SIDELIGHTS ON THE EARLY JESUIT MISSION IN SCOTLAND

The early Jesuit mission in Scotland has had little close analysis and too often documents have been printed in truncated form, yet until the other orders gathered momentum they were almost alone on the scene. About 1570 there were about seven, by 1593 twice that number and by 1609 fourteen priests and nine others. These were scattered over several countries, France, Austria, Germany, Poland, the kingdom of Naples and other lands forming a 'cordon sanitaire' around the papal states. And while it seems that no Scots were in the non-European mission territories, there were those like John Hay publishing missionary accounts from Japan and Peru, and James Gordon of Huntly, superior for Scotland, but distracted by the problems of establishing a mission in 'New France' (Canada) as agent for the French court-chaplain, Pierre Coton. It seems evident from the letters of the Jesuit General, Claudio Acquaviva, that Scotland was low down on his list of priorities. The fast-growing Society was increasingly bureaucratised and centralised; correspondence could lie months on the General's desk; the post even to nearby Aquitaine was often slow. Even so 'due subordination' had to be maintained. Some early Scots entrants had links with older ways of thinking and acting, with the ambiguous leadership of a Cardinal Beaton, for instance; on the other hand they had memories of a Scotland from which religious disunity was as yet absent. Even so they had enough of Jesuit activism to contrast favourably with comfortable clerical exiles enjoying their canonnry of St. Quentin. They corresponded like merchants, practising their priesthood as a trade, acting themselves as 'operarii,' workers. They suffered from occasional embarrassments, from forced confessions or their few defections. Even the well-publicised case of Thomas Smeaton could have its consolation. He went to Paris University at the Reformation and there is a record showing his disbursements for the souls in purgatory, while an official of the German nation. As late as 1571 he was being recommended for the college of Billem in France by Fr Edmund Hay, but soon left to become Protestant principal of Glasgow in succession to Andrew Melville, where he was teacher of William Elphinstone, later a Jesuit in Naples. At first their awareness of international horizons was exactly what Scots Catholicism needed, not to speak of their new spirit of self-discipline and their sublime confidence in the scholarship of their famous Society.¹

William Murdoch: Long Spell on Mission and Confession

Following his examination of 1607 and his subsequent letter to the Jesuit General, Acquaviva, we might conclude that William Murdoch first returned to Britain in July 1594, but in fact he was in and out of the country before then. A master of italic script, he was hired by the Edinburgh town council as writing master for their grammar school on 8 February 1594, and this at a time when sons of Catholic families were being taken away from home for re-indoctrination. The high school was at this time under the direction of the scholar-poet, Hercules Rollock, though his authority did not extend to Murdoch's chosen sphere. This startling appointment scarcely lasted a month or two, for Murdoch was soon shut up in the tolbooth for four days, not that he was detected personally as a priest but on the accusation of 'making of writtis to a priest to beg withall.' This begging letter may have been written for a junior Jesuit, George Christie, son of a burgess of Dysart, Andrew, who fell into the council's hand in March 1596.² But this was not Murdoch's first altercation with a town council. Already on 6 January 1592, he was spending a night in the kirk vault prior to banishment by the Aberdeen authorities as 'sic a blasphemous heretic that he can not be sufferet in a republict,' an attitude that would have appealed to Philip of Spain who likewise treated heresy as rebellion. If Murdoch were ever to return to Aberdeen, he was threatened with branding and having his 'luggis cuttit.'³ Not surprisingly, he retreated to Pont-a-Mousson, and can be safely identified with the William Stevenson found there in that year. But there is an earlier letter still, signed with his initial 'G.'
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(wrongly interpreted as George, but clearly 'Guilielmus') which shows Murdoch in London in June 1587, giving an English Jesuit at Trier news of the movements of his friend, 'good' William Crichton, S.J. In it Murdoch makes a typically forthright observation on hearing that the Master of Gray was thrown into Edinburgh castle for attempting to restore religion in Scotland, that his imprisonment was only right, for God, Murdoch feared, scarcely wanted his faith proclaimed throughout the land by one of Gray's calibre. We gather that Murdoch was aiding the superior of the Jesuit college at Pont-a-Mousson before leaving for home in 1586; thus King James was not far out in warning the Privy Council that Murdoch had been active in Scotland for almost twenty years. Certainly his was no transitory stay.4 The first Scottish Jesuits were men familiar with pre-Reformation Scotland: some came from Aberdeenshire but most were from the Perthshire neighbourhood, James Tyrie from Drumkilbo, Robert Abercomby from Murthly, Thomas Smeaton from Gask, Edmond Hay from Megginch, William Crichton perhaps from Ruthven. William Murdoch too was born in Dunkeld in 1539 and twenty years later was in the service of its bishop, William Crichton, whose continuing Catholicism was less muted than the nuncio, Gouda, gives us to understand, though he does admit that he was prepared to receive him if only in the loch of Clunie. In 1562 the bishop was prepared to risk celebrating an Easter mass at which a Catholic preacher could speak (probably the Dominican, Andrew Abercomby, to whom he assigned a cathedral prebend).5 Less well known are Crichton's later efforts, under accusation by the Regent Moray on 6 December 1567 of ignoring the acts against 'that abominable ydoll the mess as ane of the maist devillisch and superstitious inventiouin of the antichristis.' Supporting him were the priests David Henry, Robert Vallanche, John Cairny, Mr. John Elder, Thomas Irwin, John Betoun, David Moressoun, Mr. Alexander Crichton of Newhall, the friars Andrew Abercomby and Robert Veitch and another refugee with Crichton, Dane John Harvey, monk of Newbattle. These were involved in repeated offences, daily between the previous August and October, and monthly during three or four years past. The main locations were the loch of Clunie, the place of Newhall, but also the towns of Edinburgh and Dunkeld; the bishop, the laird of Newhall and his namesake vicar of Innerwick were with Friar Abercomby warded in Edinburgh castle, the others in its tolbooth though the 'said bishope askit instrumentis that albeit he become in will for the crymes contenit in the letteris, that he denyit himself to be an idolater of his conscience.6 It was from the Crichton circle that Murdoch emerged, arriving with Tyrie and others at Louvain in January 1563, joining the Jesuits in late August, being ordained in 1572 and, apart from his long Scottish stay, mostly stationed at Pont-a-Mousson where he died in 1616.7

It would be a mistake to rely overmuch on the 1607 investigation for a complete account of his mission. Yet the impression is clear that much of his service was to the Gordon family in the north east and not in his home territory of Dunkeld, though he did seemingly visit that town and certainly the neighbouring lairds, kinsmen of Robert Abercomby S.J. with estates at Murthly, Galbrideston and Gourdie; his servant was a John Abercomby, perhaps the same who was in attendance on Ogilvie. It was Murdoch, and not Robert Abercomby as the spies guessed, who, with James Gordon of Huntly, S.J., landed in a small boat sent ashore from a ship of Calais in the dark before dawn on 16 July 1594 at Aberdeen. An invalid out for his morning stroll recognised Gordon and reported their departure for Old Aberdeen whence friends conveyed them to the earl of Huntly in Strathbogie.8 The barque with its crew and papal gold was seized by the magistrates who sent a messenger post-haste south, but who then were faced by a large force under the earls of Angus and Errol insisting on their release, while Gordon of Auchindoun parleyed more peacefully in Huntly's name. It was natural for someone with Murdoch's background to think that a religious revolution that could be brought off by the Lords of Congregation could as easily be put into reverse by the Catholic earls.9 In a report of 1608 to his General, Murdoch related how Gordon arrived from Rome with orders
for him to accompany him to Scotland; how on arrival they left their comrades on board with the gold; how he and Gordon eluded arrest but not so their comrades who were only freed after three days in prison by the efforts of the earls who later besieged the town. In October the battle of Glenlivat took place but the victors were forced to flee for safety as King James collected his army. Gordon set off to his sister in Sutherland with Huntly’s nephew, while Murdoch went to Caithness to Gordon’s niece (perhaps Murdoch’s error for his sister, married to George, earl of Caithness) whence he was recalled to the sick earl of Sutherland, attending him for a fortnight as his physician before his death on December 6. He then remained with the widow, her two daughters and the five-year-old son of Huntly till March 1595, teaching letters and manners: in secular disguise and thus able to controvert the minister at table discoursing on good works. Indeed he had never really been comfortable abroad and was in Scotland partly for health reasons. At the turn of the year, Fr Gordon recalled him to Moray as Huntly was being exiled and Gordon was to accompany him abroad. However, he commended Murdoch to the widow of the laird of Auchindoun who fell at Glenlivat. At times he traversed the countryside, baptising thirty infants, among them Errol’s eldest son. Perhaps it was Murdoch ‘clad with a black plaid’ who baptised the child of Elizabeth Burn near Birness, the seat of the woods of Boniton, with water from a nearby stream. He certainly knew Gicht, married to Boniton’s sister.

The account is filled out in the 1607 confession. Two days before the battle of Belrynnes (Glenlivat), Murdoch claimed to have said mass for Gordon of Auchindoun at Gartly. He then left Strathbogie with two kists of Huntly’s family papers to pass by sea to Caithness and had not heard of the battle till his arrival in Sutherland where he also said mass; from there he went down to Elgin where we are told that Gordon preached exhorting the earls to stay behind, ‘with assurance of victory as of before, if they vold hazard.’ This in spite of Gordon’s reputation for being a faintheart, as when the Jesuit, John Myrton, declared that James Gordon of Lesmoir should replace ‘auld Mr James’ as a Jesuit younger and of better courage. From Strathbogie they went to Aberdeen whence on March 19 Huntly sailed and where Gordon commended Auchindoun’s widow to Murdoch’s care (she was Agnes Beaton of the cardinal’s family). By June both Huntly and Errol were at Trier where the Scots college seems to have transferred temporarily.

The desertion of the cause by the Catholic earls created a new situation and clearly the old dream of seizing power by political alignment had faded for Murdoch at least. In March 1597 he was as far south as Edinburgh again when aided by the town council as a poor man, but in the same year back in Aberdeen in a secret hiding place, visiting daily James Gordon and carrying a letter from the General across country to the sick Abercromby before embarking for Denmark on 18 August. It was presumably during the Edinburgh visit that he said mass at Helen Semple’s house in the Netherbow and in the presence of his servant only, Abercromby: Helen Semple was later said to have been in the service of James’ queen, Anne of Denmark. He was in Edinburgh again on 26 July 1602 when he signed the ‘album amicorum’ of the orientalist George Strachan, in his calligraphic hand and perhaps also from there wrote as ‘G.M. Andreas Stinsonius’ to his General’s German assistant commending Strachan on 20 September. According to his own statement, however, he had had no communication with his General as such since 1594, excluding one intercepted letter; it must have been to him and not to his junior Mortimer that an English Jesuit’s letter referred in 1606 as totally out of touch with the superior of the Jesuit mission. The mention of Helen Semple could by 1607 scarcely implicate anyone as she had been in exile since 1601. It was at a mass in Helen Semple’s by the Jesuit McQuhirrie that the writer, William Barclay of Towie, was arrested; sometime later Barclay took refuge in Ireland with earl of Abercorn in Strabane; while remaining in literary contact with Scotland, he was again in trouble for mass-hearing in Ireland in 1630. Helen Semple occupied a house belonging to Andrew Napier, uncle to John, of logarithm fame, who stood security for his relative for mass said there. Fr McQuhirrie was witness that for years past she had rendered constant help and service and there is evidence that she continued this with alms supplied from Flanders.
In the north Murdoch’s associate was the secular priest and Jesuit aspirant, Mr. David Law, a native of Kirkcaldy and brother of the Protestant James Law, later archbishop of Glasgow. Law officiated in the private chapel of Gordon of Gight, who, though husband of a Wood of Boniton, would not allow Murdoch to celebrate mass, though Murdoch visited Gight on the way to Lady Bontinon’s at Birness. He had met Law when Law was a young scholar at Paris and he became a Catholic at Pont-a-Mousson in 1585. Sometimes they would say mass and mutually confess at Strathbogie: but Law was a sick man, having acquired a double fistula in one leg while in an English prison. It looked certainly as though the authorities were inclined to turn a blind eye to Law. Law and himself had both taken the north country name of Mackie, Murdoch as Gilbert Mackie and Law as Thomas. Fr Abercromby called Murdoch ‘Gib of the Myris’ because of his tramps through Scotland on missionary work, calling on the young laird of Kynneir’s late wife, the old lady of Parbroth (Seton, whose son accompanied Strachan to Rome) and at various Abercromby homes including one in Dunfermline. Indeed he was questioned closely about Mr. Thoms Abercromby, tutor of Murthly, doubtless because of the similarity in name to the young Jesuit who had gone abroad in 1593.

Much of Murdoch’s confession was past history and being mostly about the families of Gordon and Abercromby hardly new to the authorities. But not all was such, though the capture of three misses plus a booklist with locations on Murdoch’s person may have made some revelations, in spite of initial refusals, almost inevitable. For instance, the statement in his papers about William Paterson, the Augustinian friar who usually stayed with the earl of Angus, drew the admission that he had met him in 1604 in the house of William Leslie of Conrack along with the explanation that Paterson was a former soldier turned priest; this may have renewed efforts that led to Paterson’s capture in 1609. Nothing was said of other Augustinian friars such as John Burd who escaped capture or a certain Thomas a Sancta Maria, a native of Cupar, born of Catholic parents, who was received a novice in Spain in 1599. Likewise Murdoch acknowledged meeting Mr. John Hamilton in 1606, though he denied that they were close friends, as Murdoch, a simple priest, had little in common with theologians; yet Hamilton’s capture also followed in 1609. At this date, Murdoch thought, relations between Jesuits and other priests in Scotland were friendly unlike the great discord found elsewhere. This confession, made, to be sure, by an old man of 68 with years of mission work to his credit, can scarcely have contributed to maintaining such good relations.

Murdoch and Robert Abercromby had both done long spells on the mission. In 1604, shortly before Palm Sunday, Abercromby had said mass in Perth in the houses of Archibald McBreck (father presumably of the Jesuits of that name) and later in a house where some noblemen of the family of Drummond lodged. When Abercromby left Scotland in August 1606, Murdoch accompanied the old man, beset with the diseases of age, to the port of Dundee where he took ship for Poland, leaving several unfinished tasks to the still robust, though ageing, Murdoch: to visit some of his kin as already noted; to visit the residence of Lady Linlithgow to which no access was available when he got there; and also go to other places where McQuhirrie had left useful works of religious controversy, stores of books to provide a printed arsenal for distribution to interested parties. Meantime Murdoch’s disguise as a physician helped him to gain a place at the tables of the great and not so great, at Dunrobin, Auchindoun, Strathbogie, Gight, Peill, Carron (a Grant household), and Conrack; that is, mostly of families already committed to Catholicism. It was riskier to show one’s face in the towns, yet both in Aberdeen (Patrick Butler’s house) and Edinburgh, it was a risk occasionally taken. At last, as a priest who called himself Mackie, he was taken; captured towards the end of April 1607, by Alexander Douglas, a bishop of Moray, presumably in Elgin. The bishop passed him down southwards from sheriff to sheriff till he got to the Edinburgh tolbooth. He thought of him as a simple Jesuit, ‘nocht of any heich rank,’ and suggested leniency to King James.
The first examination was on 25 June by a small Privy Council committee, who interrogated him regarding phrases in his letters, especially the 'four merchants' and 'some friends with us' (a misreading for 'quidem amice nobiscum'). Queries were also pursued regarding mentions of Drumturk, George Anderson, John Henderson and foster-parents. Murdoch was tight-lipped at first, but more forthcoming at interrogations on 1 July. One Latin letter was, he admitted, addressed to Acquaviva, the Jesuit General, and, though dated in April 1607, was, he averred, actually penned the previous September, when Fr George Christie was due to leave Scotland. The 'four merchants' were identified as missionaries, Gilbert Brown, abbot of New Abbey; Richard, his son; Mr. John Hamilton, secular priest; William Paterson, friar. The merchant going to Flanders was Christie; his lame comrade, Mr. David Law, Catholic brother of James, then bishop of Orkney; John Henderson was Hamilton, priest. Murdoch confessed himself ignorant of Drumturk and George Anderson (but he was most probably George Christie, and Murdoch may have pre-dated the letter to save Christie's skin). There was a third letter, still missing directed to Fr Robert Abercromby.

Fortunately two of the missives discovered on Murdoch's person have now turned up, and it is plain that by themselves they gave a great deal away, which, combined with the threats he was likely to receive, made a fuller confession almost inevitable, while one in particular shows how apprehensive he was of capture.

One letter is in Scots and endorsed as having been sent to Murdoch. The sender's name has been omitted, the paper is damaged and some words lost. Its date is 26 February 1607, and at a guess might be from a relative of Fr Abercromby. The writer was sending Murdoch's watch ('mounter') with the bearer, expecting Murdoch to arrive at its destination ten or twelve days after receipt of the letter. He offered greater services than the mending of a watch which had often been in the watchmaker's hands since when the writer had mended it as far as he could. There were also instructions on 'bending' (winding?) it, hanging it up and laying it on a table. If there is a cipher here it escaped the Privy Council's detection. A letter was to be received by Murdoch from 'Drumturke' (?Abercromby) who had arrived safely in Danzig and had sent Patrick Stichell (i.e. a student at Braunsberg) to Rome with 'suche newais' as he thought good. He was also due to receive a letter of George Anderson (Christie?) who had not yet left but awaited the first occasion to do so. There follows some news of peace in the empire and conditions in Flanders. John Henderson (i.e. Hamilton) had begun his journey southwards, and, as for Murdoch, 'you will doe well to abide in your awin quarteris and to go to such places as yow think good within your awin bounds with the tyme we gett better newis then we hear of as yet.' The letter closed with commendations to Murdoch's 'foster father and foster mother.' The postscript refers to a black bonnet which the writer had sent 'which is too much for me,' and requests in exchange the little black bonnet which he gave to Drumturk (?writing faded) as being more suitable.

The next letter, in Latin, is more accessible to understanding:

What we were waiting for all last year, the return of our merchant who brings this to Flanders, at last we have achieved. With his arrival I don't doubt but that he will be able to satisfy you as to the state of our affairs than with letters longer than it is now expedient to write. However that may be, I am left on my own, since my other companion is powerless with a pain in one knee whereby he cannot ride on horseback or walk. A fact that torments me, since by a law enacted we are pursued for judgement, and with whomsoever we are found, the host as well as ourselves will suffer the penalty. May God aid our weakness and console us, since the reward for his friends is great indeed. Meantime before we weaken, may we be helped by younger men able and willing to bear the day's burden, the cold and heat in turn. Four others trade here not without some fruit, indeed in friendly
collaboration, which is a gift from God. Last summer I visited places in which our McQuhirrie of holy memory had journeyed. I stayed last winter with my friends in our northern highlands, now I'm returning south where I'm awaited. But indeed if I were captured, where I, a banished man, might flee I don't know; unless perhaps it should chance to happen that I would remain entrapped by my enemies and prevented by death, a grace nobody from our Society has so far won, although there are not wanting those in Scotland who have honoured the Church by martyrdom: among them Cardinal Beaton, John Hamilton archbishop of St Andrews, friar Black priest of the Order of Preachers, even as he was vested for the altar and led before the people, a sheep as it were; fever-stricken he ended his life; as also three lairds, one of Ladyland, another of Invermarky, and a third of Boniton. More will be found when they are investigated. These are few words, but I wish my letter to be empty rather than void of comment. It is up to your Reverence then to be mindful of us: whom we wish to thrive in the Lord always, till, shedding this mortal covering for an immortal one, he will enjoy eternal glory for labours so many and so great. May you flourish ever. From Spey Water, 20 April by our computation 1607. Your Reverence's unworthy servant, William Murdoch alias Stinsonius.

Murdoch is typical of the first generation of Scottish Jesuits whose formation was almost totally in pre-Reformation Scotland, who were prepared to undo the work of the Lords of the Congregation as long as Catholic earls were prepared to back them. Unlike Tyrie and the two Hays he was no man of learning, but he had imbibed the Jesuit activist spirit, in him exemplified in evangelical foot-slogging rather than in the constant political bargaining of a William Crichton. He had not the relish for abstract thinking on borderlands of politics and religion characterising former Calvinists, Jesuits of a younger breed like Moffat and Ogilvie, men with first-hand experience of an Andrew Melville-dominated religious formation.

Ogilvie, Moffat, Anderson and Kingly Power

Before proceeding to discuss the later generation, we must briefly mention Frs Abercromby and Crichton of the earlier breed of Jesuits. The former could still find, when he revisited Scotland the two pre-Reformation friars, Veitch and Leitch, still active, who also took part in the election of Robert Hay as head of the mission following Archbishop Hamilton's death. And of course, Abercromby's name is associated with the scheme to convert Queen Anne. Crichton's involvement continued till his death. At least in respect of him, the General Acquaviva persistently took the line that it was no business of Jesuits to meddle in politics. Partly, as he wrote in 1611, it was because he did not wish the Society involved in matters spiced with more prospects of danger than success. Again in January next year he reminded him that seminaries and religious matters were one thing and things proposed by the laird of Schives (Gray) another, as the latter were not the Society's concern but only of the State as such, 'and as to the king's son being at the head of those who in his council (conventu) dissented from the king, which points to war and the procuring of the choice of him over against his father, such matters are alien from our Institute.' If, however, Schives had positive proposals about specifically religious promotion in Scotland, that was the Society's concern. This seems to be the one contemporary allusion to an incident, presumably not in parliament, but in council, in which Prince Henry opposed the king. It is odd to find Crichton wanting to get into an act more calculated to aid Protestant than Catholic dissenters, though it does illustrate the depth of disillusion with James.
If we compare the attitudes of Ogilvie, Moffat and Anderson to the oath of allegiance, we find that all concur in finding it a document with theological implications: hardly surprising in view of Rome's attitude, as when the Inquisition there summoned before it Robert Gray, professed priest of the Observant Franciscans, who had taken the oath to escape imprisonment. But tactics differ among the three Jesuits. Where Ogilvie, in order to highlight the issue of James' spiritual jurisdiction, refused to answer for the most part, Moffat on close scrutiny is no more than politely uncooperative, while Anderson seems anxious to shift the onus of proof on to his accusers. Ogilvie was not in Scotland, as was Murdoch, because 'his awne naturall ayre agreit best with him,' but to make an issue of mass-saying. Indeed, Ogilvie was in hot water from the first. His seeming failure to use his royal safe-conduct for returning; his keeping company with soldiers; the north-country tang of his speech that would lead Spottiswoode to believe he had caught a quarry the bishops had long hunted, Fr Anderson of Elgin, allegedly an accomplice of the Gunpowder Plot; his false name and the inventories of Anderson found in his keeping; all these made Spottiswoode suspect that Anderson only 'seemed' to be furth of the realm. After the royal progress of 1617 the hunt for Anderson was renewed in Glasgow, though the first wind of his presence there is in 1619. The hot pursuit of Fr George Mortimer indicates the continuing vigilance.

When Andrew Hathowie, Glasgow burgess, and his wife, Janet Pollock, were accused of harbouring Mortimer, the prosecution was already armed with statements taken from Mortimer as well as their own maidservant. The assise, which included Mr. Thomas Smeaton, younger, was threatened with wilful error if it acquitted, since to harbour Jesuits was treasonable under the 1592 act and neither accused could plead ignorance since it had 'tane effect and execution' aganis dyuers ничtbouris inhabitantis of the said citie of Glasgow within thir few years past.' Arriving at the south end of the Glasgow bridge at about five in the afternoon on 18 March 1622, Mortimer sent his boy-servant to the house of Hathowie, known to be 'ane Catholique romayne,' a home where he had doubtless been received before several times since the Christmas previous. Her husband not being at home, his wife took the Jesuit for a meal to Matthew Howeson's house on the south side, where they talked over a meal for half an hour or so, after which she conveyed him safely by the 'wuid myyne and agait wardis' so that he could proceed on horseback to Paisley, seat of the Catholic Abercorns. After a night there, next morning Mortimer went on to Largs, with friendly Montgomeries nearby. Returning on 21 March, he again repaired to the Hathowie home. His vestments in the wife's keeping were 'craftille convoyt doun be ane hoill or privat part' to the brewhouse where their maidservant hid them behind a 'masking fatt.' After some days stay the Jesuit's secret was out and searchers found him in the 'ruif or scaltit' of the house. It was left to the Glasgow magistrates by the assise of 6 August to implement the sentence of banishment. But the Hathowies did not go far, indeed no further than the Abercorn Irish estate at Strabane, where within a decade Hathowie was again in trouble for mass attendance. The archbishop of Glasgow even wrote to the bishop of Derry not to allow the harbouring of expelled Scottish recusants. One can see King James' problem: if papists grew numerous in the Lowlands, how steadfast was their allegiance and would they compound his difficulties with recalcitrant Protestants?

Ogilvie was prepared to work in the Lowlands. We now have a letter which shows his presence in Edinburgh, where he met Mr. Andrew Crichton, secular priest in July 1614. We know that he resented the cautious proceedings of his mission superior, Gordon of Huntry, whom he described as 'our auld feartie' (timidus senex noster), a judgement others shared although not he who called him 'the onlie phenix of his sect, much abhoring ther damnable positions of murdering and dethroning of kings.' Andrew Crichton, whom Rome had provided to be a benefice in Liege which he failed to hold, could teach Ogilvie the tactic of declining the court's authority. In his trial Ogilvie condemned the Gunpowder Act. Yet James were merely de facto king, implying he might not be king as of right.
He refused to answer whether the subject could deny him natural allegiance and regarding the pope's jurisdiction indicated that this followed from the king's status as a baptised Christian who could be excommunicated since heretics, though excluded from grace, were in the Church for purposes of punishment. The evidence is drawn from the martyrdom account first published in Douai after his death. Is this an edited version? There was a Roman proposal, in a letter to Fr Lescaze, French superior at Bordeaux, that the 'relation' should be revised for doctrinal accuracy, but the Douai printing of the following month, July, perhaps anticipated any toning-down process. Ogilvie hinted that he was privy to such Protestant secrets as that the ministry had sought the leadership of Lord (later Marquis of) Hamilton in vain in their crisis of 17 September (sic, for December), 1596. A notable feature of the trial was the reluctance of the government to become involved in sentencing big fish caught up with the Jesuit. On 25 July 1615, John Seton of Touch was cautioner for Sir James Kneilland or Cleland of Monkland for hearing Ogilvie's mass in his Monkland mansion; likewise Sir John Maxwell was security for William Maxwell of Cowglen for masses at the Glen; and two days later John Montgomery of Scottistoun for Robert Urie, writer in Paisley, for harbouring Ogilvie in his Paisley home and hearing several masses in places and at times designated in letters of summons unhappily no longer extant. The matter was postponed from September to November till finally a Privy Council warrant cancelled the diet. Cleland, it is true, claimed to be a Church of England communicant, but his wife was a Seton, related to Ogilvie's Jesuit friend, Fr Alexander Seton. It was probably Cleland who introduced Ogilvie to Court on his first missionary tour. Of the three Jesuits it is Ogilvie who desired confrontation above all on the spiritual issue.

James Moffat was another convert from Calvinism who had even made his 'private exercise' in theology in St Mary's College, St Andrews, under Andrew Melville. The first Catholic contact he acknowledged was the celebration of matins and evensong at Butterdein in Berwickshire (seat of the Ellem family). He admeted hearing mass at Auchindoun in Fr James Gordon's presence, and since the lady of Auchindoun was also from Fife, friendship with her relations may have occasioned his attendance. With Gordon and others he sailed on David Hay's ship to Middelburg, where Gordon left the party. From there he accompanied William Gordon to Brussels and there met Fr William Crichton. He was received into Douai seminary, moving thence to Rome in 1598, where he was ordained by the cardinal vicar. In Rome he had the chance of friendly contact with Scots noble visitors, and he was quite insistent with his superiors that there he preferred to stay. Obviously gifted intellectually, Moffat, when Fr William Johnston died in 1609 at Graz, was considered by the earl of Angus most fitted to succeed. Indeed when Ogilvie was offered the provostry (sic, for prebend) of Moffat, he quipped that it might more aptly be offered to Fr Moffat as one more learned than he.

According to his statement to the Scots authorities he left Rome by Acquaviva's direction to convert his brother, but his mission was broader of course. He sent for mass vestments to Antwerp, then sailed with them to Carriden on the south side of the Forth, a barony whose superior was the Marquis of Hamilton, though Moffat's goal may rather have been one of his tenants, Patrick Abercromby of Carriden. This was in July, 1614. Later mention was made of correspondence taken on him at his capture, 'the threi special missies withe al utheris intelligences' that his captor 'fand with him at his first apprehension.' One letter Moffat had destroyed for fear of interception: a communication from the exiled William Maitland of Lethington to the earl of Errol.

In his first statement he agreed that he would have said mass in St Andrews could he have found auditors. However, in his letter to Acquaviva after his release more details emerged. During his six months, as he put it, of freedom he claimed to have had a good harvest among the principal noblemen and all the Catholic lords in the areas he traversed, maintaining that, if he had kept longer out of enemy hands, he would have had all the Catholic aristocracy at his bidding. Yet he was never north of Dundee, though as far
south as Dumfries, possibly among the Maxwells where later the Benedictine, Adam McCall is found working. He claimed to have made no prior arrangements abroad for his reception, except that Mr. David Chalmers, himself a former advocate, had suggested a visit to the house in Edinburgh of William Sinclair, advocate.

Moffat was taken the day after his arrival in St Andrews where his brother lived. A letter of Fr Gordon of Huntly of January 27, 1615, giving news of Ogilvie’s arrest, comments also on Moffat’s in the house of his Calvinist brother. ‘He was often solemnly warned by us not to confide in his heretical brethren, but still he neglected all this, and was willing to pass the time with his brother and thus was betrayed, captured and taken to Edinburgh where he was thrown into the same prison, but not the same cell, as Ogilvie.’ He said mass in Sinclair’s house in October, setting out thereafter to St Andrews where he was taken in early November. His Rome ‘relation’ describes how he was taken by some soldiers headed by Alexander Gledstanes, archdeacon of St Andrews and son of the archbishop. The captor accompanied him to Edinburgh partly to test his learning and, Moffat thought, partly to block any attempt at escape. Gledstanes, who was an Oxford student, on the way proposed to his prisoner many questions in canon and civil law. Moffat was anxious to prejudice such disputation in the future, saying, ‘Like parrots you have memorised certain objections that Catholics make in controversy, but without attending to their solution; but I will test you in points more central to the faith.’ He then went on to questions about the Athanasian creed, in which equality, immensity and other attributes of God are affirmed both of the Holy Spirit and the Son. Yet the same creed, while affirming procession from the Father of the Spirit, asserts real generation of the Son; so ‘let your ministers assign a reason for such diversity, since the whole divine essence is no less equally communicated to both Spirit and Son.’ Here, Moffat added, ‘I paused for a moment to see if at least he understood the terms, before raising another difficulty about the nature of angelic communication.’ The third problem set was whether the human nature of Christ was complete not only in the physical and metaphysical essentials (matter and form, genus and difference) but also in the metaphysical substantial modes (subsistence and existence) and how the union of the divine and human natures came about and whether in Christ there were two persons as well as two natures. Moffat, who had not lost his Scots love of an argument on matters transcendental, found his former Oxonian wanting, ‘But I ended my questions as he scarce understood the terms, although he is supposed to be one of Scotland’s most learned ministers.’ One can see how, among other factors, the need to debate with such as Moffat drove the Scottish universities more and more to recover their lost scholastic heritage and Moffat did boast that the theology professors at St Andrews had a high opinion of his abilities; one wonders how Robert Boyd, who pioneered Glasgow’s scholastic rival, fared at Ogilvie’s trial.

Torture by the ‘boots’ was not unknown at such trials, though it achieved nothing in Mr. Robert Philp’s. Moffat related that he was threatened with it for two months, though he feared it less for the temporary pain it inflicted than for the prospect of permanent disablement. Five Edinburgh men were imprisoned on his account, though not because he or Ogilvie had revealed their names. The informer was probably a certain James Colt. Like Ogilvie he claimed to have been bribed with an offer of a benefice, of the abbey (sic, for priory) of Coldingham, unique in that it still had its leaden roof. Eventually his brother paid security of 3000 marks for his non-return from banishment. Three of those imprisoned on his account, Robert Cruickshank, stabler, Robert Wilkie, embroiderer, and William Sinclair, advocate, were brought to the scaffold, and at that point only was produced the royal warrant authorising their release and banishment. But it was less to ordinary Edinburgh citizens than to the higher classes that his apostulate was aimed, and his Rome ‘relation’ claimed that he had said mass daily starting from the second day after his boat anchored, sometimes even twice daily. Clement King, doctor of medicine, who stated he had not heard his mass but merely afforded him hospitality, was awarded a royal remission. 37
Fortunately, we now have a rough transcript of his examinations, first probably on 22 November, then on 19 December and 17 January and 13 February 1615. In December he refused to acknowledge the royal supremacy in spiritual matters: the king was the only supreme judge in temporals, but the pope in ecclesiastical 'under Jesus.' Yet the pope also had indirect power if princes troubled Catholics in their religion. Further than that Moffat would not go until 'the first agreed in religion.' The question was pursued as to whether this papal authority was mandatory as a matter of doctrine necessary for salvation; once more Moffat declined to answer, as the point was controveted between Catholics and Protestants. To the question whether he followed the Jesuit teaching on the point at issue, he responded that he found the doctors in disagreement. Asked about the pope's power to excommunicate and subsequently to depose, especially as related to kings of Great Britain, he briskly retorted that 'he desyr th archbishop of glasgow and St andres to gang over to the pope and propone that question.' As to whether after excommunication the pope had power to free a king's subjects from their allegiance or whether one could as a private person hold that theory of Suarez, Moffat again declined to answer as it was a 'contraverit heid' between Catholics and Protestants. At the December hearing, queried as to whether a prince being excommunicated and his subjects freed from their obedience might be slain by direct or indirect authority, Moffat said the matter was no concern of his; he would not meddle in such things nor proffer a personal view. In January the examiner returned to royal excommunication, especially where those excommunicated were not of his Church. Yes, answered Moffat, if they were contumacious, but this papal power did not extend to deposition as the king 'excommunicacione papali non amittitur ius regni.' Finally he reiterated his previous replies in February. Interrogated regarding his knowledge of the penal laws against Jesuits resorting to Scotland, he denied awareness of such acts of parliament, going on to add that if his superior were to direct him to go there for Scotland's conversion he would do so, such laws notwithstanding. Indeed at his 'coming furth' of Scotland there was not such persecution of Catholics as now. He did not want to subvert the subjects' allegiance to their king; his aim was conversion, not subversion. Finally on being asked if he felt himself exempt from the king's secular courts, even for murder or suchlike crimes, he maintained that 'as he is cled with his preistheid' his court of appeal was the pope as only competent judge; on church matters he was not obliged even to answer his majesty's commissioners.38

So far the Scots record, which is largely confirmed by Moffat's own Roman 'relation.' On papal jurisdiction over royalty, Moffat argued that since it was of faith that the pope was commissioned to feed the sheep of Christ, and since the king was not Turk, Jew, pagan or atheist, it would be an insult to deny that James was subject to it. The book of Suarez was brought into the hearing, an eventuality Moffat had foreseen in Paris (where it had been publicly burnt) and written to Acquaviva for his advice. His reply was that before going to press the book was first subject to academic approval, but that, while the author did not lack Moffat's approbation, they should summon Suarez or his censors and accuse Moffat only on the basis of his own actions or teaching, either that or convince him he was somehow the author of that work. Persisting in this stance, in the following hearing when, he claimed, some of the best legal minds were present, his examiners insisted that he was surely obliged, by virtue of his religious vow, to approve of what Acquaviva had passed for the press. Moffat pointed out that his vow only obliged him to keep the rules and that his General could only require his assent to matters of faith and not to his private views. Spottiswoode, 'evil judge of my comrade, the blessed martyr, Ogilvie,' intervened to declare, 'Your comrade with less ceremony approves all of that teaching,' for he strove by every means that the archbishop of St Andrews should condemn Moffat as well, and this was 'lest Fr Ogilvie's parents and all Catholics (for they doubted if many were noble stock) should think him an evil tyrant who in a like cause had proceeded so dissimilarly and so tyrannically.' Moffat therefore determined to be sent to heaven, as he put it, not for any legal fiction, but purely and simply because of his faith. The next
hearing took up the question of excommunication again. Was to deprive the king of spiritual life and of heaven not worse than to divest him of his earthly kingdom? Moffat replied that such misunderstandings were to be expected from non-theologians. The pope could not exclude anybody from heaven, only the king could do that himself. Excommunication of a king was not aimed at striking him but at healing him. But, his examiners insisted, supposing a General Council were to define that the pope’s authority extended to such a deprivation. Moffat had a good word for such Councils, but noted that, though personally a disciple of St Thomas, he had borrowed a distinction from Scotus between actual and potential objects of faith, the latter of which he was not bound to defend. To Rome he wrote that in this and similar difficulties, the Holy Spirit had unquestionably come to his aid.39

Moffat was persuaded that in all his argumentation he had followed the same course as Ogilvie, differing only in method (sed alio modo). Looking at the fuller Scots record or his personal ‘relation,’ it seems no misleading claim, though what he said is not identical, which may be because Moffat’s Edinburgh accusers were more patient of vital scholastic distinctions than Ogilvie’s Glasgow judges. However, when we look at the final summary statement Moffat is said to have signed (in the only copy extant Moffat’s name is signed in Spottiswoode’s hand) and set it over the full account of Ogilvie’s case, contrast is what springs to mind. Is this summary an edited version intended solely for the king’s eyes to obtain a royal remission? It excludes mention of Moffat’s arrival in the marquis of Hamilton’s territory, even stating that he ‘landit in some part of the water of Forth...he knew not quhair.’ Moreover, it was certainly false that Moffat had not ‘said or hard Messe sen he come in Scotland’ or that he lacked mass-clothes. In the summary Moffat’s position on papal powers is summed up accurately enough, but set against Ogilvie, there is an undeniable difference of emphasis. Like many French Jesuits (such as Louis Richeloom), Moffat was anxious to dissociate excommunication and tyrannicide and his answers implied that he acknowledged the king de jure. Yet Spottiswoode exaggerated in writing, ‘Mr James Moffet took a safer course, for having condemned Ogilvie’s positions, he was suffered to depart the country.’ His release may have been expedited by his many noble friends, especially the influence of a certain ‘Auchmuty,’ a person close to the king; that is John Auchmutie, gentleman of the king’s bedchamber and master of the royal wardrobe.40

But the attitude of Jesuits to royal authority could be affected as much by secular works as by what they read as students in the Society. Fr Patrick Anderson, it is true, had been a graduate of Edinburgh university and there could have imbibed ideas not unlike Melville’s or even George Buchanan’s. But unlike Ogilvie and Moffat, he was the son of Catholic parents and nephew of Queen Mary’s loyal servant, Bishop John Leslie. When suspicions were directed at Anderson at Mr Roger Lindsay’s trial, Chancellor Seton went out of his way to praise him, not surprisingly as Seton had contributed Latin verses to Leslie’s history in the Rome edition of 1585. But Anderson disliked Buchanan and his likely mentor in political theory could have been Adam Blackwood whose absolutist theory of monarchy is close to the views of the French royal confessor and acquaintance of Anderson, the Jesuit Pierre Coton, who maintained that those who resisted kings were damned. There is extant a letter from Coton to Anderson of January 1615, full of French court news but also concerning eight requests made by him which the French king had, through Marshall de Briassac, referred back to the French clergy meeting in General Congregation. Through Coton Anderson had easy access to the Court as long as he was in Paris, though in the event the French clergy were more generous to the English and Irish. There was some talk of using Irish Jesuits in the neglected Western Isles, and though two of them, Henry Fitzsimmons and Patrick Lenan, were contacted, there were not enough Irish Jesuits to spare. Meantime others, especially the Irish Franciscans, were establishing a foothold there, one of them, Edmund Cana or McCann, having been arrested and held at Stirling in 1620. Finance was a limiting factor, for the Jesuit letters were very concerned at this time about the funding of a Scottish mission, as collections in Scotland itself were
not advisable. Anderson had been on the mission already from 1607 to 1611, returning to his student base in Edinburgh in 1609 for mass in Patrick Abercromby's house. His printed account sent to the publisher without his superiors' leave roused Aquaviva's wrath, and only after the latter's death was he permitted to return; it was mooted that he should have a companion this time to restrain his somewhat rash zeal.\textsuperscript{41} Anderson stated later than enquiries were made about him as far afield as England and Ireland, and Patrick Young, royal librarian, certainly expected him in the spring of 1618 while a correspondent wrote to the Duke of Buckingham, 'I doubt Father Patrick, the Scottishman, is hanging about the Court.' He was being hunted in Glasgow about the same time, as the Anderson families there were thought to be relations of his as the Forrets may have been of John Ogilvie.\textsuperscript{42} Certainly James did not want any plots during his Scottish progress of 1617, but the tour's completion did not allay alarms and excursions, Jesuits and Puritans being conjoined in the royal mind. There is no evidence that Anderson was linked to the plot or even to Fr Garnet, unlike Frs McQuhirrie and Crichton.\textsuperscript{43} Yet the bishops suspected that he was, even when Anderson called it a horrible crime. For Anderson, James, like Mary, was God's anointed on whom it was unthinkable to lay hands and his subjects were in conscience obliged not only to obey but to bless and love him. If he refused to take the oath of allegiance, it was not because his allegiance was in doubt. His learning was extensive, if not always accurate by modern standards. He aimed some blows shrewdly, playing the two Kirk parties off against each other: how could a Puritan, he asked, be expected to kneel before mere bread? Like a courtier, he showed respect to men of position, but was not above using a fashionable French scepticism to undermine his opponents' assurance. His pro-royal frame of mind was so evident that he was spared the less edifying questions (such as the possibility of slaying kings by papal mandate). Yet the fact remains that they found him guilty and held him captive till on 13 February 1621 (from May, 1620) the French Court intervened through their envoy in London. And he was with their new ambassador, the Marquis d'Effiat, when he died in London in 1624.

Much more could be said about the early Jesuit mission; the very first period of Queen Mary's reign and later of the Spanish Blanks still needs further exploration for which ample materials exist. The Jesuit sample in the northeast has been well publicised as a factor in surviving Catholicism; but a man like John Hay S.J. had links both with Delgaty in Turriff parish, Aberdeenshire, and Delgety in Dysart parish in Fife. The personalities of the priests have been illuminated more than of the people they served in Lowland towns like Glasgow and Edinburgh, where a more continuous Catholic tradition is observable than is often imagined. The impact of other missionaries, Benedictine, Dominican, Franciscan, Capuchin, Minim and so on, on Scots Jesuit initiatives needs more scholarly attention. Finally the true state of affairs in the colleges abroad can be studied with the help of Jesuit documents. Enough has been said here for the present to remove the myth of the robot Jesuit cherished by some of our historians.

\textit{J. Durkan}

\textit{University of Glasgow}
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