

Journal of the Sydney Society for Scottish History



Volume 9 December 2001

**JOURNAL OF THE SYDNEY SOCIETY FOR SCOTTISH
HISTORY**

Volume no. 9, December 2001

Patron: Professor Michael Lynch, Sir William Fraser,
Professor of Scottish History and Palaeography,
University of Edinburgh

COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY ELECTED FOR 2001

President: Malcolm D. Broun, OAM, QC, BA (Hons), LLB,
FTIACyC

Vice President: Elizabeth Bonner, PhD
James Thorburn

Hon. Secretary: Katherine Thompson, BA (Hons)

Hon. Treasurer: Matthew Glozier, BA (Hons), M..Phil.

**Editorial and
General Committee:** Sybil Jack, MA, B. Litt., Dip. Ed.
Gwynne F. T. Jones, MA, D. Phil.
Ethel McKirdy-Walker, MA

The Sydney Society for Scottish History
Edmund Barton Chambers
MLC Centre, Level 44
19–29 Martin Place
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

Printed by University of Sydney Printing Services
University of Sydney, Sydney NSW 2006
ISSN 1320–4246

ALL THINGS TO ALL MEN

Mary Queen of Scots and the Scottish Civil Wars 1568–73

by

Katherine Thompson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Journal of the Sydney Society for Scottish History

Vol. no 9, December 2001

ALL THINGS TO ALL MEN: Mary Queen of Scots and the Scottish Civil Wars 1568–73

by
Katherine Thompson

	page
President's Introduction Malcolm D. Broun	v
Abbreviations and conventions	vii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 Noble Power, Kinship and Factionalism: Case study of the House of Hamilton during the Civil Wars 1568–73	13
Chapter 2 Print and Propaganda War 1568–73: The War of Words	29
Chapter 3 'Regiment of the Realm': The War of Governance and Diplomacy 53	49
Conclusion	67
Appendices	73
• List of Allegiances, 1568: <i>Hamilton Bond, Battle of Langside, Dumbarton Bond</i>	
• Affiliations of Scottish Nobility, 1571	

President's Introduction

Historians, amateur and professional, famous and infamous, fall into a number of categories. One group, that Edward Gibbon identifies as philosophical historians, tends to derive from historical events an understanding of moral and political philosophical questions. Historical events are seen as illustrations of philosophic truths. Another seem to be attempting merely to record facts without drawing any philosophical inferences or political truths from them.

Then there are those who are trying to advance some particular argument, support some political or moral position, or advance some current cause by reference to the past. One historian will argue for the folly, pointlessness and viciousness of war. Another will argue for the nobility, self-sacrifice and grandeur of war. One will argue for the civilising and beneficial effects of the Roman or British Empire. Another will argue for the oppressions and injustices of the Roman or British Empire. One will argue for the optimism of steady human progress. Another would delight in showing how human behaviour has not improved much over thousands of years.

Perhaps all of these different types of historian are really much the same. The historian who prides himself on simply recording the facts, expressing no opinions and arguing for no cause still inevitably does so by his selection of material and his selection of emphasis. There is a strong tendency for the victor to get a better press than the victim, unless the victim has friends outside the power of the victor. Perhaps the biggest change in the writing of history over the last hundred years is that improved communication of information means winners and losers will often have almost equal support internationally. The time when the winner could effectively wipe out the sympathetic historians of the loser seem to have gone. The difference between Gibbon's 'Philosophic Historian' and the one who is endeavouring by reference to history to advance a cause, will frequently just be a matter of balance or wisdom in the assessments made and the selection of material. Sadly, at least in the short term, wisdom and balance is no more likely to have popular acceptance than folly and prejudice. Indeed, we could probably find many examples where folly and prejudice are more readily accepted. I wonder whether wisdom and balance even has an advantage on the long-term in the survival of historical writings.

These questions lead to a consideration of our own Society. We gather together for meetings, we prepare papers and we publish this journal, but what sort of historians are we? It is probably fair to say that we are the usual mixture but sharing a view of the importance, significance or perhaps only interest to ourselves, of Scottish history. We live in a nation of mixed ethnic origins. Few of us find it attractive to think that our ancestry began only when we, our parents,

grandparents or great grandparents or remoter ancestry stepped off a plane or a boat in Australia. The world after all did not begin in 1788. The question, 'Where did we come from?', is a matter of continuing human interest.

Some of us have therefore been led to an interest in Scottish history, simply from a desire to know something about the past of our own ancestry. Some are led to particular interests by such personal questions why their Presbyterian grandparents so anxiously disliked anything to do with the Catholic Church. Some by tracing their own personal ancestry are able to study the historical events of Scotland in which they were involved. Some by identifying with their clan or name can find great satisfaction and pride in knowing the activities of their clan or their people or the people of their name in the distant or recent past. Taking pride in one's ancestry is certainly a common human experience — whether it is a good or a bad thing may be debated. Many member of our Society have taken a general interest in history, much as people may take up golf or stamp collecting. History can be a career but it can be an addiction at least more socially acceptable than alcohol or gambling. So our Society includes some members who are not in fact caught up by ancestral origins or ethnic background, but who are caught up by an interest in history and happen to have found Scottish history as a subject of study of particular interest to them.

Like any learned society therefore, we like to encourage an interest in Scottish history and particularly to encourage our members. Consistently with that view, this issue of our journal publishes the major work of our honorary secretary whom we have sought to encourage since her early undergraduate days. It happens also to deal with a period of Scottish history which has been over the years of particular interest to us.

Perhaps more consistently with interest in ancestry than our general historical interest, our covers have been the heraldic arms of members of our Society. From motives of economy we have in the past prepared the covers of four issues at one time. This issue is the first of four in which the arms displayed are the arms of our present treasurer, Matthew Glozier, who has over the years contributed many distinguished and indeed original papers to the meetings of the Society.

Malcolm D. Broun,
President

Abbreviations and Conventions

- APS *The Acts of Parliaments of Scotland*, ed. T. Thomson and C. Innes (Edinburgh, 1814–75)
- Buchanan, *History* G. Buchanan, *The History of Scotland*, translated J. Aikman (Glasgow and Edinburgh, 1827–29)
- BUK *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland*, or *The Booke of the Universall Kirk.*, ed. T. Thomson, 3 vols (Bannatyne Club, 1839–45).
- CSPSc *Calendar of the State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots 1547–1603*, ed. J. Bain and others (Edinburgh, 1898–)
- Diurnal of Occurrents *A Diurnal of Remarkable Occurrents that have passed within the country of Scotland, since the death of King James the Fourth till the year 1575* (Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs, 1833)
- Dowden, *Bishops* J. Dowden, *The Bishops of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1912)
- Durkan & Ross, *Libraries [ESL]* J. Durkan and A. Ross, *Early Scottish Libraries* (Glasgow, 1961)
- Cowan & Easson, *Religious Houses* I. B. Cowan and D. E. Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses Scotland*, second edition (London, 1976)
- Hamilton Papers* *The Hamilton Papers*, ed J. Bain (Edinburgh, 1890–92)
- IR *The Innes Review* (1950–)
- Knox, *Works* *The Works of John Knox*, ed D. Laing (Edinburgh, 1846–64)
- Lesley, *History* J. Lesley, *The History of Scotland from the Death of King James I in the year 1436 to the year 1561* (Bannatyne Club, 1830)
- Lyndsay, *Works* (Laing) *The Poetic Works of Sir David Lyndsay*, ed. D. Laing (Edinburgh, 1879)
- Monro, *Western Isles* *Monro's Western Isles of Scotland and Genealogies of the Clans 1549*, ed R. W. Monro (Edinburgh, 1961)
- NS *Northern Scotland* (Aberdeen, 1972–)
- RMS *Registrum Magni Sigillii Regum Scotorum*, ed J. M. Thomson and others (Edinburgh, 1882–1914)
- RPC *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, ed J. H. Burton and others (Edinburgh, 1877–)
- SHR *The Scottish Historical Review* (1903–28, 1947–)
- Scots Peerage [SP]* *The Scots Peerage*, ed Sir J. Balfour Paul (Edinburgh, 1904–14)

Introduction

Langside: First Conflict

On 2 May 1568, Mary Queen of Scots escaped from Lochleven Castle where she had been held captive since her failed campaign at Carberry on 15 June the previous year. In July 1567, the queen had been forced to abdicate in favour of her infant son James VI. Mary's bastard half brother, James, Earl of Moray, had assumed the regency and thus governance of Scotland during the young King's minority. Many people domestically *and* internationally opposed the manner in which Moray's faction had induced the sovereign's relinquishment of her crown. Mary's escape now presented the opportunity for retaliation. From Lochleven Mary now fled immediately to the safe haven of Hamilton, eight miles from Glasgow, where her supporters now rallied. Moray upon hearing the news issued a proclamation in Glasgow on 7 May calling for all supporters of the royal authority to join with him against 'the tressonable conspiratouris.'¹ On 8 May Mary's supporters signed a bond for her restoration. Mary was able to rally six thousand men in just eleven days and would have had more if she had waited for Huntly's support from the North. But the impatience of Mary's supporters, particularly the Hamiltons, caused the Queen's forces to forge ahead toward Dumbarton. Mary was aware of the military skills of her brother and Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange, but wanted to press her advantage of numbers. Moray, too was resolved to fight before fresh men from the North came to Mary's aid. Receiving intelligence that the Queen was upon the march he hastened to take advantage of the ground.² Moray's faction chose a little village called Langside two miles from Glasgow to set up forces in anticipation of her arrival.³

The battle of Langside was fought on Thursday 13 May 1568 as the Queen's party approached Glasgow. Whilst contemporary accounts vary in details of the conflict, a comprehensive picture is set in which almost six thousand Queen's men faced scarcely four thousand King's men.⁴ At Langside, the Queen's army included nineteen earls, almost all the bishops, more than half the commendators, Fleming, Argyll and Eglinton along with numerous lesser men from the south east and south west.⁵ On the King's side the list is headed by earls Morton, Glencairne, Mar and Monteith along with a number of lords

¹ R. Dickson and J. P. Edmond, *Annals of Scottish Printing: from the introduction of the art in 1507 to the beginning of the seventeenth century* (Cambridge, 1890), p. 238.

² Lord Herries, *Memoirs* (Abbotsford Club, 1836), p. 102.

³ Anonymous, *Historie of James the Sext* (Bannantyne Club, 1825), p. 25; James Melville of Halhill, *Memoirs* (Bannantyne Club, 1827), pp. 200–01.

⁴ G. Buchanan, *History* ii, p. 535, claims 6,500; Calderwood, *History* ii (Wodrow Society 1843), p. 414.

⁵ G. Donaldson, *All the Queen's Men* (London, 1983); see appendix of thesis for list of chief participants.

and lesser nobles. Two participants who would play a major role in the next years of civil war were the secretary, William Maitland of Lethington, who later defected to the Marian cause and the internationally renowned scholar and ardent King's party adherent, George Buchanan. It was a battle that despite superior numbers, the Queen's party emphatically lost.

The reasons for the surprising defeat have been discussed exhaustively in previous accounts. It seems that Moray anticipated the situation correctly and assisted by the military skill of veteran captain Kirkcaldy of Grange was able to surprise the Queen's party by a swift and united front, a move which was assisted by the arrival of MacFarlane and his Highlanders. The first catastrophe for the Queen's forces was the unexpected debilitation of her commander at the crucial moment of confrontation. Mary's lieutenant-general Archibald, fifth Earl of Argyll, swooned at the onset of the conflict leaving a large portion of the Marian forces leaderless and without direction. The delay allowed Moray to rally his forces and press the advantage. The battle was confused and violent though it only lasted three quarters of an hour. An English contemporary Raphael Hollinshead describes the sharp encounter:

after they had bestowed their shot of harquebozes and arrows, they fell to it with spears and swords.⁶

Other accounts support the claim that despite the short duration of the conflict it was not an easy fight. The mistake of the Queen's party was its lack of preparation, perhaps over-confidence, but primarily their panicked retreat. Many who were not slain in battle were slain in the heated pursuit that followed their flight.

Nevertheless, casualties were few. Though many were hurt, including Lord Home and Lord Ochiltree, only one King's man was slain.⁷ Casualties on the Queen's side were much more significant, but it is here that sources vary. Herries and Buchanan both claim that three hundred were killed and numerous prisoners taken.⁸ *Historie of James the Sext* claims that the number was no greater than two hundred, while Hollinshead claims three hundred were taken prisoner, fourteen Hamiltons being amongst those slain.⁹ The latter figures are substantiated in the *Calendar of State Papers*.¹⁰ What is crucial to note is the decisive victory of Moray's smaller but united forces which proved to be an incredible embarrassment to Mary and her party. Moray and his forces pressed a hard pursuit of Mary and it can be understood why she might feel panic enough to flee Scotland, a move which seems to have been universally condemned.

⁶ R. Hollinshead, *The Scottish Chronicle* (Arbroath, 1806), p. 347.

⁷ Herries, *Memoirs*, p. 103.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 103; Buchanan, *History*, ii, p. 537.

⁹ Anon., *Historie James the Sext* (Bannantyne Club, 1825), p. 26; Hollinshead, *Scottish Chronicle*, p. 347.

¹⁰ *CSP Sc*, ii, p. 405.

Mary's flight to England following Langside irrevocably altered the face and issues of the Scottish civil wars and led to the consolidation of opposing factions. Those who supported young King James and so adhered to Moray's government became 'King's men' whilst those who supported Mary as rightful sovereign or 'had any particular question, claim, or feud with any of the king's lords' became 'Queen's men'.¹¹ At this stage the ultimate victory of the King's party was certainly not so assured as some academics will claim. As Keith states, we are always so foolish as to applaud or condemn according to events.¹² Gordon Donaldson elaborates:

Historians like to be on the winning side, they seldom admit that things went wrong, and consequently the failures in history get bad press.¹³

This is particularly pertinent to the events of Langside which raises a number of 'what ifs'.

Ultimately, Mary did not wait for Huntly, nor wait for her forces to rally again. Most importantly, she did not heed the advice of her closest friends who urged her to either stay in Scotland or turn to France, the country of her childhood and adolescence, over which she had ruled briefly as queen. Instead, on 16 May 1568 Mary fled with a small number of adherents across the Solway Firth to arrive in Workington England, in the misguided expectation of her cousin's sympathy and protection. Mary's reasons for this course were many and extended beyond mere panic. Yet whatever her reasons, it proved to be a severe error of judgment. By this action Mary left her supporters without a monarch to physically reinstate to the throne at the commencement of a bitter multi-faceted civil war. Mary would never again return to Scotland but die on the block at Fotheringay on 8 February 1587.

b. Statement of Problem being Investigated

The Scottish civil wars were multifarious and complex, fought on a number of fronts, with an outcome far from pre-ordained. Despite the views professed by Gordon Donaldson in *Mary Queen of Scots*, and Ian B Cowan in 'The Marian Civil War, 1567–73' claiming that Mary's flight to England in May 1568 was 'fatal to her chances' or 'made the final scenario inevitable'¹⁴ the victory of the King's party was in no way assured by 1568 or even 1570. A review of the Hamilton Bond (8 May 1568), the Langside Battle list (13 May 1568) and the Dumbarton Bond (12 September 1568) shows a steady adherence to the Marian cause. Certainly, until late 1570 and early 1571 the Queen's party had the

¹¹ Donaldson, *Mary*, p. 122; J. Melville, *Memoirs*, p. 75.

¹² Keith, *Affairs of Church and State in Scotland*, ii (Edinburgh, 1845), pp. 810–11.

¹³ Donaldson, *Queen's Men*, p. 4.

¹⁴ Donaldson, *Mary*, p. 139; Cowan, 'Marian Civil War, 1567–73', in Norman Macdougall (ed.), *Scotland and War AD 79–1918*, Edinburgh; John Donald Publishers, 1991, p. 107.

support of the majority of the nobility and much of the clergy (four of the six reformed bishops supported Mary). As Ian B. Cowan himself states

At its peak as much as 600 supporters may have actively aided the queen, and at least 470 of these have been positively identified as against 150 allied with the King's party.¹⁵

In fact, it remains one of the greatest ironies of the civil wars, that whilst Mary enjoyed the majority of support (one has only to see how she rallied 6,000 men in eleven days for Langside) she ultimately lost the war.

There were a significant number of episodes that gradually ended Mary's favourable position. Damage had been done in her first trial in 1568/9 in which she was charged with complicity in her husband's murder at Kirk o'Field in February 1567. The famous 'Casket letters' were produced by the prosecution and if authentic would undoubtedly prove her guilt.¹⁶ The question of her restoration to Scotland was thrown into doubt by a 'not proven' verdict. Such uncertainty was further complicated by plans for her marriage to Norfolk, the most powerful man in England at the time, without Elizabeth's consent in 1569. In November of that year she was entangled with the Northern Catholic uprising in England which attempted to reassert the Roman Catholic faith. The damage was not yet irreparable, however, for by April 1570:

the civil war had reached a critical stage, and the prospects of a victory for the Queen's party were at their highest.¹⁷

This was mainly due to the assassination of Regent Moray in January 1570 and the consequent power vacuum. It would be July before another Regent, Matthew Lennox, was appointed. In the meantime, Marian influence flourished.

In 1571 hopes for Mary's restoration and a Queen's party victory faded and by 1572 had effectively ended. In 1570 lengthy negotiations between the two warring factions had failed to achieve results, with neither willing wholly to capitulate. In 1570 and 1571 Elizabeth succumbed to the King's party pleas for assistance against the growing strength of their adversaries and punitive expeditions were led by the English Sussex and Drury against the houses and property of leading Marians, particularly the Hamiltons. Meanwhile, foreign support for the Marians failed to translate from fair promises into concrete reality. In April 1571 the Marian stronghold of Dumbarton Castle, which stocked supplies and aid from the French, was captured by the King's party and one of the main leaders of the Queen's party, Archbishop Hamilton, was tried and executed. The situation for the Marians was becoming dire and they knew it. In

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

¹⁶ See G. Donaldson, *First Trial of Mary Queen of Scots* (London, 1969) and I. B. Cowan, *The Enigma of Mary Stewart* (London, 1971).

¹⁷ M. Loughlin, ' "The Dialogue of the Twa Wyfeis": Maitland, Machiavelli and the Propaganda of the Scottish Civil War', in A. A. MacDonald et al. (eds), *The Renaissance in Scotland: Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture* (Leiden, 1994), pp. 230–31.

mid-April Kirkcaldy of Grange, who had defected in 1569 to the Queen's Party, evicted the King's party from Edinburgh and the Marians took hold of the city. The King's party retreated to Leith and the 'Wars between Leith and Edinburgh' began, only ending with the return of King James' supporters in August 1572. Rival administrations dominated these wars with completely separate jurisdictions set up by both factions leading to a series of forfeiture and counter-forfeiture, violence and counter-violence, increasing propaganda and unstable governance. In this period there were three regents: Lennox who was killed in September 1571 in Stirling, Mar who was appointed his successor in September 1571 and who died in November 1572 and Morton who retained the Scottish regency from 1572 to 1580. In short, this period was marked by an increasing need for order and stability. As events exploded the focus on international alliances became crucial.

The Scottish civil wars 1568–1573 dragged on for so long because there had been no decisive outside intervention to end it until 1573. Unfortunately for the Marians, it was the King's party which eventually benefited from foreign assistance. Mary's involvement in the Ridolfi Plot of September 1571 had hardened Elizabeth's attitude towards her cousin and ended hopes for her return to Scotland without foreign aid. But the international civil war allies of the Queen's party— sympathetic nobles in the English court, French royalty and correspondents, Alva in the Netherlands, and especially Philip of Spain — were now absorbed by their own concerns, without the resources to aid their Scottish comrades and their weakening cause. The fall of Dumbarton Castle had effectively terminated access to French aid and resources. By 1572 Spain was immersed in the Dutch revolt; the Netherlands were in crisis after the capture of Brill by the 'Sea Beggars' in April; France and England had signed a defensive alliance by the Treaty of Blois on 27 April; and in August France became immersed in its fourth War of Religion¹⁸ following St Bartholomew's Eve and the massacre of 40,000 Huguenots. Growing Protestant paranoia regarding an international Catholic conspiracy did not aid Mary's cause.

The end came in 1573. Despite shows of defiance by Kirkcaldy of Grange and other Castilians in January, by mid February negotiations were being held between key members of the two civil war factions in Perth. These culminated in the Pacification of Perth on 23 February 1573 under which Marian adherents such as Huntly, Châtelherault and his sons agreed to accept the King's authority and support the reformed church. The final allied bombardment of Edinburgh Castle by the King's party and English forces from 17 to 28 May 1573 and the Marians final unconditional surrender a day later was a mere formality. So the

¹⁸ N. M. Sutherland, *Massacre of St Bartholomew and the European Conflict 1559–72* (London, 1973) and R. M. Kingdon, *Myths about the St Bartholomew's Day Massacres 1572–76* (Harvard, 1988). Note that while these authors refer to this as the 'fourth' religious war in France, some sources do cite it as 'third'.

Scottish civil wars ended as they began — decided by foreign intervention. It was a war fought on many fronts, with fluctuating motivations, shifting loyalties and a character unique to any other wars seen in the sixteenth century.

c. *Previous Studies*

The rise and fall of Mary Queen of Scots from her personal reign spanning from 1561 to 1567 to her eventual execution at Fotheringay Castle on 8 February 1587 has been the focus of heated and divided debate for centuries. Images of the Stewart monarch vary from Catholic martyr, to adulteress murderess, to enigma, to self-seeking opportunist, to a victim of circumstance. Yet for a monarch who has so captured the imagination of both academics and the public alike and whose personal reign has been the subject of a multitude of books, there have been very few detailed studies of the Scottish civil wars from 1568 to 1573. Despite a rich collection of primary sources, the sheer complexity of this period has dissuaded many from pursuing further studies in it which are anything more than a brief reference. The civil wars remained sadly neglected until Gordon Donaldson's illuminating publication in 1983 *All the Queen's Men: Power and Politics in Mary Stewart's Scotland*.

Donaldson had conducted a number of inquiries into early modern Scottish politics generally and Mary specifically in *First Trial of Mary Queen of Scots* (1969) and *Mary Queen of Scots* (1974) both of which reflected the complex nature of her situation after 1568 and those involved in her cause. *Queen's Men* now extended those studies to investigate the men and motives behind both the Queen's party and King's party during this turbulent era. Rather than a focus on the religious motives often associated with Mary, particularly predominant in Jenny Wormald's *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (1988) or a focus on personality such as Antonia Fraser's *Mary Queen of Scots* (1965), Donaldson's work focused on the fluctuating loyalties and mixed motives of her adherents, more swayed by personal interests than religious fervour. Thomas I. Rae commends Donaldson on the new dimensions introduced by *Queen's Men* such as kinship loyalties and marriage ties, the rise of lesser men such as lairds and burgesses and even genuine notions of sovereignty which over-rode the diverse religious affiliations of Marian adherents.¹⁹

Gordon Donaldson's work *Queen's Men* remains the most thorough and reliable authority on the structure and individuals of the Scottish civil wars but it is vastly under-referenced and its objective is to study men rather than phenomena like the print and propaganda wars that raged during this time. The intention of this work is not to challenge the detail of his study, nor redo what has already been comprehensively done.²⁰ Rather, it expands on Donaldson's suggestion of a multi-faceted war and by special studies expands on the notion of

¹⁹ Thomas I. Rae, Review in *SHR*, ixv, 179 (April 1986), pp. 75–76.

²⁰ See appendix for list of King's party and Queen's party adherents.

a war on many fronts. Most particularly, it explores the role of the Scottish nobility — an exciting new development in current academic study which still remains inadequately investigated despite recent attention. It builds on and goes beyond Donaldson's work by focusing on the house of Hamilton, one of the most powerful noble families of this era, with intimate connections to both government and the throne. The intricacies of the complex noble relationships is too vast to be analysed in this brief account but the case study presented offers insight into the general issues and characteristics of the nobility at this time.

It is a significant analysis, for understanding the nobility is the way to understanding Scottish politics. The nobility's unique relationship with kin, crown and kirk is fundamental for any informed analysis of both Scottish history generally and the civil wars specifically. In this time of uncertainty kin networks became more crucial to the maintenance of noble power faced with the threat of a rising 'middling sort' of lairds and burgesses. Further, in the face of internal and external challenges families unified in the best interests of the house or clan to maintain traditional influence, the Hamiltons being a classic example of this. At this time, the new Kirk continued its struggle to secure revenues, new programs of reform, and establish a system of church courts, yet despite its efforts and the propaganda machine which proclaimed its influence, it was still heavily reliant upon the nobility for support. Finally, a struggle for effective control of the realm with Mary in England and her son still a minor saw personal motivations for power dominate many noble actions and allegiances. In all this, the nobility was central to events.

Domestically, the civil wars of 1568 to 1573 were clearly motivated by more than religion. Religion was a consideration, certainly, in attempts to rally the foreign support so crucial to victory, but it was not the main motivation. Religion was the focus of many foreign propaganda campaigns, particularly in France and in this context it will be explored. It was also an image played upon by the King's party as a means of justification, identification and foreign diplomacy. The religious question will thus be confined here to the relevant concerns previously mentioned and those of Protestant Elizabeth's desire to avoid papist intervention; Cecil's desire for a Protestant British friendship; international Catholic sympathies for Mary's plight and so on. The study adopts a new angle on issues such as the war of words, the war of governance and diplomacy, even the war of noble kinship, power and factionalism, with a conscious effort to present a comprehensively referenced and solid reflection of key issues.

Donaldson's work *Queen's Men* recovered the civil wars from their obscurity bringing attention back to Mary's homefront and less on the diversion of Mary's years of English imprisonment which had captivated earlier writers. Many academics were relieved that somebody had tackled what was a black hole in Scottish history, yet many still hesitated to pursue it. In recent years however

there has been a flourishing of analysis of this era, focusing mainly on evaluations of some of the leading personalities behind the events. In 1985 Elaine Finnie wrote an article on one of the most powerful and intriguing families of this era — the Hamiltons. Her work ‘The House of Hamilton: Patronage, Politics and the Church in the Reformation Period’ remains one of the most complete analysis of the rise and fall of this dominant house — its landed and political influence, ecclesiastical connections, marriage alliances and web of relationships. On the civil war years, however, she presents the main themes, but provides only a brief analysis of some three or four pages.²¹ This study thus aims to provide a more complete picture of Hamilton civil war involvement by concentrating on individual family members’ motivations for allegiance, the over-riding concerns of Châtelherault’s immediate family and kin, and the costs of this allegiance.

Other major noble families of the civil war for the Marian cause include the Campbells and Gordons. Whilst the absence of any solid studies of the Clan Campbell initially beckoned me to pursue further research, it is far too complex a study to adequately cover in such a short study. Whilst it will not be covered in any depth here, it is crucial to note Dr Jane Dawson’s contribution to this area in her two forthcoming works, *Clan Campbell Letters 1559–1583* and *The First British Politician?: the Career of Archibald Campbell, Fifth Earl of Argyll 1538–73*.²² In these Dawson writes a detailed account of Clan Campbell networks, influence and motivations by reference to the correspondence of Grey Colin of Glenorchy and the Breadalbane letters. Campbell clan leader Archibald, fifth Earl of Argyll is assessed in relation to his civil war involvement as a Marian lieutenant turned King’s man in 1571, his involvement in Ireland, and his power in the Western Highlands.²³ In relation to the third major Marian house of the civil wars, the Gordons, and its leader George, fifth Earl of Huntly, Atholl L. Murray has written a short but vital account titled ‘Huntly’s rebellion and the administration of justice in north east Scotland, 1570–73’ which appears in *Northern Scotland* series.²⁴

The noble personalities of this era remain fascinating. In 1953 Maurice Lee wrote an account of *James Stewart, Earl of Moray* in which he attempted to remedy the conspicuous absence of any substantial noble study. In his words:

it became clear that no one had treated Mary’s reign from the point of view of the most powerful group in Scotland, the nobility. Previous writers had studied the period either as part of Mary’s

²¹ E. Finnie, ‘The House of Hamilton : Patronage, Politics and the Church in the Reformation Period’, *IR*, 36 (1985), pp. 1–23.

²² J. E. A. Dawson, *Scottish History Society*, 5th Series, vol. 10 (Edinburgh, 1997); Cambridge University Press, forthcoming.

²³ I am grateful to Dr Dawson for allowing me to read earlier drafts of her forthcoming works prior to publication.

²⁴ A. L. Murray, ‘Huntly’s rebellion and the administration of justice in north east Scotland, 1570–73’, *Northern Scotland*, 4 (1981).

personal biography or as the first few chapters in the story of Scottish Protestantism.²⁵

Curiously, despite this recognition, nobody else has adequately addressed the governance of Regent Moray although his assassination was addressed by Patrick Cadell in his 1975 pamphlet *Sudden Slaughter*. This study thus delivers a detailed analysis of his earlier governance and pivotal role in the war of governance and diplomacy which dominated the events and progress of the Scottish civil wars.

Other nobles of this era have been addressed in relatively recent works and so will not be included. For a comprehensive study of the second Earl of Arran, later Châtelherault, D. B. Franklin's unpublished PhD thesis of 1981 should be referred to. Mark Loughlin's PhD thesis of 1981 *The Career of Maitland of Lethington 1526–1573* is the most complete study to date regarding Scotland's Principal Secretary of State and key figure of the civil wars, providing significant insight into some of the underlying themes of this period. The regents of Scotland remain understudied. Maurice Lee's 1953 publication on Moray is now fifty years old and in need of renewed attention. Lennox is looked at but largely as part of larger narratives. Mar remains to be addressed and one recent book by George Hewitt *Scotland Under Morton 1572–80* (Edinburgh, 1982) is all that really saves Morton from obscurity. It is thus clear that further study into this period of the Scottish civil wars and its leading personalities is vitally necessary despite the recent dawn of interest.

More generally, the civil wars also receive attention but not enough. For general analysis Gordon Donaldson remains an authority on structure. The composition and motives of involvement by both the Queen's party and the King's party is also significantly addressed by Ian B Cowan in his article, 'The Marian Civil War 1567–73'.²⁶ The civil war both in its wider context and as a war within Edinburgh is covered by Michael Lynch in his various works; *Mary Stewart, Queen in Three Kingdoms* (Oxford, 1988), *Scotland: A New History* (London, 1992) and *Edinburgh and the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1981)²⁷ the latter work removing the need for further investigation. In short, there have been a number of comprehensive studies already completed to which one could refer and I do not intend to reiterate these but take the fresh approach of exploring the various 'wars' which unfolded in Scotland during 1568–73, re-evaluating the primary sources to explore the key issues of this tumultuous period.

²⁵ M. Lee, *James Stewart, Earl of Moray: A Political Study of the Reformation in Scotland* (New York, 1953), p. vii.

²⁶ I. B. Cowan, 'The Marian Civil War', in N. Macdougall (ed.), *Scotland and War, AC 79–1918* (Edinburgh, 1991), pp. 95–113.

²⁷ The latter work by Lynch provides a detailed list of Queen's men and King's men in its appendix vii and viii, pp. 294–362.

d. Brief Statement of Sources and Dates

The scarcity of secondary sources in this area means a heavy reliance on primary source materials which challenge the modern reader by the diversity in spelling, language and form.²⁸ Most of the literature regarding the civil wars is written in Scottish vernacular which often varies between authors. Whilst Graham G. Simpson discusses a new self-consciousness about handwriting which was becoming more sophisticated, Jane E. A. Dawson also refers to the literacy and language of the nobles which was often found wanting.²⁹ As Dawson states: 'Written correspondence instead dealt with the formal subject of political relationships'.³⁰ In this regard it is curious to assess not only the correspondence between nobility such as the Breadalbane letters, but also the official documentation of the civil war institutions.

The *Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland* thus proves to be an indispensable source for Scottish history generally, and the civil wars particularly. Primary materials such as *RMS*, *RPC*, *BUK*, *ASP* and the like give crucial insights into the agendas and procedures of civil war governments, especially parliaments (where 40 day notice was necessary) and conventions (requiring 14 days).³¹ But one must be wary of both what is said and what is left unsaid. James VI believed that records, like those of the parliament, were the property of the crown³² and thus the admittance of material naturally portrays particular agendas.

Issues of print, publications, propaganda and censorship will be dealt with throughout this volume, but it is important that the difficulties of these sources be illustrated. Contemporary accounts of the civil war are often written by members of the Queen's party or King's party and so lack a real objectivity. Many were also written or published some time after the event. What sources do exist are not straightforward and many lack adequate indexes. A range of material in this civil war era exists only in Edinburgh and even then is confined to such places as the Registry or National Library of Scotland. Whilst there is a good variety of the printed material, most appear as memoirs or manuscripts compiled and published in the early nineteenth century with scant literary apparatus. Nevertheless, despite the sometimes problematic nature of Scottish civil war materials, a wide range of primary sources have been selected and applied appropriately to the issues under discussion.

²⁸ A good reference for this is the glossary in *Index to the Diurnal of Occurrents*, ed. A. G. Scott (Edinburgh, 1938).

²⁹ G. G. Simpson, *Scottish Handwriting 1150–1650* (Aberdeen, 1973), pp. 27, 30; Jane E. A. Dawson, *Clan Campbell Letters* (Edinburgh, 1997), forthcoming, p. 7.

³⁰ Dawson, *ibid.*, p. 5.

³¹ D. Shaw, *The General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland 1560–1600* (Edinburgh, 1964), p. 157; W. L. Mathieson, 'The Scottish Parliament, 1560–1707', *SHR*, 4 (1907).

³² Shaw, *General Assemblies*, p. 2.

The quality of the sources and their reliability have been constantly assessed and referred to. Working in Edinburgh has allowed contact with many scholars in this field, allowing for informed discussion of key themes and clarification of complex issues vital to comprehensive analysis. Referencing of the materials is thorough and adheres to *SHR* volume 42, 1963 guidelines, style with reference to *SHR*, volume 78, 1999 guidelines. Where names have been either anglicised or bastardised I have modernised and referred to the *RMS*. My intention is thus to offer as accurate and complete a picture as possible, using as wide a range of primary sources as has been available and tackling of the inherent challenges within them.

CHAPTER 1

Noble Power, Kinship and Factionalism: Case study of the House of Hamilton during the Civil Wars 1568–73

*For sen ze first to this realm began,
Ze wer ay callit for zour tyrannie
Strypis of the Schyre, the maist vnworthie clan
That ever wes bred, or sene in this countrie,
As shawis weill be zour Genalogie :
For thrift and murther, reif and oppressiounis,
With Guidis and Rukis blasit equallie,
Is the auld arms of the Hammiltounis.*

(*Sempill Ballates*)¹

In the civil wars that ravaged the Scottish landscape from 1568–73, the Hamiltons emerged as ardent Marians. The Hamiltons had dominated the political stage in Scotland for most of the sixteenth century and were a powerful force at the advent of the strife. However, by 1579 this once formidable house had been humbled, forfeited under the regency of Morton and its leader Châtelherault deceased since 1575. For a family of such eminent stature, so close to the throne, ‘its collapse was spectacular’. By backing the losing side in the civil wars the Hamiltons had been broken. The house of Hamilton would later re-establish a level of dignity and standing but would never again reach the height of predominance once enjoyed.

Regional, National and Political Influence

The ascendancy of the House of Hamilton to its position of pre-dominance by the civil wars had been the product of three centuries of opportunistic manoeuvring, a position achieved through kinship ties, marriage connections, bonds of manrent, royal rewards of lands and political office, ecclesiastical patronage and secular consolidations. By the siring of numerous children (legitimate *and* illegitimate), the acquisition of substantial assets such as land was assured for the Hamiltons as many of them married into leading Scottish families or attained ecclesiastical positions. Probably the greatest Hamilton coup in this regard, was the marriage of Sir James, first Lord Hamilton, to Princess Mary

¹ *Satirical Poems of the Time of the Reformation*, ed. J. Cranstoun, 1 (Edinburgh and London, 1891), p. 112.

Stewart in July 1474 under papal dispensation.² Despite a later breakdown in their relationship, this marriage assured future Hamiltons a legitimate claim to the Scottish throne that would rule their personal and political machinations even at the dawn of the civil wars.

Marriage ties and extensive kin connections were a fundamental feature of the Hamilton ascendancy. The first Earl of Arran was to have three legitimate children by his second wife Janet Beaton — James, Gavin and Helen — and thirteen or sixteen illegitimate children.³ His eldest son and heir James, second Earl of Arran and later Duke of Châtelhault, also had eight children by his wife Margaret Douglas — James, Gavin, John, David, Claud, Barbara, Jean or Janet and Anne.⁴ Marriage connections provided an intimate connection for many of the Marian allies to the house of Hamilton during this period. As Donaldson describes:

One daughter Barbara, had married Lord Fleming, and had by him a daughter ... The next daughter Jean, had married the Earl of Eglinton ... Then came Anne, wife of the fifth Earl of Huntly, one of Mary's strongest supporters ... Going a generation further back, Helen Hamilton, Châtelhault's sister, had married the fourth Earl of Argyll, and thus brought the Argyll's into the Hamilton connection.⁵

Thus between them, the first and second earls were to produce some of the most significant players of the Scottish civil wars, 1568–73.

Between 1554 and 1573, Hamilton sheriffdoms, castles, burghs, baronies and ecclesiastical holdings dominated lower-mid Scotland from east to west.⁶ As Elaine Finnie describes in her comprehensive article on Hamilton patronage:

Although by far the main concentration of property was to be found in Lanarkshire, Ayrshire and West Lothian, near the fortresses of Hamilton (formally Cadzow), Draffen, Kincavil and Kinneil, the actual number of estates owned by the Hamiltons, totalling over 200, stretched from the island of Arran in the west, to Corse in Aberdeenshire in the east, and as far south as Sanquhar in Dumfriesshire.⁷

Margaret H. B. Sanderson describes charters received in the 1550s by Châtelhault for the abbey lands of Kelso, Cambuskenneth, Holyrood,

² G. A. Hamilton, *A History of the House of Hamilton* (Edinburgh, 1933), p. 9; *The Scots Peerage [SP]*, ed. Sir J. Balfour Paul, 4 (Edinburgh, 1907), p. 353.

³ Former number is stated in *SP*, 4, pp. 361–65; latter number in Hamilton, *House of Hamilton*, pp. 13–14.

⁴ *SP*, 4, pp. 368–70.

⁵ Donaldson, *Mary*, p. 127.

⁶ P. G. B. McNeill and H. L. MacQueen, *Atlas of Scottish History to 1707* (Edinburgh, 1996), p. 137; see appendix for map of Hamilton secular and ecclesiastical holdings 1554–73.

⁷ Finnie, 'Hamilton Patronage', p. 4.

Kilwinning and Saddell.⁸ This form of ecclesiastical exploitation was a feature of Châtelherault and Hamilton expansionist policies throughout the sixteenth century.

Clan rivalry in the regions — Hamiltons versus Lennox-Stewarts

Noble powers and local clan rivalries were a fundamental feature of Scottish society and the civil wars specifically. Inherent cultural, political, social and geographical divisions within Scotland saw magnates rise to quasi-independent status within their individual spheres of influence which defied effective crown controls. Here these nobles relished a position of substantial power — collecting homages, representing their people at national institutions (based mainly in the lowlands), and overseeing local justice and judicial matters. Kin relationships were central to the mental world of the Scottish nobility embracing notions of honour, lineage, blood, marriage alliances and bonds of manrent.⁹ This led to an aggregation of smaller enclosed communities rather than a single unified state.¹⁰ Church, state, lord and family all vied for loyalty, but it was ‘the pursuit and protection of power’ which was the major interest of the political elite according to Keith M. Brown.¹¹ Whilst John Knox regarded the nobles as the ‘chief pillars’ of a continuing reformation, the civil wars exemplified that both the King’s party and the Queen’s party were bound more by shifting interests than religion. A notion supported by Gordon Donaldson’s various works as well as by the complexion of the parties involved. Constantly changing allegiances throughout the course of the civil wars certainly spoke more of individual interests.¹² Throughout Mary’s personal reign the principal noble groups to emerge were the Hamiltons, Gordons, Campbells, Douglasses and Lennox - Stewarts each with their own extensive power bases and private agendas.

The house of Hamilton emerged significantly damaged from the wreckage of the civil wars. A number of reasons led to this collapse. Jenny Wormald states the primary cause as that, ‘they confused issues rather than achieved results. In part this was because, despite their national and even international importance, their vision was too often restricted to family politics at home.’¹³ Hamilton influence was extensive and the maintenance of this was an integral family concern. Their interests of advancement were reflective of other major houses of this era. Yet it lacked the cohesive unity of the of other families such as Clan

⁸ M. H. B. Sanderson, *Scottish Rural Society in the Sixteenth Century* (Edinburgh, 1982), p. 32.

⁹ Dawson, *Clan Campbell Letters 1559–1583*, p. 8.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

¹¹ K. M. Brown, *Bloodfeud in Scotland 1573–1625: Violence, Justice and Politics in an Early Modern Society* (Edinburgh, 1986), pp. 108–09.

¹² Note in this Argyll’s defection August 1571; Boyd’s renowned inconstancy referred to by Hollinshead, and Châtelherault and Huntly’s eventual submission to terms in the Pacification of Perth in February 1573.

¹³ J. Wormald, *Lords and Men in Scotland: Bonds of Manrent, 1442–1603* (Edinburgh, 1985), p. 148.

Campbell in the Southern Highlands and the Gordons and MacKenzies in the North. Protection of land and local influence was always a crucial preoccupation of the Scottish nobility and the civil wars exemplified that this often came before the larger national interests. The Breadalbane letters of Grey Colin of Glenorchy illustrate absorption with the long-standing MacGregor feud that continued into the civil wars and a concern of offending his neighbour Atholl.¹⁴ Like the Campbells feud with the MacGregors, the Hamiltons were engaged in a long-standing clan rivalry with the Lennox-Stewarts. During the civil wars the tension which had festered throughout Mary's personal reign exploded and the prize for the victor was the highest office in the land — the governance of the realm.

The motivations for Hamilton allegiance to the Marian cause were born mainly from dynastic issues of succession and legitimacy that had dominated their domestic policies for almost a century. Hamilton claims to the Scottish throne lay in the marriage of James, first Lord Hamilton, to Princess Mary Stewart (James II's daughter) by papal dispensation in April 1474.¹⁵ Both the Lennox-Stewarts and the Hamiltons could claim rightful succession to the throne by this marriage — Lennox through their daughter Elizabeth and Châtelherault through their eldest son, the first earl of Arran. As Franklin imparts; 'Arran's paternal claim, however, held precedence over the maternal claim of Lennox, provided one condition was established. Was Arran the legitimate issue of his father?'¹⁶ Such a question left the second earl, Châtelherault, constantly vulnerable to attack by his rivals and his quest to establish his royal claims dominated his respective personal and political careers, over-zealously Buchanan would suggest. Such tensions were a major factor in the machinations of Châtelherault and his house throughout this period of civil strife.

Motivations for Hamilton allegiance: 1568–73

The main weapon of the Lennox-Stewarts against the Hamiltons in the struggle for dynastic power during the civil wars was the question of Châtelherault's legitimacy. Doubt over Châtelherault's legitimacy lay in his father's doubtful divorce of his first wife Elizabeth, daughter of Alexander second Lord Home, whom he had married before 28 April 1490.¹⁷ Evidently, before November 1504 the first Earl of Arran had raised an action against his wife, stating that, 'though they were married and had lived as man and wife, he was not bound to adhere to her or show her a husband's affection, because a marriage had been formally solemnised between herself and Thomas Hay.'¹⁸ Apparently Thomas Hay had gone abroad and been reported dead, but had

¹⁴ Dawson, *Clan Campbell Letters*, pp. 48–60.

¹⁵ Hamilton, *House of Hamilton*, p. 9.

¹⁶ F. D. B. Franklin, *The Scottish Regency of the Earl of Arran: A Study in the Failure of Anglo-Scottish Relations* (University of Alabama, PhD thesis, 1981), p. 27.

¹⁷ Hamilton, *House of Hamilton*, p. 12.

¹⁸ SP, 4, p. 359.

reappeared in 1491 after Elizabeth's marriage to Arran and declared her his lawful wife.¹⁹ Thirteen years passed before a divorce was pronounced and the *Hamilton Report* reveals it repeated in similar terms on 11 March 1509–10.²⁰ Despite an annulment on the grounds of consanguinity being granted, the couple continued to live together until 1510.²¹ Such a delay aroused the suspicions of contemporaries and gave ground to later doubts deliberately perpetuated by Lennox during the era of Reformation to the civil wars.

Such marital separations were not unusual and formed part of the basic fabric of Scottish society during the sixteenth century. The rules stated quite strictly that marriages could only be dissolved on account of the parties being within four degrees of affinity or consanguinity *or* by the existence of a previous marriage however irregular.²² However, as Archbishop Hamilton stated in 1554, such was the connection between families in Scotland that 'it was scarce possible to match two persons of good birth who should not come within the forbidden degrees'.²³ The blind eye given by church officials meant that whilst profitable alliances could be made, there remained the possibility of future claims for divorce. Based on the grounds set down by *Liber Officialis Sancti Andree*, the Earl's divorce from Elizabeth would seem legitimate and his subsequent marriage to Janet Betoun before 23 November 1516 a lawful one.²⁴ However, R. K. Hannay reveals that, in the summer of 1548, 'an impediment was found in Hamilton's illegitimate birth and in the legislation of the Council of Trent (*nova concilii Tridentini sanctio*)'.²⁵ During the civil wars it was this vulnerability, and the history of Hamilton-Lennox tensions which exploded, leaving the Hamiltons defeated.

Simmering tensions precipitated a heated situation during the civil war years of 1568–73 and issues regarding Châtelherault's legitimacy and subsequent succession to the highest position in the land only grew more complex and frustrating. It was imperative for the survival of Hamilton dynastic claims that Mary and *not* her son be rehabilitated to the Scottish throne. Where family fates were often determined by the most tenuous of connections, the house of Lennox had gained the upper hand by Mary's marriage to Darnley in July 1565. Ignoring all objections, Mary had married Darnley, a Lennox and the son of Châtelherault's arch rival Matthew Stewart, much to the vexation of the Hamilton kin. Incensed, they manifested their displeasure by joining Moray's failed rebellion against Mary, or 'Chaseabout Raid' in 1565. Châtelherault's

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Finnie, 'Hamilton Patronage', p. 18.

²² *Liber Officialis Sancti Andree*, ed. Lord Melwyn (Abbotsford Club, 1845), pp xvii, xviii.

²³ Ibid, p. xxv; F. Adam, *Clans, Septs and Regiments of the Scottish Highlands* (Edinburgh and London, 1934), p. 25.

²⁴ Hamilton, *House of Hamilton*, pp. 12–13.

²⁵ R. K. Hannay, 'Papal Bulls in the Hamilton Papers', *SHR*, 22 (1925), p. 34.

consequent exile to France meant his return to Scotland was delayed until 1569 when he was declared nominal head of the Queen's party, a position he held with uncharacteristic tenacity until February 1573 when under the Pacification of Perth he buckled to the King's party demands in return for a reversal of Hamilton forfeitures.

It was not a chastised Duke who took up arms for the Queen, however, but a man fighting for his own political survival, a position in which he had invested a lifetime's work. Like many other leading nobles in Scotland at this time, Châtelherault genuinely believed that Mary had abdicated under duress and was unfairly dealt with.²⁶ Yet whilst this was a brilliant argument to justify arms, it was more than notions of rightful sovereignty that ensured his own Marian involvement and loyalty and those of his Hamilton kin. If Mary's son was recognised as the rightful sovereign, the legitimacy of succession rightfully passed to the Lennox-Stewarts. This Hamilton double-interest is conveyed by Donaldson in *The First Trial of Mary*:

In the first place, while they were unquestionably heirs presumptive of Mary, it was not so clear that they were heirs of James, for it was argued that as Darnley had been king, the succession to James passed to his paternal kinsmen and his heir was Darnley's brother Charles. It was therefore contrary to Hamilton policy to recognise James as king.²⁷

Thus, it was clearly self interest rather than issues of sovereignty which was the predominant motive for the Hamilton Marian allegiances throughout this period.

In addition to dynastic claims, there were a number of notable reasons for Hamilton allegiance to the Queen's party during the Scottish civil wars. Animosity was directed toward Regent Moray for his attainment of a position that they felt was rightfully theirs and for the extensive forfeitures of Hamilton property he had authorised after Langside. Kinship cohesion regarding the pursuit and maintenance of common interests and advancement which over-rode their inherent religious division was another factor, as the family realised that in this precarious world of Scottish politics their individual fortunes often rose and fell with that of their house. Honour and bloodfeud also bound them in a common hatred of the Lennox-Stewarts and Douglasses who benefited by the civil strife, acquiring key positions within the King's party and decision-making bodies. Lennox and Morton both became regents of Scotland, in 1570 and 1572 respectively, and led aggressive campaigns against the Marians. Unlike certain nobles like Moray and Morton, the Hamiltons did not embrace Anglo-Scottish amity but remained suspicious of English motives and were also pressured by traditional French connections which due to political necessity they could ill afford to alienate. The staggered and lengthy negotiations of 1570 between the

²⁶ Ian.B. Cowan, 'The Marian Civil War', p. 96.

²⁷ Donaldson, *First Trial*, pp. 100-01.

two opposing factions did not offer any real personal advantages for the Hamiltons and they had more to gain by playing for Mary's return to Scotland. Prior to 1571/2 there remained a real hope for this possibility, and with it the promise of a return to royal favour and position. As a large and quite united family, so close to the centres of government, self-preservation was crucial.²⁸ Finally, there was the pivotal issue of ambition which lay at the heart of Hamilton Marian allegiances. Such motivations were not extraordinary, many within the nobility shared similar aims, but given their commitment to the Queen's party as joint-leaders with the Campbells and Gordons, their blatant self interest naturally became the focus of negative and often distorted attacks by their opposition. Whatever the motivations, this commitment cost the Hamiltons dearly, as events of the civil war will reveal.

Châtelherault

Châtelherault was the head of the house of Hamilton and it was thus up to him to form the policy of his kin in order to protect and consolidate the family's regional and national interests. James, second earl of Arran and later Duke of Châtelherault, had enjoyed an active involvement in the political destiny of Mary Queen of Scots from almost the time of her birth on 8 December 1542 to the ultimate defeat of her party in 1573. On 22 December 1542 he was proclaimed 'lauchfull tutour and Gouvernour to the Quene an realme',²⁹ a position that he would not relinquish until 1554. It was this position that enhanced Châtelherault's power and allowed him to further establish the Hamilton fortunes by bestowing land and titles upon his kin when they fell vacant. Under his regency the Hamilton fortunes were thus consolidated. This allowed for their rise to major players in the civil war events.

Many argue that Châtelherault was not equal to the task of Hamilton leader because of his vacillating character as illustrated by his engagement in 'diplomatic play-acting' in the 1540s and 1550s between England and France. Realising Scotland's importance as a satellite between these two powers, he attempted to pander to both French and English demands, only to please neither.³⁰ Perhaps he *was* weak, but one could also argue that he merely portrayed the characteristics of the majority of the nobility, very few of whom showed unwavering devotion to any cause when personal power was challenged. Arran (as he was then known) reneged on his earlier promise to Henry VIII of England to betroth young Mary to his son Edward VI and begrudgingly succumbed to the French demands for Mary's betrothal to the French dauphin Francois II at Haddington on 7 July 1548. Such actions earned him the disapproval of many amongst the nobility. The French, appealing to Arran's

²⁸ Wormald, *Lords and Men*, p. 148.

²⁹ J. Lesley, *The History of Scotland from the Death of King James I in the Year 1436 to the Year 1561* (Bannantyne Club, 1830), p. 169.

³⁰ R. K. Hannay, 'The Earl of Arran and Queen Mary', *SHR*, 18 (1921), p. 260.

ambition and to assure his fidelity, had granted him the French duchy of Châtelherault in February 1548–49 valued at 12,000 livres and made his eldest son captain of the Scottish company and men of arms and archers in France.³¹ Even in 1568, many contemporaries would not forget Arran's Anglo-French negotiations as governor and the price that they had paid by way of England's aggressive retaliation for Châtelherault's personal advancement.

Châtelherault: Involvement during the Scottish Civil Wars 1568–73

Châtelherault returned to Scotland from France by England in 1569 contesting the government and pressing his own rightful claim to regency, an appeal to the English sovereign that was immediately rejected.³² His involvement in Moray's attempted overthrow of Mary in 'The Chaseabout Raid' in August–September 1565 which led to his consequent exile now seemed forgiven. In Scotland he accepted a commission from Mary as her lieutenant which forthwith made him a major player in the civil wars for the Queen's party.³³ Whilst he initially promised peaceful terms with Moray and that party, he soon reneged and was put to ward in Edinburgh castle where he was detained for a year and two days until his release on 20 April 1570.³⁴ As a major figure of the Marian cause his detainment was a crucial absence for his party attempting to assert their power in real terms. However, whilst Châtelherault was still imprisoned, Regent Moray was assassinated by a Hamilton kinsman at Linlithgow and correspondence following his release suggested his complicity in this act and his continued designs on government.³⁵

Châtelherault was a key figure in Marian diplomatic discussions with foreign powers throughout 1570 and beyond. On 16 April 1570, prior to his imminent release from captivity Châtelherault pleaded with Elizabeth for favourable negotiations with the Queen's party. He appealed to her Christian charity, policy, blood and advancement of her credit and authority to honourably deal with the two opposing factions 'to quench this heat begun amongst us before it burst out into flame which might set both countries on fire'.³⁶ Such diplomatic correspondence recognising the need for foreign intervention was not unique to Châtelherault. The Duke was simultaneously immersed in negotiations for French assistance, evoking real suspicion amongst the English as to the nature and strength of his involvement with their papist adversaries. Queen Elizabeth could

³¹ Lesley, *History*, p. 237.

³² J. Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland* (Spottiswoode Society, 1851), p. 107; J. H. Burns, 'The Political Background of the Reformation, 1513–1625', in D. McRoberts (ed.), *Essays of the Reformation* (Glasgow, 1962), p. 24.

³³ *Ibid.* Burns; *SP*, 4, p. 368.

³⁴ *A Diurnal of Remarkable Occurrents that have passed within the country of Scotland, since the death of King James the Fourth till the year 1575* (Bannantyne and Maitland Clubs, 1833), pp. 170–71; *CSPSc*, 3, pp. 128, 131.

³⁵ *CSPSc*, 3, pp. 71–72, 96, 165, 246, 451–52.

³⁶ Letter of Châtelherault *et al.* to Elizabeth, dated 16 April 1570: *CSPSc*, 3, p. 116.

certainly not forget Châtelherault's French connections during his earlier governorship. They had led to Mary's thirteen year sojourn in France and marriage to Francois II on 24 April 1558 at Notre Dame before which Mary had signed away her kingdom of Scotland to France in three not so secret agreements and after which she began to publicly assume the royal arms of England.³⁷ Mary continued to pose a very real threat to Elizabeth's cherished throne and Anglo-French tensions had not been appeased by the tentative truce of the Treaty of Edinburgh in 1560 between the English queen and Charles IX of France. Elizabeth could ill-afford active French support of Mary's cause given her own tenuous position and nervousness steadily increased within her government as events of the Scottish civil wars unfolded.

During the Scottish civil wars, France clearly supported Châtelherault's Marian party. Such evident links did little to allay English fears and suspicions. This was not aided by the presence of Marian merchant ships in France during 1570³⁸ nor the continued correspondence between these two parties. In May 1570, Sussex suspected that the French merely bragged of sending forces to the Marian aid,³⁹ and yet there remained the threat with Charles IX promising the Queen's Party via Châtelherault even six months later that, 'I will always give all the assistance possible for me to my said sister and her affairs.'⁴⁰ Contact remained between Châtelherault and the French with two letters dated 7 September 1571 addressed to both Charles IX and Catherine de Medici (Henri II's widow) which claims unwavering devotion to the Marian cause and recognition of French support.⁴¹ For Elizabeth, whose own regime struggled to assert itself in the face of internal and external instability, the power of Châtelherault and his party with their French connections posed a formidable threat indeed.

Major Hamilton Personalities during the Civil War Era

—Archbishop Hamilton

In the face of Châtelherault's evident weakness of character, it has been claimed by many that it was his illegitimate half-brother John Hamilton, later archbishop of St Andrews, who was the true director of Hamilton policies during these turbulent years of civil strife. Certainly, he was a leading figure in the Queen's party following her deposition in 1567. Born about 1510 and second 'natural' son of the first Earl of Arran, John was to establish himself as one of the leading ecclesiastics from the Reformation era until his death in 1571. On 17 May 1525 Pope Clement VII issued a Bull in which John was appointed

³⁷ J. Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London, 1988), p. 21.

³⁸ *CSPSc*, 3, pp 409–10.

³⁹ *Ibid*, pp 190–91.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, p. 360.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, pp. 687–88.

commendator of Paisley until his twenty-second year and later abbot.⁴² On 17 June 1544 John was appointed as bishop of Dunkeld.⁴³ Yet John's most significant triumph was his translation to St Andrews on 28 November 1547.⁴⁴ The exact date of his consecration and affirmation as archbishop of St Andrews is debatable, but probably 1548/9. Certainly, it was under this title that he undertook his Catholic reforms during the years 1548–52. Archbishop Hamilton was a moderate conservative in religion but is mentioned as one of the bishops solidly behind the Queen.⁴⁵ In the 1550s he initiated a program of Catholic reform recognising in Scotland the desperate need for renewal and reform, yet he displayed a defensive attitude and achieved only limited success.⁴⁶ During the Reformation era, Archbishop Hamilton became an object of great enmity to the Protestant party⁴⁷ and yet his power remained undiminished. As Archbishop of St Andrews he continued 'to rule a kingdom within a kingdom',⁴⁸ very aware of the power at his disposal.

Whilst Archbishop Hamilton's power did not translate itself into effective influence over religious opinions it did give him access to the pulse of Scottish civil war politics. In July 1568, after the Marian defeat at Langside, Archbishop Hamilton along with the fifth Earl of Argyll, was instrumental in reorganising the Queen's party.⁴⁹ Archbishop Hamilton was also implicated in a number of the Hamilton conspiracies during this period of civil unrest. There is a tale that when Darnley was murdered at Kirk o' Field in February 1567, the Archbishop was staying at Hamilton House and a light in his window was extinguished when the explosion took place.⁵⁰ Calderwood accuses him of being a conspirator in the murder of Regent Moray on 23 January 1570, providing lodging to the murderer on the south side of the High Street, Linlithgow.⁵¹ Yet for all of his negotiations and political power-plays, John, archbishop of St Andrews, could not avoid the brutal fate that befell him. In April 1571 Dumbarton Castle was surprised by hostile forces and he was captured within it. Within week the Archbishop had been sent to Stirling, tried for his part in the murders of Darnley

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ J. Dowden, *Bishops of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1912), pp. 88–89; *The Acts and Parliaments of Scotland*, ed. T. Thomson and C. Innes (Edinburgh 1814–75), p. 468.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, Dowden, p. 90.

⁴⁵ Donaldson, *Queen's Men*, p. 91.

⁴⁶ J. Kirk, *Patterns of Reform: Continuity and Change in the Reformation Kirk* (Edinburgh, 1989), p. xii; Sanderson, *Rural Society*, p. 2.

⁴⁷ *SP*, 4, p. 362.

⁴⁸ M. H. B. Sanderson, '“Kin, Freindis and Servandis”: The men who worked with Archbishop David Beaton', *IR*, 25 (Spring, 1974), p. 32.

⁴⁹ Dawson, forthcoming, *Fifth Earl*, p. 3.

⁵⁰ Donaldson, *First Trial*, p. 6.

⁵¹ Calderwood, *History*, p. 510; P. Cadell, *Sudden Slaughter: The Murder of Regent Moray* (West Lothian, 1975), pp. 2, 8.

and Moray as well as conspiracy against Lennox and the prince, and hung on a gibbet at the market-cross erected to that purpose.⁵²

—Gavin, Commendator of Kilwinning

The other ‘astute ecclesiastic’ responsible for guiding Hamilton policy during this epoch of radical change was Gavin Hamilton, commendator of Kilwinning and coadjutor of St Andrews. He was a professional individual of some legal knowledge and an ardent Marian.⁵³ Further, his substantial involvement in some of the key political events of the Scottish stage during the civil wars made him a key player in civil war events. Although he did not approve of her marriage to Darnley and was absent from the field at Langside,⁵⁴ Kilwinning remained an efficacious Marian supporter throughout the duration of the civil wars and displayed evident personal links with Mary. On 10 September 1567 Gavin, along with Argyll, Boyd and Livingston met in Edinburgh to speak with the Regent and his men regarding the coronation of the king and the redemption of Mary from captivity.⁵⁵ In the first trial of Mary, Queen of Scots, in 1568/9 Gavin appeared in London to represent the Hamilton interest. However, any pleas for Mary’s innocence were to no avail and the ambiguous sentence handed down left the Scottish nobles with no hand to play and gave the English camp a vital pawn. Mary’s fate was by no means certain in 1568/9 and Marian supporters continued to hope for a fulfilment of Elizabeth’s promises regarding their sovereign’s return to Scotland. Kilwinning left London with Châtelherault in February 1569, forbidden to call on Mary on his way north,⁵⁶ and in Scotland re-entered the cauldron of Scottish politics now stirred by further uncertainty.

When Kirkcaldy of Grange besieged Edinburgh castle in 1570 to dominate politics in that town, Kilwinning was one of the conspicuous figures who supported him,⁵⁷ and by the famous ‘creeping parliament’ of King’s men in August 1571 was among those declared forfeit.⁵⁸ By his involvement with the Marian cause, Gavin of Kilwinning became the target of opposition enmity. His death, like that of Archbishop Hamilton, was a violent one. *Pitscottie’s Chronicles* describe what was supposed to be a meeting on conciliatory terms between members of both the King’s party and Queen’s party between Leith and Edinburgh on 16 June 1571. Apparently, Morton’s men having grown impatient and perhaps urged by their leader, broke away and attacked the Queen’s men who were caught off-guard and were thus defenceless and

⁵² Spottiswoode, *History*, p. 155.

⁵³ Donaldson, *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 137.

⁵⁴ Donaldson, *Queen’s Men*, p. 84.

⁵⁵ *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 121.

⁵⁶ Donaldson, *First Trial*, p. 206.

⁵⁷ Donaldson, *Queen’s Men*, p. 120.

⁵⁸ R. Lindsay of Pitscottie, *The Historie and Cronicles of Scotland* alias *Pitscottie Chronicles*, 2 (Scottish Text Society, 1899), p. 255; Calderwood, *History*, pp. 136–37.

Kilwinning was among those slain⁵⁹ in the confusion. Thus, by mid-1571 the house of Hamilton had lost two of its leading kinsmen and the Queen's party two of its main masterminds through King's party violence, with nobody to fill the vacuum that resulted.

—*Lord John Hamilton.*

Lord John Hamilton, later commendator of Arbroath, was the third son of Châtelherault by Margaret Douglas. Despite his promise and position, it appears that John was not at Langside, but in France on 13 May 1568 and showed few signs of real leadership though his involvement in the Marian cause remained constant. Lord John's most notable contribution to the Marian cause was his role in Moray's assassination. In January 1570, Lord John was accused of complicity in the murder of Regent Moray, providing Bothwellhaugh with a hackbut gun and good horse upon which the murderer fled the scene.⁶⁰ He is cited in the *Calendar of State Papers* as being an adherent of Mary in 1571 and was later party to the Pacification of Perth. His role in the civil wars was thus limited, but illustrates the political involvement and unity of the house of Hamilton to this common cause.

Within family politics John's position was to alter dramatically over this period. Châtelherault had pushed hard for his son's ecclesiastical advancement from the abbacy of Inchaffray to Arbroath using his power as governor in negotiations with Rome.⁶¹ Despite his appointment to such a wealthy abbey being problematic, it was eventually obtained and with it considerable influence. With the 'insanity' of his eldest son and heir by the mid 1560s, Châtelherault was left with a crisis of Hamilton succession and found his best hopes for matrimonial links to Mary ended. The Lennox-Stewarts now had a renewed opportunity to fulfil their own dynastic ambitions. In the wake of this threat, Châtelherault seriously considered a possible matrimonial future between Mary and his younger son Lord John.⁶² A notion validated by Keith's accounts, which suggest that such a proposal was even being considered on the eve of Langside, earnestly enough that the Scottish queen should be apprehensive and push with haste to Dumbarton.⁶³ Any match between the Scottish sovereign and a member of the Hamilton family would have critical consequences for both sides of the civil war action, but to the relief of the Hamilton opponents such a match was never to eventuate for events would take their own course.

⁵⁹ *Pitscottie's Chronicles*, 2, p. 256.

⁶⁰ Calderwood, *History*, 2, p. 511; Cadell., *Sudden Slaughter*, pp. 2, 8.

⁶¹ Hannay, 'Papal Bulls', p. 2.

⁶² Donaldson, *First Trial*, p. 101.

⁶³ Keith, *History*, 2, .p. 812.

—Lord Claud Hamilton

Lord Claud Hamilton, later commendator of Paisley, was Châtelherault's fifth son and one of the most active Hamilton members of the Marian camp. Lord Claud did not shy away from confrontation and his name can be found amongst many of the most explosive events of the Scottish civil wars. Lord Claud's intimate connections to Mary and access to inside intelligence are seen by his involvement in her flight from Lochleven on 2 May 1568 and the events immediately preceding. As Donaldson describes; 'Mary crossed the Firth of Forth to South Queensferry, where she was met by Lord Claud Hamilton, whose family had a property at Abercorn and Kinneil, not far away, and who must have had warning that the escape was being attempted.'⁶⁴ On 8 May 1568 he was a signatory to the 'Hamilton Bond', one of nine earls, nine bishops, eighteen lords and other 'for the defence of the Queen's Majesty'.⁶⁵ At the fateful battle of Langside on 13 May, Lord Claud and not his brother John, led the vaunt-guard of the Queen's forces.⁶⁶ On Sunday 16 May, Lord Claud was one of the tiny party of about twenty that embarked on the fishing boat with Mary heading for England.⁶⁷ Soon after, Lord Claud's property was eschewed for taking part in Langside against the eventual victors.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, he would remain a staunch defender of the queen until 1573.

Throughout the Scottish civil wars Lord Claud was a man of action. Quite correctly, it was claimed in certain letters dated in January 1571, that 'Claud and the Hamiltons were never under the Prince's obedience.'⁶⁹ 'Never' being until it was in their best interests to do so. On Wednesday 17 January 1571, Lord Claud ejected the Lord Sempill and his servants from the house of Paisley which Sempill had obtained after the forfeitures of Marian properties by the King's party in 1568.⁷⁰ This achieved, he placed therein a number of soldiers 'and by them kept all parts in fear.'⁷¹ Such an act illustrates how civil war actions could often take on an element of personal rivalry and retribution. By the beginning of May 1571, 'Grange had made all his preparations for an attack on the part of his enemies; and his position was strengthened by the arrival of Châtelherault, his son Lord Claud Hamilton, and the Earl of Argyll.'⁷² Lord Claud is still mentioned as a member of the castle party of Grange in 1572 by way of a contemporary letter detailing the events in Edinburgh after the death of John

⁶⁴ Ibid, p. 87.

⁶⁵ Keith, *History*, 2, p. 807–09.

⁶⁶ Keith, *History*, 2, p. 814; Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 374.

⁶⁷ Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 368.

⁶⁸ Finnie, 'Hamilton Patronage', p. 20.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ See *Register of Great Seal of Scotland.*, volume 4.

⁷¹ Spottiswoode, *History*, 2., pp. 154–55.

⁷² P. Hume-Brown, *History of Scotland*, 2 (Cambridge, 1912), p. 148.

Knox.⁷³ Yet, like his kin, Lord Claud eventually succumbed, accepting the king's authority on 23 February 1573.⁷⁴ It took Argyll's forcible intervention to retrieve Paisley property from Sempill and return it to Lord Claud in 1573.⁷⁵ Lord Claud was eventually converted from ardent Protestantism to Catholicism when he later married the daughter of an important Catholic noble, and he remained never far from politics.

—Costs of allegiance to the Queen's Party

The cost of Hamilton allegiance to the Marian cause throughout the Scottish civil wars was significant and a price that they eventually found too expensive. The house of Hamilton at all levels was gutted by the decision of the victorious King's party to forfeit and outlaw all prominent persons who refused allegiance to the young king.⁷⁶ *The Register of the Great Seal* reveals a substantial number of such related items mainly dated June/July 1568 and in 1571 further forfeitures of Hamilton properties were made. Given the Hamiltons' collective pursuit and protection of regional and national influence, such actions struck at the heart of family pride and policy.

With their direct involvement in Regent Moray's assassination, the Hamiltons backed themselves into a corner from which they would not escape for the remainder of the civil wars. In a letter dated 10 February 1570, Gate and Drury conveyed, 'the request of a great number for revenge of the Regent's death against the Hamiltons and their favourers.'⁷⁷ Action against the Hamiltons is further considered in a letter dated 14 February 1570 where information regarding the Regent is conveyed. It debates whether force should be taken against the whole succession of Hamiltons or only a certain number and it concludes that:

force be used against John, Bishop of St Andrews, and others of his name, who have 'accumpaneit' the executors of this murder, or have taken arms since that deed.⁷⁸

Many desired satisfaction and would not be deterred. These threats became manifest reality in May 1570.

Many factors led to the May violence against the Hamiltons. The King's party sought revenge for Moray's murder and Queen Elizabeth for their alleged promotion of mischief on the Borders and harbouring of English rebels following the Northern Rebellion in 1569.⁷⁹ The King's party, now aided by English

⁷³ *The Works of John Knox*, ed. D. Liang, 4 (Edinburgh, 1846–64), p. 599.

⁷⁴ Donaldson, *All the Queen's Men*, p. 125.

⁷⁵ Dawson, *Fifth Earl*, p. 26.

⁷⁶ Hume-Brown, *History*, p. 128.

⁷⁷ CSPSc, 3, p. 59.

⁷⁸ CSPSc, 3, p. 71.

⁷⁹ Hume-Brown, *History*, p. 144; W. Croft-Dickinson et al (eds), *A Sourcebook of Scottish History*, 3 (London and Edinburgh, 1956), p. 429.

troops, marched forth to destroy the seat of the Hamiltons. Morton wrote to the Commendator of Dunfermline on 30 May to braggingly describe how the English forces had arrived on the 11 May to join King's party forces and had settled in Hamilton for four days before burning the Duke's castle and town of Hamilton which showed little resistance.⁸⁰ This was embellished in correspondence of the Lord Deputy to his sovereign Elizabeth on 1 June 1570:

On the thirteenth of the same month ... we took and burned the castle, the place, the town with half a score of villages, and certain other gentlemen's houses of the Hamilton's friends. From thence we departed to Lythco. Were burnt the Duke's place, and another of the Duke's places a myle from thence.⁸¹

Though written well after the event, Calderwood gives the most detailed description of the action, describing the devastation to Hamilton holdings as absolute.⁸² Thus, after January 1570 the campaign against the Hamiltons took on many aspects of a bloodfeud, hitting at the heart of Hamilton territorial, secular and ecclesiastical holdings leaving them devastated.

The Marian response was one of mingled despair and resentment. Maitland, now a prominent member of the Queen's party, described in a letter dated 2 June how, 'the English have burnt and spoiled as much ground in Scotland as any army in England did in one year these hundred years.'⁸³ He warned that the Duke and his particular friends would not be found conciliatory after the spoiling of their lands. Châtelherault complained to Argyll and Maitland that he had never received a reply from Elizabeth to his April letter. Her action of sending troops to aid the struggling King's party to the Marian detriment, was seen as a slight of the highest order and Châtelherault adds bitterly that, 'the Queen's English forces daily burn those left unburnt.'⁸⁴ Elizabeth had made clear her preference, for despite her steadfast notions of sovereignty, her own vulnerability meant that she could ill afford to be perceived in diplomatic circles as supporting Scottish rebels and assassins who had been so popularly condemned. George Buchanan described them as blood-thirsty loch-leeches without humanity for their key role in the assassination.⁸⁵ Moray's murder cost the Hamilton's and their friends dear, giving the King's party the justification for arms they had so long desired and giving Lennox his opportunity for revenge.

⁸⁰ *CSPSc*, 3, pp. 191–92.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁸² Calderwood, *History*, 3, pp. 562–65.

⁸³ *CSPSc*, 3, p. 217.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 229.

⁸⁵ G. Buchanan, *The Tyrannous Reign of Mary Stewart*, W. A. Gatherer (Edinburgh, 1958), p. 195.

Conclusion

A series of frustrating negotiations began in 1570 with neither the King's party nor the Queen's being able to agree to terms completely. Whilst much complaint has often been made of the Queen's party and the Hamiltons particularly, the *Calendar of State Papers* during this period reveals the uncompromising obstinacy of the King's party and the farcical demands made by the English.⁸⁶ Whilst Maitland pressed for 'peace not war', Lennox and the King's party showed no real attempts at conciliation, a stance blatantly shown by Lennox' aggression toward the Hamiltons and other leading Marianists.⁸⁷ Both sides sought legitimacy, but whilst the Queen's party could claim issues of rightful sovereignty, the King's party could hardly justify Mary's continual imprisonment in England given that she was clearly forced to abdicate. With the prince's minority and the queen's absence, the Scottish civil wars became a battle for legitimacy, and often an extension of pre-existing personal hostilities. The strife of 1570 allowed Elizabeth the opportunity to suspend negotiations for Mary's liberty which remained an unfulfilled promise. By 1572, after the excommunication of Elizabeth and the Norfolk and Ridolfi plots, Mary's return became impossible. The promise in early 1570 of Marian ascendancy had been dashed and the Hamiltons as leaders of the failed cause were the main losers — territorially, financially, and personally.

The revocation of forfeitures after the Pacification of Perth did not mean a renewal of fortunes for Châtelherault and his kin, as power still remained with their opponents the Douglasses and Lennox-Stewarts. Nor could it adequately repair the damage done to Hamilton property during the tumult of 1570. It certainly couldn't bring back Hamilton lives lost for the Marian cause which included Archbishop Hamilton and Gavin of Kilwinning. It appeared that self-interest and ambition had led to the demise of this once great house. Some may say that this was deserved, while others may argue that an inherent lack of character and leadership (particularly given Châtelherault's frequent absences and vacillating nature) would always prove an insurmountable obstacle in their quest for ultimate power. The rise and fall of Hamilton fortunes as a result of the Scottish civil wars 1568–73, however, was an illustration of noble power, kinship and factionalism at its very best.

⁸⁶ Ibid; see entry 'Detention of Mary Queen of Scots', pp. 502–03.

⁸⁷ See letter of Maitland to Sussex dated 21 December 1570, which attempts to inform Elizabeth of the true state of affairs in Scotland and Lennox' aggression toward his own lands and that of Châtelherault's poor tenants and so on; *CSPSc*, 3, p. 444; and Cecil's letter on 27 November 1570 noting Lennox' destruction, in *CSPSc*, 3, p. 436.

CHAPTER 2

Print and Propaganda War 1568–73: The War of Words

The fierce struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism, the avarice and tyranny of the nobles, the unsettled and lawless condition of the Commons, the corruption and immorality that everywhere prevailed, furnished endless themes for the balladist and the satirist. As a natural result, during the latter half of the sixteenth century the country was literally deluged with ballads containing rough-and-ready pictures of passing events; circumstantial details of deeds of darkness; satirical effusions directed against those who, from their position or abilities, took a prominent part in affairs secular or sacred; and in some cases ebullitions of spite and rancour and personal abuse.

Satirical Poems of the Time of the Reformation¹

The war of words that marked the Scottish civil wars was essentially a war of the *printed* word, particularly for the Edinburgh literary establishment and political elites. For both the King's party and the Queen's party it became a crucial tool to woo popular support both at home and abroad for their precarious positions and to evince superior legitimacy and authority. Thus, both sides invested substantial resources to cultivate their own party print and propaganda machines. An ardent war of words took on many guises and crossed many boundaries – books, pamphlets, manuscripts, seals, proclamations, ballads and poems, art and education, preaching and sermons, even diplomatic and judicial correspondence. The impact of these printing phenomena is to be explored later, but critical to observe here is the intensification of this war in 1570 when the civil strife reached climatic proportions. Lists of Scottish publications presented by James Watson (1713), Joseph Ames (1749), Robert Dickson and John Philip Edmond (1890) and Harry G. Aldis (1904) among others, all illustrate an explosion of printed literature at this time which continued until the wars' conclusion in 1573. Features of survivalism, audience, mediums and the nature of the party propaganda itself, are thus central when evaluating the impact made by the war of words upon the shifting battle front of 1568–73.

¹ *Satirical Poems at the Time of the Reformation*, ed. J. Cranstoun, 1 (Scottish Text Society, 1891), p. ix.

Problems of Survivalism

Problems of survivalism in this civil war era reveal as much about what was *allowed* to survive by contemporaries as it does about the natural ravages of time. Whilst a significant amount of literature *has* survived in the contemporary publications of George Bannatyne's *Manuscript and Memorable Buik*; the compilation titled *Satirical Poems of the Time of the Reformation*; Richard Bannatyne's *Journal of the Transactions of Scotland*; George Buchanan's *Vernacular Writings* and even the anonymous *Diurnal of Occurrents*;² not to mention various memoirs of key figures and weighty volumes of state papers, much literature of the time has *not* survived. An evaluation of material reveals that much of what does still exist is King's party propaganda epitomised by the work of Robert Sempill and George Buchanan. Ninety-one publications are known to have been produced by the King's printer Robert Lekpreuik, the majority of them theological or political publications.³ After his appointment to this position on 14 January 1568 he printed about fifty issues in Edinburgh up to the end of 1570, two in Stirling in 1571 and at least fifteen in St Andrews between September 1571 and 1573.⁴ In contrast Marian propaganda is fractured. Thomas Bassandyne was a printer, bookseller and bookbinder in Edinburgh (1564–77) and an avid Marian supporter. At a Kirk session in Edinburgh in 1573 Bassandyne was accused of having printed fifteen Marian books and tracts, but these have long since vanished from sight.⁵ Sympathetic Marian literature was quite prolific during the Scottish civil wars being printed and circulated abroad, in fact Michael Lynch states, 'It was Mary's cause that was generally judged – both in Scotland and abroad – to be the respectable one.'⁶ What then, happened to this?

Power of the press presented a double-edged sword of celebration and condemnation, unity and division, information and fabrication. Born from the commonwealth of learning came the child of propaganda, but also the need to control it. So censorship became an effective means of social control by attempts to tame print, writing and oral propaganda. As Julian Goodare states:

Words came before deeds. And if social control begins with censorship, censorship itself begins with the medium of print rather

² Many of the exact dates of publication remain elusive but these sources were undoubtedly written during the period of the civil wars; G. Bannatyne in 1568, J. Lesley, *History*, published in 1578, G. Buchanan's various works prevalent in this era, *Satirical Poems*, written by civil war propagandists such as Sempill and so on. See Aldis, *Lists*.

³ R. B. McKerrow *et al.* (eds), *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Printers of English books 1557–1640* (Oxford, 1910), p. 174.

⁴ R. Dickson and J. P. Edmond, *Annals of Scottish Printing: from the introduction of the art in 1507 to the beginning of the seventeenth century* (Cambridge, 1890), pp. 201–05.

⁵ M. Lynch, *Edinburgh and the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1981), p. 316; A. A. MacDonald, 'The Bannatyne Manuscript: A Marian Anthology', *IR*, 37, no 1 (Spring 1986), p. 41.

⁶ M. Lynch, *Scotland: A New History* (London, 1992), p. 219.

than folk ballads. Able to broadcast and multiply a message quickly, to sow its seed in the fertile ground of the literate elite, to arise hydra-headed after any setback, print acquired a glamour which was decidedly disagreeable to adherents of the status quo.⁷

Censorship of literary texts embraced both suppression and revision and in Scotland it was both the kirk and government that substantially controlled the transmission of information to the popular audience.⁸ The government too sought to tighten controls over printed literature aware of its potential power to influence the masses. As P. B. Watry conveys:

Given the volatile political climate under the reign of Mary, the survival of the minority Protestant government was clearly dependent upon their ability continually to exploit the press: the attempts to control information during this period are epitomised by the 1567 Act of Parliament, prohibiting not only the posting of slanderous bills, but also imposing penalties on those who did not rip down such bills at first sight.⁹

Given such dire penalties imposed for 'treasonous' literature the problems of survivalism for Marian literature during this period become more understandable. If such penalties were indeed implemented, it is hard to say how much printed material was actually lost or destroyed during this era.

Fractured evidence brings into question the accuracy of surviving literature. A prime example of this are the *Memoirs* of Sir James Melville of Halhill, a staunch Marian supporter and courtier not only in his native Scotland, but also in England and the Continent.¹⁰ His work dates from 1550 when he was fourteen years of age and continues into the reign of King James VI. Whilst it was written during this era of civil strife and upheaval and provides unique insights into this period of civil conflict, it long lay forgotten in Edinburgh Castle. In fact, it was only rediscovered in 1660 by an imprisoned Presbyterian minister Robert Trail. Its first publication was not until 1683, when it became the centre of controversy. For apparently the publisher had departed from the original and 'done it into English'. With the disappearance of the original manuscript which was never found, there must be grave queries as to the legitimacy of this text though it maintains its importance as a vital contemporary reflection of the times by a man with intimate connections to many of the key events.¹¹

⁷ J. Goodare, *Parliament and Society in Scotland, 1560–1603*, University of Edinburgh, PhD Thesis, 2, p. 349.

⁸ Refer to *The Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland*, p. 35; note, too, the censorship of 'Welcome Fortune' in *Gude and Godlie Ballates* in 1568 by Kirk censors and censorship committee which left no records during this time.

⁹ P. B. Watry, *Sixteenth Century Printing*, p. 30.

¹⁰ Sir J. Melville, ed. G. Donaldson, *Memoirs of Sir James Melville of Halhill* (Folio Society, 1969), p. 7.

¹¹ Sir J. Melville, *Memoirs of his own life 1549–93* (Bannantyne Club, 1827), pp. x–xvi.

Alteration and bastardisation of texts was engaged in by both contemporaries and later editors. There is a suggestion that George Bannatyne himself may have been, on occasion, responsible for some of the mutilations in the texts of poems in his anthology. A. A. MacDonald refers to the abbreviation of the poem *Chryst Crownit* in which the compiler appears to have cut the poem down to the size of most of the neighbouring poems of the *Bannatyne Manuscript*.¹² Similar alterations were made in 1724 by Alan Ramsay in his compilation of *Evergreen*, a collection of Scottish poetry taken from the above mentioned collection. The editor of Bannatyne's *Memorials* states that

[Ramsay] never scrupled altering the text where he thought he could make an improvement, and very frequently he was of that opinion when it was a very mistaken one.¹³

In regard to another major source of civil war literature *Satirical Poems*, the editor speaks of the introduction of Southern words and spellings during the Reformation era and the twenty years following. Cranstoun states that:

The continued accessions from Southern sources had made sad havoc with the language of Dunbar and Douglas and Lyndsay, and destroyed its dialectic integrity.¹⁴

One has only to look at Munro's *Western Highlands* to appreciate the scarcity of Highland works written and published in their native dialect and the impact of southern alterations upon such literature.¹⁵ Revelations of doubtful accuracy during our era challenge our comprehension of its true nature, intent and extent despite the literature's obvious importance.

Scarcity of sources and resources and dicey methods of transmission are also features of civil war problems of survivalism. George Bannatyne in his *Memorials* complained that even in his time he had to contend with 'copeis, awld, mankit and mutillait'.¹⁶ Further, the Reformation era saw a ruthless destruction of literature described by the Scottish historian Spottiswoode who bemoaned in 1562 the 'insane fury that not only casts down images but also burns the writing of the Church Fathers'.¹⁷ Various attempts to establish effective censorship by Church and governmental authorities (if at this time they could be distinguished) meant a decline of quality in both the men and work of the Scottish printers. It is not unusual to encounter the confiscation of printing materials and works from printing houses as can be seen in the cases of the

¹² A. A. MacDonald, 'The Middle Scots Expansion', *Neophilologus*, 70 (1986), pp. 472-74.

¹³ G. Bannatyne, *Memorials of George Bannatyne 1560-1603* (Bannatyne Club, 1829), p. 11.

¹⁴ *Satirical Poems*, p. ix.

¹⁵ *Monro's Western Isles of Scotland and Genealogies of the Clans 1549*, ed. R. W. Monro (Edinburgh, 1961).

¹⁶ Bannatyne, *Memorials*, p. 16.

¹⁷ J. H. Allen, *Papal Negotiations with Queen Mary*, p. 136; J. Durkan and A. Ross, *Early Scottish Libraries [ESL]* (Glasgow, 1961), p. 6.

Marian printer Thomas Bassandyne in 1571–72 and Robert Lekpreuk the King's printer in 1571 and 1574.¹⁸ Add to this the general carelessness of contemporaries failing to realise the necessity for preservation of common works for posterity 'not always by malicious neglect or ignorance, but often by simple indifference' and the problems of protection become clear.¹⁹

Transmission and transportation of civil war literature was varied. Where royalty and Scottish elites built up substantial libraries full of Renaissance and scholastic works,²⁰ popular literature travelled more precariously. Cranstoun, the editor of *Satirical Poems* could not help but comment

considering the way in which these productions were got up and issued — printed in black letter on one side of single leaves of paper, and hawked about the country by chapman and pedlars — the marvel is that any of them survived the ravages of chance and time.²¹

Many of course didn't survive and our comprehension over four hundred years later is limited and incomplete.

Then there are those texts that through misfortune and careless practice later met their demise. Lord Herries, a close friend and political ally of Mary throughout her reign and the civil war era, wrote a work entitled *Historical Memoirs of the Reign of Mary Queen of Scots* (1836). Only a fraction of the 624 pages described by his contemporary John Pinkerton have survived.²² A letter from the Roman Catholic Bishop of Edinburgh, Dr Alexander Cameron to a Mr Innes from Paris in June 1802 describes the circumstances of its destruction in the French Revolution²³ when it was defaced and burnt.²⁴ Such desecration is unfortunately not unusual. Durkan and Ross in *Early Scottish Libraries* also reveal a carelessness in practice by staff at Scots College in Paris. Over the years there was clipping off of signatures, chopping of margins, destruction of bindings and the identification of armorial stamps, the employment of methods such as erasure and scoring amongst others. It is painful to reflect upon how much of the print, propaganda and literature has been so thoughtlessly destroyed or maimed by such actions. But it is obvious that these problems of survivalism are central

¹⁸ R. B. McKerrow *et al* (eds), *Dictionary*, p. ix; Dickson and Edmond, *Annals*, pp. 274, 205.

¹⁹ Durkan and Ross, *ESL*, p. 7.

²⁰ J. Durkan, 'The Library of Mary Queen of Scots', in M. Lynch (ed) *Mary Stewart Queen in Three Kingdoms* (Oxford, 1998), p. 74 ; D. W. Doughty 'The Library of James Stewart, Earl of Moray, 1531–1570', *IR*, 22 (Spring, 1970).

²¹ *Satirical Poems*, p. x.

²² Herries, *Memoirs*, preface p. 5.

²³ G. Hamilton and J. Balfour (eds), *Edinburgh Review* 12 (Edinburgh, 1755–56), pp. 280, 282; Herries, *Memoirs*, p. xx.

²⁴ Herries, *Memoirs*, p. xix–xx states that Herries MSS lay for some time at Scots College of Douay in Flanders, but with the advent of strife it was decided that this along with other valuable royal manuscripts should be smuggled to Britain for safety. It was sent to a Frenchman to be conveyed to St Omer, but he was arrested, and his wife afraid of being caught by authorities with so fine a collection defaced and soon after burnt them.

to our understanding of the war of words during the Scottish civil wars of 1568–73.

Media

Media of print and propaganda were more varied and extensive than one might expect throughout the Scottish civil wars of 1568–73 and through these, transmission of information was affected as much through their persona as by their technical nature. Just as any author today adopts many different voices, so a sixteenth century protagonist or author could adopt varying persona in their literature depending upon their audience and agenda. In propaganda this was an essential element in persuasion of the masses to their cause. Alisdair MacDonald in his article, ‘The Bannatyne Manuscript: A Marian Anthology’, states the four main categories of mediums used in this period as ‘works of religion and religious controversy; satirical ballads on the contemporary situation (by Sempill and others); proclamations; and Acts of Parliament’.²⁵ His source for this analysis was Aldis’ *List..* Certainly his categories encompass many of the seventy or so publications of 1568–73, but these may be expanded to include popular black-letter press, judicial literature, general histories, religious messages — written and spoken, language of propaganda and popular literature. These will be further examined here to illustrate the significant permeation of civil war literature at all levels of Scottish society and the profound effect of the war of words in the tussle for political allegiances, authority and impact within the torn community.

The impact of black-letter press in this period was profound. Crude black-letter press was produced comparatively quickly and cheaply often in broadside and on single sheets. Tracts and rhymes could be swiftly turned out to keep a regular popular commentary on events and black-letter press provided a popular channel to pass on news, rumours, ballads, proclamations or images.²⁶ Often written in Scots vernacular, such pamphleteering was ‘directed at arousing popular support and aimed at readers who were versed in Latin’ making it much more readily accessible to all levels of Scottish society.²⁷ What’s more, it could be easily duplicated and distributed whether read out in the market square or passed from hand to hand. The *Satirical Poems* were often produced and issued in this form whether they be Sempill’s stinging political satires or Maddie’s more forthright and direct tabloid-like ballads.²⁸ One has only to peruse the publication

²⁵ A. A. MacDonald, ‘The Bannatyne Manuscript: A Marian Anthology’, *IR*, 37, no. 1 (Spring 1986), p. 40.

²⁶ J. Goodare, *Parliament and Society in Scotland, 1560–1603* (University of Edinburgh, PhD thesis), pp. 349, 353.

²⁷ For international Protestant comparisons, see E. L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 304.

²⁸ For an expansion on Maddie’s ballads, see Watry, *Thesis*, p. 37.

lists of Ames, Dickson, Edmond and Aldis to recognise the prevalence of such black-letter press.²⁹

In an era when the most important role of printing was to amplify the spoken word, printed broadside rhymes could be read out to large audiences issuing a succinct message elusive to cumbersome books. Further, such a medium also produced the effective 'clois lettres'. Such letters 'which poured from the signet in times of crisis, unlike proclamations or sermons, could reach the numbers of the elite individually'.³⁰ These quickly produced, almost chain letter pamphlets, are seen in Bannatyne's *Miscellany* by 'A Survey of the Cattle and Town of Edinburgh', January 1573, 'Journal of the Siege of the Cattle of Edinburgh', April and May 1573, and 'An Account of a Pretended Conference held by the Regent, Earl of Murray, with the Lord Lindsay and others', January 1570.³¹ Black-letter press was used by both sides during the civil wars, but it is clear from the lists that it was the King's party which dominated the pamphlet war, for its quest for legitimacy in the wake of general disapproval was a desperate one. The inundation of black-letter press propaganda is very reflective of each parties fluctuating strengths in this period.

In stark contrast to the black-letter press are the judicial publications of edicts, proclamations, articles of the General Assembly and Acts of Parliament. The printing press allowed for royal edicts to become more accessible to the general public as they could now be read out to audiences, though as an order proclaimed by authority they were essentially elitist. A proclamation was an open declaration, a public and formal announcement, that in the sixteenth century could be a royal decree which sought to legislate without the assent of parliament.³² In the Scottish context, the impact of proclamations was generally limited to the major burghs such as Edinburgh and it was only these urban centres which really saw much of the heralds. Nevertheless, the prevalence of proclamations is seen filtered substantially throughout the period,³³ and was especially used in the Wars between Leith and Edinburgh.

The General Assembly was the Supreme Court of the Church of Scotland³⁴ and in this period its agenda remained salient but limited. One of the few items being assessed in 1569 regarded the election of superintendents, elders and deacons³⁵ that illustrated the attempts for consolidation of the reformed kirk's

²⁹ See appendix.

³⁰ Goodare, *Thesis*, p. 356.

³¹ G. Bannatyne, *Miscellany*, vol. 2, pp. 65–81, 33–50.

³² L. Brown (ed.), *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, 2 (Oxford, 1993) p. 2365.

³³ Refer to 1568–73 lists.

³⁴ Note, the full account is given in W. Grant and D. D. Murison (eds), *The Compact Scottish National Dictionary 1* (Aberdeen, 1986), p. 322.

³⁵ J. Ames, *Typographical Antiquities: Printing in England, with an Appendix concerning printing in Scotland and Ireland* (London, 1749), p. 582; Dickson and Edmond, *Annals*, p. 239.

position that was still relatively precarious at this time. In comparison was the other judicial publication of the Scottish *Acts of Parliament* which headed the list of 1568 publications by Lekpreuik. Whilst dated 15 December 1567, the 'Acts of Parliament of James the Sext' illustrate a turning point in such royal publications. For whilst the printing of *Acts of Parliament* became a regular occurrence by the end of the sixteenth century, it is still quite unusual to see them here. The direct resort of the crown to publishing proclamations as opposed to reading them out in market crosses was thus quite novel — perhaps an attempt to establish the King's dubious claim to authority and attempts of his party to assert the image of legitimate sovereign?

Works of religion and religious controversy often intertwined with political agendas in this civil war period. Mediums of pulpit, preaching and sermons; reformed education; adapted and smuggled psalm books; Protestant and Catholic tracts, all aimed at the subtle persuasion of the public mind under the veil of 'God's will'. During a period in which the quest for religious legitimacy was as powerful as it's fellow politics, the religious realm became an important platform for civil war propaganda on many levels — as a tool for personal advancement, governmental institutions, political agendas and character assassinations. Whilst many sincerely felt or believed in their religious obligations, the advent of the Reformation made the realms of politics and religion virtually indistinguishable with the establishment of dual-role institutions such as the General Assembly and Privy Council. Education controlled by the new reformed kirk encouraged the brainwashing of schoolboys through grammatical textbooks which provided a lucrative market for printers.³⁶ Universities too were always hothouses for political and religious ideas and debate transported from the Continent. Transference of ideas through such mediums was clearly influential, but the kirk's exploitation of the spoken word proved equally effective.

The pulpit proved one of the most successful mechanisms of propaganda during the civil war era. As Goodare describes:

With a largely non literate population, the spoken word remained the most important means of reaching the masses; and not surprisingly it was the church that made most of the running.³⁷

A classic example of this is seen in Richard Bannatyne's *Journal of Transactions* which prints a sermon of the Bishop of Galloway in Edinburgh upon 17 June 1571. Galloway was a Marian with kin-connections to the Gordons and his sermon was given the day after the defeat of the Queen's party by Lord Morton. This sermon was directed primarily at the nobility and the ministers and was transported by word of mouth. To the nobility he concentrated on Corinthians' chapter thirteen, appealing to 'faith, hope and charitie', calling the people to be

³⁶ Watry, *Thesis*, p. 31.

³⁷ Goodare, *Thesis*, p. 350.

instruments to bring the nobility to concord.³⁸ He reproved the ministers claiming,

our minifteris ar growne fa wantone and ceremonious, that thei will not pray for thair laud fall heretix, wha has permitted them sic liberte of confcience, that they may vse what religione thai pleis.³⁹

Such appeals via preaching to all levels of the Scottish community were not unusual, John Knox had used a similar technique during the Reformation. Politics under the veil of religious inspiration.

At this time 'books were being smuggled in from outside, translations were prepared in places of safe obscurity, texts and manuscripts were being passed from hand to hand' and for the Church this presented both threat and opportunity.⁴⁰ In the sixth General Assembly on 7 July 1568, Thomas Bassandyne had his press confiscated for his inclusion of a bawdy song called 'Welcum Fortoun' at the back of a psalm book and printed without licence.⁴¹ Yet the church also took up the practice during the Reformation era of using popular melodies for its own lyrical purposes, using familiarity as a drawcard for recognition. Protestant and Catholic tracts were often spoken aloud by charismatic leaders of the congregation. In 1572 Lekpreuik printed a copy of Knox's letter 'To his Loving Brethren' and in 1573 James Tyrie issued his famous Catholic tract 'Refutation' written in an occasional and accidental form and receiving considerable attention from both sides of the political divide.⁴² Religious power over the presses and media of propaganda was ensured by the Reformed church leaders' patronage of printers such as Robert Lekpreuik who was made the King's official printer in January 1568.⁴³ Thus by means of the spoken and written word the Church played its influential role in the war of words by its own search for consolidation and authority.

In examining the *language* of propaganda during the civil wars a number of literary devices must be considered. According to Mark Loughlin in 'The Dialogue of Twa Wyfeis', there are two distinct languages of propaganda; 'Latin — chiefly directed at the international arena, and vernacular — aimed at the domestic audience'.⁴⁴ The *Detectio* or *Historie de Marie Royne d'Ecosse* was written by George Buchanan and printed in 1572. This was presented in three

³⁸ R. Bannatyne, *Journal of the Transactions in Scotland: during the contest between adherents of Queen Mary and those of her son* (Edinburgh, 1806), pp. 138, 141.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

⁴⁰ A. A. MacDonald, 'Poetry, Politics and Reformation Censorship in Sixteenth Century Scotland', *English Studies [ES]*, 64(1983), p. 412.

⁴¹ *BUK*, p. 125.

⁴² Dickson and Edmond, *Annals*, p. 204 ; T. G. Law (ed), *Catholic Tracts of the Sixteenth Century: 1573–1600*. (Scottish Text Society, 1901), pp. xii, xxxi.

⁴³ McKerrow *et al*, *Dictionary*, p. 174.

⁴⁴ M. Loughlin, ' "The Dialogue of the Twa Wyfeis": Maitland, Machiavelli and the Propaganda of the Scottish Civil War' in A. A. MacDonald, *The Renaissance in Scotland: Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture* (Leiden, 1994), p. 235.

languages — Latin, French and English. With Buchanan's international reputation as a leading scholar ensuring that copies would sell well there could be nothing more damaging to the Marian cause than this defamation of Mary's character on such a vast scale.⁴⁵ As one of the commissioners sent by the rulers of the nation to England in 1568/9 to 'defend their conduct in deposing and imprisoning their queen', Buchanan's work became a mouthpiece for King's party propaganda, applying the poison pen to draw an image of her complicity, conspiracy and adultery with exaggeration and remorseless skill.⁴⁶ In this instance, the use of these media of local and international languages was a sharp weapon wielded in the war of words.

Other literary tools used by civil war propagandists were those of complaint, satire, invective and rhetoric. In Roderick Lyall's article 'Complaint, Satire and Invective in Middle Scots Literature' he attempts to address the balance between historiography and literary techniques in this era.⁴⁷ *Satire* is defined as

writing which is critical of an individual or a class, which condemns a form of behaviour or set of values, and which employs some rhetorical play or narrative device to persuade us to the author's point of view.⁴⁸

Sempill's ballads in *Satirical Poems* present a prime example of this. For example, he attacks Mary's secretary, Maitland in that way in the poems, 'The Cruikit leidis the Blinde' and 'The Bird in the Cage'.⁴⁹ The former conveys:

Our Court it is decayit now:
The cruikit leidis the blinde ...
Tak they not tent he will not huik it,
To gyde them in the mist.⁵⁰

So the poem continues, reflecting upon Maitland's political duplicity as a King's man turned Queen's man for a matter of political expediency. Buchanan is no more kind to Maitland in *Chamaeleon*, alluding to him as a creature that changes colour according to his environment, thus attacking Maitland's shifting loyalties.⁵¹ By Lyall's definition *invective* is another type of satire, one of its weapons, in which there is the implementation of 'flying' (name-calling) which

⁴⁵ I. D. McFarlane, *Buchanan* (London, 1981), p. 340.

⁴⁶ Explored at length G. Neilson, *George Buchanan*. (Glasgow, 1907), pp. 439–45 and I. D. McFarlane, *Buchanan*.

⁴⁷ R. Lyall, 'Complaint, Satire and Invective in Middle Scots Literature', in Norman Macdougall (ed.), *Church, Politics and Society* (Edinburgh, 1983), pp. 44–64.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 44–45.

⁴⁹ *Satirical Poems*, pp. 128–32, 160–65.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

⁵¹ P. Hume-Brown, *Vernacular Writings of George Buchanan* (Scottish Text Society, 1892), pp. 37–53; J. Durkan, *Biography of George Buchanan: 'Poeta sui saeculi facile princeps'* (Glasgow, 1994), p. xvi.

has a cumulative abusive effect.⁵² *Complaint* is equivalent to ‘reproof’ and involves a rhetorically straightforward catalogue of faults, the poem ‘The Complaint of Scotland’ being a case in point.⁵³ Finally, *rhetoric* uses exaggerated language, raising questions with implied answers and a dash of ambiguity. Thus, through these literary mechanisms the language of propaganda found its voice, evoking various levels of response from a diverse audience worn by the ravages of war.

Further literary devices were employed by the skilled propagandist to draw the maximum response from their audience. One must here include the *bona fide* character of the civil war poets and the use of Platonic dialogue employed in some of their works. Cranstoun, editor of *Satirical Poems*, stated that:

The poems of this collection cover a period of nearly twenty years (1565–1584). They are almost all of a party political nature, and are largely tinged with a satirical element ... Their chief value lies in their *bona fide* character — the perfect sincerity, so to speak, in which the current events are presented by actual observers.⁵⁴

Indeed, in many of these poems there can be an air of credulity or exaggeration, but this was a necessary feature of party propaganda. As a vigorous supporter of the Reformation cause and a bitter antagonist of Mary, Sempill’s voice was but an echo of the leaders of his faction,⁵⁵ a plight also shared by George Buchanan whose kin connections to the Lennox-Stewarts were also quite telling in his civil war publications which damned the Hamiltons, Gordons and Marians generally.

Platonic dialogue was a device employed by civil war propagandists which took the form not of a direct debate, but a fake debate. The ‘Dialogue of the Twa Wyfeis’ is a classic example of this. Written in Scottish hand and endorsed by Cecil on 30 April 1570, it presents two Scottish women discussing the role of certain key nobles in recent political matters.⁵⁶ Their dialogue attacks the Queen’s party and specifically Maitland who is referred to in Machiavellian terms. During the Scottish civil wars, the name ‘Machiavelli’ was a byword for ‘atheism, tyranny, treachery and deceit’,⁵⁷ and whilst in 1570 Maitland was a ‘champion of the Queen’s party’, his fluctuating loyalties were renowned.⁵⁸ For Niccolo Machiavelli (1496–1527) the Italian theorist, ‘the political actor reserves the right to enter into evil when necessitated’ and by his work ‘virtue’ is redefined.⁵⁹ The ‘twa wyfeis’ remain in character until the very end of the

⁵² Lyall, ‘Middle Scots’, p. 45.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 46; *Satirical Poems*, pp. 95–100.

⁵⁴ *Satirical Poems*, pp. ix–xi.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xxxviii.

⁵⁶ *CSPSc.*, 3, p. 139.

⁵⁷ Loughlin, ‘Dialogue’, p. 227.

⁵⁸ *ibid.*, p. 233.

⁵⁹ Audi (ed), *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, p. 526.

dialogue, commenting on the role of women and expressing fears of being left on the shelf. Yet behind such conversation a clear warning is issued to the audience:

Simple gossips they may be, but they were none the less able to recognise the Machiavellian deceit that lay behind the Queen's party.⁶⁰

This platonic dialogue appealed to popular audiences as well as to the elites who could appreciate the likeness of fiction to fact.

Finally, the increasing circulation of popular literature as opposed to courtly literature played a substantial role in the war of words. Books, ballads, plays, rhymes, tracts, fables and patriotic literature all aimed to stir the senses of the unconvinced masses. Books could be of an informative nature such as *Pitscottie's Chronicles* or *Diurnal of Occurrents*. Books could also be instruments of power such as books of parliament and law courts.⁶¹ Such printed material transcended traditional oral culture to reach another invisible, silent public and could reach a wide audience even though their size made them extremely expensive to produce. Ballads were popular informative poems and jingles that could be easily remembered and reiterated by the common man as well as the courtier. Tracts as a short essay or book usually on a religious subject also took advantage of brevity to provide a swift blow. Ballads, rhymes and tracts kept a regular commentary on events and were often read out, targeting popular audiences.⁶² Ballads could often be divided into different voices, media and *persona* seen by George Bannatyne in his *Ballat Buke* which was classified under four major headings; moral poems, comic poems, love poems and fables.⁶³

During this time, plays also had a role in conveying political agendas to a diverse audience:

Plays with a Protestant message were written and performed in 1568 and 1572 — Knox was in the audience for the second.⁶⁴

Certainly such plays evoke remembrance of Sir David Lindsay's plays earlier in the sixteenth century such as *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaits*, a court play featuring John the Commonweil who 'in jest' threw off the monarch and assumed the throne.⁶⁵ Such plays as Lindsay and Davidson were designed to play on church affairs as political factors and were potentially explosive. In the years immediately proceeding the civil wars a number of censorship measures were introduced and in 1575 such plays were banned. John Davidson

⁶⁰ Loughlin, 'Dialogue', p. 245.

⁶¹ Lynch, *New History*, p. 220.

⁶² Goodare, *Thesis*, p. 349.

⁶³ For discussion of these refer to J. Hughes and W. S. Ramson, *Poetry of the Stewart Court* (Canberra, 1982), p. 30; also, MacDonald, article 'Bannatyne Manuscript'.

⁶⁴ Goodare, *Thesis*, p. 351.

⁶⁵ Refer D. Lyndsay, *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaits*, ed. A. Mure MacKenzie (London, 1954); note that the second edition of this play was performed in Fife, June 1552 written and performed for an essentially aristocratic audience whose layers Lindsay knew intimately.

(1549–1604) as a Presbyterian minister and a fan of John Knox would have known his audience and catered accordingly.⁶⁶ The Queen's party also used plays as an effective means of persuasion. Most notoriously, in 1571 the Marians in charge of Edinburgh brought back the Robin Hood plays banned in 1554 in order to woo popular support. They thus allowed religious and political agendas to be masked by 'fictional' characters whose implied message 'inside circles' would particularly understand but which in some instances could also be effectively conveyed to the masses.

Audience

Audience targets for party print and propaganda during the Scottish civil wars ranged from the secular and ecclesiastical elites, to foreign dignitaries, to the popular masses as each side sought to assert their cause. Many agree with Mark Loughlin's assertion that:

The prime audience of civil war propaganda was still the small, influential elite who controlled the means of power.⁶⁷

According to Dr Julian Goodare many propagandists aimed at a limited audience who knew their reputation and were usually from the ruling class.⁶⁸ Further, he states that the Queen's party propaganda was aristocratic and refers to Thomas Maitland's 1570 newsletter which disparaged Regent Moray and his allies by suggesting their secret connivance for aggrandisement which was then carried from hand to hand amongst the nobility.

Its wicked characterisation of individuals would have appealed to most members of the elite who knew them personally.⁶⁹

The classic counter-attack by the King's party propaganda machine was made by George Buchanan in *Chamaeleon* — his vindictive attack on Mary's secretary William Maitland of Lethington renowned for his shifting loyalties. The publication of *Chamaeleon* was suppressed in 1571 by Maitland and was not printed as text until 1710, nevertheless it is widely known to have circulated in manuscript form in English and Scottish courts. I. D. McFarlane states that, '*Chamaeleon's* appeal was limited, not likely to interest a wider public'⁷⁰ which would verify its elitist nature. In the war of words fought essentially by the literate elite this would seem only natural. Popular and elite propaganda was thus distinguished.

Further evidence of an elite audience may be deduced from the *Bannatyne Manuscript*. As well known, George Bannatyne had twenty-two brothers and

⁶⁶ For biographical reference, see *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology* (1993), p. 235.

⁶⁷ Loughlin, 'Dialogue', p. 235.

⁶⁸ Goodare, *Thesis*, pp. 350–51.

⁶⁹ Goodare, *Thesis*, p. 360.

⁷⁰ McFarlane, *Buchanan*, p. 339.

sisters whose godparents were of a considerable stature and are listed in his *Memoriall Buik*. By his publications it is revealed; ‘Courtiers, lawyers, professors and printers were among his intimate friends and acquaintances’,⁷¹ and Theo van Heijnsbergen goes further in analysing the impact of this:

To all intents and purposes, and regardless of whether we view the BM as a collection prepared for the press or merely for circulation in manuscript among a select group of friends or relatives, this list of names provides the most detailed checklist available as to who may have constituted the audience for such a manuscript⁷²

Given the time and expense involved in printing such a vast collection, the immediate impact and accessibility of such a text as the *Bannatyne Manuscript* amongst the popular masses would have been quite limited.

Scotland’s war of words during the civil unrest even reached the echelons of royalty. Indeed Queen Mary herself claims to have personally acquired a copy of George Buchanan’s *Detection* in 1571 — a malevolent attack on her character and actions during her personal reign. Mary’s dismay and outrage regarding this publication is evident in her letter to M. de la Mothe Fenelon from Sheffield on 22 November 1571 in which she demands a stop to circulation of the work and punishment of the printers.⁷³ This was not the only literature to have evoked a royal response. In Britain and abroad the printed campaign for Mary during this period *had* affected Anglo-Scots discussions.⁷⁴ The King’s party counter-attack could almost be seen as a renewal of the earlier pamphlet war between the Bassandyne and Lekpreuk presses. Certainly, given the prevalence of propaganda on the international stage as a mechanism of influences both the Scots and Anglo sovereigns could not be unaware of the extensive impact of such publications.

Whether it was essentially elitist or not, the war of words in Scotland was often written and directed by members of the Edinburgh establishment to an Edinburgh audience. Authorship of civil war print and propaganda reflects significantly upon the intended audience, as does its circulation. For instance, the *Diurnal of Occurrents* was actually written by William Stewart, Deputy Town Clerk, who was the son of William Stewart the archivist.⁷⁵ With this background, his knowledge of Edinburgh politics and general details of the Scottish civil wars

⁷¹ G. Bannatyne, *The Bannatyne Manuscript in the Time of Pest 1568*, ed. Ritchie (Scottish Text Society, 1934), p. xxxviii.

⁷² For a detailed account of these names, please see *Memorials of George Bannatyne* (Bannatyne Club, 1829) and T. van Heijnsbergen, ‘The interaction between Literature and History in Queens Mary’s Edinburgh: the Bannatyne Manuscript in its Prosopographical Context’, in A. A. MacDonald *et al* (ed) *Renaissance in Scotland: Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture* (Leiden, 1994) pp. 186, 183–226.

⁷³ G. Neilson, *George Buchanan*, p. 439.

⁷⁴ McFarlane, *Buchanan*, p. 389.

⁷⁵ I am grateful to Professor Lynch for these insights in our conversation at Edinburgh University, 5 June 2000.

is considerably accurate and rich. Yet his composition is less knowledgeable in the true nature of the war outside Edinburgh. Edinburgh was a cauldron of boiling tensions, more than anywhere else, and exemplified a war in its own right.⁷⁶ In this, it lacks the same accurate and confidential intelligence and is adapted at discretion.⁷⁷ George Bannatyne was also a member of high Edinburgh society and the 'inside information' conveyed by his *Memoriall Buik* concerning persons from the 'world of the Edinburgh legal and administrative elite' suggests a particular discourse and specific audience for his poetry within these circles.⁷⁸ The *Bannatyne Manuscript* also conveys that:

George's father was not only Tabular or Keeper of the Rolls, but acted as depute of the justice clerk, and held office as a member of the Town Council of Edinburgh.⁷⁹

This would definitely support the notion of a select Edinburgh audience of considerable connections.

Robert Sempill's knowledge and audience also accommodated a distinct Edinburgh flavour:

Sempill's accurate knowledge of political events, and of the personal conduct of men in high position, point to his having spent much of his time in Edinburgh.⁸⁰

George Buchanan aimed his work also at members of the elite political establishment and *Admonitioun to the Trew Lordis* is a case in point. Lekpreuik's Edinburgh press published three editions of this in 1571 alone.⁸¹ Richard Bannatyne's *Journal of the Transactions in Scotland: during the contest between the adherents of Queen Mary and her son* displays an access to information which reveals his close connection to Knox and also the government authorities who resided in Edinburgh.⁸² Add to this list the literature that was produced from the Edinburgh printing presses with their centrality to political and judicial matters and a predominant Edinburgh audience is a credible conclusion.

Notwithstanding, elite audiences did not eliminate the indispensability or quest for popular support through civil war print and propaganda. The

⁷⁶ Refer M. Lynch, *Edinburgh and the Reformation*, to observe this in more detail; note also the example of Colin Campbell of Glenorchy, more concerned with the MacGregors than with the national cause which would undermine the sensationalist / inclusive nature of Stewart's work.

⁷⁷ *Diurnal of Occurrents*, introduction.

⁷⁸ Van Heijnsbergen, 'Literature and History', pp. 220–21.

⁷⁹ Bannatyne, *Manuscript*, p. xl.

⁸⁰ *Satirical Poems*, p. xxxv (biographical notes).

⁸¹ See H. G. Aldis, *List of Books Printed in Scotland before 1700*; note also that Buchanan's work aimed at character assassination of the Hamiltons which could be appreciated by political elites in Edinburgh. Further, it was a direct appeal to Queen Elizabeth in England for assistance which came soon after this publication.

⁸² R. Bannatyne, *Journal*, p. x.

publication and popularity of certain Reformation works in the *Gude and Godlie Ballatis* in 1567 demonstrated the effectiveness of such propaganda.⁸³ Further, the publication of Sir David Lindsay's *Works* in 1568, Henry the Minstrel's *Schir William Wallace* in 1570 and Barbour's *The Actys of Robert Bruce* in 1571, all indicate a consistent effort to appeal to popular patriotism and notions of the 'common weal' as each side sought to prove their dedication to Scotland as both a country and community. The publication of Henry's *Morall Fabillis* in 1570 was also indicative of their appeal to the masses for authenticity via accessible literature.⁸⁴ The edicts of Mary de Guise in the 1550s against ballads, satires and heretical books and similar edicts issued later by both Queen Mary and the King's party in 1567 would suggest that popular propaganda presented enough of a threat to popular party perceptions to be suppressed.⁸⁵ Censorship of this nature thus implied that monarchs and governments needed to regulate images in the public realm, although this ambition met limited success.

Scotland and its Foreign Counterparts

By the 1570s, the international war of print and propaganda had reached a peak. An important but neglected aspect of contemporary civil war studies is the relationship between Scotland's printing industry and its international counterparts at this time. Throughout the sixteenth century conflicts continued to erupt across the globe in response to processes of religious change and shifting notions of national identity, state and sovereignty. Civil unrest was not new, nor global tensions, but now early modern rulers internationally and domestically deliberately set out to exploit the new avenues that printing provided, using the presses as agents for justification and damnation. Despite the claims made by Robert M. Kingdon that; 'Edinburgh ... simply did not have the talents and resources to support much printing',⁸⁶ Scotland clearly enjoyed a thriving small industry which maximised the new tools at its disposal.

Printing had been introduced to Scotland under James IV in 1509 some thirty years after its introduction to England by William Caxton, with the publication of a breviary of the church of Aberdeen.⁸⁷ In the civil war years Scotland remained hard on the heels of its continental companions, particularly in the nature and transmission of its propaganda and awareness of censorship. During this period Scotland was also very conscious of its international reputation and as early as 1567 it appeared as a chief concern of the nobility with Morton stating:

⁸³ A. F. Mitchell (ed), *Gude and Godly Ballatis* (Scottish Text Society, 1897); Duncan Glen, *Poetry of the Scots: An introduction and Biographical Guide to Poetry I Gaelic, Scots, Latin an English* (Edinburgh, 1991), p. 33.

⁸⁴ Refer: Aldis' *List* in appendix and literature references in the bibliography.

⁸⁵ MacDonald, 'Poetry, Politics and Censorship', p. 413 ; Watry, *Thesis*, p. 30.

⁸⁶ Kingdon, *Myths*, p. 23

⁸⁷ Ames, *Typographical Antiquities*, p. 573.

The greatest part of the nobility awaiting the rest coming, have assembled to 'put remeid' to the dangerous and miserable estate of pour commonwealth ... whereby our native country may be relieved of the shameful slander it has incurred among all nations.⁸⁸

Indeed, the effect of such negative propaganda on both popular perceptions and foreign diplomacy could be significant. Yet in such slander, Scotland was not alone. Outside an international war of words raged fiercely.

The seeds of the international war of words had been sown earlier in the sixteenth century. King Henry VIII of England had used the press to mount a conspicuous propaganda campaign following his divorce from his first wife Catherine of Aragon.⁸⁹ Others, such as John Foxe (1516–87), perpetuated images of Protestant martyrology. In 1549, the future King Phillip II of Spain pursued a public relations exercise by concluding an extensive tour of the Netherlands,

a piece of careful propaganda designed to stress the solidarity of the Hapsburg Netherlands, their political stability and their enthusiasm of the ruling dynasty'.⁹⁰

On religious matters the leading reformers Martin Luther and John Calvin also exploited the new medium. In the early sixteenth century Martin Luther led the propaganda war in Germany by using sermons and pamphlets and engaging the skills of Cranach through wood-cut cartoons and Hans Sachs (1494–1576) through verse.⁹¹ In Geneva, John Calvin (1509–64) also led his own reformed propaganda campaigns through pamphlets and sermons, aiming his message at a bourgeois audience. In Spain and Italy it was the counter-Reformation messages which found a voice through such people as the founding Jesuit Inigo Lopez de Recalde or St Ignatius (1491–1556) who proved an influential mouthpiece for Catholicism during the 1530s and beyond.⁹² The messages of these early propagandists and the methods they employed still lingered during the period 1568 to 1573.

At the time of the Scottish civil wars the international war of words had further intensified. By 1572 France was rocked by internal religious wars, Spain immersed in the Dutch revolt, Ireland focused on its own internal struggles and England still attempting to consolidate the Elizabethan regime. Propaganda proved to be a venomous weapon regularly employed in the international war of words. The Massacre of St Bartholomew's Eve in August 1572 made France the target of vicious propaganda campaigns both at home and abroad. Other

⁸⁸ Letter of Morton etc to Lord Gray, 12 June 1567, *CSPSc*, 2, p. 331.

⁸⁹ Eisenstein, *Printing Press*, p. 304

⁹⁰ G. Parker, *The Dutch Revolt* (London, 1977), p. 25.

⁹¹ O. Thomson, *Mass Persuasion in History: An Historical Analysis of the Development of Propaganda Techniques* (Edinburgh 1977), p. 76; O. Thomson, *Easily Led: A History of Propaganda* (Stroud, 1999), pp. 177–78.

⁹² *Ibid.*

Catholic nations also became the focus of anti-Catholic sentiment manifested in the propaganda of Tudor and Stuart England:

They show how clever propagandists aroused mass hatreds and fears by evoking the spectre of Catholic massacres and elaborating on the anti-Spanish Black Legend.⁹³

Catholic conspiracies, Catholic menace and the Popish plot also featured prominently on Protestant England's propaganda lists. Scottish civil war propagandists equally used the international stage to convey their messages as seen earlier in the case of Buchanan and whilst their output was limited Scotland's foreign presence cannot be disregarded.

The audience for Scotland's war of words extended to foreign shores as diplomatic negotiations became vital to each party's existence and potential victory. The illustrious list of correspondents is evident in Scotland's *Calendar of State Papers* for this period. Foreign Catholic correspondents included certain members of the powerful d'Albret family in Navarre;⁹⁴ Philip II (1527–1598) the King of Spain; Fernando Alvarez de Toledo, Duke of Alva, councillor to Philip II and captain general of the Netherlands 1568–73; Catherine de Medici, wife to King Henri II of France and intermittent regent following her husband and son's respective deaths until her second son Charles IX ascended the throne in 1563; Charles IX of France (1550–1574) who remained under the influence of his mother and with her was instrumental in implementing the religious atrocity of 'St Bartholomew's Eve'; and finally there remained correspondence with Rome via various papal envoys.

Correspondents of the Protestant English persuasion were equally abundant. These included Queen Elizabeth I who ascended the English throne in 1558 and ruled to 1603; William Cecil, Lord Burghley (1520–1598), Queen Elizabeth's Secretary of State who in 1571 became Lord Treasurer; Sir William Drury (1527–1575), the leader of England's northern forces who led a number of military campaigns into Scotland including the 1573 siege of Edinburgh castle; Robert Dudley (1533–1588), made Earl of Leicester in 1564, one Queen Elizabeth's favourites; Thomas Randolph (1523–1590), who joined the English queen's service upon her succession and became her agent in Edinburgh for a time; Sir Nicholas Throckmorton (1515–1576) who was associate to Cecil and Dudley and became ambassador to Paris — a key diplomatic post involving Scottish and French affairs; and finally, Sir Francis Walsingham (1530–90) a member of Elizabeth's parliament who became controller of England's Secret

⁹³ Eisenstein, *The Printing Press*, p. 427.

⁹⁴ Jeanne d'Albret, queen of Navarre, who married Anthony de Bourbon, duke of Vendome (from a rival family of Mary's French relatives the Guises) was the mother of King Henry IV of France and features particularly in foreign civil war propaganda of this time. *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1, 11th edn (Cambridge, 1910), p. 513; also see Kingdon, Nicholson and Thomson.

Service in 1569 and in 1570 was entrusted to deal with the French. By such correspondents on both sides of the political and religious divide, the intricate web of diplomatic connections was woven by the King's party and Queen's party. Given that there was no convincing authority of either Scottish party and the ever-shifting political affiliations of key figures that undermined their strength, an appeal to foreign aid was absolutely necessary for survival and eventual victory.

Nature of Party Propaganda during the Civil War: King's party versus Queen's party

There was no clear victor in the print and propaganda war of words as each party at different periods experienced ascendancy. Michael Lynch sees the real turning point of the civil wars as September 1571, following the Ridolfi Plot and astutely suggests that this change in the political balance is reflected in Scotland's propaganda wars.

The propaganda of the King's party shrewdly grasped the moment and began to portray young James as the 'rising sun' and Mary as the 'fallen star'.⁹⁵

What this *does* illustrate are reflections of fluctuating fortunes on both sides.

In Scotland's 'war of words' neither money nor religion were the deciding factors, but rather, which party was able to evoke the active response from foreign shores that both sides desperately needed. The King's party eventually won this war with English support as the Catholic powers were too immersed in their own civil strife to engage in aid for the Queen's party whose campaign was complicated by Mary's continual imprisonment in England and thus inability to be reinstated on the Scottish throne. Problems of survivalism present a biased view on who had the best of the war of words, because it is mainly King's party propaganda that has survived. Certainly, the lists that now survive would indicate that at least in the pamphlet war, the King's party maintained ascendancy particularly seen by the high volume of Sempill ballads produced.⁹⁶ But did volume mean victory in real terms or rather a reflection that for much of the civil wars this party had its back to the proverbial wall?

Media of propaganda whether they be black-letter press, judicial literature, general histories, works of religious controversy and the spoken word, or popular in nature, *all* sought by creative means to persuade all levels of society of party authority and legitimacy with fluctuating levels of success. Audiences varied and whilst written tracts, books, Latin texts and even some plays were often aimed at elite audience, the black-letter press, sermons, ballads, patriotic literature, caricatures and rhymes often aimed to appeal to the common man. So

⁹⁵ Lynch, *New History*, p. 222.

⁹⁶ See Aldis, *List*, in appendix, and those of Ames, Dickson and Edmond.

each party sought to strike a balance between the spoken and written word, images and literature, sympathy and justification.

Whilst the Queen's party may have enjoyed ascendancy up until late 1570 to 1571 when the King's Party reeled under the power vacuum left by Regent Moray's assassination, so the King's party relished their rise after the Ridolfi and Norfolk plots tolled the death knell of Marian hopes for Mary's return to Scotland and her re-instatement to the throne. As Mark Loughlin states:

Indeed the immense output of party propaganda is one of the most outstanding and distinct features of this bitter internecine dispute which divided a nation ... The propaganda of the civil war, however, saw a development of that novel appeal, which, if it differed little in its conservative emphasis on the commonweal and defence of the realm, contrasted sharply in its bitterness, intensity and volume.⁹⁷

Displaying little care for accurate fact, but plenty of emotion, venom and sensationalism, both sides engaged in a war of words crucial to the sustenance of domestic popularity and foreign aid, a war which hit climatic proportions in 1571 with a flood of literature continuing until the official victory of the King's party in 1573. It demonstrated that print and propaganda were instruments of power, a fact acknowledged and effectively wielded to that end by both the King's party and the Queen's party until circumstances of the civil war played the strife to its ultimate conclusion.

⁹⁷ Loughlin, 'Dialogue of the Twa Wyfeis', p. 226.

CHAPTER 3

‘Regiment of the realm’: The War of Governance and Diplomacy

PRELUDE: Events Leading to Langside, 1567

An assessment of attitudes toward Moray’s earlier regency becomes necessary because there is a scarcity of secondary material on the subject. Other than Maurice Lee’s biography *James Stewart, Earl of Moray* published in 1953 (almost fifty years and showing it) there is little else written on this. It remains almost incidental to Donaldson’s *All the Queen’s Men* argument and studies such as Patrick Cadell’s 1975 pamphlet *Sudden Slaughter* concentrate more on his assassination than his earlier political life as Scottish Regent. Primary sources would indicate that whilst Moray’s early regime did enjoy certain strengths, it is generally marked by splintered attitudes and fragile governance with occasional attempts at assertion of authority which speak more for the new regime’s defensiveness than any real strength.

Abdication of Mary Queen of Scots and her Commissions of Regency

On 31 July 1567 Throckmorton wrote to Elizabeth about recent affairs in Scotland including the dubious resignation of the Queen of Scots at Lochleven where she had been imprisoned since her failed confrontation at Carberry in June.¹ Mary had signed two commissions regarding the new regency of Scotland on 24 July. In the first she offered sole regency to her ‘dearest brother’ Moray during her son’s minority. The second stipulated that if Moray refused this office, government of the realm should fall to a council of eight including

James Duke of Chestellarault Erll of Arrane Lord Hammiltoun,
Mathew Erll of Levenax [Lennox] Lord Dernie etc., Archibald Erll
of Ergyle Lord Campbell and Lorne etc, John Erll of Atholl, James
Erll of Mortoun, Alexander Erll of Glencarne and John Erll of Mar²

Of this council, five could rule conjunctly and with full powers, for her son.³ Mary, who had once said she would sooner renounce her life than her crown⁴ now pleaded,

we are so vexed and wearied, that our bodie, spirit and senses are
altogether become unable longer to travel in the rowme: And,

¹ *CSPSc*, 2, p. 370.

² *RPCSc*, 1, p. 541.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Spottiswoode, *History*, 2, p. 67.

therefore, we have demitted and renounced the office of government of this our realme.⁵

Opponents of Mary sought legitimisation in the hasty coronation of Mary's son, young James VI. According to Throckmorton's report the young prince had been crowned in Stirling on 29 July by the Bishop of Orkney, the laird of Dun and superintendent of Lothian with John Knox reading from the Book of Kings. Afterwards, Lindsay and Ruthven

dyd by theyre othe testefye publicklye that the Quene theyre sovereigne dyd resigne wyllingelye without compulcyon, her estate and dignyte to her sonne, and the government of the realme to such personnes as by her severall commissyons she had named.⁶

Yet despite such claims, Mary had clearly been forced to abdicate under duress⁷ and international disapproval manifested itself in poor attendance at the prince's coronation and later censures, whilst domestic disapproval was seen in the non-attendance of certain key nobles, namely the Hamilton's and Huntly. If the coronation by Mary's opponents of her son attempted to counter the dubious nature of the queen's abdication it struggled to convince.

The events of July 1567 raised a number of questions regarding the new governance of the Scottish realm. Issues of sovereignty arose as did the question of insurrection against rightful authority. Further, there was still the dilemma of an imprisoned monarch and the problem of precedence. What could be done with Mary? Justification for the queen's continued confinement was balancing tentatively on the flimsy premise of her complicity in Darnley's murder. Notwithstanding, the challenge to sovereignty by Mary's opponents was unmistakable.

Moray Returns to Scotland from France to Assume Office – A Solution to an Insoluble Problem?

The two commissions for regency proposed in Mary's declaration of abdication renewed a war for 'regiment of the realm' which had dominated Scotland's political landscape for centuries due to the continual royal minorities of the Stewart dynasty. Moray in 1567 was an obvious candidate, but was he merely the solution to an insoluble problem? The right to regency was seriously

⁵ Calderwood, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*, 2 (Wodrow Society, 1843), p. 375.

⁶ CSPSc, 2, p. 370.

⁷ Throckmorton wrote to Leicester on 26 July that 'the Queen of Scotland has accorded and signed these instruments and conditions (she being in capacity), and therefore it is to be feared lest tragedy will end in the person of the Queen violently, as it began in 'Davyes' and her husbands' (CSPSc, 2, p. 365). Spottiswoode confirms this: 'At first she took the proposition quite grievously ... yet after some rude speeches used by the Lord Lindsay, she was induced to put her hand to the renunciation they presented ... to advice her as she loved her life not to refuse anything they did require' (Spottiswoode, *History*, p. 67). Other accounts indicate that Mary was threatened with further restrictions to her liberty, isolation and further force should she refuse (Keith, *History*, 2, p. 696).

argued by constitutional lawyers at the time. Donaldson addresses the contemporary arguments in *All The Queens Men* stating that

while some lawyers thought that the regency belonged of right to the heir presumptive, others thought that council or parliament had freedom to chose a regent.⁸

Inevitably such arguments embraced polar considerations of kingship and commonwealth, or rather, the divine right and absolute rule of monarchs as opposed to elective monarchy and notions of popular sovereignty. The latter notion was explored most infamously in George Buchanan's *De Jure Regni apud Scotos Dialogus* or *Dialogue* written immediately after Mary's deposition and published in 1579 which stated that

people's duty to the commonwealth must take precedence over their allegiance to the king.⁹

Mary's abdication inflamed unprecedented speculation over these opposing notions and the constitutional right of *de jure* and *de facto* sovereignty,¹⁰ references to which are abundant in the propaganda and literature of the period i.e. *Satirical Poems* and in judicial documents such as *Register of the Privy Council*.

In this atmosphere the two commissions must be considered. In the second, Châtelherault and Lennox head the list. Both were long-standing dynastic rivals, each claiming hereditary right to the succession. Argyll enjoyed the Campbell dominance in the Western Highlands whilst Huntly in the north-east had been rejected for candidature. Whilst others on the list were of lesser noble standing but decidedly opposed to the queen. Importantly, these candidates were also divided regarding the ideological debate over sovereignty. Thus, all factions could not be satisfied by the new choice of regent and attention was turned to Moray's return with mixed emotions.

Moray provided a solution to this dilemma regarding regiment of the realm on a number of fronts. First, as Calderwood states;

He was desired to accept the government of the realme, becaus he would be would be least subject to the invy of men, partlie in respect of his neerensse of blood, partlie in respect of the good estimatioun he had acquired in former times.¹¹

This claim was substantiated by Buchanan in his work *The Tyrannous Reign of Mary Stewart*;

⁸ Donaldson, *Queen's Men*, p. 91.

⁹ R. A. Mason, *Kingship and the Commonweal: Political Thought in Renaissance and Reformation Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1988), p. 2.

¹⁰ Mason, *Kingship and the Commonweal*, p. 8; Donaldson, *Queen's Men*, p. 117.

¹¹ Calderwood, *History*, 2, p. 385.

He alone, because of his relationship, his integrity proven through many difficulties, the grace that came of his many virtues, and the Queen's request, could hold the position with the least possible envy.¹²

Moray personally claimed that he was only accepting office, 'because of the miferies of the tyme and the trubles of the countrie.'¹³ For the English, Moray presented new possibilities for the affirmation of Protestantism and British friendship, though not all were so convinced. Generally, given his involvement in the establishment of Mary's government in her early reign, his knowledge of state affairs and his commitment to the new reformed religion, many embraced his candidature as the most satisfactory solution to the potential war of governance and diplomacy which now faced Scotland. In the quest for legitimate authority, the new regime saw him as the only choice.

Moray arrived back in Edinburgh via England on 11 August 1567.¹⁴ After a brief hesitation which involved writing to key Scottish nobles expressing his personal concerns over the regency and calling for their opinions, he was proclaimed regent on 22 August, a decision ratified by Parliament three days later'.¹⁵ As Buchanan describes the new regime, however, it was not embraced by all.

A few days after, those who had convened at Hamilton complained that a handful of men, and these not the most powerful, had taken it upon themselves to arrange the government without their consent, for which they had not even waited.¹⁶

Alienation by exclusion did not sit well with these nobles, nor the rumours that in Moray's recent interview with the imprisoned Mary at Lochleven he had used 'reproaches and such injurious language as was like to break her heart'.¹⁷ Both personal interest and sovereignty had been undermined and a petition was sent out to the nobility requesting support for their stance though few replied, preferring to maintain neutrality. In response, Mary's supporters each signed the bond at Dumbarton banding against the King's lords and undertaking to restore the queen to liberty.¹⁸ This list further crystallised the two opposing factions. Did the 'solution' of Moray as regent then end the war for governance or fuel it?

¹² Buchanan, *Tyrannous Reign*, p. 150.

¹³ Herries, *Memoirs*, p. 100.

¹⁴ *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 119; Calderwood, *History*, 2, p. 385.

¹⁵ Buchanan, *Tyrannous Reign*, p. 151; Herries, *Memoirs*, p. 100.

¹⁶ Buchanan, *Tyrannous Reign*, p. 150.

¹⁷ Melville, *Memoirs*, p. 74.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 74; also see appendix for the list of names to the Dumbarton bond.

Splintered Attitudes and Moray's Fragile Governance of the New Regime

For a man who 'meaneth to use no dalyinge'¹⁹ it is curious that Moray did not call his first Parliament until 15 December 1567. According to Norman Macdougall in his works *James III* and *James IV*,²⁰ it is unwise to hold the first Parliament until the new ruler is convinced that support is firm, for Parliaments provided a forum for possible dissent.²¹ Such delays would then indicate less stability than the boasts in Throckmorton's letter. In September 1567 Marian supporters appointed three regents in secret proceedings at Hamilton. These were John, Abbot of Arbroath (until his father Châtelherault returned from France), Argyll and Huntly. All agreed to have the Queen's liberty, pursue the King's murderers and obey the prince but not as king.²² Alternatively, religious issues and the confirmation of proceedings in August including Moray's regency dominated the King's party parliament of December 1567. How far this new regime was staffed by Protestants pushing forward the reformed agenda is made clear by this parliament's proceedings: the Pope's authority was abolished; the Reformation parliament of 1560 ratified and the reformed religion consolidated.²³ Yet whilst Moray appeared intent on cementing the Protestant religion in Scotland it is questionable whether the Kirk was better off in 1570 than in 1567 given that a Test Act was not passed until 1573 and no new financial arrangements were made in the meantime. A harder line was taken on Catholic excommunicates, but nevertheless, the foundations of the Moray regime appear uncertain.

Moray's fragile governance of the new regime is apparent in the events leading up to Langside. One of the pressing issues in State affairs was retribution for Darnley's murderers. Many of the key nobles who had helped Moray to dominance, however, were implicated. Moray faced a poverty stricken treasury and was already reliant on Morton to take 'the burden of the country's necessity on his own purse'. He could ill afford to lose the support of these men.²⁴ Moray thus conducted a series of trials against alleged accomplices, but there was an obvious disparity and prejudice between those condemned and those spared

¹⁹ On 26 August 1567 Throckmorton wrote to Cecil regarding the new Regent of Scotland. In his letter he described a larger than life image in which 'the Lord Regent ... wyll goe more stowtiye to worke than anye man hath donne yet. For he sekcs to imytate rather some which have led the people of Israell, than any capytaynes of our age. As I can leame, he meanethe to use no dalyinge, but eyther he wyll have obedyance for thys yonge kynge of all estates within thys realm or yt shall cost hym hys lyffe.' *CSPSc*, 2, pp. 385–86.

²⁰ N. Macdougall, *James III* (Edinburgh, 1982); N. Macdougall, *James IV* (Edinburgh, 1989).

²¹ note: in Macdougall, *James IV*, p. 185, the King refused to hold parliaments between 1496–1504 for this very reason.

²² Letter dated September 12 1567 *CSPSc*, 2, p. 393.

²³ P.F. Tytler, *History of Scotland*, 6 (Edinburgh, 1845), pp. 26–29.

²⁴ *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland [RPCSc]*, J. H. Burton and others (eds) (Edinburgh, 1877–), p. 544; Buchanan, *Tyrannous Reign*, p. 152.

from harsh justice. Such actions provoked popular outrage.²⁵ More dire were the implications for his party which struggled with internal divisions. Tytler sums up Moray's unsteady hold on early governance

Owing to such causes it was apparent that Moray's government, soon after the dissolution of parliament, was in a precarious state.²⁶

Mary's escape from Lochleven on 2 May 1568 and the subsequent battle at Langside would thus present the greatest challenge to Moray's new regime yet seen.

Moray's Regency 1568–70: England's Protestant Satellite?

The arrival of the Scottish queen on English soil following Langside irrevocably altered the course of the Scottish civil wars and created a diplomatic crisis for the early Elizabethan government. Stephen Alford sets out the central dilemma for England in *Early Elizabethan Polity* by saying:

The Queen of Scots was— or at least was perceived to be — a profound threat to Elizabethan polity: a living connection between the ideological challenge of militant European Catholicism, the threat of Catholic subversion in England, Mary's claim to Elizabeth's crown and Elizabeth's refusal to marry or settle succession.²⁷

With Mary as the focus of sympathetic European Catholic attention and general international support, England feared the repercussions of being affiliated with a rebel regime that had blatantly challenged the sole authority of a legitimate sovereign.

Equally England could not afford to alienate the new regent. An alliance with Moray was particularly desirable given the Scottish involvement in turbulent Ireland, especially by the Marian Argyll in the Western Highlands, which threatened war for England on three fronts.²⁸ Moray presented Cecil with the opportunity of fulfilling his long-standing ambition of a Protestant-British friendship and the fragility of the regent's new regime in Scotland ensured his fealty and obedience. The significance of Anglo-Scottish links is reflected clearly in Cecil's *Memoriall* of 1568.²⁹ Yet, how should they proceed? Continual suspicion over Mary's complicity in her husband's murder provided Elizabeth the perfect political pretext to decide the matter. For although a judicial trial may

²⁵ As Tytler describes; 'Handbills and satirical poems which upbraided his partiality, were fixed to the door of the privy council and of his own house'. Tytler, *History*, 6, p. 33.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

²⁷ S. Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558–1569* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 1.

²⁸ On the Irish question refer to: J. E. A. Dawson's forthcoming work *Fifth Earl of Argyll: J. M. Hill, Fire and Sword: Sorely Boy MacDonnell and the Rise of Clan Ian Mor, 1538–1590* (London, 1933).

²⁹ Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity* see appendix 6, pp. 238–43.

be hazardous, was it not her duty as 'defender of the accord betwixt the Quene and her subjectes' in Scotland to oversee a just resolution?³⁰ Elizabeth reluctantly agreed to a conference to assess the charges of both the King's party and the Queen's party against one another. The regime began to prepare their case against Mary in the summer of 1568³¹ and the war of diplomacy south of the Scottish border began.

The 'First Trial of Mary Queen of Scots', a term coined by Gordon Donaldson in his 1569 publication, began at York at the beginning of October 1568, was renewed at Westminster in late November and concluded at Hampton Court in December 1568 to January 1569. The proceedings took the form of a conference rather than a 'judicial trial'. Commissioners were called from all factions.³² The list reflected some of the major players of the Scottish civil war as the cases for all sides were presented. Rumour indicated that if found innocent, Mary was to be immediately reinstalled on the Scottish throne,³³ stirring nervousness in Moray's camp. As MacCaffrey states:

The Regent had two options: some kind of compromise with Mary which cut out the Hamiltons, or a bolder scheme which would banish the Queen from the Scottish scene altogether and completely discredit her followers.³⁴

Moray pursued the latter and to this end produced the infamous 'Casket Letters' supposedly written by the Scottish queen to Bothwell whilst still wed to Darnley. If authentic (and there was considerable doubt), these would decidedly prove Mary's guilt in the King's assassination.³⁵ The motivations for Elizabeth in negotiations were those stated in Cecil's 1568 *Memoriall*. Mary was to be restored, but she and Moray should remain dependent on 'the authority of an English umpire'.³⁶ In such circumstances hope of a fair trial seems a little naïve, for too much rode on the verdict. Nevertheless, Elizabeth's 'no verdict' sentence surprised many when Cecil handed it down on 10 January 1569.

Diplomatically, this proved to be a shrewd manoeuvre on Elizabeth's part. Mary's character had been smirched by the revelation of the Casket Letters, her imprisonment (essentially a life sentence) in England assumed a certain

³⁰ Alford, *Early Elizabethan Polity*, p. 164.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

³² P Hume Brown, *History of Scotland: From the Accession of Mary Stewart to the Revolution of 1689* (Cambridge, 1912), p. 130 states these representatives: 'for Elizabeth came the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Sussex and Sir Ralph Sadler; for Mary, the Lords Boyd, Herries and Livingstone, the Abbot of Kilwinning, Sir John Gordon of Lochinvar, Sir James Cockburn of Skirving, and John Leslie, Bishop of Ross; and for James VI Moray, Morton, Adam Bothwell, Bishop of Orkney, the Abbot of Dunfermline, and Lord Lyndsay with Lethington, George Buchanan, James Makgill and Henry Balnaves as assistants'.

³³ W. MacCaffrey, *The Shaping of the Elizabeth Regime* (Princeton, 1968), p. 254.

³⁴ W. MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I* (London, 1993), p. 108.

³⁵ For discussion of these letters, see Donaldson, *First Trial*, pp. 67–73.

³⁶ MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, p. 108.

legitimacy, England maintained a bargaining power in Scottish affairs and above all their Protestant satellite was mollified and able to resume the reigns of governance in the north. Moray returned to Scotland with the acknowledgement of his regency by Elizabeth, much to the dismay and discouragement of the Queen's supporters.³⁷ Further, Moray received a loan of £5,000 from the English for his pains.³⁸ The relationship between the Elizabethan regime and Scottish Regent thus moved from its formal stance of 1568 to more open acknowledgement in 1569.

Assertion of the New Regime

In 1568 and 1569 Regent Moray made a number of displays of strength in an attempt to assert his new regime — at least superficially. On 9 February 1568 the Privy Council responded to a proposition made to the Lords of the Articles in the late parliament. Moray requested the stripping of the lead in Elgin and Aberdeen Cathedrals in order to meet the necessary expenses of

the establissing of peace and justice in this commoun weill and suppression of the rebellious and disobedient subjects, troublaris of the commoun weill in all parts of this realme.³⁹

The Earl of Huntly soon after offered a substantial sum of money for intercepting the lead and bringing it back to Aberdeen. Birney who had undertaken the task of its sale to the Low Countries accepted, though only some was returned. Such an episode illustrated a government seeming to promote iconoclasm, the power of persuasion still held by the Northern earl and the shifting tone in the war of governance from words into hard actions.

Moray continued his physical displays of power in geographical areas sympathetic to Mary's plight later in 1568. Following the battle at Langside, Moray pursued aggressive measures against his Marian opponents, this time in the south west and Borders of Scotland. The progress of the Regent and his large army against such Marian supporters as Lords Herries, Maxwell and Fleming (amongst others) began on the 11 June 1568. A full account of the action is conveyed in the *Bannatyne Miscellany* from contemporary accounts.⁴⁰ While extensive demolition of these strong houses was attempted, however, it appears to have been far from complete and left the way open for retaliation. One victim of this violence was James Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh, Regent Moray's eventual assassin, whose estates of that name were destroyed by the regent's forces as were those of his wife in Woodhouselee.⁴¹ 'Regiment of the realm' and the wars for governance thus began to spiral into a cycle of violence

³⁷ Donaldson, *Queen's Men*, p. 117.

³⁸ A. Mure Mackenzie, *The Scotland of Queen Mary: And the Religious Wars 1513–1638*. (Edinburgh, 1936) p. 182.

³⁹ *RPCS*, 1, p. 609.

⁴⁰ Bannatyne, *Miscellany*, 1, pp. 21–29.

⁴¹ P. Cadell, *Sudden Slaughter: the Murder of Regent Moray* (West Lothian, 1975), p. 6.

and counter-violence that would mark the duration of the Scottish civil wars from 1568–73.⁴²

Moray's authorisation of the purging of King's College in the Catholic University of Aberdeen in the north west in June–July 1569 issued a challenge to the Queen's party as well as an assertion of the new reformed religion. On refusing to undertake a religious test that would demonstrate their submission to the new reformed kirk, all staff were dismissed and banned from teaching publicly or privately anywhere in Scotland.⁴³ This was the heartland of the Earl of Huntly's ancestral realm of ownership and influence and Moray's actions were a direct challenge to his authority. The Earl of Huntly's unapologetic defiance in establishing an alternative government first by the secret proceedings with the Hamiltons in September 1567, then in the Langside Bond of May 1568 and later in February 1569 was a continual challenge and insult to Moray's efforts.⁴⁴ If retribution was the motive behind Moray's aggressive policy pursued in the north east in 1568 and 1569, perhaps it reveals more about the very real threat posed by Queen's party leaders like Huntly, Argyll and Châtelherault to Moray's earlier 'Regiment of the realm' than the stability and strength the Regent fought so hard to demonstrate.

1569: Norfolk, Northern Rebellion and a Languishing Regency

Elizabeth's verdict at Hampton Court had ensured the continuance of Moray's regency, at least temporarily. But in the early months of 1569 an ambitious scheme for the marriage of Mary Queen of Scots to the powerful English Duke of Norfolk came to light, challenging his new governance yet again. According to James Melville's *Memoirs* it seems that Norfolk had developed a sympathy for Mary's plight throughout the proceedings of her trial.⁴⁵ Soon plans for a marriage were devised. Norfolk appeared the perfect candidate for such a match as MacCaffrey describes him

The sole duke in England, of unblemished descent, the richest subject in the realm, and conveniently widowed (for the third time) 'with significant Catholic connections.'⁴⁶

The conspirators included some of the key English nobles and extended to foreign acknowledgement and support by French and German ambassadors,⁴⁷ as well as Rome through such papal agents as Roberto Ridolfi.⁴⁸ These secret plans coincided with Elizabeth's plans for Mary's return to Scotland. But in these affairs, the Scottish Regent played a vital role.

⁴² These events are also reported in *Diurnal of Occurrents*, pp. 132–33.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁴⁴ CSPSc, 2, pp. 393, 403, 626.

⁴⁵ J. Melville, *Memoirs*, ed. G. Donaldson (Folio Society, 1969), pp. 78–82.

⁴⁶ MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, p. 115.

⁴⁷ Tytler, *History*, 6, pp. 93–94.

⁴⁸ MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, p. 116.

Upon the conclusion of Mary's first trial in January 1569, Moray became aware of a plot to assassinate him on his return to Scotland through the northern counties. Moray appealed to the Duke of Norfolk for assistance. Wallace MacCaffrey describes their meeting:

In their discussion the Duke forthrightly declared his intention of marrying Mary Stewart. They bargained; Moray promised to support the marriage and return Mary to her crown with honour, provided Elizabeth consented. In return Norfolk used his influence with the northern earls and secured for the Regent a safe conduct home.⁴⁹

By March the plans for a union between Norfolk and Mary were firmly in place with the view that Mary's reinstatement to throne and the match 'was likely to restore tranquillity to both kingdoms.'⁵⁰ But now Moray procrastinated and actually hindered the plot with the support of convention at Perth beginning 25 July 1569 which declined to give permission for Mary's return and reinstatement to the crown. The Norfolk scheme fell apart when Cecil was made aware of the plans. The Duke was eventually executed for treason after the 1571 Ridolfi conspiracy. Nevertheless, the support lent to this failed scheme highlighted the continued vulnerability of the early Elizabethan regime to the aspirations of Catholic powers which would continue to challenge Elizabeth's rule and her northern neighbour as long as Mary lived.

Meanwhile, Marian strength was growing. On 28 February 1569 Mary issued a proclamation appointing

Châtelherault, Huntly and Argyll her lieutenants in Scotland, with the power to assemble parliaments, dispense justice, coin money, dispose of benefices, dignities etc.⁵¹

These three nobles represented some of the most powerful houses in sixteenth century Scotland — Huntly dominant in the North East despite the royal campaign against his house in 1562,⁵² Argyll with a virtual kingdom in the Western Highlands with links to Ulster, and Châtelherault whose property, kin and connections to institutions of central government had brought the house of Hamilton to its strong position. But beyond these key nobles, the Marians also commanded support from the conservative ranks — many within the church and gentry who chose 'the pragmatic middle course' opposed to the more radical forces of Protestantism that affiliated themselves with the King's party.⁵³ The names listed in George Bannatyne's *Manuscript* reveal these conservative adherents. Recently, Theo van Heijnsbergen has discussed this social milieu of

⁴⁹ Ibid; MacCaffrey, *Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime*, pp. 307–08.

⁵⁰ Tytler, *History*, 6, p. 93.

⁵¹ *CSPSc*, 2, p. 626.

⁵² I.B. Cowan, *The Enigma of Mary Stuart* (London, 1971), chapter 5, pp. 62–65.

⁵³ van Heijnsbergen, 'Literature and History', p. 216.

moderates who concentrated primarily on issues like trade, legal reform, and education, preferably in co-operation with the crown.⁵⁴ As seen in the case of Aberdeen there remained some influence of 'civic Catholicism'.⁵⁵ Further, there existed among many a real sympathy and support for the imprisoned Scottish sovereign in England. It would seem though, by Moray's later actions following the Northern Rebellion, that the Regent underestimated the strength of his opposition and the precariousness of his governance which divided his party by 1570.

The reasons for division and disapproval in 1569 were many. Popular displeasure was aroused by Moray's obvious affiliation and dependence on England. A constant changing of sides between adherents of both the King's party and Queen's party also left the Regent vulnerable. The worst charges were perhaps against his personal ambition. As Tytler conveys, during Mary's trial rumours suggested that;

The regent ... had sold the country, he was ready to deliver up the principal fortresses; he had agreed to acknowledge the superiority of England; he looked himself to the throne, and was about to procure a deed of legitimisation, by which he should be capable of succeeding if the young prince died with issue.⁵⁶

The contemporary views of people such as James Melville were even more harsh;

Again, when he was regent, flatterers for their profit drew to him, and puffed him up into too good an opinion of himself. His old true friends, who would reprove him, thereby lost his favour.⁵⁷

Ronald Pollitt who states that Moray's confidence in Elizabeth's support 'inspired him with too much contempt for his adversaries' further substantiates such a view.⁵⁸ Swelling disapproval thus undermined the strength of Moray's new 'regiment of the realm'. The extent of Moray's vulnerability and over-estimation of his regime's power became apparent through events of the Northern Rebellion in late 1569.

In mid-November 1569 the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland led a rebellion in the North intending to restore the Roman Catholic faith, confirming

⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 212–13.

⁵⁵ Discussed by M. Lynch in *Edinburgh and the Reformation*.

⁵⁶ Tytler, *History*, 6, p. 95.

⁵⁷ Melville's account continues: 'I would sometimes say to him that he was like an unskilful player in a tennis court, running ever after the ball; whereas an expert player would discern where the ball will light, where it will rebound, and with small travail will let it fall on his hand or racket. This I said, because he took very great pains in his own person to small effect'. Melville, *Memoirs*, Folio Society, p. 84.

⁵⁸ R. Pollitt 'The Defeat of the Northern Rebellion and the Shaping of Anglo-Scottish Relations', *SHR*, 64, no 177 (April 1985), p. 4.

Elizabeth's fears of an English Catholic challenge. At this stage, Pollitt describes the dual alliance between England and their Protestant satellite:

Moray needed English backing to keep the Marians at bay and Elizabeth needed Moray to keep the French out of Scotland, so despite occasional differences, each party relied on the other's support in the event of a crisis.⁵⁹

In this crisis Moray acted swiftly and the rebellion was put down soon after it began. The rebels fled across the border and sought sanctuary with the Scottish Marian supporters despite Moray decreeing the harbouring of fugitives as unlawful. Moray's blunder was to bargain for Northumberland and secure his arrest:

for it provoked a violent reaction both among the borderers, whose code it violated, and among Mary's supporters.⁶⁰

Unwritten law stipulated that:

anyone who crossed the border for political sanctuary be spared from pursuit by crown officials and to break this law was to defy public opinion not only on the Borders but of the whole country.⁶¹

Despite Moray's attempting to rectify the slight by claiming in a report to England on 6 January 1570 that Northumberland was in Edinburgh but not 'in ward' the error was irretrievable.⁶² Soon after, on 23 January 1570 Moray was assassinated in Linlithgow by a single shot from Bothwellhaugh,⁶³ plunging Scotland into political crisis and an intensified war for 'regiment of the realm' that was, by its particular make-up, different from any witnessed previously in the sixteenth century.

1570: Crisis of Regency

The dawn of 1570 saw the changing face of Anglo-Scottish politics as England reconsidered its options after the loss of its Protestant satellite, a leadership vacuum of five months that left the King's party in disarray and the Queen's party enjoyed a resurgence and its most powerful position since the civil strife began. In late 1569 a death warrant for Mary was drawn up under the imminent threat posed by the Northern Rebellion.⁶⁴ Elizabethan policy throughout 1570 was dominated by consciousness of the continued Catholic threat and other international considerations. Elizabeth desired revenge against the Catholic rebels being sheltered in Scotland. The further challenge posed by

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁶⁰ J. H. Burns, 'The Political Background of the Reformation, 1513–1625', in D. McRoberts (ed.), *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1500–1625* (Glasgow, 1962), p. 24.

⁶¹ Pollitt, 'Anglo-Scottish Relations', p. 4; Hume-Brown, *History*, p. 140.

⁶² Pollitt, *ibid.*, pp. 4–5.

⁶³ Full account in P. Cadell, *Sudden Slaughter: The Murder of the Regent Moray* (West Lothian, 1975).

⁶⁴ Tytler, *History*, 6, pp. 103, 472.

Leonard Dacre's rebellion in Northern England after Moray's assassination hardened Elizabeth's determination on retribution.⁶⁵ Adding to Elizabeth's dilemma was her excommunication by Rome in early 1570 that left her regime vulnerable to outside Catholic threats which ranged from France, Spain, the Low Countries and even Ireland. In her attempts at once to secure Protestantism, ensure the safety of the prince, prevent international intervention and punish the Catholic rebels, Elizabeth conducted a dual policy not only engaging in lengthy negotiations with both factions of the Scottish civil wars for peaceful resolution, but also in shows of remorseless military force with Sussex's and Drury's expeditions into Scotland in 1570, following the Dacre challenge. Such physical assistance for the King's party eventually broke the Queen's party with the destruction of key Marian strongholds including the demolition of the Hamilton heartland.⁶⁶ Meanwhile, in Scotland the war for 'regiment of the realm' by governance and diplomacy, reached climactic proportions.

Assassination and Vacuum: The Nature of Regency Re-assessed

On 22 February 1570 Thomas Randolph wrote to Cecil about the late Regent's funeral.⁶⁷ Many of those in attendance were on the original list of eight nominees of Mary's 1567 commission of regency. Such a showing purposely illustrated the strength of 'regiment of the realm' which had been perhaps not so convincing in Moray's final months of life. Though he was now a committed Marian supporter, Grange appeared at the funeral to carry the corpse out of courtesy for the relationship they once shared. Knox, who had criticised Moray so adversely in *Book IV* of his *History*, preached the sermon '*Beati mortui qui in Domino moriuntur*' though they had not spoken for some time. There was the illusion of a State funeral with all the trappings — ritual, a solemn audience, the solid showing of his previous adherents. The problem faced in assessing Moray's funeral and its possible imitation of a deceased sovereign's service is that there is no immediately suitable comparison available. King James IV did not have a public funeral and no account exists of King James V funeral.

What can be deduced is that whatever the weaknesses of Moray's government, by the turn of 1570, his assassination by a member of the leading Marian house of Hamilton allowed his faction to make him a martyr. The flood of King's party propaganda that followed aimed to exploit this with moral attacks upon key members of the Queen's party and their personal motives for the brutal murder of Scotland's 'Good Regent'. King's party propaganda now claimed that the harmony that marked Moray's regime had been shattered by a callous act. Such King's party propaganda whilst seeming to be a powerful weapon actually showed not their strength but rather desperation at their

⁶⁵ Pollitt, 'Shaping of Anglo-Scottish Relations', p. 21.

⁶⁶ See Pollitt and MacCaffrey's two works, *Elizabeth I* (London, 1993) and *Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime* (Princeton, 1968).

⁶⁷ CSPSc, 3, p. 84.

weakened state. Stable regimes do not have to bid for support by these means and the very viciousness of the attacks made by King's party propagandists reveal the damage caused to the regime following Moray's death.

On 3 March 1570 a convention was held in Edinburgh to discuss the nature of a new regency. The greatest of the nobility were assembled including Morton, Atholl, Crawford, Mar, Glencairne, Ogilvy and many others of the King's party faction. Many of the leading Marianists including Argyle, the Archbishop of St Andrews and Boyd stayed away, preferring their own conference in Linlithgow. Lord Herries in his *Memoirs* describes events at the March convention:

In the mean tyme, those in Edinburgh fell into debate by what authoritie they could proceed to the election of a new Regent. Some argued, that the Queen's Commiffion, wherein eight were nominatt Governors, was not voyd by the death of the Regent. Others thought, that the Commiffion was the ground they walked first upon, by which they might proceed yet to a new election with the same power of [space] of these nominatt in the Commiffion of the Queen. There were many that advyfed the Chancellor to lay asyde the election until a full parliament should be indited and mett. Secretarie Lithingtoun was said to be the author of this opinion; but it was not must regarded, for it was thought he did this to confound business, and truble the fate. The laft opinion was, that the Queen's Refignation or Commiffion was not to be lookt unto at all, but as a thing unneceffar' that those whoe were the authors of the King's coronation should now stand to it, and proceed to an election, for the troubles of the cuntry will fuffer no delay. In the end, this meeting diffolved without any conclution; and everie man went home.⁶⁸

The issues at stake were thus plainly put forward. Yet no decision would be made for some time regarding the governance of the realm until the election of Lennox to the regency on 15 July 1570.⁶⁹ In the meantime there was no effective leadership. Instead, there was hesitation, English procrastination, diplomatic wars and the establishment of rival governments. This crisis also brought into focus a third faction in the war for governance and diplomacy described by Maitland to Leicester in a letter dated 29 March 1570. The term 'regiment of the realm' employed in many documents of this period, is in this letter given firm definition in the context of the Scottish civil wars. Maitland describes the country divided into two factions and continues :

There is accidentally fallen out another division by my Lord Regent's death, which is like to change the state of the other two factions, to increase one and diminish the other, grounded upon the 'regiment' of the realm. Some number of noblemen aspire to the

⁶⁸ Herries, *Memoirs*, pp. 123–24; note also the discussion of these events in Calderwood, *History*, 2, pp. 527–28.

⁶⁹ Calderwood, *History*, 2, pp. 567–68.

government, pretending right thereto by reason of the Queen's demission of the crown, and her commission granted at that time for the 'regiment' during the King's minority. Another faction 'doth altogether repyne against that devise', thinking it 'neither fitt nor tollerable' that three or four of the 'meanest sorte' amongst the Earls 'shall presume to challenge to them selves' a rule over the whole realm—the first in rank, the greatest both for ancienty' of their houses, degree and forces, being neglected. They think it preposterous that the meaner sort should be placed in public function to command the greater to continue as private men to obey.⁷⁰

As Maitland rightly states, the assassination of Moray would inevitably change the issues in the war for governance of the realm. Major nobles who represented the ancient blood of the nobility were essentially the key Marians — Hamiltons, Campbells and Gordons. The lesser nobles referred to included Mar and Morton. The festering tensions which arose during the regency of Moray exploded after 1570 during the regencies of Lennox, Mar and Morton and manifested themselves in rival administrations which dominated the latter years of the wars.

Rival Administrations: King's party versus Queen's party, 1570–73

Marian Lieutenants: Hamilton, Huntly and Argyll

the son's party daily decays the mothers party daily increases
(April 1570)⁷¹

After the assassination of Moray, the threat posed by the alternative Marian administration became a conspicuous concern for the destabilised King's party during this period. Jenny Wormald's *Lords and Men in Scotland* offers a detailed account of the power and influence wielded by the leading Marian nobles through bonds of manrent in which allegiance and service was exchanged for protection and maintenance. To break such a bond meant incurring significant penalties that in the cases of the noble houses of Hamilton, Gordon and Campbell were particularly exorbitant.⁷² This was not insignificant when the king's government was forced to 'conduct operations against Huntly in the north, Argyll in the west and the Hamiltons in the centre and south west'.⁷³ Further, all three lieutenants were intimately connected by blood and marriage and connections to the throne which only served to strengthen their alliance and that of their kin and adherents.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ CSPSc, 3, p. 102.

⁷¹ CSPSc, 3, p. 190.

⁷² J. Wormald, *Lords and Men in Scotland: Bonds of Manrent, 1442–1603* (Edinburgh, 1985), p. 71 and 85.

⁷³ Donaldson, *Queen's Men*, p. 90.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

The King's party concerns regarding the Marian rival administration are seen in a proclamation of the Secret Council on 8 May 1570.

Is it likely that the King's innocent person shall be preserved one month 'uncuttit away' when such as under the Queen's colour have 'usurpit' the name of her 'Lieutenantis' shall have the government of this realm?⁷⁵

A re-occurring, non-negotiable requirement in the 1570 negotiations was that no innovation be made in the government of Scotland to change it from its state before the Regent's death.⁷⁶ Also in July 1570, the determination of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland specifically demanded obedience be given 'to the Kinges Maiestie his authoritie'.⁷⁷ By October 27 1570 Sussex demanded that:

the Duke and the Earls of Huntly and Argyll cease from all execution of their commission of lieutenancy, and permit all 'cortes to be fensytt' and holden judgements to proceed in the King's name in all places ...⁷⁸

Negotiations eventually broke down between the two parties and the Marian lieutenancy begun prior to Lennox's election to regency on 17 July 1570 continued for some time afterward.

Scotland's 'regiment of the realm' and the wars of governance and diplomacy which ensued from it, also embraced a quest for legitimacy between the two rival administrations of King and Queen's men. 1570 to 1573 saw a struggle between these factions for the instruments of power and its trappings so crucial to the legitimacy of sixteenth century government. Essential to any legitimate ceremony of government were the 'Honours' or regalia of Scotland and the presence of the privy seal and great seal. Throughout the civil war both sides thus vied to get the lawyers and royal administration on their side with rather even results. Experts, administrators and lawyers over this period were usually from the ranks of the conservative establishment as discussed by Theo van Heijnsbergen. Books for a Journal were needed and official records of the justiciary court. In this, the King's party came out on top. Finally, there was the issue of coinage. By this time there was no single royal mint but two separate sites. The King's party mint was in Morton's home at Dalkeith, while the Marian mint was in Edinburgh Castle. To the embarrassment of the King's party, the Marian coinage was worth more, as it contained more silver. No fewer than six rival parliaments were held in the space of the months after May 1571 'a measure of the dislocation of the political community'⁷⁹ in a war for legitimacy

⁷⁵ CSPSc, 3, p. 165.

⁷⁶ Sussex to Maitland, July 4 1570, CSPSc, 3, pp. 245–46.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 251.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 413.

⁷⁹ M. Lynch, *Scotland: A New History* (London, 1991), pp. 220–21.

and supremacy of governance only finally decided by external intervention in 1573.

April 1571 to July 1572 saw the 'Wars of Leith and Edinburgh' a term coined by Calderwood in his *History*. It was a period that witnessed the festering tensions of 1570 explode into perhaps the most intense displays by opposing rival administrations of rival town councils, rival Kirk sessions, forfeiture and counter-forfeiture, and separate jurisdictions. In early 1571 the debate over sovereignty and government continued to rage and Lennox intensified his pleas for assistance from England⁸⁰ though by this time the Marians had been severely weakened by the expeditions of Sussex and Drury. The position was exacerbated at the beginning of April 1571 by the fall of Dumbarton Castle. By mid-April Grange complained of Lennox's 'detestable tyranny' of the 'regiment of the realm'.⁸¹ The crisis came on 30 April 1571 when Kirkcaldy of Grange had it proclaimed at Edinburgh's market cross that all who concurred with Regent Lennox should leave the city precincts or remain at their own peril.⁸² The King's men retreated to Leith. The 'rebels' held a parliament from 10 June in Edinburgh Tolbooth with the official regalia of crown, sceptre and sword.⁸³ On 12 June the appointed parliament whose members included Herries, Maxwell, Lochinvar and the Bishop of Galloway were presented a letter by Garthlie from the Queen. Calderwood described the event:

The letter of supplication was read, and according to her request, all the former proceedings touching the King's coronation were made null.⁸⁴

In May, two alternate parliaments met in Edinburgh — the Queen's party at the Edinburgh Tolbooth, the King's party in Canongate. The latter was dubbed the 'creeping parliament' held for less than ten minutes, with enough time for the lords in attendance to issue forfeitures against leading Marians.⁸⁵ Such retaliatory gestures were a key feature of these times, and as the stakes rose desperate measure were employed. The wars for 'regiment of the realm' continued to range steadily into 1572.

By 1573 all hope of a Queen's party victory was, however, lost. In August 1571 Argyll left the Marians to join the King's party, having given up all hope of Mary's return to Scotland and aware of the consequences to his personal interests if he continued to back a losing party.⁸⁶ The loss of such a key figure and the flow of defections which followed was a decisive blow to the Marian cause. However, Argyll had read the situation correctly as later events illustrate.

⁸⁰ CSPSc, 3, p. 491.

⁸¹ Proclamation by the Laird of Grange, CSPSc, 3, p. 543.

⁸² Calderwood, *History*, 3, pp. 71–72.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁸⁵ Donaldson, *Queen's Men*, p. 121 ; Lynch, *New History*, p. 221.

⁸⁶ Argyll to Châtelhault, 13 August 1571, CSPSc, 3, p. 645

On 4 September 1571 Regent Lennox, with the involvement of the Gordons and Hamiltons, was slain at Stirling. His successor was John Mar who was appointed regent over follow nominees Argyll and Morton in the parliament ending 7 September.⁸⁷ The new Regent received correspondence from Elizabeth on 2 October 1571 stating her resolve to no further aid Mary's restitution to the Scottish throne and offering her full support to the young king.⁸⁸ A further blow to the Marians was the defensive alliance between England and France manifested in the Treaty of Blois on 27 April 1572, which ended all hopes for further French assistance. Mar pursued a more conciliatory policy and was able to end the Wars of Leith and Edinburgh that concluded in July 1572 at which time the town was re-opened to all men. In October 1572 Regent Mar died (some suspected poison) and Morton, signalling the renewal of aggressive policy reminiscent of Lennox, assumed the position. By the end of 1572 Châtelherault, his sons, Huntly and Seton had left Edinburgh Castle.⁸⁹ On 23 February 1573 the effective death warrant for the Queen's party was signed in the Pacification of Perth in which key Marians received a reversal of previous forfeitures in return for their allegiance to the King's authority.⁹⁰ Despite Grange's valiant attempts with the support of Maitland to maintain their position, their final defeat came in May with the siege of Edinburgh Castle by English forces.⁹¹ On 28 May 1573 Edinburgh Castle fell. Kirkcaldy of Grange was hanged and Maitland died before capture either by disease or poison. The King's party had finally emerged victorious and the Scottish civil wars effectively ended.

The significance of these wars for governance was their unusual character. Nothing quite like it exists in the sixteenth century. For whilst Edinburgh was often a cockpit of factions of court and there had literally been incidences of gunfights on the street, the nature of these rival administrations was unique. The war for 'regiment of the realm' which ended between the King's party and Queen's party in 1573 was a war fought on many fronts: a war of words; a war of diplomacy; a war of attrition with violence and counter-violence; a war of the consolidation of the Elizabethan regime and the appeal to foreign powers; a war of rival administrations; and even a war of ideology embracing issues of sovereignty and regency and their effect upon individual allegiances. What began with Mary's abdication and a regency supported by England, ended with the same foreign intervention in 1573. No war in the sixteenth century Scotland had been won without outside assistance as the factions within Scotland were often quite evenly matched in men and resources. The Scottish Civil Wars of 1568–73 proved to be no different.

⁸⁷ Calderwood, *History*, 3, p. 141.

⁸⁸ 2 October Elizabeth to Mar, *CSPSc*, 4, p. 1.

⁸⁹ Donaldson, *Queen's Men*, p. 125.

⁹⁰ *CSPSc*, 4, pp. 495–99.

⁹¹ See Bannatyne, *Miscellany*, account.

CONCLUSION

The common thread that links together each of the individual studies undertaken here is that the Scottish civil wars from 1568 to 1573 were multifarious and complex with an outcome far from pre-ordained. Despite its importance, this period remains vastly under-researched and this study has gone back to the original sources in an exhaustive attempt to fill in some of these gaps. It has taken a fresh approach to this complicated period of Scotland's history by examining the nature and issues of certain key phenomena, studying them as wars within themselves, a view not previously taken. These special studies assess the fluctuating motivations, shifting loyalties and unique character of the civil wars in relation to their wider context. There are still many more avenues to be explored of this period that cannot be adequately addressed here. This conclusion will briefly discuss the findings of this investigation which spans from the flight of Mary Queen of Scots to England in May 1568 following her defeat at Langside, to the fall of her adherents following the siege of Edinburgh Castle five years later.

All Things to All Men

'All things to all men' was a phrase employed by Gordon Donaldson in his 1974 publication to describe Mary's conciliatory religious policy that he claimed was born from self-interest and opportunism.¹ According to Donaldson:

she would be all things to all men and commend herself to the dominant Protestants in Scotland and England without alienating the Roman Catholic minority there or the Roman Catholic powers on the Continent.²

This thesis takes Donaldson's phrase past its religious perimeters to embrace the perceptions held by many of the major players of the Scottish civil wars. Mary Queen of Scots is here portrayed as more than a mere religious figurehead or manipulator as many previous studies have suggested. By the outbreak of the Scottish civil wars few people domestically regarded her in mere religious terms (if they ever had) for she had played her role as 'politic ruler' far too well during her personal reign from 1561 to 1567 for many to be convinced. Further, the mixed complexion of both the King's party and the Queen's party are an indication of the startling extent to which personal rather than religious motives determined adherence to either party.

¹ Donaldson, *Mary*, pp. 71-72.

² *Ibid.*

One of the main revelations of this investigation is the diversity of individual motives which affected the outcome of events, particularly prevalent in the war of the nobility, the war of words, and the war for governance of the realm. In Mary's absence she was to embody almost all things to all men both in Scotland and abroad — from rightful sovereign, to inept ruler, to victim of personal ambition of her opponents, to foreign pawn among others. The phrase 'all things to all men' is used here as a suggestion that the men, means and motives behind the Scottish civil wars was by no means simple or straightforward, but a cauldron of inherent contradictions and tensions which was to erupt in the years 1568 to 1573 and end with most participants exhausted. In her absence, those at home were left to assert an image of what they wanted Mary to be according to their own personal agendas and visions.

Noble Power, Kinship and Factionalism

The most striking difference between this work and any other previously attempted is the focus given to Hamilton civil war involvement which extends beyond the overarching studies offered by Elaine Finnie and others. It goes beyond previous studies in its original approach to one of the most powerful houses in sixteenth century Scotland— the Hamiltons. It assesses the significance of the rise and fall of Hamilton fortunes throughout the Scottish civil wars as a prime illustration of noble power, kinship and factionalism during this era. It recognises the distinctive features of Hamilton affiliation with the Marian cause as well as its embodiment of certain key values of the Scottish nobility. The house of Hamilton possessed connections at all levels of Scottish politics — national, regional and local — and like most other Scottish nobles it was the pursuit and protection of this power which lay at the heart of its political allegiances particularly in the civil wars.

The house of Hamilton stood apart from other noble families because of its intimate connections with the throne and the dynastic ambitions that fuelled its policies. Nevertheless, the house of Hamilton also shared the key noble preoccupations of kinship ties, marriage ties, bonds of manrent and protection of landed interests and the pursuit of influential titles and positions, all of which were intricately connected. The Hamilton position of pre-eminence by the time of the civil wars was achieved after centuries of opportunistic manoeuvring — consolidation of titles and holdings under Châtelherault's governorship of Scotland (1542–1554), marriage ties which meant intimate links with other leading noble families, and access to centres of government.

The role of the nobility has been portrayed as fundamental to the events and outcome of these wars and the house of Hamilton as reflective of their unique position within Scottish politics. This is illustrated by their quasi-independent status, the adherence of individual Hamilton members to a common cause in the name of kinship and advancement of the house, and most importantly its clan rivalry with the Lennox-Stewarts that exploded during the

civil war era over competing dynastic claims. On another level, Châtelherault's questionable legitimacy through the doubtful divorce of his parents left him vulnerable to opponents' attacks. This contributed to a vacillating character that evoked suspicion both among his Scottish counterparts and foreign powers such as France and England particularly.

Châtelherault was a major player in the civil wars as one of the leaders of the Queen's party and though notably absent on a few vital occasions, his commitment to Mary's cause was evident. As leading adherents of the Queen's party and given Châtelherault's position shared with Argyll and Huntly as Mary's lieutenant, the Hamiltons came under increasingly vicious attacks both in propaganda and in real terms. Their direct involvement in the assassination of Moray earned them further disapproval. In May 1570 physical violence by the King's party and English forces struck at the heart of Hamilton territorial, secular and ecclesiastical holdings leaving them devastated, though the Hamiltons did not finally succumb to the King's party demands until 1573. Such a study given its multi-faceted nature could go further than has been done here. Yet what has been revealed, is a significant study into the role of the nobility in Scottish politics and the civil wars of 1568 to 1573 through the spectacular rise and fall of one of its most dominant houses — the Hamiltons.

The War of Words

Print and propaganda played a crucial role in the Scottish civil wars of 1568 to 1573, producing a war of words that reflected both domestic concerns and international influences. Aside from P.B. Watry's 1993 thesis on Sixteenth Century Printing, this facet of the Scottish civil wars has been largely dismissed as a secondary concern. Yet the war of words fought between the King's party and Queen's party infiltrated all levels of Scottish society and was manipulated by crown, kirk and community alike. This new medium of printed word and image was an effective means of persuasion that was able to reach a larger audience than ever before possible and was an avenue of expression that crossed normal social, political and geographical boundaries. While writers such as R.M. Kingdon have dismissed the strength of the Scottish printing industry, it is argued here that though smaller than its international competitors its role in the Scottish civil war was no less significant than those of its foreign counterparts. By an analysis of problems of survivalism, media, audience and the nature of party propaganda it portrays a rich industry reflecting the struggle for power between opposing factions. It goes further by recognising the place of Scotland's printing presses in relation to its international counterparts, an important analysis largely ignored in previous studies.

The impact of printing phenomena during the civil war years of 1568 to 1573 both in Scotland and abroad are assessed in this study as a provocative war of words. Certainly the power of the press is conveyed as a double-edged sword of celebration and condemnation, unity and division, information and invention

as both the King's part and Queen's party struggled to assert dominance and justification for their cause. Mainly because material issued by the opposing parties has not survived proportionately, it appears that it was the King's party that enjoyed dominance in the propaganda war, though it is doubtful whether this is an accurate reflection of the actual state of affairs. The language, output and survival of civil war propaganda provides a crucial reflection of the fluctuating position of both parties throughout the conflict — for instance, the desperation of the King's party following Moray's death in 1570 which led to an inundation of black letter, broad-side ballads in Lekpreuik's presses by authors like Robert Sempill. Another important revelation of this study is that while transmission and transportation of civil war print and propaganda varied, it was able to infiltrate all levels of Scotland's civil war society from royalty and elites to lawyers, merchants, clergy and the popular masses. Finally, the war of words extended to foreign shores as Scotland realised the necessity for outside intervention to decide the outcome of events, as neither party was powerful enough on its own terms to command a decisive victory. This study has thus provided a more detailed analysis of Scottish civil war print and propaganda than is usually given, realising its fundamental role in the course of events and attempting to present an original review of the sources available.

Regiment of the Realm

The term 'regiment of the realm' was coined by William Maitland of Lethington in 1570 to describe the war for governance and diplomacy which dominated this period and the key factions of this struggle. In this study, those factions have been identified and the intricacies of their character and motivations investigated within the wider context of Anglo-Scottish relations. The two commissions for regency passed by Mary Queen of Scots immediately after her forced abdication in July 1567 proved to be extremely problematic and precipitated a war for 'regiment of the realm' of Scotland. The election of Moray as regent was met with mixed emotions. Moray's part in Mary's imprisonment and abdication, and his commitment to the young King James which suggested ambition rather than true personal attachment, did not make him a popular choice for everybody especially those key nobles he had excluded. The alternative, however, was worse. By his blood-ties to Mary, his experience in government and on the field, his devout Protestantism and honourable reputation he appeared to be the solution to an insoluble problem.

His new regime was fragile, however, and this led to his making certain aggressive attempts to assert his authority in Elgin and Aberdeen and his progress against Marian opponents in the south west and borders. This study perceives Moray as a Protestant satellite of England, bringing into focus the crucial role of Anglo-Scottish relations in the civil war conflict. Moray and Queen Elizabeth of England, shared a relationship of necessary alliance and the formal relationship between them in 1568 had by 1569 become one of more open

acknowledgement. But in 1569 Moray had underestimated the strength of his opposition, the precariousness of his government, and the rising tide of popular resentment directed toward his blatant English affiliations. Moray had also largely disappointed his supporters in his role of proclaimed protector of the true Protestant religion for the kirk made little progress in hard terms under his regency. Realisation of his precarious position came after the Norfolk plot and failed Northern uprising in the later stages of 1569, with evident popular disapproval over his treatment of the English rebel Northumberland. By January 1570 he was dead, assassinated at the hands of Châtelherault's Hamilton kinsman, James of Bothwellhaugh.

This study considers the ramifications of his assassination in the war for governance of Scotland. The power vacuum that followed led to a re-assessment of the nature of the Scottish regency. It was July before this position was filled by Lennox. In the meantime, the Marians relished a peak in their fortunes and their best opportunity for victory in the face of their opponents' desperation and leaderless state. The flourishing fortunes of the Marians were squashed by English violence in 1570 and 1571 as Elizabeth sent in forces led by Sussex and Drury to assist the floundering King's party. Elizabeth's main excuse being the continued sheltering of English Catholic rebels by the Marians. The period 1570–73 was marked by the wars between Leith and Edinburgh and the rival administrations of King's party and Queen's party. Each sought legitimacy through a struggle for the instruments of power and actions of forfeiture and counter-forfeiture. From 1572 the position of the Queen's party was rapidly declining and by 1573 their cause was lost. Like most sixteenth century Scottish conflicts, war for 'egiment of the realm' was decided by outside intervention. The complexity of the internal issues, as shown here, also influenced the outcome. Moray's regency and developments after his assassination are analysed in a different way and an attempt made to provide a comprehensive view which challenges the notion of the 'Good Regent' and the harmonious reign projected in George Buchanan's works and other previous studies.

Scottish Civil Wars: In Summary

This study provides only a glimpse the depth of possibilities of this under-researched era of the Scottish civil wars of 1568 to 1573. It has endeavoured to draw attention to the richness and complexity of key issues, people and events by studying the wars simultaneously fought within Scotland of noble power, kinship and factionalism, print and propaganda, and 'regiment of the realm'. There is little secondary material written on these three aspects, and as such, a re-evaluation of primary material has been undertaken in an attempt to clarify the relationship between them. Each is related and they reflect the multifarious and complex interactions of the war, marked by fluctuating fortunes between its two key factions until the very end. It illustrates the complexity of this era and presents the image of a war unique to any other seen in the sixteenth century.

Appendix 1

Hamilton Bond, Battle of Langside, Dumbarton Bond: Allegiances in 1568

LANGSIDE BOND 8 MAY 1568 ALIAS HAMILTON BOND	BATTLE OF LANGSIDE 13 MAY 1568	THE DUMBARTON BOND 12 SEPTEMBER 1568
---	---	---

Nucleus of Queen's Party

Queen's Party

*King's
Party*

<p><i>Earls</i></p> <p>Argyll Crawford Cassillis Eglington Huntly Rothies Montrose Sutherland Erroll</p> <p><i>Lords</i></p> <p>Herries Fleming Boyd Seton</p> <p>Ross of Halkhead Borthwick Maxwell Livingston Somerville Ogilvy Oliphant Sanquhar Hay of Yester Drummond Elphinstone Carlisle Sinclair</p> <p><i>Bishops</i></p> <p>Ross Dunkeld Moray Galloway Aberdeen St Andrews Brechin The Isles Argyll</p>	<p><i>Commendators</i></p> <p>Arbroath Paisley Inchcolm Lindores Glenluce Holywood New Abbey Dundrennan Souleseat Crosraguel Inchaffray Kelso Pluscardih Ardchattan</p>
--	---

<p><i>Earls</i></p> <p>Argyll Eglington Cassillis Rothies</p> <p><i>Lords</i></p> <p>Nerries Seton Claud Hamilton Somerville Fleming Boyd Hay of Yester Borthwick Sanquhar Livingston Maxwell Ross Sheriff of Ayr</p> <p><i>Lairds and Knights</i></p> <p>James Hamilton of Crawfordjohn Lochinvar Waughton Bass Dalhousie Roslin Innerwick Newtown Graham</p>	<p><i>Earls</i></p> <p>Morton Glencairne Marr Montith</p> <p><i>Lords</i></p> <p>Home Lindsay Sempill Ruthven Graham Ogiltree Cathcart</p> <p><i>Lairds and Knights</i></p> <p>Lethington Buchanan Drumlanrig Grange Lochleven Balquhan Tullibardine Cessford Bargary Lus Pitcur</p> <p><i>Abbots</i></p> <p>Dunfermline Bamerino (?) Lord Treasurer Justice Clerk Magill Bargary McFarlane</p>
--	---

<p><i>Earls</i></p> <p>Argyll Crawford Cassillis Eglington Huntly Rothies Erroll</p> <p><i>Lords</i></p> <p>Herries Fleming Boyd Seton Maxwell Livingston Somerville Ogilvie Oliphant Sanquhar Hay of Yester Drummond</p> <p><i>Bishops</i></p> <p>Ross Dunkeld Galloway Aberdeen St Andrews Brechin The Isles Argyll</p> <p><i>Commendators</i></p> <p>Inchcolm Lindores Glenluce Holywood New Abbey Jedburgh Kinloss Fearn Kilwinning</p>

Sources:

G Donaldson, *Queen's Men* lists from
a) Keith *Affairs* ii p807-10
b) Goodall ii cxxxviicxxxix

Sources:

1. CSPSc ii, p. 405
2. Raphael Hollinshead, *Scottish Chronicle* ii, p. 347
3. Keith, *Affairs*, ii, p. 813
4. Calderwood, *History*, ii, p. 415

Appendix 2

Affiliations of the Scottish Nobility 26 August 1571

(from CSPS ciii, p. 667, no 895)

List of the nobility of Scotland with the letters 'q' (queen), 'k' (king), or 'n' (neutral) before each name, indicating to which faction they belonged.

Earls

(q) The Duke*; (k) Lennox, reg.; (k) Angus; (q) Huntlie; (k) Argile;+ (n) Atholl;* (k) Erroll; (k) Marschaell; (k) Craufurd; (k) Cathenes; (k) Sutherland; (k) Menteith; (n) Rothes;* (k) Glencarne; (k) Eglintoun; + (k) Cassilis; + (k) Mar; (k) Montrois; (k) Buchane; (k) Mortoun.

Lords of Barons of Parliament

(k) Lindsay; (k) Lovett; (k) Forbes; (k) Saltoun; (k) Glammiss; (k) Gray; (k) Ogilvy;+ (k) Innermeyth; (k) Methven; (k) Oliphant; (k) Drummond; (n) Elphinstoun,* — 'na force'; (n) Somirvile;* (n) Ross — 'na force'; Carlile,* — 'of na force'. 'Levingstoun *in England: his frendes servis the King'. 'Fleming'* forfatit and in France; (k) Borthuik; (k) Zester; 'Seytoun' * in France or Flanderis; (q) Hume* 'all his friends serve the King'; (q) Maxwell;* (q) Hereis;* (k) Simpill; (k) Cahcart; (k) Boyd;+ (k) Uchiltre; (k) Sanquahar 'pupill'; (k) St Johnnis; (k) Sinclair.

1 page Indorsed by Burgley

*marked with a cross against their names. + = 'new'.