he was concerned to uphold at Rome the rights of his see rather than to acquire additional benefices; and one thing, at least, stands much to his credit. In an age when prelates were too often distinguished for incontinence - and Wolsey comes within and David Beaton is very much within that category - no such aspersion is attached to the name of Gavin Dunbar.

The problems that came to light during his tenure of the see of Glasgow were highly significant for the future of the Church in Scotland and, had he but known it, made the Reformation inevitable. The controversy regarding the exemption of his see, which persisted from the beginning of his episcopate almost until his death and of which no final settlement was reached during his lifetime, cannot be dismissed as a matter of personal jealousies nor as an evanescent problem of church government which, but for these jealousies, was not insoluble. There can be no doubt that although the one point of agreement between the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow was opposition to Reforming tendencies, their dissensions impaired the unity of the Church and, by making common action largely impossible, weakened the resistance of the Church to disruptive and

1. Vide p. 2, supra. 2. Robertson has pointed out (Statuta, I., p. cxxxi) that like questions had also been at issue between Canterbury and York, Armagh and Dublin.

disintegrating tendencies. In particular, as Robertson has suggested, it thwarted conciliar action and prevented for half a century the calling of a Council of the Scottish Church.

"On one hand the denial to Glasgow of the privileges of Primate and Legatus Natus, conceded to York, appears to have kept the successor of St. Kentigern from following the example of the Primate of England and holding his own Provincial Council. On the other, the exemption of Glasgow from the Metropolitan, Primatial and Legatine authority of St. Andrews seems to have precluded or deterred the successor of "the Bishop of the Scots" from summoning a Provincial Council of all Scotland"¹.

It was not so much Dunbar's blame as his misfortune that in securing the prestige of his see, he played a part in lowering the morale of the Church in Scotland.

Dunbar's diocese of Glasgow was perhaps more deeply tinged with heresy than any other in Scotland². It may, indeed, be said to have had a native Reforming tradition since at least the time of the ambiguous episode of the Lollards of Kyle. Yet Dunbar is not prominently associated with anti-heretical activity and even if his presence at Wishart's trial and death is taken to indicate - as is by no means certain - a perceptible hardening of attitude towards those who professed the new doctrines, he preferred the repression of opinions to the repression of individuals and did not fall into line with the ruthless policy of extermination pursued by David Beaton. No policy of repression, however, could stem the rising tide of Reformation in Scotland. It can at least be said for the Beaton that they adopted one positive device to check the growth of heresy - they sought to invoke the aid of learning and to that end, founded and fostered St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. The attitude of Dunbar was almost entirely negative; and it is significant that his utmost concession to the Reforming spirit, the cautious proposal that the question of the use of the Scriptures in English should be remitted to a Council of the Church, came too late in the day and was overborne. The most that can be said is that if the Archbishop of Glasgow had maintained his ascendancy, the Reformation, which he could have done little or nothing to postpone, might have come to pass with less bloodshed. But the paradoxical fact remains that the methods by which Dunbar sought to maintain the Roman Church in Scotland were those which were best calculated to ensure that it would ultimately be swept away.

As Chancellor of Scotland, Archbishop Dunbar was a capable servant of the State and, above all, a devoted servant of James

1. Statuta, I., p. cxxxiv.

2. Liber Offic. S. And., p. 167.

v; and if James Beaton, whom he supplanted in the chancellorship, was treated with scant gratitude for his services to the realm, Dunbar's career of public service was made possible by the not undeserved favour of the king, which continued until, in turn, the Archbishop of Glasgow was ousted by the Cardinal. His loyalty to King James, which made him attach himself to the Queen's party in 1524¹ and which placed him in the small minority of those who supported the king in 1532², when that monarch's wilful, devious, complex character had come to light, must at times have placed a considerable strain upon his discretion. It was as the king's Chancellor rather than as Archbishop that he condoned the royal policy of exploiting the Church and at the same time playing it off against the lay magnates; and if the eventual foundation of the College of Justice so far brought good out of evil and accorded with Dunbar's desire for the better administration of justice, the chicanery which was involved in the negotiations between the churchmen and the king did something to weaken the Church by making it subservient to the Crown and that uneasy alliance, by increasing among the laity the unpopularity of churchmen, helped to hasten the Reformation.

While Dunbar, with a certain consistency, upheld the traditional Scottish policy of alliance with France, he played no conspicuous part in the intrigues which made Scotland "a pawn in the game of European politics"³ and was not fully admitted, it would appear, into the diplomatic counsels of James V. But if he lacked the diplomatic gifts and knowledge of David Beaton, there is evidence of political sagacity in the fact that, unlike his ecclesiastical contemporaries, he would have avoided war, waged in the interests of France and the Papacy, with England; and his moderation, had it availed, would have profited Scotland more than the intemperate zeal of Beaton, which infected the Church and influenced, disastrously, King James.

The name of Gavin Dunbar is chiefly remembered for the part he is said to have played in the foundation of the College of Justice; and while modern investigation has corrected this view and indicated that he devoted himself to the reorganization of the "Session", before the College was as much as mooted, his reputation as a judicial reformer is sufficiently justified and the opinion is not wide of the mark that it was in this sphere that his most fruitful and enduring work was done. It

1. Vide p. 9 supra. 2. Vide p. 28 supra. 3. Archbishops of St. And's., III., p. 220.

is an ironical fact regarding the more prominent clergy of the late medieval Church in Scotland that their work as churchmen proved ephemeral in its influence, while their work extrinsic to the Church, as statesmen and administrators, was of lasting quality and to this fact no exception is provided by the career of Archbishop Gavin Dunbar.

Appendix. Additional References to Gavin Dunbar.

- 19 Oct., 1524. As postulate of Glasgow, witnesses a charter.
(G.R.H. Charters, 961A).
- 20 July, 1525. Remission by the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow, the Earls of Angus, Argyle and Lennox, to the Master of Glencarne, Walter Scott of Branxhame, Ninian Crichton of Ballibucht and Johanne Dunbar of Mochrum "nochtwithstandyng the brek and cryme committit be thame one Monunday last was in this toune of Edinburgh".
(Buccleuch, II., p. 145).
- 22 Oct., 1526. As Archbishop of Glasgow, witnesses a charter.
(G.R.H. Charters, 995A).
- 21 Nov., 1526. Ibid.
(Charter Chest of Earldom of Wigtown, 471).
- 31 May, 1527. As Archbishop of Glasgow, witnesses a Crown Charter.
(Hunters of Hunterston, p. 10).
- 1 Oct., 1528. Instrument narrating that Alexander Kennedy of Bargany obliged himself to obey the counsel of Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow and of Mariota Dunbar, his (Kennedy's) wife, conjunctly, as to the infetment of Thomas Kennedy, his son and heir, in all his lands; reserving only a frank tenement to himself and a reasonable terce to his wife.
(Prot. Bk. of Gavin Ros, 909).
- 30 Aug., 1529. Ane Lettre maid to Gawine, Arkishop (sic) of Glasgow, chancellor, his airis and assignais...of the gift of the ward, nonentres and releif of all lands and annualis bayth propirtie and tennandry etc...quhilkis pertentit to umquhill Johanne Dunbar of Mochrum...togidder with the marriage of () Dunbar, sone and are of the said Johnne.
(R.S.S., II., 296).

31 Aug., 1529. As Chancellor, witnesses a charter.
(G.R.H. Charters, 1045).

6 Dec., 1530. Registered discharge (Edinburgh, 18 Sept., 1529) by Edward Bek, merchant of Manchester, to the Chancellor for 400 merks Scots, owed by the latter to the king for the ward and marriage of Mochrum which is part of what is due to Bek and is paid according to royal precept (Edinburgh, 6 Sept., 1529).
(A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 344).

16 Feb., 1530/1. Letters of Alexander, Abbot of Kilwinning, and convent thereof, presenting to Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, Bernard Peblis, sprung from the diocese of St. Andrews, student of the diocese of Glasgow, of lawful birth, without any impediment, pure in life and morals and in right of twelve merks yearly from the revenue of the said monastery, until it shall please God to provide him with a richer benefice, and praying that the Archbishop may think it meet by the imposition of his scared hands to advance the said Bernard to all the orders, greater and minor, not hitherto received by him.
(G.R.H. Charters, 1065).

2 Dec., 1531. As Archbishop and Chancellor, witnesses charter.
(Charter Chest of the Earldom of Wigtown, 488).

17 Feb., 1533/34. Archibald Dunbar, sen., brother-germane of Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow and Chancellor, appears in a writ.
(R.M.S., III., 1365).

30 Aug., 1534. Presentation, by way of a letter, to the Archbishop by John Colquhon of Luss, kt., in favour of James Lang, to a benefice of the value of £10, payable from the lands of Colquhoun.
(Colquhouns, II., p. 336).

16 March, 1535/6. As Archbishop and Chancellor, witnesses a charter.
(Hunters of Hunterston, p. 14).

20 April, 1536. Ane Lettre maid to Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, chancellor, his airis and assignais, ane or ma, of the gift of the warde of the fyve merkland...of Glentriplik and v merkland...of Colingrote...liand within the schirefdome of Wigtoun, quhilk pertenet to umquhill Johne Dunbar of Mochrum...
(R.S.S., II., 2010).

11 July, 1537. As Archbishop and Chancellor, witnesses charter.
(Charter Chest of the Earldom of
Wigtown, 837).

8 Sept., 1537. Letters of Collation by Gavin, Archbishop of
Glasgow, in favour of David Watson, elected by the parishioners,
as undoubted patrons thereof, to the clerkship of the parish
church of the parish church of Dunbertane, vacant by demission
of George Abernethy, last possessor thereof.
(G.R.H. Charters, 1156).

9 April, 1538. Witnesses a charter.
(Charter Ch. of Earldom of Wigtown, 78).

10 July, 1538. Papal dispensation for the marriage of John Mure
of Cauldwell and Cristina, daughter of Ninian, Lord Ross of
Halkhead, promulgated by Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow.
(Caldwell Papers, I., p. 67).

18 June, 1541. As Archbishop and Chancellor, witnesses charter.
(Charter Ch. of the Earldom of Wigtown, 525).

3 Jan., 1541/2. Ibid.
(Hunters of Hunterston, p. 24).

10 Jan., 1541/2. Charter by Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, to
James Striueling of Kere, of the lands of Cadder.
(Stirlings of Keir, p. 373).

6 Jan., 1542/3. }
15 Feb., 1542/3. } As Chancellor, witnesses charters.
29 June, 1543. } (G.R.H. Charters, 1278, 1309,
21 July, 1543. } 1320A, 1323).

16 Jan., 1545/6. Archbishop Dunbar, along with his chapter,
consents to the erection of the Collegiate Church of Biggar.
(Charter Ch. of the Earldom of Wigtown, 529).

26 Sept., 1546. Dunbar adds his docket to the testament of
Hugh, second Earl of Eglinton.
(Eglintons, II., p. 143).

24 March, 1546/7. Anent an action by John Carmichael of Medowflat
against certain parishioners of Cambusnethane, it was stated that
Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, with the dean and chapter, set
to him the teind sheaves for nineteen years and, later, the
heir of Finnart, to whom the teind sheaves had been set, was

restored by Parliament and called Carmichael before the lords; that he called the Archbishop and chapter "be ressoun that thai take large compositioun" and the lords, upon amicable submission, ordered them to warrant the teinds for 1540-3. The lords gave judgement for payment to Carmichael of the teinds for 1543, which was upheld.

(A.D.C., 1501-54, p. 564).

Bibliography.

Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland.

Acts of the Lords of Council, 1501-1554.

Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland.

Bapst, Les mariages de Jacques V.

Brady, The Episcopal Succession in England, Scotland and Ireland.

Brewer, Henry VIII.

Brunton and Haig, Senators of the College of Justice.

Buccleuch, Scotts of.

Buchanan, History of Scotland (trans. Aikman).

Calderwood, History of the Kirk of Scotland.

Caldwell Papers (Maitland Club).

Cambuskenneth, Chartulary of (Grampian Club).

Charter Chest of the Earldom of Wigtown (Scottish Record Society).

Charters in H.M. General Register House.

Crosraguel, Charters of the Abbey of (Ayrshire and Galloway
Archaeological Association).

Diocesan Registers of Glasgow (Grampian Club).

Diurnal of Occurrents (Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs).

Douglas Book.

Dowden, The Bishops of Scotland.

Dunbar, Scottish Kings.

- Early Records of the University of St. Andrews, 1413-1579
(Scottish History Society).
- Eglinton, The Earls of.
- Epistolae Regum Scotorum (ed. Ruddiman).
- " " " (MS. in H.M. General Register House).
- Exchequer Rolls of Scotland.
- Glasgow, Charters and other documents relating to (Scottish
Burgh Record Society).
- Hamilton Papers.
- Hannay, The College of Justice.
- Herkless and Hannay, Archbishops of St. Andrews.
- Hume Brown, History of Scotland.
- Hunters of Hunterston.
- Inchaffray, Charters of (Scottish History Society).
- Inventaire Chronologique (Abbotsford Club).
- Knox, Works (ed. Laing).
- Lennox, The.
- Lesley, Historie of Scotland (Bannatyne Club).
- Letters and Papers of Henry VIII.
- Liber Officialis Sancti Andree (Abbotsford Club).
- Macfarlane, Genealogical Collections (Scottish History Society).
- Mackay, Practice of the Court of Session.
- Master of Works Accounts (MS. in H.M. General Register House).
- Mathieson, Politics and Religion in Scotland.
- Pinkerton, The History of Scotland from the Accession of the
House of Stewart.
- Pitscottie, Croniclis of Scotland.

Protocol Book of Gavin Ros (Scottish Record Society).

Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis (Maitland and Spalding Clubs).

Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis (Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs).

Registrum Episcopatus Moraviensis (Bannatyne Club).

Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum.

Registrum Secreti Sigilli Regum Scotorum.

Sadler's State Papers.

State Papers, Henry VIII.

Statuta - Concilia Scotiae ecclesiae Scoticae statuta tam
provincialia quam synodalia quae supersunt (Bannatyne Club).

Statutes of the Scottish Church (Scottish History Society).

Stirlings of Keir.

Rentale Sancti Andree (Scottish History Society).

Theiner, Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum.

Tynningham Letter Book (in H.M. General Register House).
