

# Buchanan versus the Portuguese Inquisition: Personal, Philosophical, or Political?

**Sybil Jack**

## **Introduction**

The Scottish poet, humanist, and divisive critic of church and government George Buchanan (1506-1582) was probably born in and certainly near Killearn, Stirlingshire. He was trained at the University of Paris and elsewhere and taught in various universities in Europe before his final return to Scotland in 1560. He developed a philosophy regarding the role of the monarch which allowed for resistance to a tyranny in ways that have continued to influence Scottish and European ideas of government, and his attacks on Franciscan thought led him to be declared a heretic. I dedicate this paper to H. L. Mencken and his insight: “for every difficult and complicated question there is an answer that is simple, easily understood and wrong.” I think Buchanan would have agreed, especially in regard to his encounter with the Inquisition in 1549-1551, one of the least understood episodes of his life. Buchanan himself was remarkably reticent on the subject but there have been many accounts most of which are defective in one respect or another as the authors seek to explain either why he submitted and recanted or how he was assisted to avoid the fate inflicted on many judged heretics.

Not all historians have wanted to examine the episode too closely. To those Scottish historians who revered him as a true reformer the fact that he was able to avoid serious punishment for heresy was an embarrassment to be explained away. It appeared like Peter denying Christ. Either he was lying

---

Sybil Jack is an Honorary Research Associate in History at the University of Sydney and has previously served as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

to save his skin, or, equally unacceptable, at this stage in his life he was moderately happy with the position of the Catholic Church. Since the discovery in the late nineteenth century of the files the Inquisition kept on Buchanan, it is one of the best documented events in his life but the records have not helped elucidate why Buchanan found himself in this potentially life-threatening position. Paul McGinnis and Arthur Williamson see Buchanan in his early years as constantly in flight from powerful archbishops and bishops—David Beaton of St Andrews, Stephen Gardiner, and Archbishop Charles de Gramont<sup>1</sup> (who can be found in R. J. Knecht's life of Francis I as one using the concordat in 1530<sup>2</sup> and is described by I. D. McFarlane as “fiercely orthodox”<sup>3</sup> but who as bishop of Aire and Archbishop of Bordeaux was a supporter of the College of Guyenne)—but however true this was in his early life by 1549 Beaton (d. 1546) and de Gramont (d. 1544) were dead, Stephen Gardiner was in the Tower, and there is little evidence of other Episcopal animosity. Indeed, Buchanan in his confession claimed friendship with the religiously orthodox Cardinal de Guise, the Cardinal of Lotharingia, brother to Mary de Guise the Dowager Queen of Scotland. He certainly was when he got back to France in 1552.<sup>4</sup>

Buchanan's trial documents, indeed, have not been accurately read or perhaps accurately translated. For example, presumably extrapolating from other secondary sources, statements have been wrongly attributed to witnesses who never made them about Buchanan.<sup>5</sup> It appears, for instance, to have been Joao da Costa and not Buchanan who flogged Joao Pinheiro. Even I. D. McFarlane's account of the trial has allowed several errors to intrude such as the identification of the Inquisitor General as the King's cousin, not his brother.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul J. McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson (eds and trans.), *George Buchanan: The Political Poetry* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society Lothian Print, 1995), p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> He was Bishop of Aire and Archbishop of Bordeaux. See Robert J. Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior and Patron* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 92, 578.

<sup>3</sup> I. D. McFarlane, *Buchanan* (London: Duckworth, 1981), p. 123.

<sup>4</sup> Philip Ford, 'George Buchanan's Court Poetry and the Pleiade', *French Studies*, vol. 34, no. 2 (1980), pp. 137-152.

<sup>5</sup> Richard Henry Popkin and Gordon M. Weiner (eds), *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Dordrecht: Springer, 1994), pp. 95-9.

<sup>6</sup> McFarlane, *Buchanan*, pp. 131, ff.

Despite various other short accounts of the trial<sup>7</sup> the coyness about using the material to illuminate what Buchanan's ideas were at that time has led to their neglect. This is regrettable because what he writes in his Latin confessions, if one does not automatically assume it is misleading, casts light on some of the intellectual and political intent of his writings. His play of John the Baptist, he claimed, was based on the life and death of Thomas More and *speciem tyrannidis illius temporis* which if true makes it a far cry from the Baptist as the fiery apostle of radical reform suggested in the standard history of literature. His attitude to developments in England is, in fact, revealing. He cannot believe that the King of England can be head of the church or that if profane laws are disobeyed it is a sin.

His confessions, moreover, fit all the independently verifiable dates and events and the matter deserves a fresh examination in the light of recent scholarship. The myth of the Inquisition created in the period of the Enlightenment to stigmatise the old governments makes his escape appear more remarkable than it was. To unravel Buchanan's story it is first necessary to consider the position of the Inquisition in Portugal and to elucidate how it differed from the more frequently studied Spanish Inquisition. Buchanan's fate must be explained in the context of the internal history of Portugal and the dissension there between different religious and political factions, not to any more international religious or political developments.

### **The Trials of the Coimbra Academics**

Scottish historians have focused on Buchanan but the explanation that, as his fellow accused Diego Teive claimed, he was swept up in an attack on the Principal and Vice-Principal of the College only because he was their friend and shared their lodgings, and possibly because he might prove a weak link in the attempt to brand them as Lutherans, is perhaps more likely. Joao da Costa and Diego Teive were members of the Portuguese upper classes. People who shared their surnames were both prominent at Court and possible ex-Jews and so a more likely target. They were eventually condemned not for Lutheranism but for breaches of order and, like

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, see Chapter 10 of K. G. Jayne, *Vasco Da Gama and His Successors 1460 to 1580* (London: Methuen & Co.: 1910).

Buchanan, were soon released and Teive was restored briefly to the management of the College.

Guilherme Henriques, in printing the records of the Inquisition for Buchanan, raised the following questions to which he claimed to give an answer but which I think remain unsolved:

1. Who was the real promoter of the proceedings against Buchanan?
2. Was he the only, or even the principal, person against whom those proceedings were directed?
3. Were there any reasonable grounds for the proceedings?
4. Were the Judges impartial, lenient, or severe as regards Buchanan?
5. What opinion should be formed of Buchanan after an impartial study of the three Records?

He really answers only 3 and 4, writing that there were reasonable grounds for the proceedings.<sup>8</sup> He thought Buchanan had been dealt with exceptional lenity, and that he had behaved with prudence and integrity.

---

<sup>8</sup> Guilherme J. C. Henriques (Carnota) in his *George Buchanan and the Lisbon Inquisition the records of his trial, with a translation thereof into English, Facsimiles of some of the papers and an introduction* (1906) comments: "taking the three prisoners together, and bearing in mind the state of public opinion at the time, I am inclined to think that the Inquisition had sufficient ground for proceeding against Buchanan. Others had been tried with much less reason. The state of affairs at the Royal College at Coimbra must have given grave cause for disquiet to the ruling powers at Lisbon and caused serious doubts as to the morality and opinions of the chief Professors. It must be recollected that if, at the present day, one of the principal schools of the country was reported to be under the charge of teachers whose conduct was grossly immoral, or whose principles tended to the subversion of existing authority and rules, most assuredly the Government would feel it their duty to enquire into the truth of the rumours, and take action thereon. Neither the form of procedure or the consequences would be what they were in the sixteenth century; but action would, undoubtedly, be taken to remove the teachers of such pernicious theories.

Buchanan's past was suspicious, and the reports of it which reached the Court, probably lost nothing on the way. That there was some foundation for them, is shown by his confession that for a certain time he had vacillated and doubted in those dogmas to which, at that period, the greatest importance was attached. His fellow-professors were not so candid. Rightly or wrongly they denied everything. But they had been very imprudent, not only in their acts and in their conversations with orthodox persons, but in their friendships with suspected persons, consequently Buchanan's connection with them increased the suspicion caused by his past.

In the course of the proceedings, other matters appeared which still more shewed the

But were these records reliable? The Inquisition's apparently meticulous records, which have been described as a masterpiece of archival science<sup>9</sup> have also been subject to denunciation particularly the recent wholesale dismissal of their utility by Benzion Netanyahu on the grounds that the purpose of the Inquisition was to annihilate the *conversos* so that the records produced were fictional.<sup>10</sup> This would of course invalidate any analysis of Buchanan's trial records. Others such as Anna Ysabel d'Abrera, however, reject the arguments that they are unusable, emphasizing the factual nature of the surviving documentation and asserting that the Inquisitorial process was reasonable; the accused (in Spain) was permitted a defense lawyer and the Inquisitors appreciated the unreliability of confession under torture and required its ratification the following day. She presents a number of specific cases to demonstrate that the process gave the defendants some chance of acquittal and that the Inquisitors followed the judicial procedures laid down and did not impede "the natural course of justice."<sup>11</sup>

---

investigation to have been requisite. Costa and Teive divulged the existence of a state of immorality and bad feeling among the Staff at the Royal College which called for drastic reform, and shewed such a complete absence of religious feeling, that gave plausible ground for the efforts of the Jesuits to induce the youths to leave it and enter their establishment, or even their efforts to obtain entire possession of the College. Costa, as I have said, laid before the Court a long list of those whom he looked upon as being his enemies, setting forth the bad qualities of each, and the reasons he had for suspecting them to be inimical to him. In most of the cases he himself does not figure at all well; and, most assuredly, at the present day, no Professor with the antecedents of several of those who taught at the Royal College, let his qualifications as a teacher be what they might, would be allowed to retain his post after his real character had been discovered; and heavy responsibility would attach to his superiors." At [https://archive.org/details/buchananin00buchuoft/page/n1/\\_mode/2up](https://archive.org/details/buchananin00buchuoft/page/n1/_mode/2up). Accessed 17 February 2020.

<sup>9</sup> Gustav Henningsen, 'The Archives and the Historiography of the Spanish Inquisition', in *The Inquisition in Early Modern Europe: Studies in Sources and Methods*, eds Gustav Henningsen and John Tedeschi (De Kalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986), pp. 54-76.

<sup>10</sup> Benzion Netanyahu, *The Origins of the Inquisition in Fifteenth Century Spain* (New York: New York Review of Books, 2001).

<sup>11</sup> Anna Ysabel D'Abrera, *The Tribunal of Zaragoza and Crypto-Judaism, 1484-1515* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008).

## **The Inquisition**

The first to write a history of the Inquisition from its records gave the original impetus to Netanyahu's interpretation, Juan Antonio Llorente, had been an official of the Holy Office himself<sup>12</sup> and claimed that the Inquisition forged reports and was established to enable the property of the Jews to be confiscated.<sup>13</sup> His work established the framework on which most later writers have drawn when they wish to proclaim the falsehood, injustice, mistreatment and misrepresentation of the Inquisition.

There is a tendency to assume that the Inquisition was a single institution run centrally and controlled by the Pope. This is not so. The Inquisition differed from country to country and there was no standard way in which those institutions communicated or co-operated.<sup>14</sup> The cruelties of the *auto-da-fé* dominate popular accounts but despite the continuing horrified interest of people in the practices of the Inquisition<sup>15</sup> serious scholars have shown that only a small minority of those accused were burned.<sup>16</sup> Most, like Buchanan, were 'reconciled' and given lesser punishments. Some like Ignatius Loyola were eventually exonerated. It is important to remember this when assessing Buchanan's experience. Finance was part of the objectives—the ministers of the Inquisition in a country like Spain had the right to collect money from all the visiting boats of foreigners, for instance<sup>17</sup>—but maintaining the purity of religion was

---

<sup>12</sup> Juan Antonio Llorente, *Histoire critique de l'Inquisition espagnole* (Paris, Treuttel et Wurtz, 1817).

<sup>13</sup> He wrote: "No one could write a complete and authentic history of the Inquisition, who was not either an inquisitor or a secretary of the holy office ... *Being myself the secretary of the Inquisition at Madrid*, during the years 1789, 1790, and 1791, I have the firmest confidence in my being able to give the world a true code of the secret laws by which the interior of the Inquisition was governed, of those laws which were veiled by mystery from all mankind." Llorente, *Histoire*, xii, emphasis in the original.

<sup>14</sup> Francis Soyer, 'An Example of Collaboration Between the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions', *Cadernos de Estudos Sefarditas*, vol. 6 (2006), pp. 317-340.

<sup>15</sup> See for instance Antonio Baio, *Episodios dramaticos da inquisicao*, vol. 1 (Lisbon: Seara Nova, 1936), who includes the Buchanan episode.

<sup>16</sup> Edward Peters, *Inquisition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), p. 98, says of 30,000 recorded cases the Portuguese Inquisition is thought to have condemned 1,175 and burnt in effigy 633, so under one in twenty-five.

<sup>17</sup> Michel Moret, *Aspects de la Société Marchande de Seville au Debut du xvii siècle* (Paris: Marcel Riviere et cie, 1967), pp. 90-1.

also critical. However misguided the Inquisitors were their ostensible purpose was to bring the soul of the sinner to God; the *salus animae*.<sup>18</sup>

Racial, religious and political beliefs have distorted most attempts to interpret the purpose of the Inquisition. It suited some people, for different reasons, to imply that the apparently Christian were in fact crypto-Jews. If Antonio Jose Saraiva is to be believed, for example, the whole thing was a gigantic hoax as the Holy Office sought to create 'Judaizers' not extirpate them, seeing them as synonymous with the Portuguese mercantile class that the rulers wished to hold down.<sup>19</sup> Certainly, over a 350-year and longer period the Inquisition diligently pursued Jews, heretics, philandering priests, and sexual deviants in Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America, although it changed its focus as circumstances altered down to its abolition in the nineteenth century. Its rule was undoubtedly maintained by fear and seen as persecution by those it pursued.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless to many its objectives were a necessary if distasteful process involved in obedience to God.<sup>21</sup>

Those *conversos* who were, or were alleged to be, crypto-Jews were the main target of the Portuguese Inquisition in the sixteenth century but these Neo-Christians were not its only target. It was also concerned with those who might be otherwise exceeding the duties of the Christian like the Illuminati, the Spanish sect of intellectuals—who were called *alumbrados*<sup>22</sup>—and after 1520 the followers of Luther or Calvin in accordance with the condemnation Leo X had issued in 1520 in the bull *Exsurge Domine*.

---

<sup>18</sup> This is in itself very complex and much argument over Augustine's views continued in the sixteenth century in which Buchanan seems to have participated. The Dominicans had their own views, which may explain their attitude to Buchanan.

<sup>19</sup> António José Saraiva, *The Marrano Factory: The Portuguese Inquisition and Its New Christians 1536-1765* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2001 [1969]). Original published in Portuguese in 1969, republished in English by Brill with additions.

<sup>20</sup> Toby Green, *Inquisition: The Reign of Fear* (London: Macmillan, 2007).

<sup>21</sup> This is a claim that many who cannot believe in long running institutionalised cruelty seek to deny. Recently Francois Soyer, in *The Persecution of the Jews and Muslims of Portugal: King Manuel I and the End of Religious Tolerance* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) largely attacks the Christian regime while seeing its Muslim predecessor as a tolerant paradise.

<sup>22</sup> For this group see Ralph Tapia, *The Alumbrados of Toledo. A Study in Sixteenth Century Spanish Spirituality* (Park Falls, Wisconsin: F.A. Weber and Sons, 1974).

### **The Position of the Inquisition in Europe**

The Inquisition was not a single institution. In different countries it was controlled by different people and established at different times. While papal bulls were necessary for the establishment of an Inquisition in a particular area the Pope had only a partial and often ineffective control over the behaviour of the tribunals that were established. In the Middle Ages the powers of the papal Inquisition were often challenged by the local diocesan ordinaries and the secular authorities but were focused on heresies.<sup>23</sup> By the late fifteenth century the secular powers were starting to exert control over the institution that became more an arm of the state than a structure that the pope could control. Efforts made to rein in the behaviour of the local tribunals by popes Sixtus IV (1471-1484), Innocent VIII (1484-1492), and Alexander VI (1492-1503) were only partially effective.

The distribution of tribunals varied enormously. There were no tribunals in England, Scotland, or most of Scandinavia. In France there was a residual Inquisition dating from the Middle Ages and the Dominicans appointed Matthew Ory *Inquisiteur de la foy*, a position approved by Francis I and registered by the Parlement, but his authority was limited. The judges who sought out heretics were authorised by Parlement or King and although Clement VII sent a bull in 1533 suggesting the establishment of an Inquisition, which was registered by the Parlement de Paris, control remained with the secular courts. Francis I and Henri II did attempt to introduce the Inquisition but were opposed by the Parlement and largely unable to enforce their wishes although the *Chambre Ardente* came perilously close.<sup>24</sup> Where the Holy Office was established there was an Inquisitor General and a central office to which the records of the local tribunals were sent but each tribunal operated separately. The first and best known was the Spanish Inquisition that eventually had sixteen tribunals in towns across Castile, Aragon, and Leon established in 1478. The rather different Roman Inquisition, instituted in 1542, was controlled by the Pope,

---

<sup>23</sup> For the nineteenth century the early source is Jean Guirard, *Medieval Inquisition* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1929); James B. Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline, and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001).

<sup>24</sup> Nicola Mary Sutherland, *Princes, Politics and Religion 1547-1589* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1984), pp. 24-7.



but operated mainly in Italy. There was a separate one in Venice. In Spain and Portugal by the sixteenth century the monarchs had established virtually complete control over the church in their overseas territories by the system known as *padroado*, patronage, that was granted in return for papal exemption from expenditure on missions.

The Inquisition was almost entirely in the control of the Dominican order. This made it unpopular in the sixteenth century with other Orders like the Benedictines, Franciscans and the Augustinians and with secular ministers of the Church. In particular, the long rivalry between Dominicans and Franciscans led to friction. The Franciscans were generally opposed to the practices of the Spanish Inquisition. They had a spiritual wing that was sometimes accused of sympathy with the *alumbrados*.

### **The Coming of the Inquisition in Portugal**

Rita Costa Gomes' recent account of the late medieval court does not extend to Joao III but it serves to demonstrate that the Portuguese court was as complex and faction ridden as the English and French courts of this time and as full of internecine strife and shifts of allegiance.<sup>25</sup> Susannah Ferreira in her thesis comparing the courts of Manuel I and Henry VII of England makes plain the similarities.<sup>26</sup>

One similarity to the English court that we should bear in mind in attempting to understand the politics behind the accusations against Buchanan, da Costa and Teive<sup>27</sup> is that the Portuguese court was by no means narrowly Catholic and had wide cultural links with the rest of Europe. Many of the players in the cultural complexity of the court were to

---

<sup>25</sup> For the position somewhat earlier see Rita Costa Gomes, *The Making of a Court Society: Kings and Nobles in Medieval Portugal*, trans. Alison Aiken (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

<sup>26</sup> For part of this see Susannah C. Humble Ferreira, 'The Cost of Majesty: Financial Reform and the Development of the Royal Court in Portugal and England at the Turn of the Sixteenth Century', in *Money, Markets and Trade in Late Medieval Europe: Essays in Honour of John H. A. Munro*, eds Lawrin Armstrong, Ivana Elbl, and Martin Elbl (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), pp. 210-32.

<sup>27</sup> He returned to the Chair of Humanities in 1552-3 and was principal of the College from December 1554-1555.

some degree sympathetic to reform, and certainly to Erasmus.<sup>28</sup> Erasmus dedicated to Joao III (reigned 1521-57) his *Lucubrationes aliquot* (1527). Indeed, one threat held over the head of the Pope in the struggle to establish a Portuguese Inquisition was that, pushed to the limit, Joao III might take the route to schism that Henry VIII had and remove Portugal from adherence to Rome. King Joao III had found that without an Inquisition he was disadvantaged in his dealings with the New Christians and others compared to Charles V and I in Spain, and was probably encouraged to seek the establishment of an Inquisition by his wife, Charles' sister Caterina.<sup>29</sup> This establishment was unpopular with significant sections of Portuguese clerics. It took a long time to get it established because his first confessor, a Franciscan, was against it as was Bishop Fernando Coutinho de Silvas bishop of Lisbon and other bishops who were part of the order of Christ in Tomar. There was also opposition in the Roman Curia to his attempt in 1531 to obtain a bull secretly from Clement VII through Bras Neto his then ambassador at the Curia. When the necessary bull *Cum ad Nihil Magis* was obtained on 17 December it ran into further difficulties: his confessor, the Franciscan Diego da Silva, was named Grand Inquisitor but refused the office.

The New Christians started a campaign at the Curia to have the bull annulled and prepared to leave Portugal if they failed even though laws had been passed to make this illegal.<sup>30</sup> The bull was abrogated and a bull of pardon for the New Christians issued which stressed that they were to be treated kindly and won over by love. Paul III (1534-1549) was well disposed to the Jews and a commission of investigation reported in favour of the New Christians. Although Joao largely ignored the bulls that did not

---

<sup>28</sup> For a sketch of Neo-Latin culture in Portugal, see Jozef IJsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, vol. I, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), pp. 118-26.

<sup>29</sup> For a detailed if biased account, see Alexandre Herculano, *History of the Origin and Establishment of the Inquisition in Portugal*, trans. John C. Branner (California: Stanford University Press, 1926). Originally written in Portuguese in 1854-5, Herculano painstakingly cited archival material and his facts are widely accepted. He relates the thirty-year struggle between King Joao III and the New Christians.

<sup>30</sup> These laws had teeth: in 1544 Antwerp was willing to return newly arrived Portuguese who did not have the right letters from the King.

permit him to do what he wanted he was no nearer to the goal of establishing an Inquisition fully under royal control.

The Pope was trying to balance one concession against another. He had given the Portuguese monarchs religious control over the missions in their overseas territories in 1534 but he was unhappy about the powers the Spanish Inquisition had assumed. He was reluctantly willing to see a tribunal for matters of faith instituted in Portugal but not as an independent institution. Various restrictions were to be imposed. The evidence of servants, low persons, or convicts was inadmissible; the testimony of witnesses should not be kept secret; the prisons should be kept open; suits should not be brought against deceased persons; and the property of heretics should not fall to the state treasury, but to the heirs of the condemned. Appeal to the Curia should be permitted. On 12 October 1535 a new bull was published throughout Portugal suppressing all suits brought against the Neo-Christians, cancelling every confiscation of their property, and annulling all sentences against them.

One critical shift that affects our story was the King's attitude to Dom Miguel da Silva, Bishop of Viseu, who had risen as Portuguese ambassador to the Holy See in the 1520s and became the principal secretary of the King in the early 1530s.<sup>31</sup> The relationship had soured because Paul III wanted to make him a cardinal and Joao thought only members of the royal family—at the time his brother Dom Affonso (d. 1540)—were worthy of such an honour. Miguel's opposition to the Inquisition, however, also played its part. Similarly, shifts could go towards a humanist focus as the princes shifted their attitude and extended their patronage to such people as Andre de Resende.<sup>32</sup>

Joao III, however, was in desperate need of money. The income from the pepper and spice trade was no longer sufficient for his needs and he had been collecting his dues from the merchants further and further in advance. As most of them were New Christians, resources from the Inquisition

---

<sup>31</sup> There is the collection of letters edited by Jeremiah Denis Matthias Ford, Lucius Gaston Moffatt, and Antonio de Ataide, *Letters of the Court of John III, King of Portugal* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1933).

<sup>32</sup> See for example Patricia Kay Galloway (ed.), *The Hernandes de Soto Expedition* (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2003), pp. 65-6, 72, 94-5.

would help him but the New Christians were in a position to help the Pope's finances as well. Pressure from Charles V, however, forced Paul III's hand and a new bull dated 23 May 1536 established the Inquisition in Portugal.<sup>33</sup> Diego da Silva, forced into the role of Inquisitor, promulgated a manifesto in which all Marranos were required within thirty days to make a complete confession of faith, under promise of full pardon. The Pope referred the bull to another commission and sent a nuncio to ensure the King was behaving properly.

Suspiciously, this was undermined by an extraordinary gratuitous act whose authors are unknown and which Diego still at that moment Grand Inquisitor thought a put-up job. In February 1539, placards were found on the doors of the cathedrals and churches of Lisbon, with the words: "The Messiah has not come. Jesus was not the true Messiah." Manuel da Costa, a Marrano, was accused, confessed under torture and was publicly burned by the secular authority.<sup>34</sup> Diego resigned and the King's brother, the Infante Henrique, (not yet a Cardinal) assumed the role of Grand Inquisitor but the Pope refused to confirm him and by a bull of 12 October 1539 'recalled' him. Again, he required that the names of the accuser and of the witnesses be told to the accused; that false witnesses be punished; that no one be arraigned on the ground of statements made on the rack; that a commutation of punishment to a loss of property be not allowed without the consent of the condemned; and that appeal to Rome be always permitted. Joao ignored these limitations. The first tribunals were established in Lisbon, Evora, and Coimbra. The first public *auto da fé* in Lisbon was held on 23 October 1541.

Paul III persevered in his attempts to regulate the management of the Inquisition despite the King's refusal to admit the papal nuncios. He was eventually able to appoint a new nuncio, who entered Lisbon (September 1545) and criticized the inhumane behaviour of the King and his brother; he demanded that the names of accusers and witnesses should be

---

<sup>33</sup> Charles Ralph Boxer, *João de Barros, Portuguese Humanist and Historian of Asia* (New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, 1981), pp. 22-4.

<sup>34</sup> Saraiva, *The Marrano Factory*, pp. 33-5. Saraiva believed that the Inquisition fabricated rather than destroyed Judaizers who were mostly unremarkable Catholics and was the centre of a violent controversy with Professor Israel Salvator Rivah.

communicated to the accused. Ignatius Loyola, caught in the scissors between the support he owed the Pope who had sanctioned the order of Jesuits and the King who had helped the establishment of a college for training Jesuits at Coimbra, wrote to King Joao in 1545 about some of the difficulties he had himself experienced in his earlier life with the Inquisition on eight separate occasions—once each in Salamanca, Venice and Rome, twice in Paris, and three times in Alcalá—when he had been examined for his religious orthodoxy.<sup>35</sup> Finally however, in 1547 three bulls—1) for the institution of the Inquisition, 2) for a pardon (15 May 1547), and 3) that suspending the privileges granted saw the Inquisition firmly established. On 10 July 1548, the pardon was published and a general recantation of the Neo-Christians took place so the prisons of the tribunals in Lisbon, Evora, and Coimbra were emptied and the Inquisition in Porto ended.<sup>36</sup> The Pope as a gesture of good will appointed the Infante Henrique as a Cardinal in the same year.

The Portuguese Inquisition that called George Buchanan to answer had thus only recently been established as part of a wider and complex political struggle and internal religious factions were already at play in the struggle for continued dominance in the country. Most of the academic players had links at Court. Simão Rodriguez who had studied at St Barbe with Teive and da Costa as well as Ignatius Loyola when Buchanan was a teacher there in the early 1530s came of a prominent Portuguese family and had adhered to Loyola from the start. It was at his instigation, that Damião de Gois who in 1548 was named *Guarda Mor* (High Guardian) of the Torre do Tombo (Royal Archives) first found himself before the Inquisition although he was rapidly released.<sup>37</sup> The earliest historian of the University of Coimbra Teofilo Braga thought the Jesuits had planted the accusations against Buchanan and the others.<sup>38</sup> Although later historians doubted the

---

<sup>35</sup> John E. Longhurst, 'Saint Ignatius at Alcalá, 1526-1527', in *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, vol. xxvi (Rome: Institutum Historicum, 1957), pp. 252-6; Vincent J. O'Malley, *Ordinary Suffering of Extraordinary Saints* (Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, 2001), pp. 138-140.

<sup>36</sup> Herculano, *History of the Origins and Establishment of the Inquisition in Portugal*.

<sup>37</sup> For a full account see his biography, Elizabeth Feist Hirsch, *Damião de Gois: The Life and Thought of a Portuguese Humanist* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967).

evidence there is no doubt that they were already a force in the politico-religious intrigues of the time. George Buchanan and his friends were not the first, and clearly not the only, intellectuals to be brought before it.

### **The Political Position at Court and Elsewhere**

Internal court intrigue where the Queen who from the start had favoured the Jesuits and her own party and where cut throat noble factions sought their own best interests affected the events after Andre de Gouveia's death. Cardinal Henriques' behaviour was somewhat unpredictable. His attitude towards humanism and politics and the different religious orders varied and changed. His position at Court was an important aspect of inquisitorial behaviour at this time. He came to think well of the Jesuits but when he founded a new monastery in 1544 it was for the Capuchins, an austere order of Franciscans that had been much involved in the Portuguese early missionary work in Africa.<sup>39</sup> The college he founded at Coimbra in 1545 was for the Cistercians. Unfortunately we lack a good biography, so his relationship with his brother the King and the Queen and his shifting relationship with men who frequented the Court—such as the distinguished humanist Andre de Resende, who was one of the tutors of Joao's son, and a professor at Coimbra and Lisbon; the historian Joao da Barras, and Damiao di Gois, another historian, all of them friends of Erasmus—are equivocal. He was devout but in the early 1530s he had employed Nicholas Clenardus to teach him the Classical languages and encouraged him in his interest in learning the Arabic language. He also had an Erasmian, Nicholaus Coelho as his secretary for many years.<sup>40</sup>

In 1541, however, as Inquisitor, Henriques had banned from Portugal the circulation of di Góis book *Fides, Religio, Moresque* that had elsewhere been well received in both Catholic and Protestant countries. Di Gois was an avowed Erasmian and like de Resende had spent many years in Northern Europe, only returning to Portugal in 1545 to be brought before the Inquisition. In 1558 after Joao's death, the Cardinal, then governor for the

---

<sup>38</sup> Teofilo Braga, *Historia de Universidad de Coimbra*, vol. 1 (Lisbon: Academia Real das Ciências, 1898), p. 529.

<sup>39</sup> K. J. P. Lowe, *Cultural Links between Portugal and Italy in the Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 87.

<sup>40</sup> Hirsch, *Damião de Gois*, pp. 176-80.

young King Sebastiao entrusted Damiao di Gois with writing the chronicle of the reign of Manuel I at whose court he had passed his boyhood.<sup>41</sup> Henrique seems to have initially found the Jesuits antipathetic but by 1542 was helping them establish themselves in Coimbra. When internal strife later broke out between Ignatius and Rodriguez, however, he did not intervene.

This may have involved Diogo Gouveia, rector of St Barbe, who had known Buchanan when he was a regent there. Diogo was a strict conservative who disapproved of his nephew Andre de Gouveia's more tolerant stance and his apparent refusal to find jobs for other Gouveia family members. Andre knew that his uncle opposed the King's offering him the post at Coimbra. When Andre Gouveia died in 1548, difficulties started to arise for those he had brought with him who were left without his protection. This may have been particularly true of the outsider, Buchanan, who had no family at Court to argue for him.

### **Why was Buchanan in Portugal?**

Why had Buchanan agreed to go to Coimbra? In 1547 he was employed in Paris at the College de Boncourt an environment with which he seems to have had no quarrel. He speaks briefly in his autobiography of the invitation from Joao III mentioning Joao's zeal for education and the prospect of peace at a moment when war was breaking out elsewhere and of his friendship with those he would be going with.<sup>42</sup> Buchanan had apparently got on well with most of his colleagues at Guyenne some of whom he had taught at St Barbe when they themselves were students and seems to have regarded Teive<sup>43</sup> in particular as a friend. Coimbra was an

---

<sup>41</sup> Hirsch, *Damiao de Gois*, p. 19.

<sup>42</sup> McFarlane, *Buchanan*, p. 122. The French mathematician Elie Vinet, and the Portuguese historian, Jerónimo Osório, António Mendes the Frenchmen Gruchius (Nicolas de Grouchy), Geruntreus (Guillaume Guérente) and Arnoldus Fabricius (the Frenchman Arnould Fabrice), were among his colleagues who avoided the Inquisition.

<sup>43</sup> Diogo de Teive, wrote only under the Latin form of his name, Jacobus Tevius. Born in Braga between 1513 and 1515, he died between 1565 and 1579, probably in Lisbon. From the age of twelve he studied at the Collège de SainteBarbe in Paris, under Diogo de Gouveia Senior. From 1532 to 1534 he taught at Salamanca. Then, he returned to France, studying law at Toulouse and teaching at Bordeaux, where he held a chair in Humanities. See the

enticing invitation because Joao III intended that the newly founded university should break new educational ground. It was also not to be under church control. Its role was envisaged as training the elite who would be the rulers of the Portuguese empire and obviating the necessity of their going elsewhere, principally to Paris for their training. The idea was for a college to teach Latin and Greek and Philosophy that would have its own separate statutes distinct from the University that would provide for the higher faculties.<sup>44</sup>

### **The Position at the University**

Joao had throughout his reign been attempting to upgrading the educational levels of his subjects. He started by supporting fifty places for his subjects at the College of St Barbe in Paris that was a centre of new style teaching.<sup>45</sup> The result was a small group of Portuguese scholars who had been competing since their first academic instruction, all of them known to Buchanan who was teaching at St Barbe in the early 1530s. By the mid 1530s Joao was turning to reviving the sole Portuguese university, moved from Lisbon to Coimbra. In 1537 he had granted it new statutes so that the Holy Cross monastery, reformed in 1527, which had been effectively a university, was largely obliterated. Within the new university, which was to teach all the higher academic subjects like Law, Theology and Medicine, there was to be a separate College of the Arts. To staff it Joao had turned to

---

account of his life and works in Diogo de Teive, *Tragédia do príncipe João*, ed. Nair de Nazaré Castro Soares (Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos da Universidade de Coimbra, 1977).

<sup>44</sup> The original history of Coimbra University is in Braga, *Historia de Universidad de Coimbra*, vol 1. Mário Brandão, *O collegio das artes*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade, 1924) revises some of this and more in Mário Brandão, *Alguns documentos respeitantes à Universidade de Coimbra* (Coimbra: Biblioteca da Universidade, 1937). He also wrote Mário Brandão, *A inquisição e os professores do colégio das artes*, 2 vols (Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra, 1948) in which he considers the trials of da Costa and Teive and treats Buchanan only in passing.

<sup>45</sup> Buchanan when teaching at St Barbe had met many Portuguese scholars and also Ignatius Loyola. For their links with humanist culture see Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmus et L'Espagne* (Paris: Droz, 1937); Luis de Matos, *Les Portugais en France au xvie siècle* (Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra, 1952). It was the college principal, Diogo Gouveia the elder, who encourage Loyola and his friends to go as missionaries to Portuguese territories overseas. See Donald Frederick Lach, *Asia in the Making* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1977), pp. 12, 30.



the Portuguese who were staffing the College of Guyenne in Bordeaux. This was a gymnasium or academia (basically a Latin grammar school) headed by Andre Gouveia whose staff included Joao da Costa and Diego de Teive. He must have been aware that a number of these were second or third generation New Christians, suspected of evangelical leanings.<sup>46</sup> These Portuguese looked to the King for protection and promotion and were usually justified in their trust.<sup>47</sup>

The professors of the College of the Arts were in competition, however, with a number of religious colleges intended specifically for the education of the clergy. Since virtually every student would have to attend the College of the Arts in order to matriculate there was bound to be friction with all the religious colleges except St Michael's (1535), which belonged to Holy Cross, and was restricted to theologians and canonists. All Saints (1535) was for poor students, St Thomas' (1539) was Dominican, Our Lady of Carmel (1541) built by the Inquisitor Balthasar Limpo for his order of Carmelites, St Peter's College built for twelve clergy of the diocese of Miranda, Jesus College 1542 for Jesuit missionaries had room for two hundred pupils, the College of Our Lady of Grace: established in 1543 by Brother Luís de Montoia for the Order of the Hermits of Saint Augustine 1545; St Bernard's College, or the College of the Holy Spirit: established in 1545 under the patronage of the Cardinal Prince Henry, belonged to the Cistercians.<sup>48</sup>

The new arrivals and the new secular college were not necessarily welcomed. The academic community was already divided into factions. The two leaders of the more conservative academic group at Coimbra Antonio Pinheiro, bishop of Miranda (another of this extended family who had also studied at St Barbe when Buchanan was there) and Jerónimo Osório later bishop of Silves, whose mother was a Gouveia, had links at Court.<sup>49</sup> The attitudes of other scholars who had been in Coimbra longer were not necessarily amiable. A group who had come from Paris earlier

---

<sup>46</sup> Marcel Bataillon, *Etudes sur le Portugal au temps de l'humanisme* (Coimbra: Acta Universitatis Conimbrigensis, 1953), pp. 49-129.

<sup>47</sup> Lach, *Asia in the Making*, pp. 12, 30.

<sup>48</sup> Hirsch, *Damiao de Gois*, pp. 181-2.

<sup>49</sup> Hirsch, *Damiao de Gois*, pp. 181-2.

perhaps orchestrated an attempt to undermine the newcomers, but this was not necessarily linked to the Inquisition's process. The incomers, better paid, were, after all, in Coimbra at the specific invitation and with the support of the King and like all new brooms probably did not keep their criticisms to themselves.

Conflict with the Jesuits was evident but not the result of the arrival of the Guyenne group. The Jesuit novices had already in 1545 made themselves unpopular by their extreme activities on the streets to the extent that Loyola had to write ordering them to moderate their excesses. This did not prevent the Jesuit college authorities from persuading promising young men to join their college with a view to joining the Order, a practice that the Guyenne group condemned but were not alone in doing so. Nevertheless, there is no obvious evidence of a strike, although all students in theory had to study for their first degree at the college.

Was this a storm in an academic teacup? Perhaps, but it fitted the wider quarrel. To understand what was happening, I believe we must alter our focus and consider what was occurring in Portugal and Europe in 1549. Reform movements within the Catholic Church and at the papal curia at the time were also as divisive and crucial as outright Protestantism. In 1549 it was still possible that the Catholic Church would opt for a moderate, humanist internal reform that would permit some freedom of thought. Those who found this abhorrent sought support where they could find it. The Inquisition was one useful institution in this regard.

Why then in 1549 did the eyes of the Inquisition apparently turn to Buchanan and his two Portuguese friends? Why they were suddenly accused? Why were others, named by Pinheiro, Master Guilhelmo Garanta, and Reginaldo Piloet, omitted? It is very possible that timing of the case was influenced by a moment when the King's attention was elsewhere, and that once embarked on it was impossible to terminate. It is therefore worthwhile noticing what major events were affecting Portugal and Europe at this time. Late 1549 may have been a good moment to activate plans to derail the Guyenne teachers. Joao III was preoccupied with developments in Brazil where the French were trying to encroach despite the bull *Inter Caetera*. The eyes of Europe were on Rome where the 81-year old Pope Paul III was dying. His death on 10 November was followed by a conclave that lasted from 29 November 1549 to 7 February 1550. The Cardinal Infante Henrique was one of only three of the fifty-four cardinals who did not attend. Nearly all the other cardinals and other senior ecclesiastics were converging on the city to participate in the congress that would elect his

successor. The Infante Henrique was perhaps more free than usual to act without hindrance. It may have meant that an intervention illegal under normal canonical practices, let alone relationships between monarchs, could be undertaken.

The emptying of the Inquisition's prisons in 1548 had opened the way for a new initiative. The Inquisitors, most of whom had a long history of extreme orthodoxy were free to turn their attention elsewhere. Friar Jorge de Santiago, a Friar Preacher, had been on the heels of Andre de Gouveia since at least 1537 when he took John Gelida with him to Bordeaux. It seems likely that it was de Gouveia who was the original target of the inquisition but he died before they could act.

### **Summary of Events**

In October 1549, a Commission signed by the Cardinal Prince, Dom Henrique, as Inquisitor General, ordered Braz d'Alvide, and Friar Duarte, an Augustine Priest, to examine "a certain witness, then in Paris," together with such other witnesses as he might suggest, with regard to the characters of the Portuguese and other foreign Professors who were then teaching in the Royal College at Coimbra. This lasted from 11 November to 22 December in Paris.

The original complaint on which the investigation began must have been lodged in Lisbon—something all writers on the subject pass over. Their understanding of the Inquisition was flawed. There was probably no way in which the Portuguese inquisitor could have legally approached their Episcopal counterparts in France where the relics of the medieval Inquisition was effectively powerless. In any case the French court was unlikely to have been co-operative. Henri II was not likely to feel co-operative towards the Portuguese monarchy, which was once again complaining about the activities of French pirate/privateers and French activities in Brazil.<sup>50</sup> There was also an internal fight going on over heresy trials between King and Parlement and Henri II had just started the *Chambre Ardente*.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Robert J. Knecht, *The Rise and Fall of Renaissance France* (Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 247-9.

<sup>51</sup> McFarlane, *Buchanan*, pp. 15-30.

The Inquisition's assumption, however, was that the basis for a serious accusation would need to come from witnesses in Paris. How was this to be achieved? The Commission laid stress on secrecy. Most historians have not wondered why but clearly a public court held outside their jurisdiction would be attacked from various directions. The commission ordered that "a certain witness, then in Paris," together with such other witnesses as he might suggest be required to provide testimony. It described Braz d'Alvide as the Judge of the Lisbon Court of Appeal, the Licentiate, and Friar Duarte, an Augustine Priest. This is a rather misleading description of d'Alvide who was currently the ambassador at the court of Henri II. The Portuguese Inquisition did not have jurisdiction in France. The authority of an ambassador or indeed a foreign judge to hold what amounted to a court in a country not their own without the written assent of the local authorities was very doubtful. Secret it doubtless was, Bataillon (claiming to cite the process against Joao de Costa) says that the judicial enquiry took place in the Dominican monastery before Father Henry Gervais, who replaced the French Inquisitor the Dominican Matthew Ory, but this is not what the reports to Lisbon say.<sup>52</sup>

France was not involved and this would have been kept as quiet as possible. The enquiry however was reported as a formal proceeding.<sup>53</sup> It started in Paris in late November 1549 and witnesses were examined. The last witness was heard on 21 December. The identity of some of the witnesses against the three professors is obscured by time although most had distinguished patronyms.

Several months then elapsed during which the Inquisition evidently continued to consider whether it had sufficient material to charge them. It evidently decided to extend its scope to the conduct of the professors in Coimbra itself probably in search of more damning evidence. Depositions were obtained from people in Coimbra, Lisbon and elsewhere, some from Jesuits. Much was not directed at Buchanan but at Joao da Costa (1512-78) and Diego (Jacobus) Teive (1513-1565). Master Simon Rodrigues, the principal of the Jesuits in Portugal, who benefited from the stoush as the

---

<sup>52</sup> Bataillon, *Etudes sur le Portugal*, p. 122.

<sup>53</sup> These documents relating to Buchanan are those found in the late nineteenth century and published by G. J. C. Henriques, *George Buchanan and the Lisbon Inquisition* (1906).

Jesuits took over their positions for a time, was examined on 1 October 1550 and deposed that he had been told, during the previous Lent, by some of the priests of the Coimbra College of a dispute between Joao da Costa and Father Luiz da Gra about the entrance of D. Teotónio and D. Diogo de Alarcão to the College of Jesus. Buchanan in fact admitted to discussions with the Jesuits at Coimbra and in arguing that those *qui apostoli vocantur* (probably the Jesuits) were at fault for persuading young people to enter their order before they attained their majority because the result was their subsequent withdrawal “and this more particularly because their order had not been confirmed by the Pope. Even so, he had never felt badly disposed towards it.”<sup>54</sup> Luiz da Gra gave evidence as to the dispute they had had chiefly against Costa.

It was not until six months later, on 20 June 1550, that the Notary at the Lisbon Inquisition forwarded the Depositions to the Cardinal Prince. He, Baltazar Limpo, Bishop of Porto,<sup>55</sup> a Carmelite, and Rodrigo Pinheiro, Bishop of Angra, signed the finding of a bill against all of the accused. The Records were returned to the lower Court on 1 August with an order to arrest the three teachers. Da Costa was in Lisbon and as it was evidently thought imprudent to bring the accused before the Tribunal in Coimbra, Teive and Buchanan were arrested in Coimbra on 10 August by the Lisbon inquisitor, Jorge Gonçalves, their rooms searched and some works seized. Buchanan asked that the rest of their belongings be delivered to Master Nicolas de Grouchy. Teive's were entrusted to Antonio Mendes who became principal as Costa had been arrested. Some at least at Coimbra were shocked. In September 1550 Martin of Azpilcueta Navarro a distinguished scholar wrote a letter to Queen Catherine asking for an immediate pardon and deploring the damage done to the University.<sup>56</sup> The examination of their rooms and the listing of the books they owned produced some that were deemed heretical such as Calvin's Institutes, and some works of Melancthon but eventually nothing that could not be

---

<sup>54</sup> James M. Aitken (trans.), *The Trial of George Buchanan before the Lisbon Inquisition* (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1939), pp. 66-7.

<sup>55</sup> He had started the Inquisition in Porto in 1541 but it was closed down in 1547 Amílcar Paulo (a protégé of Barros Basto). See Elvira Cunha De Azevedo Mea, *A Inquisição do Porto*, vol. I (Porto: Centro de História Da Universidade Do Porto, 1979).

<sup>56</sup> Annex 1 in Brandão, *A inquisicao e os professores do Colegio das Artes*.

explained as a work necessary for the teaching they were undertaking or which, like Bucer's works they were refuting. They were taken to the Estaus Palace in Lisbon where the Inquisition was located.

### **The Process**

The right of a prisoner of the Inquisition to see the accusations against himself, or any other was one various popes had vainly sought to impose first on the Spanish and then on the Portuguese Inquisition. The accused learned only so much of the accusation as could be learned from the interrogations and accusations to which a reply was required and from extracts from the declarations of the witnesses. The identity of the witnesses was never revealed. This was justified by the claim that the accused should concentrate on the reply they made and it was the judge's job to assess the answers. The accounts of the prisoners were therefore imperfect because they knew nothing of the background and the accounts given by the Inquisitors themselves were deliberately limited. These were the rules that the Pope Paul III was attempting to oppose in his long struggle with Joao III<sup>57</sup> but it is clear that Buchanan was subject to them.

Buchanan's trial proper before Doctor Ambrosio Capello began on 15 August 1550 and ended on 15 May 1551. The interviews started on 18 August and comprised eleven in all: 21 and 23 August, 1, 6, 17 September, 15 October, 12 December, 7 January 1551, and 15 May when the formal abjuration and reconciliation took place. On 29 July 1551 Buchanan was sentenced to a term of imprisonment in a monastery to undertake religious exercises considered necessary for salvation. He was sent to the Monastery of St Benedict of Xabregas on the outskirts of Lisbon, where he began composing his Latin paraphrases of the Psalms. Similar sentences were inflicted on da Costa and Teive. At this stage Joao III probably intervened for all of them.<sup>58</sup> On 13 December 1551, the Cardinal Infante Henrique

---

<sup>57</sup> Henry Kamen outlines the orders of Sixtus IV in his 1482 bull: "Accordingly, in future all episcopal officers should act with the inquisitors; the names and testimony of accusers should be given to the accused, who should be allowed council; episcopal gaols should be the only ones used; and appeals should be allowed to Rome." See Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), p. 58.

<sup>58</sup> Williamson and McGinnis think that he was extremely lucky to obtain his release from the Lisbon inquisition possibly through the intervention of Dom Joao himself but it is clear that

ordered his release. This took another two months. The decision was not announced until 28 January 1552 and a month later on 29 Feb 1552 Buchanan was released. The King evidently hoped he might stay in Portugal—Buchanan had pleased the King by the poetry he wrote praising him and lauding his potential in an empire where the sun never set and his role as a giver of justice<sup>59</sup>—but he soon slipped away, first to England and then back to France and once there reversed his praise of empire. His anti-commercialism was typical of humanist attitudes and were part of his attitude towards education where learning and military virtue were rated higher.

### **The Reason Why**

Various explanations for the accusations have been offered, none of them wholly convincing. In the first place it was presented as a Jesuit plot, part of a long-term plan to take over the College of the Arts.<sup>60</sup> The Jesuits who were new on the scene were struggling to establish themselves as the main source of education. In 1542 they had founded a college at Coimbra to train missionaries for foreign parts<sup>61</sup> with some help from King Joao in buying up the necessary properties.<sup>62</sup> Braga and Texeira think that this was part of a long-term plan to take over the College of the Arts as was the denunciation of Teive, Costa, and Buchanan.<sup>63</sup> Certainly, in 1555/6 a few years after the scandal, they were able to take over the College of the Arts. What could be clearer? The denunciation of the principal, Costa, the vice principal, Teive, and the foreigner, Buchanan, was a means to this end.<sup>64</sup> In fact, Teive was restored to his position at Coimbra after his release and was

---

all three were released at about the same time. See McGinnis and Williamson, *George Buchanan*.

<sup>59</sup> McGinnis and Williamson, *George Buchanan*, p. 8.

<sup>60</sup> Texeira published this idea in 1899 following Braga but the earliest English promotion of this idea is probably Henry Charles Lea, 'Book VIII: Spheres of Action', *A History of the Spanish Inquisition* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907), where he wrote of the Portuguese inquisition that it "exercise[s] its blighting influence on the intellectual development as well as on the material prosperity of Portugal."

<sup>61</sup> Lach, *Asia in the Making*, pp. 30-1.

<sup>62</sup> Antonio Jose Teixeira, *Documentos para a Historia dos Jesuitas em Portugal* (Coimbra, Coimbra University Press, 1899), p. 618.

<sup>63</sup> Teixeira, *Documentos para a Historia dos Jesuitas em Portugal*, p. 660.

<sup>64</sup> Teixeira, *Documentos para a Historia dos Jesuitas em Portugal*, p. 660.

there in 1555. The Jesuits were, nevertheless, gaining ground. Luis Gonçalves da Camâra<sup>65</sup> became the King's confessor in 1553 reluctantly at Ignatius' direct command.<sup>66</sup> He was the first Jesuit to have such a role but may have helped forward their ambitions in Coimbra.

Da Costa and Teive thought Diogo da Gouveia the elder<sup>67</sup> was responsible for the denunciation. Costa while rubbishing Friar Joao Pinheiro, on account of his great hypocrisy "since amongst other things when at Bordeaux, he used to eat meat on days of abstinence the same as other people" saw him as a mere instrument, the real enemy was Diogo de Gouveia, who pulled the strings without letting himself be seen.<sup>68</sup> Teive claimed Diogo "went to the Cardinal [presumably he means the Cardinal Infante Henrique] to denounce as heretics both the foreign and the native Professors." Teive and Buchanan were included because Teive had incurred Pinheiro's enmity, and Buchanan's past was open to question.

Henriques adopted da Costa's explanation. The denunciation resulted from antagonism resulting from conflict between the moderate Andre Gouveia and his uncle, Diogo Gouveia, the elder, who was a hard-core traditionalist who, in Henriques view, was already intending to denounce his nephew. Forestalled by Andre's death in 1548 he then redirected his attempt when da Costa was appointed Andre's successor, seeking to turn the college in a traditional direction. Da Costa and Teive certainly blamed Diogo Gouveia the elder and suspected his favourite nephew, Marcial Gouveia, as another enemy.

---

<sup>65</sup> Gonçalves da Camâra born about 1519 in Portugal and it was to Gonçalves de Camâra that Ignatius of Loyola narrated his autobiography.

<sup>66</sup> From Ignatius' Letter to Father Diego Miró (1553): "Now, if we consider the universal good and God's greater service, even greater good will follow from this, as far as I can see in the Lord, because all the members of the body share in the good of the head and all his subjects in the good of their sovereign, so that the spiritual good which is done to the sovereign should be more highly esteemed than if it were done to others." Online at <https://www.library.georgetown.edu/woodstock/ignatius-letters/letter24>. Accessed 17 February 2020.

<sup>67</sup> Diogo Gouveia was possibly a Dominican although he was rector of a secular college. When sworn to his deposition he, having been sworn by his Orders, placing his hand upon his breast, as was the Dominican way.

<sup>68</sup> Henriques, *George Buchanan and the Lisbon Inquisition*.



Buchanan himself primarily blamed his colleague Belchior Beleago (d. c.1579) also suspected by da Costa and Teive.<sup>69</sup> He later wrote a vitriolic poem against Beleago, accusing him of being both a Jew and an Informer, probably hoping to throw the threat of the Inquisition back on Beleago,<sup>70</sup> possibly the only occasion on which Buchanan attacked Jewishness. Robert Crawford's recent translation of this has "cretinous, silly-git, syllogist, philosobutcher, Zeno of Lard, Exhibitionist, inquisitionist ... Throatlitter, nestshitter, brainquitter, inkspitter, Grand Inquisitor's Portuguese ... Supergrass who grassed me up, got me arrested, tested, tortured, chucked, in prison" which perhaps gives us the flavour.<sup>71</sup> One should, nevertheless, remember that the evidence in rebuttal given by the three cannot be taken wholly at face value. It would appear that Beleago had given the funeral oration for Andre, a copy of which is in the *Bibliothèque Lusitanani*.<sup>72</sup> As Beleago had in 1549 published at Coimbra a study of Aristotelean logic<sup>73</sup> there may well have been some academic infighting involved. In recent works, nevertheless, the blame for the accusations seems to rest here.

As the trials went on, nasty scandals and amazing accusations started to emerge. Teive and Costa accused many of the other professors of sexual crimes and some of peculation. Their own unpopularity was due to their wish to cleanse these Augean stables. Teive claimed that Diogo Gouveia had threatened him (Teive) and Costa, that he would kill them, and had even gone to the extent of taking a sword under his gown, for that purpose, when he went to the College.<sup>74</sup> Only one of these scandals involved Buchanan. Teive claimed that Manoel de Araujo:

under the pretext of calling to see Master George and me, was endeavouring to seduce a visitor of ours, the daughter of a Scotsman, and a relation of Master George's; and one day he left in her hands a

---

<sup>69</sup> Henriques, *George Buchanan and the Lisbon Inquisition*.

<sup>70</sup> Popkin and Weiner, *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews*, p. 116.

<sup>71</sup> Robert Crawford (ed.) *Apollos of the North: Selected Poems of George Buchanan and Arthur Johnston* (Edinburgh: Polygon, 2006).

<sup>72</sup> Teixeira, *Documentos para a Historia dos Jesuitas em Portugal*, p. 660.

<sup>73</sup> It was evidently Teive who had brought the necessary printing hardware to Coimbra, but it is not clear whether this played a part.

<sup>74</sup> Had the elderly Gouveia travelled from Paris to Portugal at this time? He was in Paris and aged 81 in 1549.

purse containing ten crusados and withdrew; and she complained to her husband, whose name was Robert Granjoun, and he spoke to us about it, greatly to my sorrow; and I reprimanded him in very harsh terms, in consequence of which we remained enemies. Of this my only witness is Master George.<sup>75</sup>

The main witness against Buchanan in particular was Joao Pinheiro who was by 1549 a Dominican.<sup>76</sup> He had been a pupil of Buchanan's at the College of Guyenne (from 1539-42), and evidently had a strong grudge against da Costa for a flogging inflicted when he was an adult. The Pinheiros were a large and influential ecclesiastical clan. Henriques thinks that he was the source of all the trouble. This, however, is where straightforward explanations start to break down. His uncle, the diplomat and scholar Goncalo Pinheiro, bishop of Safi, Tangiers and later Porto could perhaps have changed his mind but at least originally he was a supporter of the College at Guyenne. Goncalo who had been at Bayonne for the settlement of prize issues between the French and the Portuguese in 1539 had brought his nephews to the College and was one who recommended to Joao that he appoint Andre de Gouveia to Coimbra.<sup>77</sup> Goncalo was to rise at the Cardinal Infante's recommendation to the more prestigious bishopric of Viseu. Had another Pinheiro, the bishop of Angra, who signed the original bill who was to rise to be Archbishop of Braga when the Cardinal Infante resigned that See and yet another, Antonio Pinheiro, later bishop of Miranda, a conservative teacher at Coimbra and a respected courtier at the court of João III, who had often preached at the most important monarchical ceremonies also done the same?<sup>78</sup>

The worm in the apple may equally have been the elder Diego de Gouveia the head of the College of St Barbe, where Buchanan had once taught, who was well known as a hard-core religious traditionalist. He may have had a grudge against Buchanan and certainly had one against his late nephew who had refused to appoint his brother Marcial Gouveia to a post at

---

<sup>75</sup> Henriques, *George Buchanan and the Lisbon Inquisition*.

<sup>76</sup> Bataillon, *Etudes sur le Portugal*, p. 126.

<sup>77</sup> Bataillon, *Etudes sur le Portugal*, p. 116.

<sup>78</sup> José Pedro Paiva, 'Bishops and Politics: The Portuguese Episcopacy During the Dynastic Crisis of 1580', *e-Journal of Portuguese History*, vol. 4, no. 2 (2006) argues that the political role of the bishops in this period has been underestimated.

Coimbra. He was certainly a supporter of the Jesuits. Another witness, Joannis Ferreris, a Piedmontese had been tutor of Cardinal Beaton's children and may have been rounded up to testify to the late Cardinal's known hatred of Buchanan and to repeat hearsay stories about Buchanan in Scotland. Sim Simson a Scot Doctor of Sacred Theology in Paris, Jean Talpin MA<sup>79</sup> a Frenchman from the College of Guyenne, whom Costa identified as an opponent; Dr Alvaros de Fonseca Doctor in Theology, a Portuguese, and Sebastian Rodrigues a Portuguese, were also called.

A good deal of the evidence related to attempts to smear by association 'popular report says'—for example that Costa was a friend of Nicholas Cop (the rector of the University who had been obliged to flee after preaching a radical sermon in 1533); that he conversed with the third Order of Franciscans who were reputed to be Lutherans; and by behaviour such as eating flesh in Lent that was deemed to be an indication of Lutheran leanings. Buchanan responded by showing how he frequented those of impeccable Catholic standing like William Cranstone (d. 1562), a doctor of Theology and a rector of the University of Paris, Prior John Erskine, and the Archbishop of Glasgow David Paniter.

### **The Wider Struggle**

It is clear that these proceedings were driven in part by a serious attempt by the extremely orthodox to draw the line of obedience to the church between them and what we may call the middle or Erasmian ground and to push the Inquisition into concurring. For example, a key concern was how God should rightfully be served. Costa, had to defend himself against the accusation that he had told his pupils that God should be served from love rather than from fear, and confessed that he had said so more than once, and that "it was because those of the College of Jesus were constantly enticing the boys of good parentage, in his College, to leave it and go to theirs, frightening them in a thousand ways, telling them that they were lost, and could only be saved by their Order—as is well-known in all Coimbra."<sup>80</sup>

The reports that the Parisian witnesses provided did not produce very conclusive evidence. The line taken by the witnesses was that the accused kept bad company—they were friendly with people known to be heretics.

---

<sup>80</sup> Henriques, *George Buchanan and the Lisbon Inquisition*.

While this was a form of accusation that was favoured in the period and indeed later, it was not on its own enough. Successfully to condemn any one as a Lutheran or a Calvinist required evidence that they either public preached or privately maintained theological views or possessed books that had been condemned as heretical.

Several new articles of Spanish origin had recently been added to the annual edict of the Portuguese Inquisition.<sup>81</sup> *Exsurge Domine*, Leo X's 1520 bull excommunicating Luther, had provided a list of things that were heretical relating to matters such as confession and purgatory and prohibited reading Luther's works. The bull is actually quite nuanced but the edict is not. Saying, maintaining or thinking that the sect of Luther was good, or believing any of his condemned propositions<sup>82</sup> which were listed in a bald manner, far more extreme than the bull (and some of them were not Lutheran)—Luther for example held to the Real Presence—although Calvin and more radical sects did not.<sup>83</sup> Some but not all of these were questions that the Inquisitors pressed on Buchanan.

In the Church where the Council of Trent was still underway they were still subject to possible alteration. This was a time of great change and uncertainty. To clarify what was acceptable, a papally summoned Council had started to meet at Trent in 1545. It was to meet intermittently until 1563 and each session set up some new Canons on contentious issues. At its fourth session in 1546 it had laid down that only the old Vulgate version of the Bible was acceptable.<sup>84</sup> The sixth session in 1547 had turned to the

---

<sup>81</sup> For example, "It is not necessary to confess sins to a priest, and that it is sufficient to confess to God; neither the Pope or the priests have the power of remitting sins; the body of Jesus is not actually present in the consecrated host" and other edicts. See Llorente, *Histoire*, p. 113.

<sup>82</sup> Condemned again at the Diet of Worms as a heretic Luther and other Protestants had put forward various propositions that were again rejected in 1529 but many matters remained to be determined.

<sup>83</sup> Llorente, *Histoire*, pp. 113-4.

<sup>84</sup> For example, part of the Decree read: "And wishing, as is just, to impose a restraint, in this matter, also on printers, who now without restraint—thinking, that is, that whatsoever they please is allowed them—print, without the license of ecclesiastical superiors, the said books of sacred Scripture, and the notes and comments upon them of all persons indifferently, with the press oft-times unnamed, often even fictitious, and what is more

thorny issue of justification by faith a definition of which had snared wholly orthodoxy theologians in difficulties. The Council however was adjourned not completed and its decrees had yet to be ratified by the Pope let alone by the different kingdoms of Europe. There was therefore no definitive canon yet endorsed Europe wide on justification when Simson and Erskine reported on Buchanan's teaching on justification at the College Lemoine in Paris.

The trial of Buchanan took its formal course. The reports minute these. On 21 August, in the year 1550, in Lisbon, in the Prison of the Holy Inquisition, Senhores the Deputies of the Holy Inquisition being there, ordered Master George Buchanan to come before them, and, by oath upon the Holy Gospels, they put the following questions to him. As recorded in Henriques' volume, they asked him if at any time, being in the company of other persons, he had said any things about the ceremonies of the Church, laughing and ridiculing them; he said, no. Asked if, at any time, when eating with other persons, he had said to some of those who were present that they should eat, because God had not commanded anyone not to eat meat, not even on prohibited days, but rather he had told his Disciples to eat of all that was put before them. To each, Buchanan is given time to reply. Basically he denies the thrust of the accusations but admits to some trivial matter. Thus he admitted in Scotland, some twelve years ago, eating meat to persuade a dying friend to do likewise.

Asked what he thought of the monastic life; he said that he thought that it was good for those who could bear the monastic state. He confronted Pinheiro's accusation head on saying he had joked about his taking Dominican orders because he considered him "little adapted to become a monk." He admitted saying the Jesuits did very wrong in persuading young people to enter their Order before they attained their majority, but justified it because the result was their subsequent withdrawal; but claimed he had never felt badly disposed towards the order. Asked about the Real Presence in the Eucharist, he said that he felt that the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ was truly and really there, just as the Holy Church of Rome believes it to be. Although he admitted wavering for a time because Saint Augustine, in *De Doctrina Christiana* seemed to say that, in the Holy Sacrament of the

---

grievous still, without the author's name; and also keep for indiscriminate sale books of this kind printed elsewhere..."

Altar, the Body of Our Lord was only figuratively there but claimed that his doubt was afterwards cleared away by his attending the lessons of the Catholics, at Paris and by reading John Fisher and Josse Clichthove and as a consequence he considered the Mass to be a sacrifice but while he was in England, hearing sermons sometimes by Catholics and sometimes by Lutherans, and arguing with learned men upon these things of Luther, he was often in doubt as to which of them was in the right. He then begged them to order paper and ink so he could to draw up his confession in an orderly way: and they ordered them to be given to him, admonishing him to thoroughly unburden his conscience and ask pardon for all, because, if he did so, he would be received with much mercy.

Two days later he was summoned again before the Reverend Senhor Master Priest Hieronimus d'Azambuja and the Licentiate Jorge Goncalves, and he read out his first Latin confession. This first confession is the source for Buchanan's explanation of what had happened over his poems against the Franciscans and the enmity of the King's mistress<sup>85</sup> and how he came to go to England, with the implication that as the Pope was preparing for war against England and the Scottish king feared conspiracy and so Buchanan was sent to England to see what was occurring and report. What is questionable is that the '*episcopus loci*' that he refers to could at that time be David Beaton as before 1539 it was his uncle James Beaton who was Archbishop of St Andrews. Moreover, Buchanan sets this at the moment when the King '*aberat Gallia*' when Beaton was at his side.

A week later on 1 September, summoned again he was asked whether had further meditated upon his sins as he had been ordered to do:

He replied that he had with him, written down, the little that he had been able to recollect, which he himself at once read out, and then and there by the oath which he had taken, he was asked if he recollected anything else in addition to that which he had confessed in his last previous Confession, and he replied that he did not,

---

<sup>85</sup> "*Interea franciscani amicam regis mulierem nobilem, et maxime apud regem potentem in me inflamaNt iam antea sua sponte iratam. Nam cum antea de me sparsisset rumores varies, ego ab episcopo loci iudicium de iniuria postulavi. Episcopus etsi tam rex aberat in Gallia potentiam mulieris reueritus de ea re ius dicere non est ausus.*"

because it appeared to him that he had mentioned in his Confession everything that he had done and said.<sup>86</sup>

He admitted that his doubts had lasted on and off for three years but he was convinced when he came to France by the sermons and lectures of the Catholics and “he was never again subject to those doubts, down to the present time, but rather was firm in that which Holy Mother Church holds and confesses.” It is at this point that he admits that what he had argued with the Franciscan monk about was a form of tribunal in which men were condemned upon the evidence of their enemies, without giving them an opportunity of contradicting their enemies testimony—exactly the Inquisition’s power although he does not present it as a direct challenge. He is cautious about his criticism of the religious, saying that it did not apply to all and he had never thought badly of the Religious Orders as such.

To paraphrase the records, when asked what were the reports which, in his Confession, he says that a lady (Margaret Erskine, James V’s mistress and mother of James earl of Moray)<sup>87</sup> spread about him he argued that it was a mistake because she thought it concerned the new testament or Lutheran books when actually it related to the Ecclesiastes of Solomon. Asked if when, persuaded by the Dominican priest of whom he speaks in his Confession, he ate meat, his opinion then was that there was no need to obey the precept of the Church which prohibits the eating of meat in Lent; he said, “that it appeared to him that he did not sin by eating meat on days when it was prohibited by the Church, because he thought that it was not a breach of the Law of God.” Asked, with regard to the article of his Confession in which he states that he divulged everything to the Examiners he replied that he only divulged to them that he had eaten meat on prohibited days and that he confessed to having eaten meat more times than he really had, on account of the threats of his Examiners. When asked about what the preachers in England spoke, he told them of lay-preachers who spoke of Lent, and a Catholic named Stephen, Bishop of Winchester and a Lutheran who discussed matrimony and the avoidance of fornication.<sup>88</sup> He

---

<sup>86</sup> Henriques, *George Buchanan and the Lisbon Inquisition*.

<sup>87</sup> In 1527, Margaret had married Sir Robert Douglas of Lochleven.

<sup>88</sup> It is clear from this that Buchanan had been attending the sermons at Pauls Cross in London in the period of Lent in 1539 when Parliament and Convocation were debating the Six Articles and Gardiner was out of favour with the King. He misremembered William

also spoke of the sermons and books he had encountered which discussed the subjects of Justification and Purgatory: “he remembers that, when in England, after reading the various books, sometimes, if his memory serves him, he vacillated in his mind and doubted, but he is not quite certain about this, because, if it was so, he thinks that it must have been for a very short period.”

He was asked if he had “held that formerly priests were free to marry,” whether “the Franciscan Habit has all the virtues with which the common people believe it to be endowed,” if “those who are buried in that Habit will obtain all the Indulgences granted to them by the Pope” and whether works can be performed by both the Saints and the Devil. He was queried on his belief in the sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrament on the Altar, whether the Saints should be regarded as our intercessors, and if prayer without attention was equivalent to sinning in praying. He admitted to wavering about the real presence but was convinced by reading the works of John Fisher, bishop of Rochester (d. 1536), Josse Clichtove (d. 1543) and others.<sup>89</sup> Since Clichtove was a disciple of Lefevre d’Etaples whose approach to theology was reformist and quite opposed to that of the Dominicans, he may not have been the best influence to cite but he was well known as a committed opponent of Luther. He wrote in fact that Andre de Gouveia had convinced him that the Eucharist was both body and symbol. He wrote that it appeared to him that the saints ought not to be asked for that which only God gave which is the life Eternal and the Remission of sins and that he had always felt that the saints should be our intercessors with God, but that no saint was as merciful as God.<sup>90</sup> On the value of Confession, the record states:

he said that it was the Divine Law that man should confess to the Priest; but that the time for doing so was of human law, as he has already said in his Confession. Asked how it was that he held it to be a venial sin that a man should fail to confess at the time which Holy

---

Jerome who was not a layman but vicar of Stepney. Jerome was executed with Robert Barnes and Thomas Garret in 1540 with three others who were Catholics. The main subject of both sermons was, in fact, justification. See Glyn Redworth, *In Defence of the Church Catholic: the Life of Stephen Gardiner* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), pp. 110-6.

<sup>89</sup> James K. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris 1500-1543* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), p.14; Aitken, *The Trial of George Buchanan*, pp. 81-2.

<sup>90</sup> Aitken, *The Trial of George Buchanan*, p. 105.



Mother Church commands; he said that he considered it to be venial as compared with sins which are contrary to the Divine Law; and this because he thought that all sins which are contrary to human laws were venial, but not so much so as not to render men sometimes deserving of damnation...

His abjuration reads:

I, Master George Buchanan, a Scotsman, of the diocese of Glasgow, before you, Senhores Inquisitors, swear upon the Holy Gospels, upon which my hands are placed, that, of my own free will, I renounce, and put away from myself all and any heresies, especially these which I have confessed, vacillating and doubting as regards things of the Faith, often inclining to Lutheran opinions, holding that the Body of Our Lord was not in the Sacrament of the Altar, being only there figuratively and not really; doubting, also, if the Mass was a sacrifice; and also doubting and vacillating, as regards the article of Purgatory, holding, mentally, that we were justified by confidence only; holding and believing that it was no sin for one not to confess at the times ordered by Holy Mother Church, if scandal did not arise therefrom; and that the precept of Confession was human and not Divine; and also that it was not a sin to disobey human laws, if scandal was not caused thereby, or injury to our neighbour; it appearing to me, also, that there was no need to obey the precept of the Church with regard to the prohibition of meat on forbidden days; and that it was better to go straight to God than to the Saints. And I confess, with a pure and true heart, the Holy Catholic Faith, as held and believed by Holy Mother Church of Rome. And I swear to be obedient to our very Holy Father, Pope Julius III, our Lord, who now rules and governs the Church of GOD, and to his successors after him, and to never swerve from that obedience for any admonition or heresy whatever, and to always remain in the Bond of Holy Mother Church, and be a defender of the Holy Catholic Faith, and to denounce and publish all those who are opposed to it; and GOD grant that I may not fall into the penalty of backsliding; and I promise that I will not refuse the penance which may be given to me, and I will fulfil it within the limits of possibility.

To summarise, while he was under arrest, Buchanan made the standard objections to the form of the Tribunal saying it was unjust to condemn men upon the evidence of their enemies without giving them the opportunity of arguing against them. He was asked the usual list of questions about his age, status, education and so on. He said that he was

fourty-five, came from Scotland, had studied Latin, Greek and Philosophy at St Andrews and Paris, but made no claim to theology.<sup>91</sup> He answered various questions about his beliefs.

He was interrogated on a number of topics not all of which had emerged from the depositions made in Paris. In his first examination he said that his criticism of the dissolute life of some clergy only applied to some and that he had never thought badly of the religious orders. He admitted to eating meat in Lent for medical reasons.<sup>92</sup> Buchanan in his deposition offered an orthodox if unpopular view of miracles—that they had happened in the time of Jesus and the Apostles but not lately. He believed in purgatory. On religious matters he said that in Scotland he had pursued inquiries rather than discussions and in England the law forbade discussion of the matter.

In the minutes of his third Examination on 1 September 1550, Buchanan said that he had formerly been in error on some matters; but that now, thanks to the teaching of Father Hieronimo d'Azambuja (Jerome Oleaster), one of the Inquisitors, he already thought differently. Oleaster was a distinguished scholar on the Pentateuch and it is possible that Buchanan was genuinely persuaded to change his mind on its interpretation. Henriques thought this implied some special kindness on the part of that Inquisitor, but one must remember that persuasion was a key part of the role of the Inquisition.

His response to some of the criticisms was to ask to be able to return to in one case Scotland and in another Paris to answer his critics face-to-face: "To the Scots indeed to whom I had been a public scandal I always particularly desired to give public satisfaction; but I have been robbed of the chance."<sup>93</sup> There was suspicion over Buchanan's claims to have relied on absolution given him by a priest in 1543 or 4 whose name he could not remember and who could be found in accordance with a dispensation

---

<sup>91</sup> For theological studies see Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, p. 13-4 where he explains that for a doctorate in Theology 13-15 further years of study, teaching, academic disputation and residence were required. The core of study was the Bible and the Sentences of Peter Lombard.

<sup>91</sup> Aitken, *The Trial of George Buchanan*, pp. 48-54, 88.

<sup>92</sup> Aitken, *The Trial of George Buchanan*, pp. 48-54, 88.

<sup>93</sup> Aitken, *The Trial of George Buchanan*, p. 41.

permitted by a bull of Paul III that turned out to be illusory.<sup>94</sup> In the penultimate interview between Buchanan and the Inquisitor, Father Jorge de Santiago, a friar Preacher, which took place on 7 January 1551 at the Inquisitor's suggestion he gave up this line of defence so that he could be summarily judged.

One of the fables about Buchanan that continued to be purveyed down to the eighteenth century related to his Judaizing, which was one of the many hearsay slanders that Joao Pinheiro raised. This was so clearly without foundation that the inquisitors did not include it the things he had to renounce although they put in things such as his vacillation and hesitation that he had rejected a decade or more ago. The basis for these accusations is not clear. In his trial he was accused of Judaizing tendencies but although thrown at a *conversos* the meaning of this was clear, against Buchanan it was not. So far as accusations about practicing Jewish feasts in Scotland or recommending to James V of Scotland that he should eat the 'passover lamb' were concerned, Buchanan could dismiss them with the comment that there were no Jews in Scotland (or indeed in England). As they had been expelled in the late thirteenth century remnants of Jewish practices were improbable and the Inquisition did not pursue this. He had, however, had the opportunity of meeting Jews in Bordeaux.

Judaizing, however, was an epithet that one Christian group was liable to throw at another for quite other reasons. It had various connotations. Used by the reformers against the papal party it was a criticism of excessive legalism as the Jews had in the Old Testament. It could also mean someone who adopts rabbinical explanations. This was anathema to the extremely orthodox but also to some Lutherans. The new, papally approved, translation of the Bible from Hebrew and Greek by Sanctes Pagninus (1470-1536) was attacked on the grounds that he employed the comments of mediaeval rabbis.<sup>95</sup> This was suspect on various grounds, including the comment, repeated by Luther, that the rabbis deliberately misled Christian scholars who had little or no contact with Jews. This religious debate had little to do with any adoption of Jewish

---

<sup>94</sup> Aitken, *The Trial of George Buchanan*, pp. 140-1.

<sup>95</sup> G. Lloyd Jones, *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983), pp. 40-42.

practices and its later misinterpretation in Buchanan's case need to be corrected.

What then was his attitude to the Jews? McGinnis and Williamson write of his "highly peculiar anti-Judaism."<sup>96</sup> Williamson has also written on Buchanan's crypto-Judaism and the critique of empire but this while stressing the neo-Christian background of many of the Guyenne college professors does not get us very far.<sup>97</sup> Jean Gelida's wife may or may not have shown Jewish leanings, but the accusations against Gelida were of Lutheranism not Judaism. His poems against his enemy Beleago were certainly anti-Jewish but hardly unique to Buchanan if one looks beyond John Mair and the humanist writings to the theological.<sup>98</sup> Although the New Christians in Bordeaux were not necessarily crypto-Jews there were overt Jews in Bordeaux and Buchanan would probably have known some of them as they were under French royal protection. Since their own laws prohibited Jews by from eating and drinking with Gentiles, any claims of great intimacy would need considerable, and currently unavailable, proof.

The records show that at the end of February in 1551, the court and told Buchanan how "the Cardinal Prince and Inquisitor General had been pleased to release him entirely, so that he might depart; and they charged him to, from henceforth, endeavour always to converse with virtuous persons of good reputation, and to confess frequently, and draw near to Our Lord and be a good Christian."<sup>99</sup> He was nonetheless sent to the São Bento monastery in Lisbon to learn from the monks. It was during this time he translated the Psalms into poetic metre in Latin. He was released from the monastery after seven months, and retained in the city until February 1552.

---

<sup>96</sup> McGinnis and Williamson, *George Buchanan: The Political Poetry*, p. 16.

<sup>97</sup> Arthur Williamson, 'Buchanan's Crypto-Judaism and the Critique of Empire', in *Secret Conversions to Judaism in Early Modern Europe*, eds Richard Henry Popkin, and Gordon Weiner (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 19, ff.

<sup>98</sup> McGinnis and Williamson speak of Mair serving on "the infamous Paris commission" that in 1514 condemned Reuchlin but this was a heresy commission not for his Judaising *per se* and the result of Johannes Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans who were furious that he had written against the destruction of all Jewish books. See McGinnis and Williamson, *George Buchanan: The Political Poetry*, p. 18.

<sup>99</sup> Henriques, *George Buchanan and the Lisbon Inquisition*.

He then left Portugal for England, soon moving onto France where he took up the position of regent at the College of Boncourt in Paris in 1553.

### **Conclusion**

Buchanan had only taught at the College of Arts in Coimbra for a few years before he and his friends were arrested for charges of heresy and brought before the Portuguese Inquisition in 1550 to answer for their sins. This article has not addressed the impact of this experience on Buchanan and his philosophies at large, but rather focused on the complexities of the historical context in which this event occurred. It has also brought into the light aspects of this trial that have otherwise gone unexamined. To understand this event, the factionalism within the College, the unique situation of the Inquisition in Portugal, and the broader theological concerns of the Church in Europe at this time must be considered.

Some of the accusations leveled at Buchanan and his colleagues were of venial although punishable offences. Pinheiro deposed that Buchanan Teives and a French physician had laughed and joked and made fun of the rules about eating meat in Lent so (he said) he believed they were Lutherans. More serious were the accusations of Judaizing. Other accusations brought against them were for the most part dubiously heretical at a time when the Church itself had not yet determined what reforms should be embarked upon. The reforming agenda for monasteries at the Council was not yet finally confirmed. To suggest that any accusation against the religious orders was heretical was to cast doubt not only on Buchanan and his co-accused, but also on many of the body of cardinals in Rome including Gasparo Contarini, Reginald Pole, Jacobo Sadoletto and others who had made an official report to the Pope in 1537 that included proposals for a re-organisation and re-establishment of the religious orders that involved the abolishing of existing orders and the creation of new.<sup>100</sup>

Many of the points of interrogation leveled at Buchanan were nonetheless intricately theological, and since Buchanan had not undergone the long and expensive training as a theologian it is surprising that he was

---

<sup>100</sup> Michael A. Mullett, *The Catholic Reformation* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 68; Bruce Gordon, 'Italy', in *The Reformation World*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 281-3.

speaking on the subject at all. It was clear, however, that his answers were not offering a theological position but arguing some of the logical issues underpinning theology with his opposition to the text *facta posse esse infecta* which was one of the paradoxes (can something done be at the same time undone) used in philosophy and also in plays where doubles are involved. The Inquisitors reported that he claimed to think that Catholics and Lutherans made the same statement in different words saying that the one thought justification by faith in works and the other by faith acting through charity. More distinguished theologians than he had attempted similar reconciliations. Buchanan's later response to Diego Gouveia's deposition (that presumably went back to the early 1530s when Buchanan was teaching at St Barbe) was that although he censured certain customs which the 'apostles' were reputed to follow he carried his complaints to Diogo de Gouveia but never spread them abroad in public, indeed he used to express approval of most of their rules "so that only one actuated by malice could interpret my censures as being due to hatred of the Order but if I did err in this way my error was surely so slight that I was guilty of artlessness rather than of worse transgression."<sup>101</sup>

Buchanan certainly had his detractors, and the evidence of Joao Pinheiro and antagonism of the elder Diego de Gouveia made his religious purity suspect. Wider concerns with deviation from traditional teachings and divisions within Christendom also played a crucial part in this trial. One thing is clear from the evidence at hand—the underlying bitterness towards the accused was tied, whether truthfully or merely for expediency, to serious issues of theology. It represents an effort of conservative forces, utilising the Inquisition, to reinforce and protect their vision of orthodoxy.

---

<sup>101</sup> Aitken, *The Trial of George Buchanan*, p. 13.