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Abstract

The purpose of this essay is to describe the complex diplomatic relations between England and Scotland that led to, and immediately followed, the armed English aggression toward Scotland known as the “Rough Wooing”, the attempt by Henry VIII to force the Scots to submit to English political influence in the mid 1540's. Much has been written about specific events that moved England and Scotland from diplomacy to war during the years 1543-1547, but no one has produced a study that utilizes both scholarly assessments and primary source material. This synthesis of modern insight with contemporary sources is intended to produce a more clear and detailed picture of a chaotic time and the individuals who shaped Anglo-Scottish relations.

The essay begins by providing a brief synthesis of Anglo-Scottish politics and diplomacy in the years leading up to the death of King James V of Scotland in late 1542. Background is given from both the English and Scottish perspectives, so as to give the reader added insight into the dealings to come. The remainder of the essay describes the intricate and often ruthless relations between the two kingdoms prior to the deaths of Cardinal David Beaton in 1546 and Henry VIII in early 1547. Primarily the paper will cover the “Gentle Wooing” of English diplomacy in 1543 followed by the English invasion of Edinburgh in 1544, which constituted what contemporary sources described as Henry’s “Rough Wooing” of Scotland. Perhaps most importantly, this essay will explain the motives of the key individuals on both sides of the border who determined the course of Anglo-Scottish relations from 1543-1547.
Anglo-Scottish Relations from Gentle to Rough Wooing

1543-1547
Introduction

And so the Scots must be kept in constant readiness, poised to attack the English in case they stir ever so little.¹

The mid-sixteenth century is a fascinating time in which to study relations between the kingdoms of England and Scotland. In particular, the period which falls between the Scottish defeats at Solway Moss in 1542 and Pinkie in 1547 holds special interest for the student of Anglo-Scottish politics and diplomacy. Those years witnessed a divided Scotland under the rule of various factions, all of whom claimed to represent the infant Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. King Henry VIII’s plan to control Scotland through an Anglophile political party seemed foolproof in early 1543, that is before a Francophile party led by Cardinal David Beaton gained power. In 1544 King Henry ordered the future Protector Somerset, Edward Seymour, to sack Edinburgh, and the period of English aggression known as the “Rough Wooing” began. Yet Scotland refused to be intimidated by her cousin to the south and the Scots managed politically and diplomatically to outmaneuver Old King Hal from 1543 until his death in 1547.

My thesis will cover Anglo-Scottish relations from the death of King James V of Scotland in late 1542 to the death of King Henry VIII of England in early 1547. While many historians have covered these years in their surveys of Tudor history, Scottish history, and the life of Henry VIII, none has written specifically about the period itself, even though there has been an ongoing debate concerning the nature of Henry VIII’s

Scottish policy. Therefore, I wish to write a brief account of Anglo-Scottish politics, diplomacy, and conflict, focusing primarily on the events of 1543-44 and evaluating relations from both the English and Scottish points of view. My thesis seeks to understand the basis of Henry’s “Rough Wooing” and make the complex political situation in Edinburgh more comprehensible. I shall also emphasize the importance of religion and nationalist sentiment in each kingdom’s respective policies, as well as showing how the events of 1543-47 affected the future course of Anglo-Scottish history. From a historical standpoint, the relationship between the two kingdoms comprehended issues of national sovereignty and independence, religious reform, political allegiance, and diplomatic treachery. Events during these four years shaped the life of Mary Queen of Scots, affected the policies of Protector Somerset, helped to bring about the Scottish Reformation, influenced the 1560 Treaty of Edinburgh in which Scotland’s “Auld Alliance” with France finally ended, and may have produced ideas which led to Anglo-Scottish union by 1603.

In the process of analyzing Anglo-Scottish relations, I hope to answer some of the questions which historians have posed about this period. Did King Henry VIII have a coherent Scottish policy at any time from 1543 until his death? I would argue that he did not, but was England’s policy toward Scotland based entirely on her policy toward France? What about the assistance and directions given to the Anglophile party in Scotland, which actually had control of the kingdom in early 1543? Was the Scottish Governor Arran sincere in his reformist, pro-English beliefs, or was he simply stalling the English for time? More specifically, was Arran the fool that both contemporaries and
historians have scorned as unfit for the duties of the regency? Were the “assured” lords the unprincipled double-dealers that historians have made them out to be? Who else influenced Scottish policy and what were the attitudes of Scottish diplomat Sir Ralph Sadler and the future Protector Somerset, Edward Seymour, concerning the Scots? Why was the Anglophile party in Scotland so strong at the beginning of 1543 and so weak at the end? Was its collapse the fault of the English Ambassador Sadler? Was Henry’s “Rough Wooing” a poor strategy? What benefits did it have for the English? Why were Governor Arran and Cardinal Beaton seemingly so unprepared for Seymour’s 1544 invasion? If religious reform did play such a large role in Scotland’s relations with England, why were the Scots still firmly allied with Catholic France in 1546? How did Cardinal Beaton rise to such prominence in Scottish affairs overshadowing the queen Dowager and members of the Hamilton, Douglas, and Stuart families? And finally, was Henry VIII responsible for Beaton’s murder in 1546?

My source material consists of contemporary documents which relate to Anglo-Scottish diplomacy, as well as modern English and Scottish political surveys. To achieve a broader perspective, I will also use documents written by the principal figures of each kingdom, while including letters written by foreign ambassadors in London. The most important primary sources for this period are Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, documenting nearly every source associated with Henry's government; The Hamilton Papers, which focus primarily on Anglo-Scottish relations; Sadler State Papers, including the dispatches of the English ambassador in Scotland; The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine, which comprises the letters received by the
Scottish queen Dowager; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, documenting Scottish government proceedings from 1545; the Letters of James V, which includes the correspondence to and from the Scottish King until 1542; and The Works of John Knox, focusing on the Protestant leader's opinions and recollections of the period.²

I shall begin this essay by laying out a broad history of events and synthesizing the secondary source material, focusing on England in the first chapter and Scotland in the second. Thus, the first part of the essay examines the background of the period from the perspective of both the English and the Scots. The second part consists of a more detailed study of the period itself. For the remaining six chapters I look more closely at the complexities of Anglo-Scottish relations, using primary sources and my own interpretations of the persons involved and the policies those parties espoused. As much as possible, I want the principal figures of the period to tell their own story. My goal is to present a clear perspective on an often misunderstood period of deceit, chaos, fear, and confusion.

² Full bibliographic citations are included at end of essay.
Chapter 1

Henry VIII's Scottish Policy leading up to the "Rough Wooing"

There exists no standard explanation of Henry VIII’s foreign policy that most modern scholars would agreeably accept. Anglo-Scottish relations in the early 1540’s - the period before the “Rough Wooing” - have particularly been open to interpretation. Yet, two distinct theories for England’s policy toward Scotland have been advanced. The first theory, argued by historians such as A.F. Pollard, R.B. Wernham, G. Donaldson, R.G. Eaves, and P.S. Crowson, insists that King Henry had a “unified Kingdom of greater Britain”\(^1\) in mind before 1540 and molded his Scottish policy to achieve that end. A second group of historians including D. Potter, W. Ferguson, S. Gunn, J. Guy, J.J. Scarisbrick, G.R. Elton, L.B. Smith, and D.M. Head, believe that there was no policy aimed at dynastic union with Scotland before 1542-43 and, in any case, Henry VIII had no coherent Scottish policy, since his focus was never on his northern neighbor during the 1540’s. In either case, by 1542, in the context of the political crisis in Scotland caused by the death of James V, Henry had an excellent opportunity to exert English control over Edinburgh. The fact is, Henry tried to do so, but only half-heartedly because his true interests by this time lay in one last honorable military coalition against France. Thus, all Henry required was the assurance that the Scots would not open up a second front along England’s northern borders. A combination of poor English diplomatic strategy,

exceptional Scottish stubbornness, and Henry’s bad temper ruined this chance for Anglo-
Scottish peace that Henry needed if he were to devote all his resources to the continental
theater. Thus, the English military coercions of Scotland in 1544-45, known as the
"Rough Wooing", proceeded not from a long-term imperial strategy but directly from
Henry’s decision, as early as the Spring of 1541, to once again make war against the
French.

Throughout Henry’s reign, the kingdom of Scotland loomed on the periphery of
English foreign policy. Henry, and also Wolsey before 1529, was much more interested
in continental affairs than with a kingdom perceived as backwards and powerless in the
European sphere of influence. England viewed Scotland as simply a hindrance along the
northern border that occasionally needed to be contained. However, this policy
dramatically changed during the periods of Henry’s three wars against the French: 1513-14,
1522-23, and after 1542. The Franco-Scottish “Auld Alliance” dating back to the 12th
century and renewed in 1492 and 1512 forced England to take Scottish relations more
seriously for fear of a northern invasion backed by France. The first two periods of war
resulted in England seeking peace with the Scots against a backdrop of armed conflict.
Following each reconciliation between Henry and Francis I, Scotland would again
become an insignificant object of English foreign policy. R.G. Eaves states that after the
Scottish disaster at Flodden in 1513, “because Henry’s sister was queen of Scotland and
his young nephew the new King, the English monarch believed he might annex
Scotland. While this may have been true throughout the course of Henry's reign, the fact is that Henry never actually formulated or attempted a policy which would bring Scotland under England's control until after 1542. D.M. Head argues that the only coherent Scottish policy was that "Henry consistently sought a tractable Scotland that would follow the English lead." Usually this meant trying to keep the peace with Scotland while attempting to wean them away from the "Auld Alliance" by maintaining ties with influential pro-English supporters such as Henry's sister queen Margaret. During those periods of French conflict, however, attempts to keep the peace most often failed and English policy required a forceful containment or submission of the Scots. Therefore, English foreign policy towards Scotland was far from long-term and mostly situational, depending on English policy towards France and vice-versa. But while this description fits nicely the period before 1540, there was much more to Anglo-Scottish relations after this point.

The decade of the 1530's was a period of relative peace for both Scotland and England. Henry was forced to forego an aggressive continental foreign policy in order to focus on his marital negotiations with Rome and the domestic aspects of the Reformation. In 1526 Henry made peace with France and the 1528 truce at Berwick established an official peace with Scotland in 1534, although border violence was on the increase throughout the 1530's. By 1535, Henry even sought to improve Anglo-Scottish relations

---

and until 1541 he periodically sent Sir Ralph Sadler to tempt James into undertaking his own financially expedient reformation. However, English envoys were met “frostily” by James who had no intentions of moving closer to a schismatic England when he could strengthen the popular “Auld Alliance” with a French bride. James would marry Francis I’s daughter Madeleine in 1537 and that same year receive a sword from Pope Paul III with advice to set an example for Christian kings against heresy. By 1539 and the truce at Toledo between the Emperor Charles V and Francis I, Scotland was still firmly behind both the Pope and the French King. Fearing a papal-supported crusade from the 1539 truce, England readied herself for an invasion not only along the southern coastline but also along the northern borders. It was rumored that Francis had indeed asked James to be prepared to invade by May 15th of that year, but the threatened invasion of England never occurred. As the threat of war passed, Henry kept relations with Scotland on good terms and intermittently sent Sadler north to try to dissuade the Scottish king of amity with France. Nonetheless, as of 1540 Scotland remained very much aligned with France and very much opposed to an English-directed attack on the church.

In June 1540, Thomas Cromwell, who had always pleaded for a pacific policy towards Scotland, was arrested and executed. Following his former minister’s suggestions, Henry tried to persuade James that he should renounce France and keep the peace with England. During one of Sadler’s intermittent trips to Edinburgh, the English envoy proposed a meeting between Henry and James and returned to London under the impression that James would support such a meeting. Thus, early in 1541, Henry scheduled a royal progress to the north for the following summer and planned to meet
with James at York. When the Scottish ambassador Thomas Bellenden visited London in June 1541, he carried a vague message from James, one that neither accepted nor outrightly refused Henry's invitation. While James was not unwilling to attend the meeting, his council, led by the pro-French Cardinal Beaton, strongly advised James not to make the journey for fear of an English scheme to kidnap their king. For his part, Henry had convinced himself that James would meet him at York, although few of his councillors believed that the king of Scots would actually appear. Historians still speculate on Henry's reasons for wanting to meet with James in 1541.

R.B. Wernham states that Henry VIII turned to his "British Problem" in the closing years of his reign, after the incorporation of Wales in 1536 and the assumption of the title "king of Ireland" in 1541. But Wernham adds, "The key to that mastery, however, lay with Scotland." John Guy and J.J. Scarisbrick each attribute this apparently imperialist stance to the practical efficiency of Henry's chief minister Thomas Cromwell, not a specific strategy by Henry. Steven Gunn argues that "the king's flexibility over his claim to the overlordship of Scotland was even greater than that over France." Putting aside English imperial aims, D.M. Head suggests that the worsening relations between the emperor and France by early 1541 was the real reason for Henry's amicable attitude with James. Head states that the emperor's plan to bestow Milan upon his son in October 1540 "was almost certain to bring renewed war with France, and as it

---

became clear that Henry would enter on the emperor's side, Scotland resumed a central role in English diplomacy.⁶ J.J. Scarisbrick states a similar view when he writes "It was probably in the Spring of 1541 that Henry decided to resume his military career."⁷ It is a fact that Henry sent the duke of Norfolk to inspect the northern border defenses early in 1541. If a return to war on the continent was Henry's objective by the spring of 1541, then securing peace with Scotland would have been ample reason for Henry to meet with James that summer.

Henry waited two weeks for James to arrive before leaving York in a rage on September 29, 1541. Contrary to a popular belief, this fit of anger did not lead directly to war with Scotland, for Anglo-French relations would most always dictate military policy toward the Scots. But the failed meeting at York did resolve that were there to be a continental war, England would have to contain Scotland by force before landing an army at Calais. By late 1541, Henry had allied himself with Charles V and by early 1542 plans were being made for an English invasion of France the following summer. In August 1542, Henry sent Norfolk north to negotiate a peace or forcefully contain the Scots. However, before Norfolk arrived his deputy, Sir Robert Bowes, led a raiding party into the lowlands and was soundly defeated by the Scots at Hadden Rig. Still angry over being made to look foolish the previous summer, Henry took the battle at Hadden Rig as a provocation of war and declared war on Scotland in October. When Norfolk arrived on the borders to negotiate a settlement, Henry purposefully made the demands too high and

---

⁶ Head, "Henry VIII's Scottish Policy", p.15.
from that point conflict was inevitable. Henry ordered Norfolk to invade but the year was growing late and the English could only manage to burn the town of Kelso and some rich border land, hardly the blow that Henry had needed to knock the Scots out of the next year’s campaign scenario. Therefore, England sought peace once more and Henry’s council issued a pamphlet which laid out the history of Anglo-Scottish relations and the reasons the Scots should accept peace. Despite rumors of a Scottish counter-offensive, Henry marshaled his resources to prepare for the 1543 invasion of France. James’ decision to follow through with a late November invasion produced the rout that occurred at Solway Moss and led to his own death in December 1542.

Gordon Donaldson states that “the foreign policy to which Scotland was committed by James V’s French marriages was to lead directly to the disaster with which his reign closed. But it was not the only cause of that disaster, for the King’s domestic policy also played its part.”8 Scotland chose to strengthen the “Auld Alliance” with France over seeking better relations with England when James married first Madeleine and then Mary of Guise. Thus, as of late 1541 and the Anglo-Imperial alliance, the Scots would either have to work out a truce with England or support their French allies and fight England. Any hope for peace was ruined by the failed meeting at York, for which James himself deserves some of the blame because of his indecisive behavior. Donaldson insists that James officially agreed to attend the meeting then backed out on the advice of his council and the pro-French clergy led by Cardinal Beaton.9

9 Ibid., p.59.
invasion of late 1542, James felt the need to retaliate against his English uncle.

Both Donaldson and William Ferguson agree that the defeat at Solway Moss was directly related to the political dissent in Scotland caused by James himself. The Scottish king neglected his nobles by raising up subjects of low degree and also enriching his own finances at his lords' expense. James disregarded the well-being of the Church as well, exacting substantial levies while persecuting many wealthy subjects who were clearly innocent of heresy in order to finance his lavish lifestyle. Thus, when James proposed a counter-offensive to Norfolk's raid, many of his nobles refused to risk invading England. Furious, James excluded all but Beaton from his council and with little support did his best to mobilize an army. Under the unpopular and relatively inexperienced royal favorite, Oliver Sinclair, some 14,000 Scots encountered a much smaller English force near the River Esk led by the deputy warden, Lord Thomas Wharton. The Scots, who were reluctant to fight in the first place, retreated in a state of confusion and were routed at Solway Moss on November 24, 1542. Although few Scots were actually killed, approximately 1,200 men, including a few dozen nobles, were captured. Those who lived along the border, dissatisfied with James and his domestic policies, captured most of these Scottish nobles themselves and gladly handed them over to the English. James, who had been suffering from melancholy ever since his two sons had died in 1541, could not bear the defeat and died of a crushed spirit on December 14, 1542. He left behind both a six-day old daughter and a country in political turmoil.

D.M. Head writes that “the English policy after Solway Moss must be seen as
proof of Henry’s limited interest in Scotland.”. The Imperial ambassador in London, Eustace Chapuys, noted that after Solway Moss, Henry was as jubilant as he had been before the execution of Catharine Howard. Indeed, his chances to neutralize Scotland before he undertook the French war had greatly improved once James was dead. No less than six factions of noblemen were attempting to become young Queen Mary’s regents and thus gain control of Scottish politics. But even with the internal division in Edinburgh, Henry and his counselors failed to grasp the opportunity of controlling Scotland and closing England’s vulnerable "back door". The English were simply too preoccupied with their continental strategy to annex Scotland. As Steven Gunn argues, glory, tradition, and chivalric machismo together explain Henry’s somewhat obsessive need to make war with France. David Potter also observes that Henry’s court was comprised of many young courtiers who dreamed of achieving honor and prestige in France. John Guy suggests that after the revelations about Catharine Howard and with his “ego in this fragile state, Henry resolved to restore his ‘honour’ in war against France.” But a full treasury also explains Henry’s fixation with a French war, as Richard Hoyle has shown. Hoyle states that "the confiscation of the monastic lands and the extension of taxation over the church promised royal affluence and fiscal independence.” In other words, Henry’s coffers were filled with monastic spoils and for the first time since 1513-1514, he had the money to go to war with France without having

to make his subjects pay a costly special subsidy. That he used this money to fight the French and not to subjugate Scotland reveals the intentions of the English court at the time. Henry was content to release the prisoners taken at Sloway Moss in the hopes that they would form a pro-English faction in Edinburgh that would bring Scottish politics under English control.

James Hamilton, the earl of Arran, was proclaimed regent of Scotland on January 3, 1543. Arran was mildly Anglophile and favored reform of the church, but he was also under heavy pressure from Beaton and other factions. The English had hoped to take advantage of this factionalism, but the “assured” lords who were to form Henry’s pro-English faction were not good collaborators and were eventually undermined by Henry’s own flawed diplomacy. As M.H. Merriman states, the most devoted assured lords were those who had a “desire for the reformed faith”13 and supported Henry’s efforts to marry the young Queen of Scots to the heir of Protestant England, five-year-old Prince Edward. In addition to the marriage scheme, Henry demanded that the Scots renounce the French alliance and send Queen Mary to England. The Scots felt these terms to be unacceptable and, according to R.B. Wernham, in February 1543 the assured lords were the first to ask the English for easier terms. The most influential assured lords, the earl of Angus and his brother Sir George Douglas, were in fact able to influence Arran for a time, and the Anglo-Scottish treaties of Greenwich were signed in July 1543. However, Cardinal Beaton, who had fallen from favor at the Scottish court, had been building a pro-

French/pro-Church party and successfully garnering French support with the help of Mary of Guise. By the end of July, Beaton and his followers had moved young queen Mary from Edinburgh to Stirling and by September, Arran had allied himself with them. The pro-English party was dwindling fast and the Douglas brothers could not prevent the Scottish Parliament from annulling the Greenwich treaties in December. Henry’s plan for containing Scotland lay in ruins and the Scots were once again firmly behind France.

The year 1543 was to have been a time of glorious victory for Henry but instead it became a period of diplomatic collapse. Because of Scottish affairs and coordination problems with Charles V, the planned attack on France was postponed until the summer of 1544. In Scotland, Henry’s pro-English party had surrendered their castles to Arran and Beaton, who together had stabilized Scottish politics. J.J. Scarisbrick insists that Arran and his ambassadors had purposefully complied with Henry and Angus throughout 1543 in order to buy time. Henry, in demanding a dynastic union and Scottish subjugation so abruptly, asked for entirely too much from the stubborn Scots and vastly underestimated their deceitful political skills. Thus, in 1544 “Henry lost all patience with the Scots and resorted to violence and blustering rather than diplomacy.”

In order to force the Scots into submission during the June invasion of France, Henry ordered Jane Seymour’s brother, the earl of Hertford, to sack Edinburgh, Leith, and St. Andrews. Hertford and various other councillors urged Henry to be more lenient for fear of further alienating the Scots but the old king refused. Hertford carried out his orders and with

---

14 Head, "Henry VIII's Scottish Policy", p.22.
about 12,000 men surprised the Scots and devastated Edinburgh and the surrounding area in May 1544. Although St. Andrews was spared, the destruction drove many of those who were still pro-English to France’s side. Even Angus turned his back on the English and in 1545 led a Scottish army to a resounding victory at Ancrum Moor. After Hertford’s raid, there would be no peaceful English alliance with - or control of - Scotland in Henry’s lifetime. But, as R.B. Wernham states, “At whatever cost to the long-term prospects, Henry thus achieved his short-term aim. The Scots were paralysed for the 1544 campaigning season.”

Henry afterwards had little success in France; the English captured Boulogne but failed to occupy Montreuil or march anywhere near Paris, which was the original plan. Charles V added the insult of making peace with Francis without consulting Henry, and if that was not enough for the English monarch, Hertford was forced to return to Scotland in 1545 to ward off a possible French-led invasion. Henry was also out of money, having spent most of the revenues from the sale of monastic lands to finance the French war. But as Steven Gunn contends, few of Henry’s subjects complained because although the war was for the most part a failure, the honor of its undertaking remained. The fact that continental warfare also held a much greater importance politically and economically than victory over the Scots explains the focus Henry placed on the French war and the indifference with which he tried to control Scotland. As D.M. Head argues,

As long as the king had his eyes to the continent, Scotland occupied a secondary position in his calculations. Scottish

---

15 Wernham, Before the Armada, p.157.
matters often had to be dealt with before European adventures could be undertaken, yet Henry generally viewed relations with Scotland as a distraction from the larger context of European diplomacy.\textsuperscript{16}

Henry never practiced a coherent policy with Scotland other than attempting at times to create factions of Anglophiles who would try to influence Scottish policy. By 1542-43 and the political upheaval in Edinburgh, Henry decided to bring about a practical, cost-efficient settlement by uniting England and Scotland through marriage and thus controlling his northern neighbor. Even though he had the opportunity to conquer Scotland, Henry did not consider it “because he had never intended to do more than contain the Scots and because his major interest lay elsewhere.”\textsuperscript{17} Henry’s ineffective strategy of relying on the assured lords and his decisions to demand unreasonable terms and then devastate the lowlands had the combined effect of pushing Scotland into a closer alliance with France. The “Rough Wooing” made the Scots even more stubborn supporters of the “Auld Alliance” and the Catholic Church, and united them, despite the problems of 1542-43, against the English. There was no long-term strategy of Anglo-Scottish relations even after 1542. The violent events of 1544-45 were the direct result of Henry’s plans to make war on France. As D.M. Head concludes, “It seems clear that at least from 1542 and the abortive meeting at York, Henry had aimed at settling relations with Scotland in order to turn to France. Amidst the twists of English policy this was Henry’s only consistent goal.”\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{16} Head, "Henry VIII's Scottish Policy", p.23.
\textsuperscript{17} Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, p.436.
\textsuperscript{18} Head, "Henry VIII's Scottish Policy", p.21.
Chapter 2

Scotland in the 1540's: James V and his astute cardinal

"Adieu, farewell, it cam' wi' a lass, it will pass wi' a lass,".1 King James V of Scotland muttered these famous words only hours before he died on December 14, 1542. The king was referring to the Stuart (Stewart) line of kingship that had begun when Marjorie, daughter of Robert the Bruce, married Walter Fitzalen, sixth hereditary steward of Scotland. The Stuart house had held the throne since 1371, passing the crown from father to son successively for over 150 years.2 Alas, James V had no surviving sons, as both had died tragically in 1541. However, a daughter was born to Queen Mary of Guise just six days before James died. When he learned of the news, only hours before his death, he uttered the prophecy above, expecting the Stuart line to end with the prospect of a week-old girl's long minority. The Scottish king could not have been more wrong, for the house of Stuart would hold not only the Scottish throne, but by 1603, the English one as well.

Scotland had faced a long minority for James himself only a generation earlier, and found that "the practice was for men of the same surname, whether or not they were demonstrably related by blood, to act together."3 Thus, various factions of noble families fought to control the regency while the Duke of Albany was periodically in France, and

after he had left Scotland for good in 1524. In 1528 James had to rely on a faction loyal to him to battle his stepfather, the Douglas earl of Angus, and claim his crown. Hence, the Scottish nobles, during James’ minority, had gotten a taste of the bitter factionalism that would divide Scotland in 1543.

The death of James V created a power vacuum in Scottish politics that two powerful rivals, who were also cousins, rushed to fill for their own respective factions. The first was James Hamilton, the earl of Arran, heir presumptive to the throne and a man “who had leanings toward Protestantism and who favoured a new alliance with England and with an English king who had broken away from Rome.” The second was Cardinal David Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, the late king’s chief advisor and “advocate of the old faith and the old alliance.” In January 1543 Arran was proclaimed regent and Beaton was arrested. Yet only months later, Beaton was reinstated as chancellor, and practically controlled Scotland until his murder in 1546. In order to achieve this remarkable turnaround, Beaton skillfully and ruthlessly appealed to the supporters of Roman Catholicism, those who were anti-English, and particularly his old friends, the French. He also used a very clever and astute political sense to harness both the regent and all opposing factions. Thus, together with Scottish stubbornness and Henry’s “Rough Wooing” of 1544-45, quite possibly the most influential force that kept Scotland from allying with England until 1560 was Cardinal Beaton and his conservative faction.

John Stuart, the Duke of Albany, was the Francophile governor of Scotland for a time after the Anglo-French wars of the early 1520’s.


Ibid., p.316.
However, before considering the confusing politics of 1543, one needs to be aware of the circumstances which led to Solway Moss and the internal dissention that followed. The political situation after Albany had left Scotland in 1524 almost mirrors the factionalism that was to come in 1543. James Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, "was regarded by the English as the principal obstacle to their cause," just as his nephew, David, was two decades later. The archbishop, with the support of the earls of Argyle, Lennox, and Murray, urged the Scots to remain loyal to Albany and France. But the earl of Arran, father of the future regent, joined with Queen Margaret Tudor, mother of James, to argue for an end to the boy's minority and a treaty with England. A compromise was arranged in 1525 that declared Albany heir presumptive and determined that James would remain in the care of each of the leading nobles in turn. But Archibald Douglas, the earl of Angus, refused to give up the young king, and supported by Arran and Queen Margaret, deprived James Beaton of the great seal. Thus, a pro-English party, led by Angus and his brother, Sir George Douglas, took power in 1526 and kept control of Scotland until 1528. During these years Anglo-Scottish relations remained good and Henry VIII believed that he might gain his nephew's confidence through Angus, but this was not to be. The Douglas brothers quickly alienated their supporters within the pro-English party, including their old enemy Arran and Angus' estranged wife, Queen Margaret. By 1527, the Scots began to suspect that Angus and Sir George were simply keeping the young king prisoner and Lennox attempted to rescue James but was killed in

8 Ibid., pp.38-40.
the process. The Scottish nobles were hesitant to unite against the Douglases with the
king in their possession, but in the Spring of 1528 James escaped and the brothers were
forced to take refuge in England. They would remain in exile until 1543.9

William Ferguson argues that “James V grew up hating the Douglases and
everything that they stood for, including friendship with England.”10 Ferguson believes
that this is why James’ foreign policy favored Scotland’s “Auld Ally”, France. The king
had also been quite attached to the earl of Lennox, who had been a Francophile victim of
Angus.11 In any case, James’ two French marriages in 1537 and 1538 brought France and
Scotland closer together than they had been since Albany was governor. In fact, until his
death in 1536, Albany was James’ Scottish agent to the French and to the Pope. The
policy that Albany and James would arrange with the papacy was to have a significant
impact on Scotland during the 1540's.

James began exploiting the wealth of the Church in 1531 when he asked Pope
Clement VII to force Scottish prelates to contribute ten thousand Scottish pounds
annually in establishing a College of Justice. Clement agreed and the College was
established in 1532, but most of the money went to the king himself. Most likely,
Clement was only providing that James would remain loyal to the papacy since he was
aware that a crisis was brewing in England. Thus, “James had bargained to remain true to
Rome provided he was allowed to use part of the Church’s revenues for state purposes.”12

---

9 Ibid., pp.40-41.
12 Dickinson, Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603, p.308.
Throughout the 1530's, the Scottish prelates grudgingly handed over the money to their king. However, the Scots were not oblivious to continental ideas of religious reform, and Tyndale’s translation of the New Testament into the vernacular quickly became available in Scotland. As in England, the Church in Scotland was widely felt to be too wealthy and “most of the bishops and abbots, with few and notable exceptions, now led secular and often disreputable lives to the neglect of their spiritual office.”

Many Scottish reformers actually found refuge in Henrician England, which provided the reformers in Scotland with an example of ecclesiastical and doctrinal reform. For example, Sir John Borthwick was indicted in 1540 for approving of the “English heresies” and urging them on his fellow countrymen. Meanwhile, the bishops, although unhappy with the king’s financial requirements, were more content to be abused by their monarch if it meant that he was less likely to perform an English-style attack on the Church. Thus, with the wealth of the Church being shared by the king and the Pope, official Scottish policy throughout James’ reign remained firmly attached to Rome.

Scottish nobles, on the other hand, were clearly divided on matters of religion and loyalty to the papacy. James had exploited them almost as much, if not more, than he had the Church. In his desire of increased revenues, James initiated many questionable proceedings against certain lords and earls which resulted in forfeitures of land and money to the monarchy. But the issue which would most effect Scottish politics in the

---

13 Ibid., p.314.
15 Donaldson, James V - James VII, p.44.
coming years concerned the role of the Scots nobles in James' government. For the most part, the king ran Scotland without the consent of his nobility, appointing churchmen to government posts that in England were held by the peerage. The king also neglected his nobles by delegating authority not to local magnates but to personal favorites. James' ineffective judicial policy along the borders led to increased instability and dissatisfaction there as well as in the western highlands. By 1540, James' faulty policies were causing growing political dissention. Since the king was enriching his own finances at his lords' expense, the prospects of an attack on the Church seemed propitious to some of the reform-minded nobles. A dissolution of monastic lands would provide greater revenues for both the king and the nobles while also introducing much-needed ecclesiastical reform. Not surprisingly, many nobles who fostered these beliefs supported a pro-English foreign policy as well. Gordon Donaldson suggests that before the king's death in 1542 there were two opposing factions in Scotland: one pro-French and conservative, the other pro-English and reformist.¹⁶

"Ecclesiastical disaffection apart, the events which closed James' reign in 1542 reflect a clear lack of enthusiasm, to say no more, for papal policy."¹⁷ Nowhere is this evaluation more evident than the Scottish defeat on November 24, 1542 at Solway Moss. Many of James' disaffected nobles refused to risk a counter-offensive into England after Norfolk's invasion. Donaldson surmises that the nobles' reluctance to support James stemmed from the fact that Scotland would be fighting on behalf of the papacy against a

¹⁶ Donaldson, All the Queen's Men, p.14.
schismatic England.\textsuperscript{18} James’ chief advisor, Cardinal Beaton, was in fact the most influential supporter of the invasion and pressured the king into viewing the act as a crusade. Thus, when James mustered his army, many of the nobles with Protestant beliefs did not attend and those who did only did so out of obedience for their king. When the Scots ultimately engaged the English at Solway Moss, many of the disaffected nobles chose surrender to the English over dying for a king in whom they had lost all confidence. Henry VIII would later use these Scottish prisoners to aid the pro-English group already in Scotland.

By early 1543 the Anglophile reformers were ready to seize power from the bishops and conservative nobles. Donaldson states “in later years, reformers were often divided in their personal allegiance, but at this stage the issue was so clear-cut that Protestantism and advocacy of amity with England were inseperable.”\textsuperscript{19} However, Dickinson argues that even though they were pro-English, Henry VIII’s “assured lords” constituted a third faction that worked with Arran’s reformers but had an agenda of their own.\textsuperscript{20} Ferguson admits that the assured lords did little once they returned to Scotland because what Henry asked of them “went against national opinion which was strong for independence and thus still inclined to the Auld Alliance.”\textsuperscript{21} At any rate, the long-exiled Douglas brothers returned to Scotland in early 1543 to lead Henry’s collaborators in putting pressure on the earl of Arran. In fact, Beaton was seized and jailed by the

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., pp.14-15.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p.15.
\textsuperscript{20} Dickinson, Scotland from the earliest times to 1603, pp. 316-317.
\textsuperscript{21} Ferguson, Scotland’s relations with England, p.60.
Douglasses after Arran was chosen as regent, but it was only a matter of time before the cardinal resumed his leadership role.

David Beaton had worked as a Franco-Scottish diplomat for years before becoming bishop of Mirepoix on 1537 and that same year returning to Scotland to become coadjutor to his uncle, James Beaton. He was made a cardinal in 1538 and when his uncle died in 1539, he became the new archbishop of St. Andrews. In 1543 he would be made a papal legate and, like his uncle before him, became the champion of Roman Catholicism and French interests in Scotland."22 Yet Beaton was unable to take control of Scottish politics immediately after the death of James V. Since the cardinal had been humiliated and disgraced by the Solway Moss disaster, the strong reformist faction suspended James’ testamentary depositions which would have established Beaton as the head of government. Instead, the Protestant-leaning heir presumptive Arran was named regent. On January 25, Angus, Sir George, and the other assured lords were welcomed home by Arran and the next day Beaton was warded at Dalkeith. Soon after, the Scottish parliament, on an act introduced by assured lord Maxwell, officially encouraged possession of the English bible and preaching of “the true word of God.”23 Parliament also appointed a commission to negotiate a treaty with England which was to include a marriage between young Queen Mary and five-year-old Prince Edward. On March 18 Sir Ralph Sadler arrived in Edinburgh to further King Henry’s plans and it appeared that Scotland would soon be aligned with the English.

22 J.D. Mackie, Earlier Tudors, p.405.
23 Donaldson, James V - James VII, p.64.
Nevertheless, the conservative Francophile faction had the benefit of skillful diplomacy on its side in the persons of both Beaton and the queen dowager, Mary of Guise. While Beaton was still a prisoner of the Douglases, Mary was busy organizing the conservative bishops, sowing mistrust between Arran and Sadler, and encouraging Henry VIII to make excessive demands which would antagonize the Scots.\textsuperscript{24} The queen dowager also appealed to France for aid and the French were happy to oblige by sending two Scottish exiles home to help the conservative cause. These two men, who were to play important roles over the next few years, were Matthew Stuart, earl of Lennox, and John Hamilton, former abbot of Paisley and Arran’s half-brother. By sometime around May, Beaton had regained his freedom and negotiated with the French to receive sixteen ships loaded with money and munitions.

The conservatives were now prepared to utilize political, religious, financial, and coercive methods to regain control of the Scottish government. Arran himself was known to be quite irresolute and it was said “What the English lords decide him to do one day, the abbot changes the next.”\textsuperscript{25} Nor did the Scottish nobles remain firm in their convictions, for the earls of Fleming, Bothwell, Eglinton, and Semphill had all switched to Beaton’s side by July. Politically, the earls of Argyle, Murray, and Huntley led the conservative nobles against the Douglases and Arran’s dwindling number of reformist supporters. Thus, even though the Anglo-Scottish Treaties of Greenwich were agreed to on July 1, Arran’s government was facing major difficulties both internally and

\textsuperscript{24} Ferguson, \textit{Scotland’s relations with England}, p.60.
By late summer 1543, the Scots were becoming increasingly annoyed with Henry’s overbearing attitude, and his refusal to compromise his demands molded the events which closed out the year. In August, Arran was able to get the Treaties of Greenwich ratified by parliament, yet only a week later he “suddenly re-embraced the Roman faith, did penance for his apostasy, and made Beaton and Mary of Guise, the Queen Mother, members with him in a new council of government.”26 Henry VIII then made the terrible mistake of breaking the treaty by seizing several Scottish merchant ships. This final action shattered the pro-English faction and Angus and Sir George were left to pick up the pieces. The Scottish parliament convened in December under much different circumstances than had been the case eleven months before. The conservative Francophiles now controlled Scotland and on December 11 parliament annulled the Treaties of Greenwich. The assured lords were made to forfeit their castles and the Douglas brothers, who attempted to disrupt parliament by force, fled Edinburgh along with English ambassador Sadler. As Ferguson correctly states, “Henry VIII was completely outmanoeuvred by the subtle Frenchwoman and the crafty prelate.”27

Resentful and needing to protect his northern borders as he prepared for war against France, Henry ordered the earl of Hertford to sack Edinburgh and lay waste to the surrounding area. On May 4, 1544 the English policy of coercion known as the “Rough Wooing” began as Hertford landed outside Newhaven and proceeded to march on the

26 Dickinson, Scotland from the earliest times to 1603, p.318.
27 Ferguson, Scotland’s relations with England, p.60.
Scottish capital with some twelve thousand troops. The invasion seemed to take Beaton and Arran completely by surprise: "the Scots thought that they had no cause for fear, and when in the early summer of 1544 at great fleet appeared in the Firth of Forth the Governor and the Cardinal persuaded themselves that it was only a fleet of fishing-boats returning from Iceland,". At first, the devastation of Hertford’s invasion turned the Scottish nobility against the ruling faction prompting Mary of Guise to attempt to supersede Arran as regent. Rival parliaments were summoned by the governor and queen dowager but in the end Beaton effected a reconciliation by making an appeal for unity against “our auld inymeis of Ingland." Beaton’s skillful manipulation of both Arran and Mary of Guise placed him in exclusive control of Scottish policy from late 1544 until his murder in 1546. One could argue that Henry’s “Rough Wooing” in 1544 resulted in the firm establishment of the French-supported Beaton as leader of Scotland. While the strategy of fear did lead many Scots to question their alliance with France initially, by late 1544 when Beaton successfully appealed for unity against the English, the Scots were more angry than afraid. As J.D. Mackie states, “The effect of his [Henry’s] severity was to unite all Scotland against him.”

29 Donaldson, James V - James VII, pp. 70-71.  
Chapter 3

The English Ambassador and the Assured Lords

youe and my lord your brother, with the rest of your friends do sitt so still; and much the rather mervailleth because there hath been so gret a bande and promise made by othe from one of youe to another, that youe shuld cleve togidres and never to fayle one another, but all to take one parte...And wheras youe saye that youe suffre much hurt and dammage for his majestes sake, we canne litle perceave as yet that youe have suffred any thing for his sake, but by his meanes and grat charge youe have not onely brought yourself to the restitucion of your landes and possessions, with a gret encreace of the same; but also gat such authoritye, as, whenne youe wer in it, and wisely woold have used it, youe might have kept both him and yourself from the charges which he susteyneth nowe, and have ordered the realme at his majestes and your will and pleasure.¹

- The Privy Council to Sir George Douglas
  December 1, 1543.

In the early Spring of 1543, King Henry VIII waited impatiently for some sign from his "assured" lords that they had indeed taken control of Scottish politics and would initiate a pro-English policy. Matters had become quite complicated north of the border since the unexpected death of James V in December, and Henry hoped to benefit from the Scots' misfortune. James had left a week-old daughter as the new sovereign and the ensuing political battle for the regency pushed Scotland into a dangerous state of confused factionalism. The Scottish nobles taken prisoner at Solway Moss in November - the assured lords - had taken formal oaths to promote English aims in Edinburgh and write progress reports to Henry about the northern situation. Yet, Henry had not received

¹ The Hamilton Papers, ed. Joseph Bain, (Edinburgh, 1890-1892), Vol.1, #127, pp.203-204. (Hereafter designated as HP)
any correspondence of value from the earls of Glencairn, Casillis, Bothwell, Fleming, Maxwell, or Somerville, or even the earl of Angus and his brother, Sir George Douglas, who had both formerly been in exile in England and returned to lead the pro-English party.2 Henry was all the more frustrated because he had recently agreed to ally himself with the Emperor for the purpose of invading France, an invasion tentatively scheduled for later that year. Since diplomacy was much cheaper than war, the English king had planned to use his assured lords to dispose of Scotland’s “Auld Alliance” with the French and thus lock England’s “back door” against invasion before having to cross the Channel. The pro-English party was also supposed to secure a marriage treaty between the young Queen of Scots and five-year-old Prince Edward, thereby making Scottish policy more favorable to English wishes and less likely to lead to a border war while England was preoccupied with France. That he had not heard any favorable news from his collaborators since they returned to Scotland in January was a cause of great concern for the English monarch. Therefore, on March 13, 1543, Henry ordered Sir Ralph Sadler to be his emissary in Edinburgh and work with Angus, Douglas, and the assured lords to further Anglo-Scottish amity in the earl of Arran’s new government. Henry wrote, “As Sadler has been ‘sundry times’ in Scotland and also is privy to the things promised here and to all proceedings since, no man can so well serve this purpose...to go in post to Edinburgh to reside there until revoked, and shall there proceed, according to certain

instructions sent herewith and as he thinks best." Yet, as Sadler would soon learn, Scottish politics in 1543 was a complex game of alliances and intrigues in which sometimes those who could least be trusted were those who were supposed to be assured to England. However, it was neither incompetence on Sadler's part, nor the untrustworthiness of the assured lords which ultimately doomed Anglo-Scottish relations and led to the violent "Rough Wooing" of 1544.

Sir Ralph Sadler had been sent to Scotland before, and was considered Henry's Scottish expert, but never had the diplomatic stakes been so high as they were in 1543. Either the Scots would agree to what many considered a humiliating marriage alliance and end their Auld Alliance with the French, or Henry would have to subdue Scotland forcibly before he and Charles V made war against Francis I. Yet, it seemed that each mission Sadler undertook in Edinburgh for Henry was doomed to failure from the start. Whether or not these setbacks were the fault of the ambassador himself is a question this essay will attempt to resolve, but it does appear that Sir Ralph was hindered in his embassies by a combination of poor instructions and inconceivable objectives. For instance, his foremost biographer, A.J. Slavin, admits that in 1540, "It is hard to escape the conclusion that Sadler had been sent on a fool's errand, and that not for the last time..." Indeed, again in 1541 Sadler's final embassy to James V would result in the incident at York that summer in which James failed to meet with Henry and thus

---

provoked the old king’s wrath. Much like these previous missions, that of 1543 required Sadler to push for a policy which was fundamentally against Scottish national and religious interests. Sir Ralph was a respected and quite competent diplomat, but even Paget or Gardiner would have found it very difficult to persuade the Scots to acquiesce to Henry’s consistently inflated demands.

Throughout the later 1520's and early 1530's, Ralph Sadler was employed as a clerk in the household of Thomas Cromwell, the second most powerful man in England after the fall of Wolsey. Sadler’s fortunes thus rose with Cromwell’s and in 1537 Henry himself noticed the clerk’s abilities and took him into the government. That same year Henry chose Sadler to make an embassy to Scotland in order both to survey the northern counties (in the wake of the Pilgrimage of Grace), and attempt to sway James V away from French and papal influence. It seems impressive that Henry would choose Sadler for a mission such as this, but the fact that he sent a fairly inexperienced commoner without so much as a knighthood to speak with the Scottish king also shows the relative unimportance of Scotland in Henry’s mind. Henry wrote that he chose Sadler for this mission because he could “sett furthe and with siche dexteritie conduit negotyacyons that he coulde gentilie perswade the sayde king...” Sir Ralph subsequently showed that he could conduct himself well in Edinburgh and in the presence of the Scottish king. Unfortunately, he was unable to “gently persuade” James away from the French Alliance, but Henry was still pleased with the results of Sadler’s first Scottish mission. His next

embassy in 1540 would prove to be a much more delicate matter, and one in which he was much less successful.

By 1540, James was quite content with both the four-century old Auld Alliance with France and also the state of religious affairs in Scotland. In fact, he repeatedly wrote to Pope Paul III asking that the Archbishop of St. Andrews, Cardinal David Beaton, be given a legateship which “he promises without hesitation that the Cardinal will use for the honour and profit of the realm and the church,” and that “this favour will forge the closest link hitherto between him [James] and the holy see, and none will be found readier to do all that becomes a Christian prince on behalf of his holiness and the faith.”\(^6\)

Thus, breaking with his father-in-law Francis I and Pope Paul III to embrace his untrustworthy and schismatic uncle, Henry VIII, and the largely detested kingdom of England could have hardly been further from James’ mind when Sadler arrived in February 1540 to promote just that.

In the course of several meetings at Holyrood, the Scottish king was completely unresponsive to Sadler’s anti-clerical railings and repeatedly stood up for both his cardinal and the church. It is clear that James had no intention of attacking either the church, from which he already gained substantial revenues, or Beaton, whom he relied upon as a vital member of his government. James relied upon Beaton’s counsel to the extent that he wrote to Paul III in 1540 stating “The Cardinal of St. Andrews is frequently distracted by the royal service from his pastoral office, desirous as he is to fulfil it. He

has chosen master William Gibson...to deal promptly with pastoral affairs. James thoroughly approves...”7 During the late 1530's the king had been Beaton’s strongest supporter for a Cardinalship when the prelate was still Bishop of Mirepoix but also James’ most respected diplomat to France. Thus, noting the frequent correspondence of James to Paul III concerning the Scottish king’s obvious dependence on Cardinal Beaton both as a supportive religious leader and as an important link to France, Sadler’s mission in 1540 was a true "no-win" scenario.

Even after his failure to turn James against Beaton and the Auld Alliance, upon his return to London Sadler was made principal Secretary of State. At this point, Sadler’s fortunes diverged from those of his mentor, Thomas Cromwell, who was executed three months after Sadler’s failed mission to Scotland. A successful embassy might have saved Henry’s chief minister from execution, and A.J. Slavin theorizes that “the mission of 1540 was perhaps conceived in desperation by Thomas Cromwell as part of his doomed effort to retain control of the council and the machinery of state.”8 If the 1540 mission was taken “in desperation” with the knowledge that there would be little chance of success, this would explain why Henry would appoint Sadler to such a high office in the wake of an apparent diplomatic setback. Also, if the 1540 mission was believed to be nearly impossible, Sadler’s 1541 embassy must have been considered almost as difficult. That year England moved closer to an Imperial alliance against France and Henry aspired once again to make war on French soil. But if Anglo-French war was to be the case, it

7 Ibid., p.397.
8 Slavin, Politics and Profit, pp.92-93.
was necessary now more than ever to try to bring Scotland over to the English side. 

In July of 1541, Sadler returned to Edinburgh with instructions to persuade James to meet Henry at York sometime later that summer as a show of peace and friendship between the two kingdoms. Doubtless Sadler purposely waited until Beaton was away in France before proceeding to convince James to agree to the meeting. Yet, James’ consent was probably due less to Sadler’s persuasiveness than a sincere wish to keep the peace along an increasingly violent border. Although Pope Paul III had sent James a sword with the advice to cut away schism in the Church, James himself seemed to have felt less inclined to make war against his uncle. Sir William Eure wrote to Henry late that summer that “my espials say, the Scots are in great fear because of your Majesty’s coming to York. The Spirituality, great Lords, Borderers, and the Out Isles desire war; but the King and his Privy Council... peace.” James even sent his envoy Thomas Bellenden to England to secure safe conduct passes for late September. However, it appears that Beaton and the Scottish bishops must have dissuaded James from going into England without so much as a note to Henry. Sir Thomas Wharton, the Warden of the Marches, wrote to the Council in early September that

there was no likelihood of his [James] coming to England, for he promised the Cardinal, at his passage into France, not to go into England until he had answer from France to the Cardinal’s message...the laird of Crage, usher of the Chamber, think, with the Cardinal and bishops, that the king should not come into England.

---

Later correspondence from Francis I to his English ambassador Marillac stated that "He [Beaton] assured me that the king of Scotland would never be there [York]."12 The message that James waited for from France was hinted at in a letter from Beaton to James stating that "Francis is as affectionate to James as to any of his own sons, and thanks him that he has not condescended to any meeting with the king of England. If the king of England were to invade James' realm, Francis would defend him."13 Thus, if James was assured that France would aid Scotland in case of an English attack, it might help to explain the reason why James failed even to offer Henry an excuse as to why he never came to York. In any case, Beaton's influence caused Sadler's mission to fail again and prompted an angry Henry scathingly to write to James that "The Scots have made spoils and raised fire in England...These attemptates declare rather open hostility than any such friendship as James lately expressed...speedy redress to be made, the lack or delay of which should force him to provide other means to protect his subjects."14

The failed meeting at York led a humiliated and vengeful Henry to a new policy toward Scotland: if James would not peacefully ally with England, he must be forced to do so. The next year, 1542, witnessed England preparing for war and an "amicable loan" taken which was collected with the knowledge that the money was to be used against the Turk and their adherants (namely France, and therefore also Scotland).15 Yet the border defenses were in poor shape and it took the better part of the year before the English

14 LP, Vol.16, #1207, p.561.
15 LP, Vol.17, #261, p.140.
commanders could supply enough men, munitions, and victuals to support a northern army. On August 24, the privy council wrote that “the King has determined to send the duke of Norfolk with a main force against the Scots...and not only defend the realm against the Scots but invade Scotland.” Henry’s official reasoning was that the Scots had broken the peace along the borders, refused to return English heretics (Catholics seeking asylum in Scotland), and had humiliated the honor of England by not keeping the meeting at York. In actuality, the English had broken the peace twice before the Scots finally retaliated, and there were also Scottish Protestants who had taken refuge in England to escape punishment from Beaton. When James would write Henry asking for a continuance of peace, the English king reckoned that his nephew’s requests were attempts to stall for time, which in actuality they probably were. Then came the defeat of an English raiding party at Haddon Rig, which was used by Henry as an excuse to declare war on Scotland that October. Norfolk immediately invaded, but owing to the time of year, could only manage to burn Kelso and some farmland before returning to England.

In the meantime, James pleaded with Pope Paul III to aid Scotland, saying:

Henry will pour out his vast new and ill-gotten resources to force James into his impious courses, or to wreak heavy vengeance upon Scotland. The pope is urged to do all he can...If...the danger to Scotland is neglected, the evil may spread to the destruction of the Christian common weal.17

Yet, neither the Pope nor Francis I, who was busy warring against the Emperor, came to Scotland’s defense in 1542, forcing James to take matters into his own hands. The result

17 The Letters of James V, p.444.
was the ill-fated and poorly organized Scottish retaliation in November 1542 which ended in the Scots being routed at Solway Moss by a numerically inferior English force. The capture of some twelve hundred Scots, including a few dozen nobles, followed by the unexpected illness and death of James V three weeks later, set the stage for the complex Anglo-Scottish relations of 1543.

The plan to subdue Scotland by using captured Scots nobles to promote pro-English policies seemed to be the brainchild of Henry himself. He wrote to Wharton on November 30 that he wanted “20 or 24 of the very best of the Scots now taken conveyed to London before Christmas...only such as are noblemen or of the king of Scots’ Chamber, or, of such substance to be worth sending.”\(^{18}\) Henry wined and dined the surprised Scottish Lords and allowed them to carry their swords like free men. He presented them with gifts and bid them stay in some of London’s best manors with his own councillors’ households. After “splendidly entertaining” them, Henry offered them a way to be back in Scotland before the month of January was out. In return for their freedom, they would be bound to Henry by solemn promises to advance certain English aims in Scotland, known as the four articles. The most important of these articles was the securing of a marriage treaty between young Mary Stuart and Prince Edward, followed by the delivery of the Scottish heiress into Henry’s keeping in England. Furthermore, ten of the prisoners thought to be the most trustworthy (or most treasonous depending on the way one views it) subscribed to an additional article, called the secret article. The earls of

---

\(^{18}\) *LP*, Vol.17, #1148, p.628.
Casillis and Glencairn, lords Maxwell, Somerville, and Gray, Robert Erskine, and Oliver Sinclair, among others, all agreed to assist Henry in taking the crown of Scotland should young Mary die. In addition, these men pledged to place the chief strongholds in Scotland into the king of England’s hands.19 In addition to the prisoners of Solway Moss, three influential Scottish exiles also swore oaths to Henry and sought to regain their lands following the death of James V. The first was the earl of Bothwell, who subscribed to the four articles, but was felt to be too inconstant to know about the secret article. By contrast, the other two exiles had been in Henry’s service for a number of years and were expected to coordinate the pro-English party upon their return to Scotland. Both Archibald Douglas, the earl of Angus, and his brother, Sir George Douglas, subscribed to the secret article and quickly became very much involved in influencing Scottish policy.

As the new Scottish regent - James Hamilton, the earl of Arran - well knew, the Douglas brothers had had a long history of cooperating with England before the events of 1543. Archibald, the earl of Angus, had married Henry’s sister, the queen Dowager Margaret Tudor, after her first husband James IV had died on the field at Flodden. In 1526, after a series of disputes over which family would act as regent for James V, and following Governor Albany’s departure to France, Angus kidnapped the young prince and took control of Scottish politics. From 1526-1528, a Douglas-led pro-English party ruled Scotland and kept very friendly relations with Henry until James escaped and the

19 LP, Vol.18, Part 1, #22, pp.10-12.
Douglas brothers were forced the flee to England. In fact, the Douglasses themselves participated in the 1542 battle at Haddon Rig, where they fought on the English side. They wrote to Henry of the defeat saying “The scttys ar warray wantoun, and becaus of thys gryt mysfortoun that we have had, it makis thaim the prouder...Trewly it wos nocht tha that wan the feyld, it was we that losd it with our mysordour.”20 James referred to the brothers as “the Douglasses, James’s rebels,”21 and in 1538 he had a number of the Douglas family still residing in Scotland put to death. It was obvious to the Scottish king that the Douglasses were treasonous and working against him, and it appears that he was correct. Angus was clearly in Henry’s pay by 1543, receiving a pension of approximately three hundred pounds, while Sir George Douglas frequently kept the English informed of happenings in Scotland through contacts he met with in northern England from time to time.22 Thus, the Douglas brothers became the natural leaders of the assured lords, for all of those in Scotland who considered either Arran or Beaton their enemies flocked to Angus and Sir George. They were also the two Scots whom the English implicitly trusted from the beginning, since they had been so long in England working for Henry. Nevertheless, Sadler would later have trouble deciding if Angus and Sir George were in fact the most, or the least, “assured” of the pro-English group.

As January 1543 wound to a close and the assured lords journeyed north to return to Scotland, their good faith towards Henry was already beginning to come into question.

20 HP, Vol.1, #128, p.159.
The English Lord Lisle wrote to Henry on the 14th saying that "he spoke with Angus secretly, who said their conclusion was... not to issue the proclamations, but to bring the king’s purpose to pass by the aid of their friends (and perhaps of some money)." Thus, the assured lords had decided to change their agreement with Henry even before they left England! The proclamations were supposed to be made on the borders in an attempt to "assure" more Scots and Lisle added that "upon 'reknowlege' of the king's determination the proclamations shall go forth." The Scots also opposed sudden action against the new government and preferred reasoning with Arran instead of overpowering him. These modifications appeared logical at first, but could soon be viewed as the start of a series of deceits and outright lies the assured lords employed to remain in favor with both Henry and Arran.

The editor of Letters and Papers, James Gairdner, perhaps put it best when he remarked that "Henry was strangely sanguine if he thought that the pledges given him by a number of Scottish prisoners in his hands - eminent, as these were, in rank and station - constituted anything like a safe guarantee to secure him complete control of the government of Scotland." Yet, the answer was quite simple: complete control of Scotland was not foremost on Henry's mind in late 1542 or throughout 1543. He only wanted to make sure that the Scots would not attack England while he was preoccupied with his main objective, the invasion of France. It took Henry only six days from Solway
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Moss to write Wharton requesting the best of the prisoners be sent to London, so not a
great deal of planning went into his "assured lords" strategy. In any case, the king needed
to save money. Hertford's invasion in 1544 was a measure of last resort and cost Henry
plenty, but political treachery obviously cost Henry very little and meant that he could
invest more energy and money in southern England, closer to France. Finally, Henry's
thinking concerning Scotland stressed short-term objectives. It would be well enough if
he could gain control of Scotland but in 1543 all he wanted was the infant Mary in his
safe keeping, which assured him a measure of security against the Scots. Henry should
have realized that the Scots would soon resent his demands to deliver Mary, but he did
not care as long as he had Mary in his hands by the time Charles V was ready to begin the
projected invasion of France. The king's short-term aims are revealed by the fact that he
became anxious over events in Scotland less than two months after his assured Lords
returned. Henry wanted quick results, and ordered Sir Ralph Sadler to travel to
Edinburgh to make something happen. But Sadler was thrown into a situation that the
English had failed to understand, and thus faced overwhelming demands on one side
while receiving contradictory information from an irresolute governor on the other.
Nevertheless, it appeared that the pro-English party had a chance of meeting its objectives
early in 1543, before completely falling apart by December and forcing Henry to switch
from "Gentle" to "Rough" Wooing.
Chapter 4

The Diplomacy of Sir George Douglas

Sir Ralph Sadler arrived in Edinburgh on March 18, 1543 with orders from Henry VIII to advance English aims in the new government and also discover what, if any, progress the assured lords had made in Scottish politics.¹ The English ambassador quickly found that the Scottish Parliament he had hoped to influence had already adjourned, without his knowledge, just days before. Sadler immediately sought out Governor Arran, who assured him that all was well and that favorable relations with England would continue. Yet, “there was a great company of noblemen and gentlemen about him, which pressed so near him, as it seemed to me, that either he would fain have had me in some other place, where he might have secretly communed with me, or else intended to take counsel afore he entred farther with me.”² Perhaps Arran’s hesitation to speak in detail with Sadler had something to do with the Parliament that had just met, where instructions for peace with England were drawn up for Scottish ambassadors en route to London. These instructions, in some cases, strongly contradicted the demands Henry VIII had been making from Westminster, and leads one to the conclusion that the bishops and the conservative nobles Argyle, Murray, Huntley, and Methven had

persuaded Arran to adjourn Parliament before the arrival of the English diplomat.\(^3\) However, Sir George Douglas assured Sadler that the Scottish Parliamentarians “had agreed all well together”\(^4\) for peace with England and proceeded to inform Sadler of the hard work the assured lords had undertaken since their return to Scotland in late January. Nonetheless, Sir George was also forced to account for the failures the pro-English party had faced, including Parliament’s refusal to deliver young Mary to England and the assured lords inability to block a petition calling for the freedom of Cardinal Beaton. But, before considering Sadler’s initial conversation with Douglas, it would be best to go back and clarify the important events in Scotland prior to Sadler’s arrival.

Upon James V’s death on December 14, 1542, a power struggle began in Edinburgh between the heir presumptive, James Hamilton, earl of Arran, and the late king’s chief advisor, the conservative, pro-French Cardinal Beaton. A new government was proclaimed from James’ will on December 19 committing Arran, Murray, Argyle, and Huntley to the regency with Beaton acting as lord chancellor. Yet, almost immediately Arran had a falling out with the cardinal, reportedly calling him a “false churl” and drawing his sword on him.\(^5\) This incident probably was related to a “black list” of heretics that Beaton had drawn up for James and that was said to include Arran’s name. Arran was indeed a “great favourer of the scripture”\(^6\) and was said also to favor better relations with England over France. In contrast, Beaton was allegedly involved in

\(^3\) List of instructions to Scottish diplomats in *SSP*, pp.59-63.
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giving his consent for the murder of an English agent, Somerset herald, and stating that he “had authority from the Holy Father the Pope to interdict the realm of England...”\(^7\).

Thus, recognizing Beaton’s contradictory outlook, while also being politically ambitious himself, Arran accused the cardinal of forging James’ will.

Arran was clearly hesitant to share power with Beaton, and in the aftermath of Solway Moss, for which Beaton was partially blamed, he reckoned that the time was ripe to take control of Scotland in the name of the nobility. Arran capitalized on the memory of James’ unpopular policies toward his nobles to show that the will would have bypassed the realm’s natural leaders and given Scotland over to the cardinal and his churchmen. Therefore, Arran sought the support of the lay earls against Beaton, and also sought the position of governor to give him control of the Council of Regency. The many references to the twenty-six year old Arran as irresolute and weak, in addition to rumors concerning his expendability, make it seem that those who agreed to support him hardly feared him as much as the more formidable cardinal.\(^8\) Sir George Douglas had written Lisle as early as December 17 saying that “Arran was but a simple man, and th’ other were but fools, so that the strongest of the field were like to obtain the crown.”\(^9\) But those earls who supported Arran as one of their own did not expect him to sway toward Henry and Protestantism as much as he would once the assured lords returned. In any case, Arran took advantage of a reformist backlash against the old government and was
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named governor and regent on January 3, while Beaton was relegated to a minor position on the council. Meanwhile, Mary of Guise, the queen dowager and mother of the heir to the throne, waited in Linlithgow to determine what her role should be during the regency.

By early 1543, Sir Richard Southwell and Sir John Dudley, Viscount Lisle, were Henry’s main contacts with Scotland. At first, Henry took Arran’s appointment as governor as an affront to his own suzerain rights in Scotland, which he had untactfully announced to the Scots as soon as he had learned of James’ death in December.10 Then, Henry changed his mind and issued a second set of instructions to Southwell, ordering that Arran be informed that he was expected to co-operate with England, while also adding that “the sayd Sir Richard must also remembre that the nature of the Scottes is full of gelousy and envye, and therfor albeit he is ordred to take the advise of therle of Anguishe, Erle of Glenkerne, and Lord Maxwell who will be the chief men of trust in this consultacion.”11 Thus, Henry, although not as concerned with the Scots as with the French at this time, was nonetheless taking nothing for granted north of the border and tried to intimidate Arran from the start. This action underscores Henry’s short-term way of thinking about Scotland, for intimidation might not have been the most productive policy to use on a man already said to favor English ties. In a mixture of friendliness and veiled threat, Lisle even had a Scottish pursuivant inform Arran that “if he knew the King, he would rather be his subject than to be king of all Scotland.”12 To build up even
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more pressure on the governor, the assured lords had agreed at Darlington to "reason with Arran and, if he will not be persuaded, to oppose him".13

True to their word, Angus and his brother journeyed straight to Holyrood to meet with Arran in late January. The two had been in exile for fifteen years and Beaton opposed letting them reenter Scotland, as did Argyle and Murray, on the grounds that the two had been "long nourished" in England. But Arran nevertheless welcomed the Douglasses back with open arms, restoring their lands and immediately placing them on the Council of Regency.14 That Arran would be so amiable toward Angus and Sir George was surprising since the Hamilton and Douglas families had been rivals for decades, especially after the 1520 incident known as "Cleanse the Causeway" when the Douglasses forcibly ran the Hamiltons out of Edinburgh. But it seemed that Arran was quite forgiving toward James' old enemies, just as he was rather spiteful toward the late king's main adherants.

At the suggestion of the assured lords, the day after the Douglasses arrived in Edinburgh, Arran allowed Angus to arrest Beaton and detain him at Dalkeith, a Douglas stronghold. It was reported that "therle of Anguishe and his broder ruleth the rost aboute the governor, and that all the lorde which were prysoners here dependithe moche uppon therle of Anguishe."15 Whatever the extent of their influence, the Douglas brothers did at least persuade Arran to consent to Beaton's arrest, and face the inevitable opposition from
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the bishops and conservative nobles. Was the cardinal’s imprisonment merely a show put on for the English? The answer will have to wait until the motives of Arran and the Douglases are more fully understood.

Arran himself remains somewhat of a mystery. Most historians classify him as having been irresolute and unfit to govern. A.J. Slavin describes Arran as “a weak man and a trimmer”. Henry VIII once wrote that “he is a man that seeth not deepliest in these matters, all must be laid before him,” while Mary of Guise called him “a simple and inconstant man who changed purpose every day.” Yet, as J. Gairdner writes, “It was not that the governor was weak, though perhaps he did not mind being so considered.” It must be remembered that Arran was successful in both gaining the protectorship of Scotland for himself, and also overriding the opposition of Beaton and the conservative lords to the reentry of the Douglases to Scotland. The arrest of Beaton, a cardinal and papal legate, whether or not it was meant as a facade, was a bold act in itself. Arran had indeed written to Lisle to inform Henry that “if sure of quietness with the King [Henry], he would put hands on the Cardinal and reform the whole church as the King has reformed England.” As for Arran’s inconstancy, any man placed in his position was predictably going to be viewed as somewhat irresolute, given that Henry was on one side, the conservative Francophiles on the other, and the assured lords somewhere in between.
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Neutral Scots, of course, were playing off all sides. The year 1543 would certainly find Arran to be quite changeable with regard to religion, policy, and loyalty, but, as with most other Scots involved in this game, he was only looking out for himself and the continued independance of Scotland. These two objectives characterized Arran’s decisions and actions throughout the rest of his governorship, for without the one, he could not have had the other.

Following the arrest of Cardinal Beaton, public opinion in Scotland toward Governor Arran abruptly changed for the worse. When the Douglas brothers had first returned to Scotland, they encountered a great number of supporters who were either pro-English and reform-minded, or simply unsympathetic toward the old government. But after Angus’ arrest of Beaton, these supporters seemed to dwindle drastically. Priests in Edinburgh refused to sing mass, christen children, or bury the dead in the wake of Beaton’s imprisonment, which angered the Scottish people considerably.21 People began saying that “the Governor was a good man till he rounded with th’erle of Anguishe and his brother.”22 Because Arran had appointed a Protestant named Thomas Guilliame to preach daily at Holyrood and openly supported reform of the church as opposed to traditional religion, people began to acknowledge the influence of Angus and the others, now referred to as “English lords”.23 Yet, regardless of whether or not Arran truly wanted to effect an English-style reformation, he succeeded in keeping all his rivals at least
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somewhat contained.

As Arran attempted to please the English, Mary of Guise ended her silence at Linlithgow and had secretly written to her uncle, the duke of Guise, asking for French aid. Almost immediately, rumors quickly spread throughout Scotland and England that a major French force was on its way to Edinburgh. In order to keep the duke from assuming power over young Mary and possibly Scotland itself, Arran continued to show that he was ready to compromise with the assured lords and thus gain Henry's favor. This would in turn make the French, who were already hesitant to provoke England into open alliance with the Emperor, less likely to take over matters in Scotland. It would additionally, and perhaps more importantly, cause Henry to suspend his raids into Scotland if he believed that the Scottish governor was agreeable to English demands and working in England's favor. Lisle was indeed ordered to end all military incursions into the lowlands after repeated letters from Arran asking "to grant an abstinence of four or five months" while peace negotiations proceeded "with goodly haste".24 A truce was finally granted on February 11 by the English privy council, and Arran was no doubt content with his successful bid to stall for time. Arran seemed to know that Scottish politics were still too disjointed to ally with either France or England and risk losing Scottish control of Scotland. The governor also realized that he could both consolidate his own power and please the English if Beaton was detained. That the cardinal was not held more tightly by the Scots, and easily escaped to St. Andrews only months later,
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reveals not only the prelate’s individual influence, but also Arran’s policy of remaining friendly toward all sides. No doubt the Scottish bishops, the conservative lords, and the French were less incensed by Beaton’s relative freedom than they would have been if he were held in a dungeon, locked in chains. That Beaton did in fact free himself from the governor’s quite lax authorities shows the changing situation that Arran himself faced throughout the year.

On March 12, 1543 the Scottish Parliament convened in Edinburgh for the first time since the death of James in December. Both the pro-English party, led by the assured lords, and the pro-French party, led by the bishops and conservative nobles, arrived in force to make their beliefs and complaints known to the new governor. The opposition to Arran’s pro-English stance had already met near Perth only days before, harshly condemning the governor for his impious actions, calling for the release of Beaton, and making threats to boycott the Edinburgh Parliament. The Douglas brothers wrote to Lisle that “the Governor replied that he would grant no such unreasonable desires, and sent a herald charging them on pain of treason to come and serve for the commonwealth.” On account of Arran’s bold command, the oppositionist lords and bishops decided to sit at Parliament, and the policy agreed upon was indeed meant to preserve the Scottish commonwealth.

The most important business the Parliamentarians faced was the drawing up of conditions for peace that their ambassadors would convey to the English privy council in

London. Contrary to Henry’s demands, the Scots refused to deliver young Queen Mary to England and agreed that she should be kept by her mother - the queen Dowager, Mary of Guise - and chosen Scottish Lords. They did agree to the proposed marriage of young Mary to Prince Edward of England, but under the following heavy stipulations:

it is to be desired that Scotland stand at liberty and be governed by the present Governor until our Sovereign’s “perfect age,” without any impediment from England...The Queen being of perfect age and married in England, this realm shall always have the name of Scotland and its old liberties, and shall be governed by a governor born of the realm, and have its own laws...the present governor shall remain governor for life...After the marriage all the strengths of Scotland shall remain in the hands of noblemen of the realm, at the Governor’s pleasure...26

These instructions were quite unlike those that the assured lords had pledged to promote, and gave Arran a considerable amount of power in determining the future of Scotland. Arran was in fact officially made second person of the realm at this time, a move that was for the most part supported by the oppositionist lords and bishops in attendance. However, the assured lords did gain a victory against the Scottish bishops when Lord Maxwell introduced an act that officially encouraged preaching of “the true word of God” and the reading of the English bible.27 Yet, the “clergie and the commynaltie” battled back with three petitions to Arran:

The firste is, that the Cardinall may be restored to his libertie and former estate...the second, that the state of the clergie may stand and contynue in suche condicion as yt ys at this present, and not followe the cast of England; the thirde, that the yonge Quene...
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may be put into the keeping of iiiij noble men of realme till suche tyme as she shalbe of yeres of consent to marye... ²⁸

Thus, the Scottish Parliamentarians of March 1543 - pro-English and conservatives alike - sought primarily to safe-guard the continued independence of Scotland during Mary’s minority. Over those few days, the Scots showed an unlikely display of unity, at least on the most important point of remaining loyal to their young queen. It was under these circumstances that Sadler arrived in Edinburgh on March 18, knowing that a brief Parliament had just taken place, and wanting to consult the assured lords on exactly what had occurred at Holyrood.

After his aforementioned meeting with Governor Arran, Sadler was escorted back to his lodgings by Sir George Douglas, whom he began to question concerning the political situation in Scotland. Sadler discovered that Douglas was quite eager to speak about all that had transpired since the assured lords had returned to Edinburgh. He began by saying:

I have laboured with all my power to do the King’s majesty service, and will do while I live, wherein I have always pretended outwardly the commonwealth of Scotland, and spake not much of England, because I would not be suspected...And now...all is well, and we have kept our parliament honourably agreeing well together, and have concluded...that the King’s majesty shall have the marriage of our young mistress, and that we shall be assured friends to England for ever... ²⁹

From the start, Douglas hinted at the double-dealing he was later accused of, conveniently informing Sadler that he had to actively work for Scotland’s behalf lest he
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be thought an English agent, which in reality he was supposed to be. Douglas was quick to exaggerate the friendliness of the Parliament toward England, but failed to mention that the marriage arrangement came with a series of conditions that he knew Henry would find completely unacceptable. However, Sadler was no fool, and proceeded to accuse Douglas and the other assured lords of not fulfilling their promises, asking "'Wherefore I pray you...how be the noblemen affected to his majesty? Which be assured of his majesty's party? And why have ye not written more frankly from time to time?'"  
Douglas responded that he and his brother had indeed written periodically, but the real problem was that the assured lords "were never, nor yet be able to perform" the oaths they swore to Henry. He added, "...though the most of them be well affected...the rest...are mean men, and the others that be of any power are slipt and gone."  
Yet, Douglas wished to assure Sadler that he and his brother still had many friends, and that the pro-English party was the strongest faction "so long as we keep the governour that he start not from us; for by him we must work all things for the King's purpose, unless we should do it by force, whereunto the time serveth not."  
As can be seen, Sir George at the time was very much opposed to taking over Scottish politics by force. Later in the discussion, he again reiterated this point by stating, "if there be any motion now to take the governour from his state, and to bring the government of this realm to the King of England, I assure you...there is not so little a boy but he will hurl stones against it..."  
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Thus, Douglas counseled caution, time, and patience; options utterly contrary to Sadler’s instructions from Henry and the privy council.

The rest of the conversation between Sadler and Douglas exposed not only Sir Ralph’s instinctive abilities, but also Sir George’s hesitancy to proceed in treachery as strongly as Henry would have liked. Sadler informed Sir George that:

Mr. Douglas, the King’s majesty hath had large offers...to have the child brought into his hands, with also the strong holds, according to your promises; and if your ambassadors should come with mean things, not agreeable to his highness, you are a wise man, ye know what may ensue thereof.34

Sir George seemed to take Sadler’s veiled threat quite seriously, and quickly sought to both console English doubts and establish himself as having been true to Henry. Stating a position often repeated by the assured lords over the next few months, Douglas replied that “his majesty shall have the marriage offered to be contracted...and having that first, the rest of his desires may follow in time.”35 The consensus of the pro-English party was that, once the marriage contract was concluded, English expectations would soon be placated by a favorable Scottish policy. It was a hopeful stance, taken by those who were powerless to take the impractical English demands any further. Before leaving, Douglas spoke frankly to Sadler, saying, “all things cannot be done at once”36; for he was obviously frustrated by the lofty goals set by the English king. He argued that even if promises had been made, circumstances would not allow the assured lords to perform
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them. Thus, Douglas believed the English demands to be impossible to fulfill either politically or by force, but still felt obligated to promote English aims to Arran in order to keep his standing with Henry. Perhaps to regain Sadler’s confidence, Sir George boasted that, “I have so insinuate myself with the governour, that I am in chief credit with him; I have caused him pull down the cardinal, who was, and would have been, chief enemy to the King’s purposes...”37 But no matter whether or not Sir George Douglas actually deserved the credit for influencing Arran toward a pro-English stance, it was obvious from the discussion that he was either unwilling or unable to follow Henry’s instructions. Which of these was truly the case would explain, at least from one angle, the failure of Sadler’s mission in 1543.

Sir George Douglas was said to be a man of spirit and talents, and most likely himself led the loose coalition of assured lords. But, Sadler soon discovered that the assured lords were less a coherent party than a group of self-interested peers who distrusted one another as much as they did their conservative, pro-French counterparts. Sir George took the credit for bringing Arran over to the pro-English group, but was Arran truly an Anglophile? His stance on religion and the arrest of Beaton made it seem as if he were on England’s side, but one can see where these decisions were in his and Scotland’s best interests, and hardly prove that he was either Henry’s or Douglas’s political puppet. The governor no doubt favored better relations with England, but not to the point where he would risk his governorship to bring it about. Douglas did seem to
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have some amount of influence over Arran, but most of his power was used over his own brother. A.J. Slavin stated that “His influence over his brother Angus was complete...”\textsuperscript{38} More importantly, Lord Somerville himself insisted to Sadler that Angus, "be too much led and directed by his brother George,"\textsuperscript{39} The editor of Sadler State Papers, Arthur Clifford, adds that Godscroft, the Douglas family historian, recorded that Angus’ common answer to any suit was “we shall advise with our brother...”\textsuperscript{40} Thus, since the Douglas brothers were considered by the English to be the natural leaders of the pro-English party, and knowing that Sir George Douglas had direct influence over his brother Angus, it would seem that the weight of the assured lords’ success or failure rested firmly on the shoulders of the younger brother.

From his personal standpoint, George Douglas had much to gain, but also much to lose if he decided to appear overly pro-English upon his return to Scotland. He would receive a substantial English pension and probably an important post in an English-run Scottish government should Henry gain control of Scotland, yet he could just as easily lose all the power and land he and his brother had regained in January if Henry should fail. While aligning with the conservative nobles could offer prestige and security to the Douglas brothers, Henry could only offer the promise of future rewards if they followed an impractical set of guidelines which would undoubtedly alienate their friends and followers, as it already had when Beaton had been arrested. By playing both sides, Sir
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George had the luxury of reaping the benefits from both England and Scotland, without having to choose between the two. He could work on England’s behalf to an extent, counseling Arran to keep Henry’s favor, while also securing his prestige in Scotland by appearing to support young Mary as well. It was a politically safe manoeuvre for Douglas, as it was for Arran, to attempt to please all sides and thus stay independent of constraining alliances. By remaining free to choose the most beneficial options which presented themselves in this complex web of diplomacy, Douglas could take advantage of both English money and Scottish power, while being able to fall back on his reinstated Scottish lands should Henry lose Scotland to the French. In addition, Scottish nationalism had begun to swell up in the people following the arrest of Beaton and so-called “corrupting” of Arran by the “English” lords. Henry’s demand for the delivery of both the cardinal and the young queen to England was too much to ask of the traditionally stubborn Scots. Thus, by March of 1543, it could be argued that Douglas was both unwilling and unable to promote English aims to the fullest. He was definitely pro-English in his beliefs, but only to the extent that his political treachery was realistically within reason. He seemed to have had no moral qualms whatsoever in selling out his fellow Scots to the English, but Henry’s demands were far beyond even what Douglas felt comfortable supporting before his peers. Whether he in some way felt a deeply hidden loyalty to Scotland is impossible to know, but on a practical level, Douglas was as equally trapped by Henry’s diplomacy as was Sadler, and to a lesser extent, Governor Arran. All three were in one way or another competent supporters of better relations with England, and all were faced with the impossible objectives of the English king.
Chapter 5

The inconstant Governor and deceitful queen Dowager

By the end of March, 1543, Cardinal David Beaton was back in the safety of his own castle at St. Andrews, having supposedly bought off his former jailkeeper, Lord Seton, with French gold. Yet, for the lack of measures to prevent it, apparently Governor Arran and the pro-English party had not the strength nor the desire to keep the cardinal captive, even though Sir Ralph Sadler had made Henry’s wish for the continued imprisonment of the prelate perfectly clear to both the governor and the Douglases. Sadler himself admitted that the governor “lacketh here good ministers for that purpose...”, after Arran had assured the ambassador “that he [Beaton] was in as sure prison in his own house, and as straitly looked unto as he was before...”. Arran must have known that his own words were untrue, but was under significant pressure from the conservative lords and the clergy to free Beaton while still wanting the situation to appear as favorable as possible to the English. Circumstances were slowly starting to change in the Francophile party’s favor, and the governor was more content to act amicably towards Beaton and his supporters than to risk his position by firmly following advice from the English and their assured lords either to transfer the cardinal to a more pro-English stronghold or deliver him to England. Sir George Douglas hesitated to follow English instructions in this situation as well, failing to take custody of Beaton and personally
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move him to Tentallon Castle as Sadler had wished. As Henry had complained to Sadler on March 30, "how George Duglus hath handled that matter, himself best knoweth." In fact, Sir George's position as the governor's most influential advisor had already been undercut by Huntley and the conservative earls.

A series of effective diplomatic moves by the queen dowager, Mary of Guise, had placed the Catholic, pro-French conservatives in a much better bargaining position by April, 1543, than they had been only two months before. First, the queen dowager, with the help of conservative earls such as Huntley and Murray, sought aid from France in the person of Matthew Stuart, earl of Lennox and next in line after Arran to the Scottish throne. As a part of their secret correspondence, Lord Methven wrote Mary concerning the invitation offered Lennox to act as a counterbalance to the assured lords. He stated, "Remeber that contenuall lawbouris be maid that Lennox be had gif it ma be but inconvenyent, and gif he can be had hastilie depesche in France...and remember that ther departing be sacret kepit...and I sall thar efter cum and speik wyth you an quhat sarvice I can salbe don wyth deligens." Thus, the queen dowager was very much involved in the covert diplomacy of the pro-French faction, acting as its virtual leader until Beaton was again at liberty, and welcoming Lennox and three shiploads of French money to Linlithgow on April 5. But Mary was perhaps most effective in her diplomatic
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deceitfulness; attempting to present Sadler and the English with a skewed view of Scottish affairs by stating her support for the marriage alliance with England while urging Henry to be even more demanding of the Scots.

Sadler met with the queen dowager on March 22 in an attempt to better understand the Scottish situation and also inform her of the benefits of the marriage alliance. In this last respect, his instructions must have seemed as futile as the ones he had received in 1541, for if he could not turn James against France, how was he expected to turn James’ French widow against her homeland and into the arms of her husband’s worst enemy? Yet, Sadler was hopeful that Mary would understand Henry’s offer to be in the best interests of her daughter and Scotland as a whole. For her part, Mary hoped to lull the English into a false sense of security, thereby stalling for time as Lennox sailed to Linlithgow and Beaton worked to obtain his freedom. Thus, Sadler “found her most willing and conformable in appearance to your Majesty’s purpose, for the marriage of her daughter to my lord prince’s grace; and also, that your Majesty should have her delivered forthwith into your hands and custody...” As the term “in appearance” implies, Sadler was somewhat hesitant to trust that a French princess would be so gracious as to hand over her only child to the English. Arthur Clifford surmised that Mary wished to draw Sadler into some plot for abducting the young queen, then would have let the plot be known, raising the already high popular indignation toward the pro-English party. But this was not her only goal, for Mary also sought to win the trust of the English over Arran
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and the assured lords by informing Sadler that “the governour and council have
determined in their parliament, that your Majesty shall not have the child delivered into
your hands, for sundry considerations alledged amongst them.” Thus, Mary forced
Sadler and the English Privy Council to question the motives of both Arran and the
assured lords who had allowed the measure to pass. Even Douglas had not been so frank
as to go into detail on the reasons the Scots would not deliver the young queen, but Mary
was quick to point them out to Sadler, making it seem as if she was the more honest
source of Scottish information.

The queen dowager directly condemned Arran for working against the interests of
England, thereby attempting to sow dissension between the ambassador and the governor,
and also provoke Henry into making increasingly threatening demands. Nevertheless, the
queen dowager’s facade fell for a moment and her true loyalties were revealed when she
added that “The cardinal, if he were at liberty, might do much good in the same...”.
After their conversation had ended, and Mary had shown Sadler the healthy future Queen
of Scots, Sir George Douglas was summoned to speak with the queen Dowager alone.
Douglas afterwards correctly told Sadler that “She was nothing willing, nor comformable,
to your majesty’s purpose...”. Douglas saw through Mary of Guise’s charade, and tried
to convince Sadler of this fact, but the ambassador, hopeful to have finally found a way in
which to convey young Mary to England, submitted to London only a mild rejection of

7 Ibid., p.85.
8 Ibid., p.86.
9 Ibid., p.88.
her sincerity when he wrote:

Thus your majesty may perceive, that some juggling there is; which, by the grace of God, a little time shall reveal unto your majesty. And, for my part, if my wit and experience would serve me as well as my good will, I should sooner decipher the same;\textsuperscript{10}

One of Sadler's main faults throughout his mission to Scotland was his optimism that the Scots would realize the benefits of a marriage alliance with England and an English-style religious reformation. Perhaps his view of the Scots was a bit too condescending, for he should have understood the uncomfortable position in which Henry's demands placed the pro-English party and all who wished an Anglo-Scottish alliance to come about. Nevertheless, the queen dowager's comments drew an equally hopeful response from the English privy council:

\begin{quote}
In the queen...the king's majesty judgeth to be a frank and plain manner of proceeding, such as motherly love to the surety of her child should of reason easily perswade her. In the rest, the king's majesty is in a marvellous perplexity what to say of them, being their deeds so repugnant to that the queen saith, with the strange fashion of removing of the cardinal, so denied at one time, doubted of afterward, and then granted by sir George Douglas...\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

Thus, Henry and the council felt that Mary of Guise spoke more truthfully than their own assured lords. Mary had successfully deceived not only the privy council and King Henry, but also Sadler, who was sceptical at first, but later remarked that "wherein also I was fully perswaded upon my last conference with her,"\textsuperscript{12} This stands as yet another

\begin{footnotes}
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\item\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p.100.
\item\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p.112.
\end{footnotes}
example of the “quick-fix” nature of Henry’s Scottish policy. To avoid the trouble of
sending an expensive army to Scotland on the eve of the French invasion, the English
happily accepted that a French princess would side with them. Sadler was instructed to
meet with the queen Dowager again to discover what lords she believed would be willing
to deliver young Mary, and then secure their commitment by “alluring them with
promises and rewards...”\textsuperscript{13} It seemed that those in London already had begun to distrust
their pro-English party, and felt that an equal number of empty promises that had been
given them would eventually lure someone to bring the infant queen across the border.
Henry and his councillors especially felt betrayed by Sir George Douglas, who they
blamed for allowing Arran to allow Beaton to go free.

After having been in Scotland for less than a week, Sadler too was becoming
suspicious of the motives of Arran and Douglas. The ambassador had urged the governor
and Sir George to move Beaton to the Douglas castle of Tentallon, an impregnable
stronghold where he would be more closely confined. Yet, the cardinal was put under the
less-than-watchful eye of the Catholic Lord Seton and a small garrison at Blackness.
Douglas explained to Sadler that Arran had suggested moving Beaton to St. Andrews so
as to be able to confiscate the castle and the gold within it for the governor himself. To
Sadler’s objections against the plan, Sir George responded “That he is in as sure prison
there, as in any place in Scotland,” and later, Arran promised “That, whilst he lived, the
cardinal should never have liberty, nor come out of prison”.\textsuperscript{14} The governor added that

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p.101.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., pp.89-90.
the move was also meant to persuade the Scottish clergy to resume their religious duties for the upcoming Easter holiday, duties which they had abruptly ceased performing upon Beaton’s initial arrest. At that point, Sadler wrote “But if the cardinal shall have his liberty, I shall never trust him [Douglas] nor the governour.”.15 However, Beaton did gain his liberty because, for one reason or another, his jailor Seton never occupied St. Andrews castle and the cardinal was left a free man inside a fortress protected by his own men. Beaton proceeded “to lead the clergy in making an offer of money and plate for the defence of the realm against England.”16 The cardinal’s personal authority further strengthened the resurgent conservative party, while Sadler was left with worthless assurances from the very men who were supposed to be his allies.

On April 1, Sadler dined with Governor Arran at Holyrood and proceeded to question him about the queen dowager’s comments made only a few days before. Arran made it a point to entertain the English ambassador with “great cheer and good countenance”, and requested Sadler to write to England to procure “some books of the New Testament and Bible in English, and also the statutes and injunctions made by the king’s majesty for the reformation of the clergy, and extirpation of the bishop of Rome...”.17 When informed of Mary of Guise’s ill words towards him, Arran prophetically replied to Sadler “That I should find her in the end (whatsoever she pretendeth) a right French woman,” admitting that:

15 Ibid., p.89.
17 SSP, p.108.
She studied nothing more than to set the king’s majesty and him [Arran] at pick; and so to keep both realms from unity and agreement...as she is both subtle and wily...And still she laboureth...by all means she can, to have the cardinal at liberty; 18

Thus, Arran had correctly ascertained Mary of Guise’s ruse as well as Douglas, but the governor’s opinion of the situation was not taken seriously by the English for they were still questioning his loyalties. Arran had pledged that Beaton would never go free and that Seton was well-bound to him, yet the cardinal’s imprisonment had become but a nominal reality. Since the queen dowager and the governor both professed to be on England’s side and accused the other of working against the marriage alliance, the ambassador knew that one of them must be in league with Beaton and the conservative earls.

After his dinner with the governor, Sadler wrote that “I cannot tell which of them to trust, but refer the same to your wisdos...” 19 One could blame Sadler for not realizing that both of them might have been lying for different reasons - Mary for France and the Auld Alliance, Arran for the continued independence of Scotland and the safety of his own position as governor - but even if he had understood this, he was already defeated by his own king’s outrageous demands. The assured lords were not powerful enough to take control of Scotland without a figurehead such as Arran, the queen dowager, or Beaton, so Sadler’s only other diplomatic option if he could not place his trust in someone substantial would have been to admit defeat and request that an army be

18 Ibid., pp.111-112.
19 Ibid., p.112.
sent to place the pro-English party in control. Remaining optimistic that a peaceful alternative could be found, Sadler continued his mission to work out the marriage alliance, and hoped, like the assured lords, that all the rest would follow. Unfortunately for him, the English privy council’s instructions to Edinburgh only revealed its ignorance of the situation, and moved an already faltering Arran even closer to Beaton’s side.

Around the middle of April, Arran first began to show signs of leaning toward the pro-French party. The governor was only a man of twenty-six and was perhaps beginning to realize the risks involved in maintaining a pro-English agenda. The delivery of the young Queen to England would have been nearly impossible for Arran to undertake and remain as governor, especially since the few followers he now had - the assured lords - refused to risk it themselves. The arrest of Beaton had cost Arran a great deal of popular support, as had his open embrace of Protestantism. The conservative, Francophile party had always had a larger base of supporters, and was now strengthened by the leadership of Beaton, the arrival of Lennox, and the bargaining power of both French gold and the church’s own supply of wealth, which was safely locked away at St. Andrews. While Arran remained on good terms with Sadler and Henry, it was also clear that he was increasingly telling the English what they wanted to hear. Arran would commonly refer to Henry’s obviously impractical aims as “reasonable demands” while saying to Sadler that he felt the Pope to be “a very evil bishop.”

It cannot be proven that Arran directly gave Beaton his freedom, which indeed would have been unlikely given

---

20 Ibid., pp.92&94.
their prior associations, but the governor certainly could have provided a better guard than Lord Seton, or allowed the assured lords to move Beaton to a stronger fortress. However, public opinion would not have stood for the latter option, as the assured lords were already considered "English lords" and corruptors of Arran. The most practical move for the governor was to allow Beaton to be moved, then attempt to console English fears that he would gain his liberty, which was inevitable once he was back at St. Andrews with his gold and means of open correspondence. Arran was not, as Douglas finally called him in frustration, "the most wavering and unstable person in the world," but he was also not blind to the fact that the nobles who supported Scottish nationalism far outnumbered those who backed England, Protestantism, and a marriage alliance which might make Scotland into an English satellite much like Wales or Ireland. Thus, from mid-April through the month of May, Arran more openly sided with the conservative party, while still keeping England docile by feeding her claims she wanted to hear. It was clear that Arran was no longer forming his own policy, but reacting to the situation put in motion by the conservative leaders.

Regarding the remainder of the assured lords, apart from Sir George Douglas, one has to wonder if their role in Anglo-Scottish affairs included as much double-dealing as their more prolific comrade. It has been shown that Angus had no real individual motives apart from those of his more intelligent brother, and mirrored Sir George's comments when he told Sadler that "there was no doubt but your majesty once having the interest in

\[21\text{ Ibid., p.105.}\]
the young queen, all the rest of your grace’s desires should follow.”22 The old exile perhaps put the Douglas family’s situation best when he admitted that “but yet...I am not fully established here; I am but newly restored to my possessions, trusting to be every day more and more able to serve his majesty.”.23 But, as shall be seen, Angus did perform all the duties that he was realistically capable of executing on behalf of England, and by late 1543 and early 1544, was one of the few assured lords still trusted by Henry and still fighting the conservatives.

In contrast, William, fourth earl of Glencairn, and Gilbert Kennedy, third earl of Casillis, were both “Lutheran in sympathies and anglophile in antecedents,”24 yet Glencairn died in 1548 in receipt of a French pension and Casillis died at Dieppe in 1554 while arranging the match between young Mary and the Dauphin. Lord Maxwell also held Protestant leanings and proved his worth by introducing the very liberal religious legislation at the March parliament, but he too held questionable loyalties to England as time passed. Bothwell and Fleming had almost immediately rounded with the conservatives upon their return, and Lords Somerville and Gray were the only other assured lords of note left in the pro-English party by April 1543. But, if his collaborators had begun to abandon Henry, the English king was certainly not making any pretense of supporting their cause. While most of the assured lords favored Protestant religious reform, Henry had openly allied with the Catholic Emperor Charles V and in the process,

22 Ibid., p.74.
23 Ibid., p.75.
24 The Scottish Correspondence, p.xxv.
placed a hold on Protestant preaching in England. Furthermore, the blustering attitude evident in Henry's correspondence must have made them think twice about handing over their homeland and young queen to such a vengeful man. As Arthur Clifford states in Sadler State Papers, "The violent expostulations here enjoined must have had the natural effect of disgusting those of the noble captives who remained attached to Henry's cause, and alienating such as were wavering. Sadler, accordingly, hesitates at delivering these reproaches."²⁵ Like the Douglases, the remainder of assured lords hardly wanted to risk both their positions and possibly their lives in support of an England which seemed to care little for them, as her religious policy, foreign affairs, and bullying demands increasingly suggested. Yet, perhaps the main obstacle to the continued obedience of the assured lords was the attitude of the Scottish people, and their growing resentment towards the English marriage alliance. The possibility that the influential and quite zealous cardinal, backed by the majority of the Scottish nobility, might lead the masses against the impious "English lords", at best driving them from Scotland, at worst executing them as traitors, could not have been far from their minds.

In the wake of Lennox' April landing in Scotland with a party of French soldiers, Sadler counseled caution to Henry and the privy council, feeling the time was not right to resort to effecting changes by force.²⁶ Yet, Beaton was meanwhile producing an even greater threat to the English cause in the person of John Hamilton, the abbot of Paisley and Arran's half-brother. Beaton had convinced the ambitious churchman to travel to

²⁵ SSP, p.103, footnote.
Edinburgh and persuade Arran to capitulate to the conservative party. It seems that the cardinal hoped Hamilton would have an effect on Arran much like the one Sir George had on Angus. Yet, it was not that Arran did not wish his half-brother to come to Scotland, for Sadler admitted to the privy council that the governor “much wanted” him there, even though he must have realized that Hamilton was a strict churchman who would certainly not support an alliance with England. If Arran had suspected that his individual power would be stifled by the abbot’s arrival, he would probably have informed Sadler of this and asked that a safe-conduct for the prelate not be given. This and the fact that rumors were spreading concerning an influential position for Hamilton make it seem that Arran actually wanted his clever half-brother’s counsel, and in turn was not a pawn in Beaton’s plans but a willing participant. Sadler was in fact the real pawn here, but without reliable sources of information, he was correct in admitting to Henry that “the state of affairs is very perplexed...”

The remainder of the month of April witnessed the true victory of the conservative Francophile party over the disaffected and disunited pro-English party even though the marriage alliance with England was still to be ratified by the Scots in July. On April 19, Sadler wrote to Henry that “the Governor was now ruled by his brother the Abbot of Paisley, and seemed no way disposed to accede to the King’s propositions...” John Hamilton was made chief advisor upon his arrival in Edinburgh and soon after,

---
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Arran dismissed the Protestant preachers at court whom he had supported since late January. Sensing that Sir George Douglas would no longer be effective in counseling the governor toward English aims, the privy council instructed Sadler to undergo a strategy which resulted in Arran moving even closer to Beaton and the conservative earls. Sadler was instructed to inform Arran that should Beaton declare him an illegitimate child, the French agent Lennox could become the new regent. It was widely known that Arran's father had undergone a complicated divorce, and Sadler was to show the governor that the Scottish nobility thought "he was neither wise, constant, nor politick, and had no title to the crown of this realm; for he was a bastard undoubtedly." The ambassador explained that Lennox had come to Scotland on Beaton's behalf to challenge the governor for the regency. Being the leading church official in Scotland, the cardinal could conceivably call Arran's legitimacy into question and thus hand the regency over to the man next in line to the throne. While the queen dowager, and not Beaton, had invited Lennox to Scotland, the conservative party no doubt had this strategy in the back of their mind, but had not openly pursued it prior to Sadler's conference with Arran. In any case, this attempt to frighten Arran over to the English side seemed to have had the exact opposite effect. Instead of moving against Beaton, which would have been dangerous to his governorship, Arran chose to move closer to the conservative party, thus ensuring his continued position as director of the regency.

As the month ended, Sadler received word from Henry "that your majesty hath

30 SSP, p.151.
determined to alleviate and disburden me of the office of secretary...”31 Although the official reasoning for Sadler’s removal as co-Secretary of State (with Thomas Wriothesley) was that Henry could not afford an absentee secretary, it would be naive not to believe that his demotion had something to do with his failed efforts in Scotland which by then had only resulted in Beaton’s freedom and Arran’s growing separation from the pro-English party. A.J. Slavin insists that “At a crucial time in the intrigues in Scotland, Sadler’s labours were hampered by his dismissal...”32 However, this merely exemplifies yet again how the king and privy council hindered the success of their ambassador to Scotland.

In order to reveal the constantly changing circumstances surrounding Sadler’s mission in 1543, one has only to consult his personal account of the political episode. As previously stated, Sadler wrote on April 19 that Governor Arran was in no way disposed to accept Henry’s demands. Yet, less than two weeks later, on May 1, Sadler wrote to Henry that "the Governor is now wholly on Henry’s side," and optimistically believed Arran’s claims that the marriage alliance with England would be swiftly concluded.33 However, the English ambassador was well aware that the Scots could prove deceitful, and shared his true feelings of the situation with the Lieutenant of the North, the Duke of Suffolk, when he surmised:

Nevertheless, the state of this realm is so perplexed, that it is hard to judge what will follow; for all this while the feares of

31 Ibid., p.168.
32 Slavin, Politics and Profit, p.119.
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our warres hath made them sit still and agree togethir. But when the pece shalbe concludid, it is not unlike that the warre which nowe goes on will begin here among themselfes in earnest, the realm being divided as it is into sundrie partes.\textsuperscript{34}

Since England and Scotland were still officially at war with only a fragile truce keeping the peace, both the conservative Francophile party and the assured lords urged that Sadler request the English privy council to extend the truce until July 15. The Scottish nobles from both political groups stated that the extension would provide them with more time to debate Henry's demands; of course it would also give each side additional time to consolidate its power. As Sadler pointed out in his letter to Suffolk, it was far from clear which party could take control of the kingdom after the threat of war with England abated. Yet it became more obvious day by day that the conservative bishops and earls had more popular support than the pro-English nobles, with the possible exception of the merchant community, which saw in a treaty with England new markets and safer waters. The conservatives appealed to the traditional views of most Scots, both in religious terms and also national sentiment, as they fanned the age-old hatred of the English by accusing Henry of wanting to make Scotland his own. Throughout the early summer of 1543, that skillful politician and persuasive diplomat, Cardinal Beaton, was clearly the central player in the Fancophile party. The Scots were becoming violently anti-English and in one instance, Sadler and his English servants were fired upon in the garden of his Edinburgh residence. The ambassador informed the privy council of another unfavorable sign when he wrote "I am privily advertised, that the cardinal hath made such earnest

\textsuperscript{34} SSP, p.216.
labour by friends unto the said governour for his favour, that he [Arran] hath been thereby
induced to forget and mitigate a great piece of his displeasure towards him [Beaton]...".35

Yet, as the month of July 1543 approached, Sadler had good reason to feel more
confident about the eventual success of his mission. Arran, slowly turning toward the
conservatives but still solely in control of the government, had agreed to offer modified
conditions of the English demands to Henry, and assured Sadler that the king would not
refuse them. Glencairn and Sir George Douglas were sent to London in May with this
latest Scottish response to Henry's demands, and returned with a set of similarly harsh,
but somewhat more flexible conditions.36 Primary among these involved the delivery of
the young queen to England, which would still occur, but would be postponed until the
child was approximately ten years of age. Apparently, Sadler had been effective in
urging Henry to be more conciliatory, for on May 6 he had pleaded that "All had been
done that could be in furtherance of the king's wishes, whom he strongly urges to accept
the terms to be laid before him by Glencairn and Douglas.".37

Throughout the days of May and early June, the Scottish nobles met to debate the
modified English demands. Conservative earls such as Murray and Argyle told Sadler
that they were not altogether against the marriage as a tool for peacefully allying Scotland
with England, but added, "until the same shall be so united, by the consummation of the
marriage, they will spend their lives to preserve the liberty of this realm, which would be

35 Ibid., p.222.
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If these words were true, some of the most conservative nobles were quite open-minded concerning an alliance with England, so long as Scotland remained free. Thus, it appears to have been Beaton and the Scottish bishops who actually represented the anti-English ideology of the conservative party. However, Sadler was instructed to use increased threats of force to better urge the Scots to accede, and surely by this time both nobles and prelates had realized that Henry's patience would not last much longer. Finally, on June 8, a Scottish Parliament consisting of both Francophiles and Anglophiles agreed that,

> Our sovereign lady shall be delivered to the King or the Prince, his son, at her age of 10 years...The perpetual peace to be like the last...that whomsoever either party shall comprehend shall not enjoy the benefit of that comprehension if the same detain any land, possession, or pension from the King or from Scotland...\(^\text{39}\)

Yet the negotiations were far from over. Henry still had to agree officially to the terms, ratify them in the English Parliament, and send the draft treaty back to Edinburgh for formal ratification from the Scottish Parliament before the marriage alliance and peace treaty became a reality. Thus, the political wrangling continued into the summer of 1543 and if anything became more confrontational.

Sadler knew that Beaton could present the greatest threat to the ratification of the treaty, and with peace being so seemingly close at hand, he urged Arran to make good on the threats he often uttered:

> That if the peace were concluded, he would not fail to pursue

\(^{38}\) LP, Vol.18, Part 1, #482, p.290.
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both the cardinal and the said earl of Lennox...But of force he must
suspend and stay his proceedings in that behalf, till he see how
all things shall stand between these two realms; till which time
he may not conveniently make any great stir within this realm.40

Yet, after all this talk of how Beaton would be captured and punished, Sadler was of the
opinion that "the Governor seems to wax cold in the prosecution of him and Lennox."41
Sir Ralph's intuition was correct, for Arran had no intention of arresting the cardinal, and
most likely lacked the support needed even to attempt it at this stage. Arran was once
again practicing his policy of safe diplomacy; putting off an important action till the
English made the first move and granted a peace treaty.

In order to place their goals in Scotland on more firm footing, Henry and the
English privy council instructed Sadler to offer bribes and rewards to Arran and the
assured lords in return for their continued allegiance. Sir Ralph thus provided Casillis,
Glencaim, Maxwell, and Somerville with three hundred marks apiece, and granted the
earl of Marshall one hundred pounds sterling. Casillis even informed Sadler that the
conservative earl of Murray would perhaps be swayed by English gold. Yet, these added
incentives were no match for the resources of Beaton and the Francophile party, or even
the government itself under Arran. Sadler had remarked that none were rich in Scotland
save for the clergy, and Gordon Donaldson admits that:

Henry's policy of tampering with the allegiance of the Scottish
magnates had failed to maintain a party, if only because others
could counter his financial bids...the Scottish government could
offer inducements in the shape of tacks of crown property, while
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the cardinal could grant feu charters and offer ecclesiastical patronage, and in the background there was France, whence pensions could come to the well-affected.\footnote{Donaldson, \textit{James V - VII}, pp. 72-73.}

That Henry was being as "cost-efficient" as possible with his Scottish policy has been made clear, thus his hesitation to give large amounts of money to men who were by this time very suspect in their true loyalties. Henry had once described the Scottish nobility as a group of "wild beasts, sometimes hunting in a pack, sometimes tearing each other to pieces; but governed...whether separate or united, only by a greedy ferocity."\footnote{J.A. Froude, \textit{Reign of Henry the Eighth}, vol.4 (London, 1875), p.306.} Still, the English king was becoming increasingly impatient to quickly - and cheaply, which meant peacefully - conclude the marriage treaty with Scotland. To this end, Henry went so far as to offer Princess Elizabeth's hand in marriage to Governor Arran's son. Of course, this plan would have served the double-purpose of assuring that Arran would not match his son with the young queen of Scots, and also that he would more importantly remain steadfastly allied to England as the Anglo-French war drew nearer. Yet, Arran must have realized that the Scottish people would certainly not have approved of their governor being in such league with the English, and for that matter, neither would the conservative bishops and earls whom Arran was being careful not to upset. He answered Henry by humbly saying that as long as Scotland remained free when the treaties were settled, he would desire the marriage.\footnote{\textit{LP}, Vol.18, Part 1, #395, pp.231-232.} As with his threats toward Beaton, the governor made it seem as if everything the English desired would be taken care of once the peace treaty
was concluded. Thus, Arran succeeded in placating both sides while still keeping his personal options open. As J. Gairdner wrote of him, “the way he received the King’s great offer hardly indicates such weakness as was so generally imputed to him.”

Stalling for time in order to put off restricting decisions, while making sure to keep England content enough not to invade and wreak havoc on the land - these were the ultimate goals of Arran’s government throughout the summer of 1543. No matter that Arran supported Protestantism and English-style reformation, self-interest was his primary consideration. Even as the marriage alliance and peace treaty proceeded, the governor took steps to fortify both his and Scotland’s position against English incursion. First, soon after his half-brother, the abbot of Paisley, arrived in Edinburgh to be his chief advisor, Arran entered into a clandestine agreement with the abbot and Cardinal Beaton that would secure financial stability for his oft-brokered son. Supposedly, this bargain included a simoniacal transaction in which Arran’s son would gain a sizeable church pension for life, contingent on his entry into the holy orders. Thus, by late April the governor was already building favor with the conservatives, while still working with Sadler to bring about the marriage alliance with England. Yet, one must assume that as of late April, Arran was no longer acting in good faith towards the English. It seemed Arran had no strict preferences as to which side he entertained, and this observation is further proven by his actions on May 14, when he sent a secret correspondence to Pope Paul III committing “the kingdom to the protection of his Holiness, whom he begs to
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undertake the defence of its liberty and privileges...". But why would Arran commit Scotland to papal interference while moving to finalize a treaty with England? Even more puzzling, why did the conservative earls and bishops - including Beaton - so abruptly agree to Henry’s modified demands?

It appears that the governor, along with the Scottish bishops and most of the nobility, agreed to continue the marriage negotiations throughout May and June for no other reason than to avoid a potentially devastating war with England. It had been less than six months since Solway Moss, and a strong English force led by Wharton had been stationed on the Scottish border ever since that time. Henry had been threatening for months to invade if his demands were not met, and only the optimistic counsel of Sadler and the assured lords that the situation was under control had prevented him from driving Arran out of Edinburgh and placing Angus in control of the government. Yet, there was also the English king’s troublesome financial constraints which led him to favor diplomacy over invasion. In any case, most Scots were still afraid of the English king’s power, and the nobility certainly did not want another war. However, the Scottish bishops were already preparing for conflict. Beaton had called a convention of the clergy at St. Andrews near the end of April, one that placed among its goals the obtaining of French military aid and the bribery of the neutral Scottish nobles to ensure their allegiance to the conservative cause.

Still, the Scots were not ready to fight a war with England, and had to solve their
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own political problems before preparing to do so. This was the mission of both the conservative party and the government in May and June; not wary acceptance as Henry believed but a new unified level of deceit, meant to keep the English off-guard and on their own side of the border. As A. J. Slavin surmises, the peace would signify “the end of foreign intervention in their affairs, leaving Scot free to fight Scot in diehard combat...”.\( ^{49} \) In other words, without intricate plans to do so, conflicting parties of Scots were nevertheless unified in the one purpose of appeasing the English long enough so that they could settle their own affairs. Arran and Beaton remained enemies, but they both realized it would be foolish to provoke Henry into a needless war when consenting to a marriage ten years hence would probably keep the English king satisfied for a bit longer. The ever practical Sir George Douglas perhaps stated it best when he remarked that “we being unprovided for war, gain by this treaty ten years of peace; during which, king Henry or his son, or the queen, may die, or the parties coming of age may refuse each other, or matters may so stand that the match may be concluded on more equal terms.”\( ^{50} \) This explains the lack of protests from the most anti-English conservatives - the bishops - at the June parliament. Rome was already sending a papal legate to aid Beaton and focus European attention on Scotland’s plight. The cardinal himself even added to the amicable facade toward England by claiming to support the marriage alliance and further confusing an English privy council that was desperate to find someone in the whole of Scotland

\( ^{49} \) Slavin, Politics and Profit, p.124.
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whom they could trust.

Yet, nearly three months after pledging that he would no longer trust Arran if Beaton were set free, Sadler continued to support the governor and the assured lords, believing, as J.A. Froude surmised, that “it was possible that they were still partially honest, and had broken their promises as much from inability to keep them as from unwillingness.”51 But the ambassador had already spent too much time waiting on the governor to act, and both his and Arran’s inaction had made it possible for the Francophiles after the disaster of Solway to mend themselves into a much stronger political force than the pro-English party. While Beaton had been busy building an impressive coalition of bishops, nobles, and foreign allies, Arran had been busy stalling the English, but losing many of his original supporters. He did still have a number of loyal retainers, including the assured lords, together with the governmental resources to call on many more. However, the governor had already misread Seton’s trustworthiness, if he had ever believed Seton to be loyal in the first place. By late June months of endless negotiating had resulted in the conservative bishops and earls substantially outnumbering the Anglophiles. Nevertheless, the draft of the marriage treaty was approved by the Scottish Parliament.

In this atmosphere of betrayal, the Treaties of Greenwich were signed by Henry, Douglas, and Glencairn on July 1 and perceived by Sadler as a diplomatic victory.52 In the final version agreed to by Henry, young Queen Mary would not be delivered to
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Scotland for another ten years, and Scotland itself was not forced officially to relinquish the Auld Alliance with France. Yet, peace was granted and formally the two kingdoms were to be allied to one another, provided the treaties were ratified within the two months stipulated. Yet both Henry and his ambassador had sorely misjudged the strength of their pro-English party in Scotland. Sadler was too blinded by relief and optimism to realize that Beaton and the conservative Francophiles would never really support the treaty, and could now take steps to further consolidate their power since English interference was no longer a threat. That Henry cared little about Scotland once he gained their neutrality was evident over the next few months, as the English never bothered to ratify the treaties, concentrating instead on preparations for the military campaign across the Channel. The fact that the marriage alliance with Scotland was less about English sovereignty than short-term political objectives is obvious when one considers that on June 22, nine days before the imminent Scottish treaties were signed, an anxious Henry finally felt it safe publicly to declare war on France.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{LP}, Vol. 18, Part 1, \#754, p.423.
Chapter 6

The defection of the Governor and the failure of English diplomacy

To Sadler's dismay, both English and Scottish jubilation over the signing in July of the Treaties of Greenwich was short-lived and the superficiality of the alliance became increasingly apparent as the summer wore on. Only two months after the signing of the treaties, what was left of the eroding Scottish amity toward England disintegrated and Sir Ralph was forced to flee Edinburgh. The English Lord Warden, William Parr, had seemed to grasp the volatile situation in Scotland better than Sadler or Henry, and soon after the treaties were signed began to write of alarming signals concerning the rapidly changing circumstances across the border. In a early July dispatch to Suffolk, the Lieutenant of the North, Parr wrote,

the hoole multitude of Scotlande...be all bente and determyned rather thene they woll condissende and aggree at any tyme to delyver thereire yong quene into England, or to conffourme themyselves to other covenauntes touching that purpos, to stande in ennemytie and to die upon the same.\(^1\)

Through his position as Warden of the Marches, Parr received intelligence from English and Scottish spies in the pay of England. Far from the political intrigues of Edinburgh, Parr could effectively gain information on which side the Scottish nobles and commoners were supporting: reformist pro-English or conservative, nationalistic pro-French. In another of his frequent reports to Suffolk, Parr estimated that "the commonalitie in every place through Scotlande is clerelie geven and leanethe unto hym [Beaton] and his

\(^1\) *HP*, Vol.1, #397, p.557.
adherantes" and other than the assured Scots, "the rest of Scotlande, both spirituell and temporall, is against the governour...". Yet, it appears that the king and his chief Scottish diplomat chose to ignore this information, instead placing all their hopes in the fact that Arran and the assured lords could, as they themselves had been saying all along, bring Scotland under control now that the treaties for peace had finally been signed.

While different religious attitudes still separated the supporters of each political faction, it seems that as the year progressed, the split became more nationalistic in nature. In a July dispatch to the privy council, Suffolk, Parr, and Cuthbert Tunstall, the bishop of Durham, related the opinions of a trusted Scottish informant who believed that "the Scots will never have their Queen 'come in England' and will rather die than 'be under any other King than one of their own'". To better understand the nationalistic fury of the Scots, Scottish historian Robert Mason suggests that they interpreted Henry's blustering claims to their homeland as meaning that the English king wished to create a "colonial empire" of Greater Britain. Henry had already claimed suzerainty over Ireland and Wales, and the Scots believed that an alliance with England would only force their kingdom into this English empire where they would have to acknowledge the English king as their superior. This response to English saber-rattling was far from new, and had persisted from on one hand the reign of Edward I, and on another less concrete level, the fictional legend of Brutus created by Geoffrey of Monmouth in 1136 to justify English superiority over the island's peoples. Mason states that "there was much in the Brut tradition to irritate the

---

2 Ibid., p. 556-557.
3 LP, Vol.18, Part 1, #868, p.482.
Scots. In particular, there was the claim that the Kingdom of Scotland was nothing more
than a dependency of the English crown."\(^4\) Of course, Henry did not do much to allay
Scottish fears in late 1542 when he released the pamphlet entitled *A Declaration,
Conteynyng the Just Causes and Considerations, of this Present Warre with the Scottis*,
which argued for "the trewe & right title that the Kinges most royall maiesty hath to the
soverayntie of Scotlande."\(^5\) Thus, Mason contends that the Scots resisted English
demands to bow to their feudal superior both militarily and ideologically throughout the
years before, during, and after the 1540's.\(^6\) This innate fear and hatred of the hostile
intentions of the heretical English king who wished to subjugate both their religion and
their homeland was no doubt exacerbated by an influential Scottish clergy determined to
break the unnatural English alliance signed on July 1, 1543.

In another of his many worrisome letters to Suffolk, Parr stated that "all whiche
the Governour of Scotlande promyseth to the Kingis majeste is but craft, frawde and
falsitie, for the governoure never entendeth, nez is able, to perfourme his promyses...".\(^7\)
Parr had reason to make these accusative remarks, for he was using intelligence gained
from his Scottish spies which would seem to prove that Arran was purposefully deceiving
Sadler and Henry concerning the marriage treaty:

\(^4\) Mason, "Scotching the Brut: Politics, History and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century
Britain", in Mason, ed., *Scotland and England 1286-1815* (Edinburgh, 1987),
p.62.
\(^6\) Mason, "The Scottish Reformation and the Origins of Anglo-British Imperialism", in
Mason, ed., *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*,
\(^7\) *HP*, Vol.1, #397, p.555.
And he [Arran] aunswered his counsaill againe, 'Ye knowe the King of Englande is a mighty prince, and we not able nez of powre to resist his puissance, and for that cause I thinke and take it best by fare wordes and promyses, with the concluding of this peas to deferre and put over the danger that might otherwise fall upon us; and in the meane tyme the yong quene maye chance to die or other change maye happene, wherebie Scottlande may be relieved and more able to resist Englane.'

If the information was true, Arran was in fact deceiving the English and did not plan ever to deliver the young queen into English hands and risk losing the kingdom. But he also could have been trying simply to justify the English alliance. Perhaps not surprisingly, Arran's statement concerning the treaties was very similar to the one spoken by Sir George Douglas. This explanation was probably common among the pro-English party, for they could not very well admit that they supported the English king and the marriage for it's own sake. Yet, the sheer incompatibility of the English demands on Scotland were proven by the fact that Henry's most influential collaborator and the heretofore pro-English governor of Scotland had both expressed cynical and unsupportive views concerning the alliance. Nevertheless, in early July 1543 Henry and the privy council were confident that a strong and lasting agreement had been made by men who wanted it to work. Even Sadler, who should have known better the situation, dismissed Parr's comments as falsities and prepared to get the treaty ratified by Scotland's Parliament as soon as possible. On July 7 Parr wrote that a servant of Sir George Douglas informed him that "the Governor will turn to the party of the Cardinal and Lennox, and only awaits the coming of George Duglasse ('because of a promise made to him') to forsake Angus

---

8 Ibid., p.555.
and him and revolt to the Cardinal,". Later that autumn, the English would begin to take
the Lord Warden's analysis seriously, but by then it was too late to influence events north
of the border.

Soon after the draft treaties were signed and returned to Scotland for ratification
by Parliament, Beaton's conservative pro-French faction, which had been relatively
compliant until then, finally began to display its true motives. For two months, Beaton
had persuaded the English that he supported the goal of peace and friendliness between
the two kingdoms promised in the treaties. Yet, now that the main threat of English
violence had abated in the jubilation surrounding the signings, Beaton and the clergy
could step up their pressure on Arran and begin to move Scottish politics in their own
direction. Arran, still playing both sides, appointed a Convention at Edinburgh for the
ratification of the treaties. However, this time it was rumored that the conservative
bishops and earls would not appear as they had in June. Next came the news that Beaton,
Huntley, Argyle, Bothwell, and Lennox were preparing a force which would meet at
Stirling, proceed to Linlithgow to take possession of the young queen, then head toward
Edinburgh to remove the governor from power. While it seemed that Scotland was
possibly on the verge of civil war, Parr, and a number of historians, believed that the
whole conflict was being "staged for English eyes". If this was the case, the deceitfulness
of the Scots was far beyond what Sadler could have been trusted to determine. It is more
likely that this was the point from which Arran and Beaton would begin to eventually

unite against the English. However, if Arran and Beaton did come close to starting their own little war, it must have been that growing feeling of nationalism for their homeland, combined with political practicality, which kept the two most powerful men in Scotland from destroying each other.

The conservative faction based their rebellion on the "defence of the Faith and Holy Church, and preservation of the liberty of the Realm."\textsuperscript{10} Considering the gold they spent to secure allegiances, these reasons undoubtedly persuaded many in Scotland to unite against the reformist governor and his "English Lords". In response, Arran "summoned his friends and warned the country in the Queen's name to resist this rebellion,"\textsuperscript{11} while he and Angus prepared their own force to assemble outside Linlithgow. The governor then wrote Glencairn and Douglas, who were still in England, that insurrections had arisen against the cardinal and wishing them to inform Henry that his aid was required. However, Arran made it clear that it was not military aid he desired, but monetary aid, and "he said he had men enough, and would not bring Englishmen into the realm unless his adversaries brought in Frenchmen...".\textsuperscript{12} The cardinal's party arrived at Linlithgow with about six to seven thousand armed men, yet they were unable to take possession of the castle which held the two queens. It seems that Linlithgow was brilliantly guarded by those most loyal to the governor, which suggests that Arran remained a respected and powerful figure even as the conservative faction grew in

\textsuperscript{10} LP, Vol. 18, Part 1, #897, pp.490-491.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., pp.490-491.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., pp.490-491.
opposition. Soon after, Arran and his band arrived with an equal number of men and assured lords Angus, Casillis, Maxwell, and Somerville. Even if the two bands that faced one another at Linlithgow were numerically comparable, it was said that throughout the whole of Scotland the armed supporters of the Francophile faction outnumbered Arran's followers by a count of three to one.

However, no battle was to take place for the regency of Scotland. The two sides agreed to forgo a confrontation and meet to discuss terms. Beaton and Arran, each with a dozen of their loyal nobles, talked for a long while and finally agreed to lay down their arms and appoint a group of barons, from both parties, to look after and protect the young queen while the treaties with England would remain unchanged. Sadler praised Glencairn for hastily returning to Scotland and bringing about the conciliation by convincingly arguing for the marriage treaty and alliance with England. Glencairn even informed Sadler that Beaton was still content with the draft treaties, as long as the queen was no longer solely under the governor's protection. Yet, Douglas correctly warned the ambassador "that this rebellion is only to frustrate and annul the peace." Nevertheless, Sadler failed to grasp the gravity of Beaton's beliefs, and masked the importance of the "rebellion" by writing to Henry that "had Glencairn and Douglas come home sooner, this inconvenience might have been prevented."

It seems as though the English never realized the significance of Arran and Beaton's agreement to avoid what could have become a costly civil war. In their

14 LP, Vol.18, Part 1, #938, p.506.
meetings together at Linlithgow, the ambitious twenty-six year old governor was faced with an experienced and persuasive diplomat twice his age who surely must have laid the political realities before the regent: the conservative faction had the support of the entire clergy, most of the nobility, and most of the population. At this point, Arran must have finally realized that the cardinal now had the upper hand and that the English alliance was doomed to failure. The governor knew he must make concessions if he was to keep his governorship, and as a result, gave up his greatest advantage over the conservative faction: the possession of young Queen Mary. Arran quickly informed Sadler that the earl of Huntley had declared that the conservative lords and bishops would not come to Edinburgh to ratify the treaties, and additionally, had pressed him "to leve the cast of England", and in return the cardinal had pledged to serve and obey him as regent.\textsuperscript{15} The assured lords - all except George Douglas - declined to believe this story, thinking that the conservatives were now resolved to support the treaties. But it appears that Arran was speaking the truth to Sadler, perhaps in desperation, for he knew that unless something substantial occurred, he would be forced by necessity to join with the cardinal.

At any rate, Scotland's shift from a pro-English stand to a nationalist one was significantly yet subtly revealed soon after the conflict at Linlithgow was averted. While the citizens of Edinburgh cheered Arran on High Street as he proclaimed the peace, Mary of Guise and her daughter were taken from his protection and moved to Stirling under the auspices that Linlithgow was too small for the retenues of the four lords

\textsuperscript{15} HP, Vol.1, #433, p.603.
keepers. Of much greater significance, Stirling was further away from both the English border and the coastline, more defensible than Linlithgow, and was in an area of great support for the cardinal. In response to the removal of the two queens to Stirling, Sadler despondently wrote Henry on July 28 that "thinges here go so frowardlie, and so moche untrewthe, jalousie, feare, and suspicion is amonges these men here, oon of another, that I cannot tell what to write to your majeste...".16

Arran was not so foolish as to make a break with Henry immediately, for both he and Scotland had much to gain by remaining compliant a bit longer. A.J. Slavin suggests that the governor and the cardinal each wished to remain outwardly friendly towards England at least until the autumn when the campaigning season would be nearly over and a destructive English invasion avoided.17 But Arran was still in charge of the government, and wanted to gain as much from Henry as he could without forsaking his country or the young queen. It could be argued that he thus played his game of appeasing both sides a few more weeks, perhaps hoping that Beaton would make a mistake and England could help him regain the amount of political control that he had earlier in the year. Throughout the month of August, Arran was much more available to Sadler than he had been for months, was honest to the ambassador that the cardinal had invited him into the conservative faction, and made a series of amicable assurances with Henry while all the while being careful not the compromise Scotland to English incursion. It was over the course of these few weeks that an English strategy that was entirely too ill-conceived,
grossly misinterpreted, and poorly managed, in essence defeated itself. Beaton or Arran or even the ineffectiveness of the assured lords did not so much deceive the English as much as the English deceived themselves by overlooking Scottish national feeling, and as a consequence, lost their hold on Scotland. By contrast, Huntley's message to Arran to join the Francophiles and remain regent was a stroke of political genius, for it allowed Arran to keep his governorship while it undermined his need to remain loyal to England.

Nevertheless, Sadler continued as best he could to support Governor Arran and keep him on England's side, although it was said that Arran "begynneth a lytell to droupe."\(^{18}\) Perhaps the only politically adept assured lord, Sir George Douglas, informed Sadler that Arran "is at this present, if he will so remain, as dedicate to the King as any of them," but could use the added persuasion of English monetary aid.\(^{19}\) Soon after, as a result of Sadler's letters describing the offers made to Arran by Huntley, Henry sent instructions to offer Arran further allurements in order to keep control of Scotland out of Beaton's hands. Thus, on August 6, the ambassador presented the governor with one thousand pounds sterling and the gratitude of the English king in putting down Beaton's insurrection. Sadler was again instructed to inform the governor that he could mobilize five thousand English border troops against the cardinal, but was also commissioned to tell Arran that, by virtue of the ancient English claim of superiority, Henry would make him King of Scotland beyond the Firth if his son married Princess Elizabeth.

Once again, even the inducements offered by the English sorely misjudged the

---

\(^{18}\) HP, Vol.1, #419, p.585.
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attitudes and circumstances north of the border. The bait of a kingship for Arran went far beyond the boundaries of clandestine agreements and approached the unchivalrous level of blatant treason. Henry failed to realize that accepting English military aid against fellow Scots would ruin Arran politically and open the door even wider for Beaton's party. As Arran replied to Sadler, "to bring in 5,000 Englishmen would make 20,000 Scots forsake them," and so he asked that Henry loan him five thousand pounds instead. The opportunistic governor must have felt that at least he could gain some rewards from the English and perhaps buy back some neutral nobles, for he was not foolish enough to accept a kingship in the less productive lands above the Firth when his own ancestral lands lay on the opposite side.

Angered by Arran's request for five thousand pounds, Henry refused additional requests from the governor that the time allowed for ratification of the treaties be extended. In keeping with his "cost-efficient" method of formulating Scottish policy, the king wrote to Sadler on August 16 that he "cannot perceive to what good purpose the 5,000l. demanded can be employed" and added that Sadler should "grope the Governor whether he will, in gage for it, deliver the strongholds on this side the Firth or the young Queen." In addition, Henry commented that Scottish ships traveling to France were in violation of the treaties and he had "stayed five or six of them, and the rather because they show themselves to be of the Cardinal's faction..." On the same day, Arran wrote

---

20 LP, Vol. 18, Part II, #22, p.12.
21 LP, Vol.18, Part II, #46, p.22.
22 Ibid., p.22.
to Henry concerning the taking of a Scottish merchant vessel called the *Boneaventure* and stating that "so recent an attemptate requires hasty redress."23 The detaining of ships such as the *Boneaventure* incensed the merchants of Edinburgh and the heretofore reformist, pro-English burghers began to loudly protest the siezures along with the entire set of English trade restrictions on shipping to the continent. With the last bastion of unified public support for England slipping away, the conservative lords began to show their true feelings toward the English and their adherants in Scotland. Huntley wrote to Mary of Guise that

\[
\text{gif the governour makis scharp perswyt on our soverane Lady and your grace that ye wryt to my lordis of Argyle, Lennox and Bothwell to caus thame to persew all thame quilk ar in company with the governour, thair landis, friendis, and placis and gudis, be fyre and sword in maist extreme maner...}^{24}
\]

Sadler had reported as early as July 31 that the cardinal’s faction had grown aggressive, yet the queen dowager and Beaton himself were both still, in her words, “of the same good mind to accomplish all the King’s pleasure, especially the marriage of the Prince with her daughter.”25 In this air of open hostility and suspect promises, Henry demanded that the Treaties of Greenwich be immediately ratified by Arran, whether Beaton and the conservative lords participated or not.

Thus, on August 25, Governor Arran officially ratified the Anglo-Scottish treaties at Holyrood with Sadler and the assured lords looking on and with the supposed consent

---

24 *The Scottish Correspondence*, #XXVI, pp.19-20.
25 *The Scottish Correspondence*, footnote to #XIII, p.16.
of the absent cardinal and conservative lords and bishops. Afterwards, Arran asked Sadler if he had heard from Henry concerning the loan of five-thousand pounds sterling. Sadler responded that since the “cardinal and his complices had already consented to the treaties,” Henry “would be loath to defray such a sum, unless you might be assured what commodity should ensue thereby to your grace’s affairs.”26 The ambassador added that now, with the treaties ratified, if Arran would “go roundly to work, he and his friends might easily repress” Beaton and his party.27 Thus, Sadler had turned the tables on Arran, exempting England from further monetary aid until the governor himself made a move in Henry’s favor. However, the neutral Scottish lords had pledged to resist any ratification not achieved through Parliament, so the English clearly knew the risks involved of pushing for immediate ratification and not giving Arran the money which he desperately needed. For his part, Arran now knew that he could not count on Henry to aid him against Beaton, save possibly for an English invasion which he had no intention of instigating. Sadler wrote that when Arran had heard Henry’s answer on the point of the loan, the governor coolly replied that:

if he [Arran] shall be put at, or pursued by the cardinal and his complices, (which, no doubt, with the aid of money, which the whole Church will advance unto him, besides the aid they look for out of France, shall be able to be a great party unto him) he must needs make his refuge to your majesty, without whose help and aid in that case, he shall not be able to withstand their malice.28

Thus, Sadler chose not to press Arran concerning the strongholds or the delivery of the

26 SSP, p.272.
27 Ibid., p.272.
28 Ibid., pp.272-273.
young queen, and stated that the governor prepared to visit St. Andrews and the cardinal himself in order to better set things at peace.

Yet Sadler was no fool, he knew that Beaton would never actually support the treaties with England and that Arran could never arrange to deliver either the young queen or the strongholds to Henry at that time. He wrote to Henry that

I told him [Arran], I hardly believed that the cardinal would declare himself so honest a man as he said...And besides that, I know the one part thereof he cannot perform, though he would, which is the delivery of the queen...And the strongholds, I am sure, he will not deliver.29

But Sadler also knew that Henry would not pay Arran five thousand pounds, even with the governor's thinly veiled hint that without equal monetary resources to Beaton, the pro-English party could not survive. Yet, Sadler could only perform the instructions given him by Henry, even though it would appear that Arran meant to discuss strategy with Beaton at St. Andrews, insofar as he had never bothered to seek the cardinal out before. It must have been plainly obvious to everyone that, as the conservative leaders had not journeyed to Edinburgh, they did not want the treaties ratified. Beaton stated it was because he feared arrest, but it would have been difficult for Arran to attempt that manoeuvre a second time, after what had happened months earlier. The assured lords, the privy council, and Henry VIII were all under the false impression that Beaton would consent to the treaties now that they were ratified, and if not, Arran could handle the situation with English troops. Only Douglas, Sadler, and Arran himself believed the

29 Ibid., pp.272-273.
opposite, and after a meeting on August 17 with the cardinal in St. Andrews, Douglas changed his mind as well, no doubt believing it to be in his best interests to do so. Sadler had been too long in Edinburgh, surrounded by the assured lords, to effectively gauge the feeling of the entire kingdom. Moreover, he trusted Arran to keep his word. The governor, however, saw clearly his predicament and acted on it with no concern to whom he had or had not pledged allegiances.

After ratifying the treaties of Greenwich on August 25, Governor Arran traveled to St. Andrews with the probable intentions of either working out a compromise with Cardinal Beaton or forsaking the English altogether and submitting to the conservative pro-French faction. Yet, upon arriving at St. Andrews castle, “the Cardinal neither met him nor would speak with him,” and in a fury the governor “caused the Cardinal’s treason to be proclaimed in St. Andrews,” and hastily returned to Edinburgh “to gather his force and make like proclamations elsewhere against the Cardinal and his complices.”\textsuperscript{30} Thus, if Beaton and Arran were indeed putting on a show for the English, as Parr insisted, they were certainly doing a fine job of it. More likely, Beaton knew he now had the upper hand and wished to repay the governor for his actions earlier in the year. The two factions prepared to face each other once again at Stirling, and in effect decide by force who would control Scottish politics. Upon meeting with Arran following the events in St. Andrews, Sadler found him to be “incensed” against the cardinal, and when asked about the forfeiture of his castles, which Henry had been pushing for over the previous

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{LP}, Vol.18, Part II, #94, p.45.
few weeks, Arran answered plainly that he “is not able to perform the treaties within the
time limited in the same. And also, if he should deliver the strong-holds to your majesty,
it shall behave him to fly the realm; for in that case his own friends will detest and
forsake him.” 31

Meanwhile, the citizens of Edinburgh, still enraged over the capture of the
Scottish merchant ships on the probably correct premise that some of them conveyed
messages to France, “swear they will set Sadler’s house on fire and burn both him and
his, and say that the Governor has ‘coloured a peace’ only to undo them.” 32 If that was
not enough for the unfortunate ambassador, the assured lords had been pressing him for
weeks to convince Henry either to send them money or “else send a main army to
conquest the realm,” but he had only received negative answers from the king. 33 Douglas,
stalling for time as he attempted to find a middle ground between the English and the
conservatives, and probably figuring that Arran was going to defect to Beaton, informed
Sadler that the governor “will rather put himself in the hands of his enemies” than fight,
but Henry “should bear with the Governor for a time, and meanwhile the war and division
here will make them easier to deal with next year.” 34 The assured lords wished to solve
their own internal problems without English intervention, but were also seemingly
committed enough to their pledges to join an invading army. Yet, Angus and the others
always followed their violent suggestions with advice to keep the peace, and most likely
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reckoned that Henry would not spend the money and resources required to sustain an invading force in Scotland. Douglas specifically stated to Sadler that "the season is very late" to embark on a Scottish invasion. Thus, with the political situation in pieces around him Sadler desperately tried to contact Governor Arran, but the regent had already left Edinburgh. With no recourse but to bolt to Beaton’s party, Arran rode to Stirling on September 4, ceremoniously recanted his reformist acts, and with the cardinal and queen dowager, officially crowned young Mary as the Queen of Scots on September 9.

Sadler began to hear rumors of Arran’s defection to Beaton almost immediately and in desperation proceeded to write various dispatches to the king, Suffolk, and Parr documenting the latest news. The governor had told Sadler that he was riding to Blackness to look after his pregnant wife, yet Sadler feared the worst since Arran was not accompanied by Douglas, Angus, or any of the other assured lords. The frightened ambassador wrote to Suffolk that he had heard accounts of conservative supporters taking vengeance upon Protestants, and painted a bleak picture of the situation when he stated, “Never saw people in such fury as they be now, and all the realm is in commotion, and great slaughter said to be in the Highland.” On September 5, Sadler informed Henry of Arran’s actions, and added that “some think that they will now concur to observe the treaties.” Yet, most likely he only added the statement to somewhat placate Henry’s anger, for he had been overly optimistic concerning Scottish politics for months when

36 LP, Vol. 18, Part II, #128, p.69.
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writing to Henry while being a bit more blunt and practical when corresponding with Suffolk or Parr. For his part, Henry quickly wrote Angus and the assured lords, praising them for acting like true gentlemen while Arran betrayed them all by running to the cardinal. But when Sir George Douglas asked for relief in money, Henry only responded with words of encouragement and a questionable promise to send funds and troops into Scotland to aid them.

Henry’s apparent anger and eagerness to punish the Scots for Arran’s defection mirror his temper in 1542, when he bid Norfolk to invade Scotland because of James’ failure to meet him at York. The ego-bruised king was even asking his Lords Lieutenant in the north to prepare figures for the sacking of Edinburgh. But Suffolk, Parr, and Tunstall were well aware that it was getting too late in the season to victual that many troops, and besides, at this point war had already broken out on the continent. Henry’s urgings this time were probably meant to move the assured lords to fight the conservatives themselves, although no aid would be forthcoming. There exists other evidence of English attempts to prod the Scots into action with promises of aid: Suffolk wrote to the privy council on September 13 that the assured lords were,

too poor to retain the men they need, Suffolk means to put a little more to that which is to be employed about Sir George Douglas, so as to let them have some money amongst them at this beginning, for money has hitherto allured them to the King’s purpose, but he will not be lavish till he knows the King’s pleasure.

---
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But perhaps the most extraordinary dispatch that was delivered in this period of confusion was one addressed to the town of Edinburgh from Henry VIII himself. The English King condescendingly informed the citizens that if they “misintreat the ambassador or infringe the treaties, he will use as enemies to both realms [France & Scotland],” adding that “It shall be wise of them to foresee their danger...”. Henry later learned from his northern lieutenants that it would be too expensive and risky to attempt the burning of Edinburgh in 1543.

On September 13, Parr sent Suffolk a dispatch containing the eye-witness account of the events at Stirling as related by Sandy Pringle, a Douglas agent under the pay of England. Pringle stated that Arran and Beaton had "agreed verey well" to the young queen's coronation and "the Governour alsoo agreed to deliver up the castles, holdes, and fortresses of Scotlande to the Cardinall...". Arran additionally yielded enough to place Beaton, the queen dowager, and the earls of Huntley, Argyle, Bothwell, and Lennox on his council and "doo nothing but by theire consentes advice and counsailles." In a disturbing scene of betrayal toward those religious reformers who had supported him and believed him to be like-minded - including Sir Ralph Sadler - Arran recanted his heresies, was absolved by the cardinal and bishops, and received the sacrament. The conservative faction still sought peace with England and planned to meet with Sadler in Endinburgh, but would refuse to honor the Treaties of Greenwich and expected that the pro-English

---
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nobles would forsake the King of England and "consider their duties, and have respect to their natural country".\textsuperscript{45} Beaton remained hopeful that aid from France would soon arrive and therefore bolster his position should Henry attempt a late-year invasion. Parr wrote that Pringle,

\begin{quote}
\textit{saithe he heerde the Cardinall saye, that or the King of Englande shulde have any interrest in Scotlande, or medle within the same, he and manye of the clargie shulde first die, and saue him ride in harnessse furnished with weapon, as if he thene shulde have gone to battale.}\textsuperscript{46}
\end{quote}

Yet Pringle also brought news of great significance concerning Sir George Douglas’ role in the freeing of Beaton in March. He had heard the cardinal say that five days after he was arrested in January,

\begin{quote}
he gave to George Duglasse foure hundred crownes, and aftre that, with the consent of the said George, he was removed to Lord Setons place...and there was meanes devised bitwene the said Lord Seton and George Duglasse for the loosing hym from thens...\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

When the cardinal asked Douglas why he was aiding him, Douglas supposedly replied that “he did it because he knewe others laboured for his loosing, and if he had bene losed by other, it had bene contrarie to his myende, and therefore he did it to lette hym prefilie knowe, that it was none but he that lost hym.”\textsuperscript{48} Nevertheless, Douglas repeatedly assured the English that he was on their side, and while Henry was hesitant to trust him, he really had no other choice.

Thus, the two most influential men whom Henry and Sadler had trusted as

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p.38
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., p.39.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., p.40.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p.40.
working in the best interests of England in reality felt very little allegiance to the English cause. In a letter to Sadler in late September, Henry desperately called upon Angus, Glencairn, Casillis, and the remaining assured lords to apprehend Arran and Beaton, which was clearly a misconceived and impossible order at the time. The enraged and frustrated English king additionally admitted that England was once again in a state of war against Scotland, breaking the peace signed in August. Sadler met with the new Scottish administration on September 20, with Cardinal Beaton now acting as Lord Chancellor and arguing that the Scots nobles felt the Treaties of Greenwich were advanced by private council and were thus unofficial. Yet, the political and diplomatic deception that the conservative faction had used so well in 1543 finally turned one of their most useful members against them upon Arran’s defection.

A number of Scottish lords chose to change sides as a result of Arran’s move, but none were so influential and ambitious as Matthew Stuart, the earl of Lennox and French envoy to Scotland. On September 17, Lennox responded to a letter sent him by the queen dowager which expressed her surprise at seeing him depart Stirling so soon after young Mary’s coronation. Lennox answered that he could offer reasonable excuses, for he had business to take care of in Glasgow. Unknown to Mary of Guise, Lennox had been negotiating with the pro-English party and was planning a defection of his own. Sadler wrote to Henry on September 20 that,

50 *SSP*, pp.294-299.
51 *The Scottish Correspondence*, #XXIV, p.31.
thErle of Glencarn sent me woorde that undoubtedlie the saide Lenoux woolde leave his affection to Fraunce, and adhere to your majeste...to have ayde and help at your majestes hande, for the recoverie of his right and title to this realme, which (he saith) the Governour nowe usurpeth. 52

It is surprising that Beaton did not anticipate a move from Lennox once Arran had entered the conservative ranks. With Arran no longer the enemy, and young Mary crowned Queen, Lennox had lost his place as the main contender for the regency as well as the throne. There was also the blood feud between Lennox and the House of Hamilton stemming from the death of Lennox’ father at the hands of Sir James Hamilton of Fynnart. Thus, it would have been nearly impossible for him to remain on the same side as Arran, and he looked to England to support his dynastic interests in Scotland.

Still playing his game and keeping himself involved with the English cause, Sir George Douglas informed Sadler he believed that Lennox would be more loyal than Arran had been if he was assured a marriage to the king’s niece, 53 and a substantial stipend to replace what he would lose from France. After all that had already taken place, Sadler was weary to trust Douglas’ information and wrote to Henry that “the world was so full of falsehood he knew not whom he might trust!” 54 Yet Lennox was to prove his change of allegiance, as well as his skills in duplicity, when in October he dealt the conservative faction a major setback.

For weeks, the cardinal and queen dowager had been awaiting a small French fleet

52 HP, Vol.2, #38, p.56.
53 Sir George was referring to the daughter of his brother Angus and Margaret Tudor, Margaret Douglas, who would give Lennox a stronger claim to the Scottish throne.
sponsored by the Duke of Guise bringing not only military and monetary aid to the Scots, but also a French ambassador, Jacques de la Brosse, and papal legate, Marcus Grimani. Lennox met the ships not far from Glasgow and proceeded to deceive the French into believing that he was still on their side and was sent to commandeer the gold and munitions on behalf of the cardinal. But as Lord Methven hastily pointed out to Mary of Guise,

sen apperandlie it sall nocht failze gif Levynnox cummis nocht to you and usis nocht your counsall bot he has ane hey purpose as to be princepall and to ws all mone artalyery and utheris thingis that com out of France to his awn particular efecttis;55

Lennox' actions were all the more ironic because he believed the Guises to have more control over French actions in Scotland than he, the ambassador, and had felt abandoned by Francis I. In any case, Sadler was no doubt relieved when he wrote to the privy council on October 18 that Lennox had a great deal of French money and artillery stockpiled in his castle at Dumbarton and he, Angus Glencaim, Cassilis, and other assured lords had essentially taken Glasgow.56 The only consolation for the conservative faction lay in the fact that Grimani and de la Brosse had escaped capture and were with Beaton, Arran, and the queen dowager at Stirling. Upon learning of this rare victory from his pro-English party, Henry wrote that “lynoux, who if his deeds correspond to his promises, shall find great kindness at Henry’s hands;”.57 Thus, Sadler and Henry were not the only ones fooled by Scottish duplicity in 1543, for neither Beaton nor Mary of

55 The Scottish Correspondence, #XXXII, pp.38-39.
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57 LP, Vol.18, Part II, #289, p.162.
Guise were prepared for Lennox’ defection. In late September, even the most devoted of conservatives, Huntley, was thought to have defected to Angus for a short time before he returned to the cardinal’s side. Loyalty and sincerity during these months of chaos and confusion were truly rare characteristics, as Anglo-Scottish relations repeatedly demonstrated.

By the middle of October, Sir Ralph Sadler was confined to his residence in Edinburgh, with angry residents attacking his servants and the burghers meaning to detain him as long as possible in the hopes of recovering their captured ships. The situation throughout Scotland remained tense, as conflicts broke out along the borders, the pro-English lords skirmished with the conservative faction, and Beaton and Arran demanded that Lennox turn over the French gold and munitions. The papal legate Grimani reportedly found Scotland to be so wild he wished himself at home again. Henry still wanted the assured lords to apprehend the young Queen and deliver her to England, yet Sadler informed him that it would be impossible to get her out of Stirling Castle. Fearing for his own life, the English ambassador prepared to be escorted out of Edinburgh by Angus and Douglas and conveyed to Tantallon Castle. On October 30, as Sadler left Edinburgh, he wrote to the privy council that

Assuring your lordships, that, as far as I can see, the whole body of the realm is inclined to France; for they do consider and say, that France requireth nothing of them but friendship, and would they should continue and maintain the honour and liberty of their realm...Whereas...England, they say, seeketh nothing else but to bring

58 LP, Vol.18, Part II, #302, p.171.
them to subjection, and to have superiority and dominion over them;\textsuperscript{59}

As Sadler left Edinburgh, he finally comprehended the reasons why Scotland was so afraid of any kind of agreement with the English.

By November of 1543, the Francophiles were daily eclipsing the pro-English party; Maxwell and Somerville had been committed to Edinburgh Castle on November 1, and on November 7, Arran had taken both Dalkeith Castle, which belonged to the Anglophile Earl of Morton, as well as Sir George Douglas’ house at Pinkie. As James Gairdner writes in the preface of \textit{Letters and Papers}, by this time “Henry’s friends were but a small body of lords who had private interests and private feuds with others.”\textsuperscript{60}

Perhaps this had been true all along. In any case, Sir Ralph Sadler’s mission in Scotland was almost at an end. Arran sent him a message ordering him either to “repair to him [Arran] or depart the realm,” to which the ambassador commented to Angus, “would fain be at home; but, so long as the King would have him [Sadler] remain, he may with Angus’ favour abide a charge more of the Governour.”\textsuperscript{61} Henry wanted Sadler to accompany Angus and coordinate strategy for the assured lords, but they themselves rarely met together and did not want Sadler overseeing their actions anyway. On November 16, Sadler reported to Henry that the governor, who so lately supported reformist preaching, had joined Beaton in persecuting Protestants as heretics, and a day later a government commission under the authority of Mary Queen of Scots ordered

\textsuperscript{59} SSP, p.326.
\textsuperscript{60} LP, Vol.18, Part II, preface, p.xxvi.
\textsuperscript{61} LP, Vol.18, Part II, #388, p.211.
Angus to remove Sadler from Tantallon, for the ambassador was “a resetter of Englishmen in time of war.” The peace with England, after months of misjudged diplomacy and calculated deceit, was for all intents and purposes now over and the realigned Scottish government prepared to host a Parliament in Edinburgh in December.

On December 12, 1543, Ambassador Sadler was escorted by Sir George Douglas and four hundred horsemen out of Scotland to Berwick, almost eight months after he had arrived in Edinburgh to aid a strong pro-English party which was seeking to take control of Scotland. The political situation was much different in December than it had been in March, for the Scottish Parliament had annulled the Treaties of Greenwich because of Henry’s failure to ratify the treaties and the English king’s unlawful seizure of the Scottish merchant vessels. Perhaps more importantly, Scotland formally renewed her previous treaties with France, and the Auld Alliance, after a brief hiatus, became a reality once more. A small force under the command of the Douglas brothers attempted to prevent the parliament from meeting, but their demonstration was to no avail against the superior resources of the cardinal and the governor and so they retreated. Neither Lennox nor the assured lords attended the Parliament. The pro-English party would assemble a larger force at Leith by the end of the year, but this flexing of muscle also led to nothing for there was no firm foundation of money or support behind it. In England, Henry requested that his ally Charles V consider Scotland an enemy, while back in Scotland, Governor Arran called upon Pope Paul III and the Cardinal of Carpi for monetary

---

63 LP, Vol.18, Part II, #481, pp.259-260 for the full set of Scottish declarations.
assistance against an English king seeking to destroy both Scotland's independence and her religion. But as 1543 closed, a vengeful Henry wished for nothing less than the complete destruction of his northern neighbor. His assured lords had failed him, and on December 31 he had signed an Anglo-Imperial treaty for the joint invasion of France in the summer of 1544. His main antagonist in Scotland, Cardinal Beaton, felt confident in his popular support, as well as the promise from France of six thousand troops and unlimited funds for the ensuing year.64 With the Pope and Francis I urging Beaton into taking the offensive against England, it was obvious to Henry that the Scots would have to be neutralized before the continental war could begin. The period of "gentle wooing" was over.

64 SSP, p.338.
Chapter 7

Hertford's invasion of Scotland

To-day Hertford has again visited Edinburgh, which had...rampared the chief port with stone and earth; but the assault was quickly handled, the gate set open with artillery, and the town won again, with slaughter of 400 or 500 Scots, and loss of but 7 of our men. The King’s commission is now well executed, for the town and abbey of Holyroodehouse is in manner wholly burnt and desolate...Standing upon the hill without, to view the burning, the writers could hear the women and poor miserable creatures of the town cry out upon the Cardinal in these words ‘Wa worth the, Cardinall!’.

The beginning of the new year in Scotland was no less chaotic than 1543 had been, but was soon to become much more violent than the new conservative government had anticipated. Governor Arran remained in alliance with the Francophile Cardinal Beaton and queen Dowager, Mary of Guise, who were in turn pitted against what was left of the pro-English party, newly energized by the entrance of Lennox into their ranks but still poor, indecisive, unpopular, and, in many cases, prone to double-dealing and reaping rewards from both sides. Skirmishes continued between the Scots and the English along the borders, and between the government forces and assured lords throughout the country. Since leaving Scotland, Sir Ralph Sadler now worked with Bishop Tunstall and Lord Lieutenant Suffolk in Darnton attempting to coordinate the movements of “Henry’s friends”, who had control of Glasgow but not Edinburgh and most importantly not Stirling, where young Mary Queen of Scots lay under heavy protection. Sadler and

---
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Suffolk both endeavored to stir the assured lords into action against the governor and cardinal, and repeatedly complained of their apathy to Henry. But Angus, Sir George Douglas, and the others had inadequate funds to make war against the ably supported and financed cardinal, and while Suffolk would periodically give them small subsidies, it was just enough to whet their appetites and provide for their closest followers. Yet, the pro-English party still sought to influence the new conservative government and gathered their forces for a display of power outside Edinburgh in early January.

Suffolk had written to George Douglas on December 30 with a set of Henry's instructions on how the assured lords should proceed against Arran and Beaton. The plan was for the pro-English party to assemble at Glasgow on January 3, then march on Edinburgh, apprehend the governor, appoint their own council, then secure the young queen and all Scottish strongholds in her name. As usual, this English scheme was far too ambitious and fanciful, but Henry’s friends did succeed in assembling a respectable force and occupied Leith on or about January 8. For five days, Angus, Lennox, and Douglas positioned their men “in battle array” between Leith and Edinburgh, not daring to enter the capital for they realized they were outnumbered approximately ten to one. Writing to Suffolk, Sir George complained that the pro-English party was weakened by lack of money, the defection of many of their followers, and the failure of the northern lords to join them. In addition, the assured lords had no artillery (having left Lennox’s munitions at Dumbarton, presumably because of the weather), and when Arran had his

---

men positioned cannon from Edinburgh Castle toward the Anglophiles, the confrontation abruptly ended. Unable to take the capital, Henry's friends capitulated to the Francophiles. An agreement was made at Greenside on January 13 stating “that Angus, Lennox, Cassillis, and Glencairn, for themselves and their complices, shall be true to the Queen, and shall assist the Governor in defence of the realm and of Holy Kirk.”\(^4\)

However, the pro-English lords simply wanted to escape arrest and, as in most Scottish political affairs over this period, their submission was soon to be proven insincere.

Upon learning of his assured lords' agreement with the Francophile government, the English privy council wrote that “the King marvels at the disloyal and untrue dealing of Angus and Sir George and the rest that have received such inestimable benefits at his hands;”\(^5\). It appeared that Henry could no longer trust his men in Scotland - apart from Lennox, whom he still favored - to accomplish anything that would benefit England. The Douglas brothers had obviously been dealing with both sides, and this became even more apparent in early 1544. Sir George consistently extracted money from Suffolk, with promises of pro-English victories that never came about and were later explained away as the fault of either someone else or natural circumstances. For months, Sir George was reported to have been in conference with members of the conservative party according to testimonies made by Scottish spies to Henry's border officers, lords Wharton, Parr, and Eure. Suffolk, whom Joseph Bain contends “seems to have possessed some common

\(^4\) LP, Vol.19, Part 1, #24, p.11.
sense," grew increasingly suspicious of the Douglas' motives until finally writing to the privy council that "Angus and Douglas have not sent for their month's wages, which we think their consciences will not suffer them to do...has stayed the payment of wages of Angus and Douglas...". Sir George was so caught up in his diplomatic game that he informed Suffolk that he might be forced by Arran and Beaton to write misinformation to the English and that they should look for a small outline of a heart on dispatches that were to be trusted. An able politician, Douglas had dealt with both parties ever since returning to Scotland, and had always used the excuse that if he wrote or acted against English interests, it was not because he had switched sides, but because he had to keep up the appearance of being a patriotic Scot. While not as clever or deceptive, Angus nonetheless followed his brother's lead in most instances, so that both of them talked convincingly of working for England while in reality doing very little to bring Henry's plans to fruition. Yet, as stated earlier in this paper, the brothers' ineffectiveness had just as much to do with Henry's attitude and inflated demands as it did the brothers' unwillingness to cooperate.

But the fact that Henry constantly complained about the trustworthiness of his assured lords while still urging them throughout 1543 and early 1544 to effect results shows that the king did not want to risk a costly invasion and cared little about affairs in Scotland as long as the Scots were not actively raiding the English borders. These

---

positions directly reflect Henry’s greater interest in the impending continental war against France; he wanted to conserve money and resources while not having to worry about his “shabby” northern neighbor. Yet as Henry prepared to invade France in the summer of 1544, he realized, no doubt much to his chagrin, that he would have to spend the money, use the resources, and turn his attention to Scotland that spring. With the pro-English party not only in shambles but dishonest as well, Henry had no choice but to take Scottish matters into his own hands. As early as January 25, Suffolk and Sadler had prepared the first set of figures and timetables for the invasion of Scotland in May.\(^9\)

It is significant that, although the Douglas brothers played both sides in Scottish politics and had signed a truce with the Francophiles at Greenside that would end hostilities in Scotland, they sided once again with Henry and Lennox and began to work against the government in the north and west. Yet, as the winter of 1544 wore on, Governor Arran and Cardinal Beaton increased their pressure on the Anglophiles and religious reformers, readying forces to apprehend any pro-English supporters. In keeping with his own deceptive diplomacy, Beaton even wrote letters of peace to Henry, saying that the kingdom was now “in perfect obedience to the Queen and Governor,”\(^10\) and requesting new treaty negotiations to be organized. But Henry continued his correspondence with Suffolk concerning costs, supplies, and strategy for an early spring invasion. The king was eager to knock the Scots out of the military scenario, and asked

Suffolk if a March invasion would be possible so he could better concentrate on France.\textsuperscript{11} The lord lieutenant replied that a Scottish campaign in March would be virtually impossible, and had from the start suggested a May invasion, when the English could burn the newly sowed corn and grain before the Scots could gather a large army or receive aid from France. In Suffolk’s view, if the destruction was widespread and effective, “the scarcity in Scotland would make it impossible to bring an army to invade England.”\textsuperscript{12} Henry eventually accepted Suffolk’s timetable, but was anxious to harass the Scots with border raids in order to keep them occupied until the invasion could commence. Then in March, Lennox opened the way for a less costly solution to Henry’s dilemma.

For two months, Lennox and Angus had been requesting a new arrangement with Henry, being fearful of the Francophile threat and knowing of the plan being made to invade Scotland sometime later in the year. Reckoning that Lennox and the assured lords might still be useful if the defeated people turned against Arran and Beaton, Henry dispatched a fresh set of articles and instructions to his friends in Scotland on March 28. As was now the common case, the English king asked for much from his men, and promised that if the word of God was preached in the kingdom, certain strongholds were delivered to England, young Queen Mary was secured, and Henry was named protector during her infancy, his army would set up a puppet government with Lennox as its head and the assured lords as prominent counselors. Even though many of the assured lords

\textsuperscript{11} LP, Vol.19, Part 1, #71, p.33.
had already given up their castles to the government and were ill-prepared to stage an offensive against Beaton and Arran, Lennox agreed to these terms.

By the end of March 1544, Lennox and the assured lords, with the support of Lord Ruthven, were up in arms again, and for the first time since January assembled a respectable force in the west of Scotland. Using the French supplies Lennox had acquired in October, the pro-English party took Paisley and reestablished themselves in Glasgow. But by this time the Francophile government had assembled its own force, and marched west behind Governor Arran. While Henry had informed his friends in Scotland that an English army would aid them, this was probably meant to urge them into battle, for Suffolk made no move northward and the pro-English Scots faced a seige of Glasgow by a much superior force. Although Lennox was forced to surrender, he escaped to the safe confines of Dumbarton Castle. The assured lords were not so lucky, and were arrested by the governor. Yet, information gleaned from English spies suggested that Angus, Maxwell, and Casillis had already spoken with Arran before the seige, and their subsequent arrests were made by their own consent. Sir George Douglas was also arrested soon after, but his son, the Master of Morton, contended that his father remained true to the English cause. This final defeat was the end of the organized pro-English party in Scotland, with Glencairn on the run, Lennox escaping to England, and Somerville having already gone over to the governor. By early April, Henry knew what had transpired in Scotland, and decided that placing a friendly government in place would

never work. He had placed his trust in the assured lords one final time to no avail, and
was more than a little displeased with their ineffectiveness and hints of treachery. Thus,
plans went forward for a full-scale and highly destructive invasion, much like the one
Henry had proposed in a similar rage back in September and one much more violent than
the one Suffolk had envisioned in January.

On January 29, Henry had informed Suffolk that he meant to remove him from
the Scottish campaign in order to accompany the English army to France and help prepare
what the king viewed as the more important invasion of 1544. In Suffolk’s place, Henry
planned to send Edward Seymour, the Earl of Hertford, a new and quite capable royal
favorite who would later rise to great prominence as regent to Edward VI and lord
protector of England. To the Scots, he would also become known as a great villain of
Scottish history because of his exploits in 1544 and again at Pinkie in 1547. But as of
March 4, when Hertford reached Darlington and discussed strategy with Suffolk, his
official title was lieutenant-general, and he was obviously regarded as less valuable than
Suffolk to the king.

In February Suffolk had sent Henry figures for expenses with the interesting
comment that “since the King intends to spend money for revenge on his enemies, this
way seems best.”14 But not even the stout military leader Suffolk was prepared for the
plans Henry had formulated for the May invasion, and in the same dispatch advised that if
Edinburgh and St. Andrews were razed, “the King will be no nearer his purpose, and his

friends (if he have any) will be in worse case thereby, for it will be taken to prove that the King intends only the destruction of the young Queen and the realm.” Instead, the lord lieutenant suggested fortifying certain positions in Scotland so as to better protect pro-English Scots in their fight against the government. Yet, Suffolk mistakenly believed that Henry wished to continue working with Scottish Anglophiles to bring Scotland over to England’s side, which was no longer the case as of early 1544. Henry had ceased to care about his northern friends and whether or not the Scots would peacefully acquiesce to English demands. Through Hertford, he was going to take direct action to make certain that the Scots would submit, for this time he would give them no choice.

On April 10, soon after hearing reports that the pro-English party had surrendered Glasgow to Arran and the Francophiles, Henry dispatched instructions to Hertford for the May invasion. His aims were plainly set forth in the introduction:

considering the King’s purpose to invade France this summer in person, the principal cause of his sending the army into Scotland was to devastate the country, so that neither they nor any sent thither out of France or Denmark might invade this realm.

The king ignored Suffolk’s plans to fortify key positions within Scotland with English troops, and opted instead for a quick, month-long path of destruction extending from the Firth of Forth south into the most productive Scottish lowlands. The invasion would utilize a combination of sea and land forces, with Edinburgh and St. Andrews as the primary targets, together with the lowland corn and wheat fields. Specifically, Hertford

---

was to “burn Edinburgh town, and so deface it as to leave a memory for ever of the vengeance of God upon their falsehood and disloyalty,” but the English commander was not to stop there. Showing the traits of a man who possessed a terrifyingly cruel temper and who repeatedly had been frustrated by circumstances, Henry ordered that Hertford put man, woman, and child to fire and sword without exception where any resistance shall be made against you, and this done...spoyle and turne upset downe the Cardinalles town of St. Andrews, as thupper stone may be the nether, and not one stick stande by an other, sparing no creature alyve within the same... 

Professor J.D. Mackie once referred to these orders as “the most brutal instructions ever issued by an English council.”

But on April 12, Hertford boldly responded to the King’s orders by stating that the fortifications that Suffolk suggested should be undertaken, and more importantly, that the mass destruction and vengeance taken on civilians should be curtailed as an ineffective strategy. He wrote that,

it is supposed that a great number in Scotland would aid the King’s army if they saw he intended to have a foot within the realm, whereas fire and sword would put all to utter despair... would grieve to see the King’s treasure employed only in devastating two or three towns and a little country which would soon recover.

Hertford wanted to create a network of garrisons in Scotland in order to control the Scots

---
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more efficiently without having to invade the country. The lieutenant-general’s intention was to enforce order and protect Anglophiles within what he viewed as an English province, much like Ireland. Hertford clearly saw what he believed should be the practical, long-term goals for the English army royal in Scotland, and never deviated from this course after Henry’s death. However, Henry cared little about long-term, costly initiatives in Scotland when he was about to lead what he hoped would be a glorious invasion of France in only three months' time. Henry did not want Leith and other points garrisoned by English troops who could be fighting on the continent; instead he sought a quick and simple solution that would rid him of the Scottish threat in 1544. Thus, the privy council tersely replied to Hertford that the scheme for fortification “be laid apart,” and that he should “proceed to the devastation of the country.” As for Edinburgh itself, the king and council would not relent to the northern commander’s reasoning, and ordered that he sack the Scottish capital “without taking either the castle or town to mercy, though they would yield; for ye know the falsehood of them all.” Obviously, Henry did not want Hertford fooled or stalled by Scottish deception as his ambassador had been in 1543. Not wishing to lose his privileged position as lieutenant-general in the north, Hertford finally agreed to abide by Henry’s cruel instructions for the massive invasion.

The build-up of troops, armaments, ships, and supplies for the Scottish invasion

23 Ibid., p.226.
centered on Newcastle, where Hertford and his staff had established their headquarters. The staff consisted of Cuthbert Tunstall, bishop of Durham; Lord Lisle, the Lord High Admiral of England; and Sir Ralph Sadler, the former ambassador in Edinburgh and now treasurer of the army. The English Parliament provided Henry his justification for the invasion by passing the “Act For the Subsidie of the Temporaltie”, which stated in part that “the Kinges Majeste our moste naturall and dreade Soveraigne Lorde hathe good juste tytle and interest to the Crowne and Realme of Scottlande.”24 Thus, Henry could more easily argue, as he did, that the invasion was meant to punish the treachery of his subjects, making the event more palitable to his ally in the French war, Charles V. As of April 18, there were reportedly gathered at Newcastle about two hundred English ships and ten thousand troops, though not without a degree of difficulty in securing the needed supplies and victuals for the journey. One week later, Henry sent Hertford a proclamation to be posted on the church doors of every village the English army sacked. The document blamed the governor and the cardinal for the English persecution of Scotland and promised that all who submitted to England after the punishment had ceased would be shown mercy and kindness by their true sovereign, Henry VIII.25

However, these proceedings did not go unnoticed by the Scots and the French. Francis I had received word of the invasion and recommended to Arran that he make concessions so as to stall the English.26 The French king, also receiving pleas from Mary

24 Mackie, "Henry VIII and Scotland", pp.112-113
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of Guise, supposedly planned to assemble a naval force of ten thousand men at Normandy to set sail in late March, but foul winds, mutinous troops, and the pressures of the continental war prevented this. Contrary to popular belief, Arran was nonetheless preparing his own defenses as early as late April when he sent a series of dispatches throughout the country “charging all manner of men baith to burgh and land to be ready upon twenty-four hours warning baith to pass upon the Englischmen.”27 Just days later, another dispatch was sent to all the towns on the south coast of the Firth of Forth ordering inhabitants to make trenches to resist the English. Then on May 1, the day that Hertford finally sailed north from Tynemouth, the governor sent summons through Fife “charging all manner of men between sixty and sixteen to meet my lord Governor upon the Burgh Muir of Edinburgh the fifth day of May, to pas upon the Inglische men.”28 Unfortunately for the Scots, their preparations were too little too late, for the English fleet arrived in the Firth on May 3 and safely disembarked at Inchkeith the next day with no organized resistance from the Scots.

In his History of the Reformation in Scotland, John Knox contended that Cardinal Beaton remained nonplussed in the days before the invasion and even discounted Arran’s preparations for defense as unnecessary.29 Yet, as historian Sir J. Balfour Paul once stated, Knox “always lays on his colours with a heavy brush.”30 It had been rumored that

27 Sir J. Balfour Paul, "Edinburgh in 1544" Scottish Historical Review, 8.1911, pp.120-121.
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the Scots optimistically believed the English fleet to be Icelandic fishing vessels, and
counts from Leith seem to verify that the Scots were taken somewhat by surprise,\textsuperscript{31} but
this does not mean that they were totally unprepared or that the cardinal did not act
quickly to repulse the English. On May 6, Hertford and Lisle encountered what they
estimated to be six thousand Scots deployed between Leith and Edinburgh, led by the
governor, cardinal, and the earls Murray and Seton. However, the Scots were not as
battle-ready as their English counterparts and when Hertford pressed forward after several
exchanges of artillery fire, the Scottish lines broke and the poorly managed soldiers
fled.\textsuperscript{32} It was reported that Arran and Beaton retreated to Linlithgow, leaving Edinburgh
virtually defenseless before the English advance. Unable to defend the city, the provost
of Edinburgh, Sir Adam Otterburn, requested a meeting with Hertford to discuss terms.
Ironically, in 1542 and early 1543, Otterburn had strongly advocated a pro-English
stance, but he and the rest of the Edinburgh merchant community had since reconsidered
this.

Upon being granted a meeting with the lieutenant-general, the provost told
Hertford that the keys to the city would be delivered to him on condition that the
inhabitants might escape and the city be saved from fire. Hertford replied that unless
Edinburgh was yielded without condition, he would put the citizens to the sword and burn
the town. Most likely he had planned to torch it in any case. Placed in such a hard
circumstance, Otterburn reportedly responded that “it were better...to stand to their
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defence than to yield to that condition.”33 Thanks to Otterburn's brave convictions, the inhabitants of Edinburgh rallied under his leadership. A militia was quickly formed, centered on the castle rock and its powerful artillery. Outside the city, Hertford and Lisle brought up their own guns, and that same day the assault on Edinburgh began.

The English troops rushed through the outer gates and into the city, driving Otterburn's militia back with their archers and arquebusiers. The remainder of the day consisted of bloody hand-to-hand combat in the narrow streets. The Scots inflicted considerable casualties on the Englishmen, but Hertford's trained and disciplined troops had the advantage of sheer numbers, and claimed to have slaughtered four to five hundred Scots on that first day of hostilities. Yet Edinburgh Castle under the command of Captain Hamilton of Stanehouse kept up a steady artillery fire on the English troops attempting to make their way up High Street, forcing Hertford to deem the stronghold impregnable. By the end of the day, the battle for the city was over. The castle was not taken, but the English proceeded to pillage and torch the city around it.34

All night long the rising flames from the blazing town lit up the darkness. The next day and the next and the day after that there came bands of English from the camp at Leith, 'and began where they left off,' burning and plundering till the sack of the city was complete. It is needless to say that Holyrood did not escape.35

The destruction would continue for the next four days, with less and less

35 Paul, "Edinburgh in 1544", p.125
resistance from the Scots, who were fleeing the city by the hundreds with all the possessions they could carry. On May 8, the four-thousand man rear guard, which had ridden north from the borders under the command of the earl of Shrewsbury and Sir Ralph Evers, joined with Hertford’s main force and proceeded to ransack and loot the city. Their ruthlessness was such that when the castle would not fall, they ravaged everything within a seven-mile radius, leaving “neither pile, village, nor house standing unburnt.”36 Yet, as Sir J. Balfour Paul points out, neither Hertford, the English Chronicler, William Patten, nor any Scottish historian ever referred to a massacre of women and children, leaving one with the impression that the four to five hundred armed citizens mentioned in the official account were the bulk of Scots killed in Edinburgh.37 Nevertheless, one can be sure that many more Scots were wounded in the fighting, not to mention the destruction caused by the English forces throughout the southern section of the Firth of Forth. As Hertford himself wrote, “will so devastate this realm and annoy the King’s enemies as to make the punishment of their falsehood an example to the world;” 38 Viewing the scene on the morning of May 7 from Calton Hill, the English commander could see the mass exodus of citizens in a somber procession westward as Edinburgh burned behind them.

On May 11, Sir George Douglas visited Hertford at his headquarters in Leith, rejoicing that the English army had arrived, lest “his brother and he should have lost their

36 Ibid., p.127.
37 Ibid., p.124.
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heads,”. It appeared that Governor Arran had released the Douglas brothers from Blackness Castle just before escaping to Linlithgow in an attempt to assuage the English commander. Sir George stated that the governor and cardinal were “perplexed” by the invasion, but were “recomforted” by the knowledge that five French ships had landed at St. Andrews bringing news of aid coming shortly from Francis I. He shrewdly added that he, his brother, and a number of other assured lords were ready to serve the king again, for he alleged that

Fair means would win the hearts of the people, and that by fortifying this town and garrisoning Edinburgh and Stirling, so that such as declared for the King might be relieved, the whole realm would soon fall to the King’s devotion, whereas this fire and sword put them in despair.40

Douglas no doubt spoke the truth, but also reckoned that a permanent English presence in Scotland would afford his family better protection and more opportunities for power and reward than would the conservative government if the English abruptly departed the country. However, when asked to deliver Tantallon Castle to Henry immediately, Sir George nervously answered that Angus would have to be consulted on that matter at a later time. Hertford had listened patiently to Douglas, and assured him of English aid, but remarked to Henry on the Scot’s “crafty juggling and falsehood.”41 On May 14, Hertford prepared to leave Edinburgh and march back to England with his army, “spoiling the country according to the King’s instructions.”42 But first, Hertford’s troops

40 Ibid., p.316.
41 Ibid., p.317.
42 Ibid., p.316.
sacked and burned Leith, a town whose citizens, as Sadler once remarked, had always been eager Calvinists.  

The English filled their ships with over ten thousand pounds sterling worth of booty, and Lisle sailed away with skeleton crews as Hertford led a path of destruction across the Scottish lowlands. Fields of newly planted crops were torched and many old houses and castles were completely destroyed. In all, some thirty-three towns, villages, and castles were devastated by the English forces.  

The inhabitants of Dunbar, thinking themselves safe when the enemy broke camp, let down their guard and went to bed, whereupon an English detachment succeeded in setting fire to the town, and “men, women, and children were suffocated and burnt.”  

A large force led by Lord Seton challenged the English at Pease Pass, but inexplicably failed to engage them, as if paralyzed by fear, and let them continue unmolested south toward Renton. On May 16, sixteen days after entering Scotland, Hertford’s army crossed the borders into Berwick and rejoined Lisle’s fleet. That same day, Hertford received a dispatch from the privy council ordering that three thousand nine hundred of his troops be immediately sent to Calais for the war against France.  

So as not to allow the Scots to regroup, Evers remained in command of a light calvary force which conducted various raids into Scotland for the next few months, burning the towns of Kelso and Coldingham. No longer hesitant to destroy sites in Scotland, Hertford himself suggested that a further raid

---
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on Jedburgh was needed, so on June 10 Wharton and Eure sacked the city and torched the surrounding countryside.

Although Hertford had decided that it would be too risky to attack St. Andrews, Henry was still well-satisfied with the results of his Scottish invasion: Edinburgh was virtually destroyed, countless people were left homeless, a great deal of arable land had been decimated, the Francophile government was in a state of disrepair, and the entire country was very much afraid of the English and their king. Henry's objective had been met: the Scots had been effectively knocked out of military action for 1544. In the context of Anglo-Scottish affairs, Henry did not have time to consolidate his position, for the French invasion was only weeks away. Curiously enough, the original reports on the continent stated that the Scots had won a great victory and had caused "incredible rejoicing" in Rome before the truth was discovered.47

Why had Arran and Beaton not attempted to increase Scotland's defenses before late April? It seemed that after the stalling tactics of 1543, the governor and cardinal complacently believed that Henry would not commit to an invasion if the government favored a renegotiated treaty with England. Certainly Beaton was of the opinion that the French would send troops at the first sign of an English military build-up, as Francis I had promised the Cardinal in 1543. Since messages between the two "auld" allies were being intercepted by the English, Beaton could well have caused Arran to remain confident in French protection until at the last minute, Arran could wait no longer and summoned

troops. Since a large force had earlier besieged Glasgow, the Scots were obviously capable of mounting a defense, but appear to have been poorly organized and managed by the conservative lords. In addition, the Scots were not as well armed as the English, nor did they have the training and discipline of Hertford’s troops. Throughout the period covered in this essay, Beaton had seemed prepared for almost every situation, diplomatically and politically, but as John Knox was quick to point out, on this particular occasion the cardinal was outmaneuvered by the English army, as had been the case in 1542. Although preparations were made, the English still took the Scots by surprise in 1544; the results of Hertford’s invasion adversely influenced Anglo-Scottish relations for decades to come.

Surprisingly, the immediate results of Henry’s Scottish invasion were exactly what the king had anticipated in March: the Scots were knocked out of the French war and fear of England had caused many to question the authority of the Francophile government under Arran and Beaton. The ferocity of Henry’s vengeance temporarily strengthened the Scottish Anglophiles and weakened the cohesiveness of the Francophile party. The need to lay blame for the mass destruction enabled the opportunistic Mary of Guise to lash out against Arran’s leadership, and in the process attempt to gain the regency for herself. The queen dowager had never trusted the governor, and Beaton’s diplomacy between them had not satisfied her desire to gain greater control over her daughter and her late husband’s kingdom. On June 10, various Scottish nobles of both

---
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political factions, including Angus, Sir George Douglas, Casillis, and Sir Adam Otterburn, signed a bond at Stirling to maintain the queen dowager in "the office of government", and effectively suspend Arran as governor. Through the summer months Mary was able to create an administration recognized by many Scots as the true government, but she lacked the political and financial support needed officially to strip Arran of the regency or obtain possession of the seals. Her main obstacle was that she failed to convince Francis I to give her precedence over Cardinal Beaton and the existing government. In any case, Arran and Beaton enjoyed greater political and ecclesiastical patronage than the queen dowager, which may account for the stance of many Scottish lords during this period. The editor of *The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine*, Annie Cameron, stresses that "bribery was a potent force at this juncture". That old assured lord the earl of Glencairn abruptly left the pro-English ranks to support the queen Dowager and was fighting Lennox in the west by July, no doubt with a pension more sizable than the one he had received from Henry. In the "pretended" government of the queen dowager, none other than Angus had been appointed lieutenant of the borders. To put an end to the confusion, both sides called for rival parliaments to be held in the autumn of 1544 in order to gain official sanction for their respective governments; Arran's would meet in Edinburgh, the dowager's at Stirling. But Mary of Guise was
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49 *The Scottish Correspondence*, p.62.
51 Although he still claimed to be loyal to Henry, from July through September 1544 the English feared a retaliatory invasion led by Angus who was indeed effectively mustering Scottish forces. *Ibid*, p.101.
"outdone in...promptitude and energy" by Arran when his parliament met first on November 6 and deemed her piecemeal administration unconstitutional.\(^5\)\(^2\)

Afterwards, Cardinal Beaton worked as a mediator in an attempt to avert a civil war and keep the Francophile party together. It seems surprising that he would have allowed the division to continue throughout the summer, but it must be remembered that the dowager had no quarrel with the cardinal - indeed, they were rumored to be on intimate terms - and only worked against Arran. Beaton might have seen the split as a way to bring both antagonists under his wing and make the conservative government his own, for his support of Arran during this period forced the governor to rely more heavily on his lord chancellor. Beaton ultimately succeeded in doing just that, for Scottish indignation toward the government over Hertford's invasion subdued, and the cardinal united the Scots using as a foundation their common fear and hatred of England and Henry VIII. As J.J. Scarisbrick wrote, "exactly as Hertford had foretold, in the long run ten days of violence only made the [England's] Scottish problem more bitter and more tenacious".\(^5\)\(^3\) The sacking of Edinburgh had not brought the Scots to heel, it had only heightened Scottish enmity toward England and made the country more resistant to any form of rapprochement.

Immediately after the invasion, on May 17 at Carlisle, a treaty was signed between the English and the only two Scots whom Henry dared to trust, Lennox and

\(^5\)\(^2\) Ibid., p.64.
\(^5\)\(^3\) Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, p.445.
Glencairn.\textsuperscript{54} By June, Glencairn had bolted to the queen dowager’s party, but Lennox remained on the king’s side, determined to win the regency from whomever eventually obtained it. He traveled to London in June to conspire with Henry on how to make himself more of a threat to the Scottish government. The answer was a marriage to Margaret Douglas, daughter of Henry’s sister Margaret Tudor, the mother of James V. Lennox would therefore become Henry’s nephew, while also strengthening his claim to the Scottish throne. He and Margaret were married on June 29, and soon afterwards the overly ambitious earl was back in Scotland with English money, raising the western lords and highland clansmen against the Francophiles.

Henry himself met with varying degrees of success in his French campaign, but the invasion was certainly not as glorious as the English court had made it out to be. Following a debasement of the currency in 1542, Henry pushed through Parliament an “enhancement” of coinage in 1544 in order to pay for the German mercenaries who filled out his army.\textsuperscript{55} The projected costs of the invasion were nowhere near the actual expenses, and Henry found that his riches gained from the dissolution of the monasteries would not be sufficient. Therefore, the king drained England of its resources to fight the French, and as a result, the English economy suffered throughout the remainder of the 1540’s. Yet Henry accomplished some goals in his French expedition, including the taking of Boulogne, where he personally oversaw the seige and later the English

\textsuperscript{54} LP, Vol.19, Part 1, #522, p.324.
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defenses.56 But the English were not able to gain Montreuil, which was brilliantly
defended by the French. Finally, the emperor asked Henry to begin his march on Paris
for the combined Anglo-Imperial assault, but Henry refused, making various excuses
about the condition of his forces. At the moment of truth, the English king felt his army
insufficient to take on the French main force; his mercenaries had deserted him, his
commanders lacked resolve, and his troops were in disarray. In any case, Charles V
knew that Henry had probably never intended to risk an attack on Paris.57 Thus, the
emperor signed the Treaty of Crespy with Francis I in October without consulting his
English ally, later making his own excuses to Henry as to why the couriers did not inform
him in advance of the event. Henry, left friendless before fifty thousand advancing
French troops led by the dauphin himself, was enraged. He returned to London, and by
1545 held Boulogne as his only reward for a very costly invasion. As J.J. Scarisbrick
stated, “the English campaign of 1544 was a muddle even by the generous standards of
the times.”58 Of greater concern to Henry was the fact that as Francis and Charles were
now allies, and Scotland had healed her wounds, England faced the prospect of a
threelfold invasion by the summer of 1545.

57 LP, Vol.19, Part 1, #126, p.66
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Chapter 8

The Consequences of the "Rough Wooing" and murder of the Cardinal

...the Cardinall satt doune in a chyre, and cryed, 'I am a preast: ye will not slay me...but James Melvin...said 'Repent thee...of the schedding of the blood of that notable instrument of God, Maister George Wisharte...And so he stroke him twyse or thrise throwght with a stog sweard...1 - John Knox

By November of 1544 Cardinal Beaton had effectively gained personal control of Scottish politics and would remain in this position until his death eighteen months later. His power rested in his ability to keep the governor and queen dowager “in double harness” by giving them each something that would satisfy their respective ambitions.2 Mary of Guise was allowed more influence on the Council of Regency, while Arran was approached concerning a marriage for his son with the infant Queen of Scots. The governor had considered the match in early 1543 as a means to consolidate his position as regent, that is until Henry’s demands for an Anglo-Scottish marriage prevented it. But now Beaton proposed that young Mary be betrothed to Arran’s young son, assuring Scotland of a Scottish, and not an English or French, king.3 In fact, Arran was so successful in obtaining signatories for the match, that by October 1545 he was said to have the support of “the maist part of bayth temporall and spirituall astait.”4 Not

2 Donaldson, James V-VII, p.71.
4 The Scottish Correspondence, #CVIII, p.147.
surprisingly, Mary of Guise disapproved of the scheme and preferred a French match, yet it seemed that Beaton was hesitant to subject Scotland to French domination. Ignoring pleas from the queen dowager to deliver young Mary to France while the English threat remained, Beaton was determined to keep the Queen of Scots safe inside Stirling Castle so as not to lose his prime bargaining chip. Little in the way of French support had materialized in 1544, and as his biographer, Margaret Sanderson, states, Beaton “was probably no more inclined to put Scotland, in the person of the Queen, into the hands of the Most Christian King of France...than into those of the apostate King of England.”

In fact, in 1545 the French envoy, de Lorges Montgomery, accused the cardinal of self-interest in his Franco-Scottish diplomacy. Annie Cameron surmised that Beaton’s commercial agreement with Flanders and appeals to Rome “may be construed as efforts to keep open other sources of support, lest Scotland should become entirely thirled to France.” It seems that the Cardinal, although a quite zealous churchman and Francophile, was nevertheless politically practical on the matter of keeping Scotland indépendant of French control.

As for Henry, his French campaign had been a virtual disaster, and as 1545 opened his commanders Arundel, Norfolk, and Suffolk were struggling to hold Boulogne and Calais from the seiges of the dauphin. Anglo-French peace negotiations had stalled; when told that the English defenses were weakening, Henry remarked, “Give up

6 Ibid., p.200.
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Boulogne, forsooth!". In Scotland, a convention in December had absolved all the former assured lords of treason. Sir Ralph Evers and the other English border officers were making an average of a dozen raids a month into the marches to keep the reunited Scotsmen off guard. The high costs of supplying the English soldiers in the north during winter actually forced the privy council to appoint a commission to collect an unpopular and unconstitutional benevolence from the king’s subjects. Probably as a result of these hefty expenses, English agents in the north (including Sadler at Darlington) were instructed to remain in contact with many of the newly pardoned Scottish lords and urge them once again to work actively for the English cause. The Lutheran Casillis was pledged to the queen dowager, but again sided with the English, and Lennox was dispatched to Carlisle in an attempt to bring the Douglas brothers back into the fold. Yet by 1545, Henry was much less trusting of Angus and Sir George, and put a price on their heads for capture if they refused to cooperate with Lennox. If nothing else, Henry reckoned that the Douglas brothers might be able to give information about French plans to land troops in Scotland. Sir George Douglas indeed informed Sir Ralph Evers in February that the French Captain de Lorges Montgomery was arriving in March with six thousand French soldiers for an invasion of England. Sir George also stated that rumors in Scotland were that “if master here, the King [Henry] would make their

---

gentlemen no better than shepherds," and that certain Scots "say that the King will make
a plain conquest, and kill man, woman, and child. Gentle handling and good words will
help the King's affairs." It seems Douglas spoke the truth here, honestly relating the
feelings and fears of his countrymen while also hoping that Henry would again show him
favor. Yet neither Evers nor Henry took these words very seriously, and in late February
Evers led a large force into Teviotdale to destroy some border towns that could be used to
garrison Scottish or French invaders. What happened next has been long debated by
historians, but was without a doubt an event of much significance for the Scots.

On or about February 27, 1545, Evers' troops devastated the town of Melrose and
ruined the Douglas family tombs located nearby. On guard against just such an attack,
Governor Arran and the earl of Angus led a force of equal size from Jedburgh to engage
the English. They overtook them at Ancrum Moor, where the Scots had the advantage of
the high ground. Reportedly furious over the desecration of the Douglas tombs, Angus
himself led the Scottish assault which resulted in a humiliating English defeat. Evers was
slain along with many of his officers. Even though the encounter was actually slight,
the Scots were nonetheless overjoyed, and from first-hand accounts Sadler reported to
Henry that,

the Governor...took him [Angus] about the neck and kissed him
20 times, saying he repented having ever mistrusted him, who
had that day done so much for Scotland. Whereunto Anguisshe
answered that God knew his loyalty to his native country.
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Thus, Hamilton and Douglas were on the surface reconciled, and all Scotland rejoiced at the news of victory, the first decisive success for Scottish arms against England in generations. Yet, Angus did not turn patriotic so abruptly, for he later explained to Casillis that Evers had forced him to fight or else take great shame, and still pledged devotion to the king of England. In fact, as Gordon Donaldson stated, as of late 1544, “Angus was granted a Scottish pension of one thousand pounds - possibly a more cogent argument than the spoilation of Melrose in causing him to lead the Scots at Ancrum.”

By the Spring of 1545, Henry and his privy council faced a greater threat from their enemies then they ever had in 1539, and barricaded England on all sides against a two-front invasion by the French. The defeat at Ancrum had created considerable apprehension for the safety of the borders, and Casillis was directed to query the Scottish Council concerning an Anglo-Scottish treaty. Yet, he reported that the military victory and imminent arrival of de Lorges had strengthened the government’s resolve, and talk in Scotland was of war, not peace. A summons for men to join an expedition to England had already been sent across the kingdom, and Casillis barely escaped arrest in Edinburgh as an English agent. At the end of May, the French fleet finally arrived in the Clyde, with over two thousand men, five hundred horse, and sixty thousand crowns to aid the Scots in invading England. A convention was hastily called at Stirling to welcome de Lorges and reconfirm Scotland’s formal support of the Auld Alliance. Jacques de Montgomery,

16 Ibid., p.233.
17 Donaldson, James V-VII, p.72.
Seigneur de Lorges, was of Scottish extraction himself and a captain in the king of France’s Scots Guard, yet his background did not ensure smooth interaction with the Scottish leaders and from the start there was friction between the French and the Scots.

Curiously enough, Francis I attached safeguards to de Lorges instructions, warning him to be suspicious of the Scots and not trust anyone without due consideration. At the convention at Stirling on June 26, fifty-four Scots signed a document in favor of pursuing war with England, and a “bipartisan” commission that included Angus, Huntley, Argyle, Bothwell, Rothes, Glencaim, Arran, Beaton, and the queen Dowager were to plan the conduct of the war. Yet, from the beginning de Lorges acted like a commander rather than an auxiliary captain, and it was soon clear to the Scottish lords that France regarded operations in Scotland “simply as part of a wider military commitment.”

As Sir George Douglas had stated in February, the Scots believed that Francis was sending them six thousand troops instead of the two thousand that actually arrived; the result was to put more pressure on the Scots to assemble an army. A kingdom-wide muster arranged for Roslin on July 28 was poorly attended, and French soldiers stationed in Edinburgh soon became very unpopular. As in 1542, the Scots refused to risk invasion for the sake of another party. But there were other reasons for the change of heart and subsequent lack of commitment to the invasion found in Scotland that summer.

The first concerns Sir George Douglas and a secret meeting that occurred on July 4 with Hertford’s servant, Thomas Forster. Asked about the expedition to England,
Douglas stated that he “would do his best to stop them,” and also remarked, although it may or may not have been the truth, that “the Cardinal was thought the only occasion of the war and was smally beloved.” But in addition to the calculated patronizing of Sir George, Forster also secretly met with Casillis and Angus and they too pledged to remain true to Henry and prevent the invasion. Angus did in fact lead the Scottish opposition to the campaign in the war council, and Huntley was named the new lieutenant of the borders. Thus, this group of seemingly pro-English lords may have had something to do with the low turnout at Roslin, yet just weeks before Angus was seen leading Scottish forces against Lennox and his English-sponsored clansmen in the west. Probably the main reason the Scots were indifferent towards war with England was because they had had enough destruction and desired peace. According to the Imperial Ambassador Chapuys, “the Scots were thought to be short of food,” and the French soldiers were “already deserting because of famine,” no doubt because the lowland fields had been decimated over the previous twelve months. The Scottish lords, who never appeared to share the warring zeal of Henry’s men or the anti-English hatred of the Scottish bishops, had their own problems to deal with in their own territories without having to risk another Solway Moss. Argyle, for instance, had to remain on his lands in the west for fear of an invasion from a rebel coalition of clans led by a “Lord Donald of the Isles”, who was charged with “burning harrying and slaying in the service of the King of England.”

---

that they were ill-prepared and hesitant to attack is not to say that the Scots were idle in their defenses, for a special force was raised through an extraordinary tax to defend the borders in the Merse and Teviotdale. Nevertheless, by the summer of 1545 the mood in Scotland had changed and the fiery thoughts of war had been dampened by the scarcity of food, the presence of the French troops, the caution of the Scottish nobility, and the realization that it would be foolish to provoke the English king. The prevailing attitude now favored defense over an offensive, and no doubt many Scots feared that if Henry was pushed too far, he would again take vengeance on Scotland as he had done the previous year.

Henry was, in fact, planning to raise a large force along the borders, one that could both defend England from a Franco-Scottish invasion and be used to form an English expedition to Scotland that August. In May, 1545 Hertford reprised his role as lieutenant of the north and the privy council calculated expenses for the “putting ready of the army of 30,000 men which the King has determined to levy for resistance of the enemy.” The northern recruits were additionally reinforced by the arrival of Spanish and German mercenaries. But strangely enough, by the summer the English no longer anticipated a devastating attack from the north. By June Hertford knew that de Lorges brought with him a small company, and that “the Scots cannot at this season keep men together for lack of victuals.” Consequently, he requested that his own invasion of

Scotland commence as soon as possible. Yet, the shortage of food was not the only reason the English considered themselves safe from a Scottish invasion in July, for as Chapuys noted, "the Scots have been so punished and are so disunited that they are unlikely to invade [England] in force". Thus, the prevailing opinion was that the Scottish government was not nearly as unified as Beaton had made it seem in his optimistic letters to France and Rome.

Lord Methven wrote the queen dowager before the June Convention at Stirling that "your graice is prinsipall mediatrix to lawbour concord betuix all lordis and greit men...and to solist tham to mak unyte and concord wythin all thar bounds,". So it appears that an invasion of England was not as desirable to the nobles as Francophiles such as Beaton and Mary of Guise would have liked. Beaton wrote to Pope Paul III on July 6 that "the quarrels of the nobility are appeased, and heretical opinions almost extinguished," yet Annie Cameron states that the correspondence of the queen dowager clearly shows that "the country was honeycombed with heresy, distrust, and private feuds," and Scottish unity was only a nominal reality. In any case, probably the most significant indication of the state of Scottish unity was the invasion of England in early August, which supports Cameron's contention that the internal dissention continued throughout 1545.

---
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Referring to the Franco-Scottish invasion of England, Knox wrote that the troops “returned with more shame to the realm than scathe to their enemies.”\textsuperscript{32} The expedition proved a failure and humiliated Beaton and the Scottish government. No more than a few thousand Scots gathered on July 28 at Roslin (although the Scots reported as many as fifteen thousand) where they joined the two thousand French soldiers and marched toward the borders. They were nominally led by Governor Arran, but were in fact under the fateful command of Angus and the previously pro-English Glencairn. The Scots encamped near Wark castle and proceeded to make daily incursions into England, burning a few fields and towns, but never venturing more than a few miles from the borders. De Lorges urged Arran and Angus to penetrate farther into England, but for want of heavy artillery and more troops, the Scots refused. On August 14, Hertford reported that the Scots and their French allies had retreated having done little damage.\textsuperscript{33}

About the same time a French armada of over two hundred ships was harassing the southern English coastline, having been sighted by the King’s flagship, \textit{Great Harry}, on July 19.\textsuperscript{34} By August 9, Lord Lisle had put out from Portsmouth to battle the French, but apart from a few skirmishes, nothing decisive occurred and the French retreated. As J.J. Scarisbrick stated, “by early September...the threat of invasion seemed miraculously to have lifted,”\textsuperscript{35} and Henry was free once again to take vengeance on the Scots.

Hertford deliberately postponed his counter-invasion of Scotland until early
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September, when "the year being very forward, the Scots' corn will be ripe and shorn."\textsuperscript{36} The large English expedition, including many foreign mercenaries, reached Kelso by September 9, and over the following two weeks devastated, killed, pillaged, and burned all it could throughout the Scottish lowlands. The expedition hit Catholic buildings and places of worship especially hard. Hertford’s second invasion was nearly as destructive as his first:

Fortresses, Abbeys, Frere-houses, Market Townes, Villages, Towers & Places brent, raced, and cast downe by commandment of Therll of Hertforde...Between the 8th of Sept and the 23d of the same...Sum Total...287.\textsuperscript{37}

Although Hertford avoided larger towns such as Edinburgh and Stirling, and killed many fewer Scots than in 1544, his destruction of the crops worsened the already critical food shortage in Scotland, which had the effect of creating more critics of Beaton’s government. In fact, the “Rough Wooing” of 1544-45 served to bring many Scots in the west country and along the borders over to the English side. Tired of the disruption of life caused by both armies, the men of the Merse, Teviotdale, and parts of the Lothians sought to “assure” themselves to the English in great numbers. As a result, the English faced little resistance and the “assured” Scots for the most part were spared the destruction that befell their neighbors. Actually, the government’s problem of border Scots assuring to England had been of great importance ever since the beginning of Arran’s reformist policies in early 1543.

\textsuperscript{36} LP, Vol.20, Part II, #130, p.61.
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As M.H. Merriman states, there was a “sustained and remarkably systematic English effort during the Rough Wooing to create a body of collaborators - Scots who worked for an English victory in this particular war”. However, unlike the assured lords, the majority of assured Scots were commoners along the borders who, for fear or religious reasons, sided with the English against their countrymen. The Scottish government took action against the collaborators in early 1545, and by June had lists compiled of persons suspected of assurance to England. The attention paid to the assured Scots was not only a response to their collaboration, but also to their military importance, for Merriman contends that

In early 1545...Arran moved in force against the assured in Teviotdale and the Merse, and on 27 February, owing to the revolt of Scots serving in the English force, the battle of Ancrum Moor was won. This was followed up by a general pardon...But in September the English merely had to attack once again in great strength and all reassured with alacrity.

An act of Parliament on October 2, 1545 declared all Scots’ assurances with the English discharged under the threat of loss of land and goods to the government, and by 1548 a confirmed assured Scot was to be immediately hung, drawn, and quartered as a traitor. But the fact that the Scottish government moved with such severity against the assured Scots reveals that these collaborators were dangerous to the continued independence of Scotland. This was true in both a political and a religious sense, for of all the assured
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Scots, it was the religious reformers who gave the English "their most consistent and devoted supporters." This religious aspect of Anglo-Scottish relations, combined with ruthless English politics, brought about the murder of Cardinal Beaton in 1546.

English plans for the elimination of Beaton had in fact originated long before the act was committed at the cardinal's own castle at St. Andrews in late May 1546. As early as March 1543, Sir Ralph Sadler subtly remarked to the earl of Glencaim that "it were pity but he [Beaton] should receive such reward as his merits did require." Nothing more came of the idea until April of 1544, when a Scotsman named "Wysshert" arrived in Newcastle with a letter for Hertford and Sadler concerning an arrangement to be made with Henry. Supposedly, the former Treasurer of Scotland (the Laird of Grange, James Kirkaldy), the master of Rothes (Norman Leslie), and John Charteris were prepared to "apprehend or slay the Cardinal...if they knew what support the King would give them afterwards." The would-be assassins' motives seemed to be both political and religious, for they wanted one thousand English troops of Hertford's invasion force to aid them in destroying various abbeys and bishops' houses, while also capturing the chief opponents of amity with England. The privy council responded to Hertford that "if the lords and gentlemen he named be compelled to flee into this realm, they shall be relieved as shall appertain;" and approved a grant of one thousand pounds for the conspirators.

42 Ibid., p.21.
43 SSP, p.77.
own agents to Scotland and ordered Hertford secretly to allow them to cross the borders.\textsuperscript{46}

The letter, addressed from the privy council to Hertford, fails to explain the reasons behind their mission, but if an assassination attempt was made in 1544, it was undocumented and did not cost the lives of the main conspirators. In any case, it was not until 1545 when the scheme surfaced again, and this time it was driven not by reformist fervor, but by political motivation.

By 1545, Henry was less vague in his exhortations to eliminate Beaton, but still wanted to distance himself as far as possible from the actual plot. On May 30, the privy council informed Hertford that the king had seen letters from Casillis to Sadler that contained “an offer to kill the cardinal.” The calculated response from London stated that,

\begin{quote}
As to the first point [the murder of Beaton], the King, reputing the fact not meet to be set forward by him, and yet not misliking the offer, thinks that Sadler should write to Cassillis that it does not seem meet to be communicated to the King, but that if he [Sadler] were in Cassillis’s place he would do what he could for its execution, thinking thereby to do the King acceptable service and to benefit Scotland.\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

Thus, Henry approved of the plan passed on by Casillis to eliminate Beaton, but delegated the matter to Sir Ralph Sadler, not wanting directly to involve himself in a murder plot. Then in July a set of ciphered messages were sent to the Council of the North (Hertford, Sadler, Tunstall) from the laird of Brunstone, “touching the killing of

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{LP}, Vol.19, Part I, #589, p.359. \\
\textsuperscript{47} \textit{LP}, Vol.20, Part 1, #834, p.411.
the Cardinal.” The matter was referred to Sadler, who responded to Brunstone that it would be an "acceptable service to God to take him out of the way who does so much to obscure God’s glory and confound the common weal," and added that a reward would be "paid immediately upon the act executed." Sadler added that Sir George Douglas, "who appears to be of the same opinion touching the Cardinal," also be informed of what he has written. While the previous messages from the privy council concerning the murder of Beaton had been vague and questionable, Sadler plainly urged the conspirators to go forth and eliminate "the worker of all mischief...the Cardinal," and assured them that the King would "liberally reward" them for their actions. This letter was most likely the assurance the conspirators needed to go forward with the plot, and the frequency with which Sadler mentioned the reward reveals that profit was probably as much a consideration in the scheme as politics or religion. Yet, in this case the religious fervor came from Sadler himself, who was a strict Protestant and justified the murder as an event which would be looked upon favorably by God.

By the Spring of 1545, Beaton was firmly in control of the Scottish government and the religious toleration of 1543 was only a memory. But, whereas the heretical activity of 1543 had been dealt with severely by prosecutions in the winter of 1543-44, Beaton’s preoccupation with war and political dissention had prevented him from dealing as effectively with the reformists in 1545. Thus, renegade preachers were beginning to

49 LP, Vol.20, Part 1, #1178, pp.574-575.
50 Ibid., pp.574-575.
51 Sanderson, Cardinal of Scotland, p.206.
gain a sympathetic following in places such as Dundee and the Mearns where they could preach publicly to a general audience. The most prolific of these preachers was George Wishart, a Scotsman who held strong Protestant leanings and was an excellent communicator with the masses. The Cardinal himself ordered Wishart to cease preaching in mid-1545, but Wishart defied the order and by the autumn of 1545 had returned to Dundee to comfort those who had contracted the plague. Wishart’s fame spread rapidly, and a zealous former schoolteacher and tutor to the Douglas family named John Knox became his bodyguard, wielding a large broad sword at Wishart’s side during public sermons. But in addition to being a popular and respected evangelist, Wishart also may have been involved in the long-term plot to murder Beaton.

Although it is virtually impossible to prove, Wishart might have been an original member of the group conspiring to kill the cardinal. Wishart could have been the Scot “Wysshart” who delivered the first datable conspiracy message to Hertford and Sadler in 1544. He was definitely in contact with Casillis, Glencairn, and other reformist lords throughout the period, and was frequently sponsored and protected by local gentlemen who were members of the Leslie or Kirkcaldy families. Sir George Douglas, who also knew of the plot, attended several of Wishart’s sermons, and Wishart himself was known to have visited England on various occasions, possibly as one of Leslie’s agents to Henry in 1544. But whatever his connection to the plot to murder Beaton, it was as a heretic that Wishart was arrested in January 1546 and handed over to the cardinal by the earl of

By 1546, de Lorges Montgomery and his French troops had left Scotland in disgust, the money to finance a war with England was running low, the Scottish bishops were losing ground to reformist ideas, and the cardinal was facing political opposition from the notoriously fickle Scottish lords. Margaret Sanderson noted that it was "against this background of domestic and international frustration and failure and hint of lay-ecclesiastical friction that the trial of George Wishart has to be seen." Beaton was aware of the opposition he faced from the lay nobility and wanted to restore a sense of order and ecclesiastical authority over the country. On March 1, the cardinal personally presided over Wishart's trial at St. Andrews Cathedral before a large convocation of clergy. The sympathy in the cathedral for Wishart was shown when armed guards cleared the building of spectators before the sentence of guilt was announced. Wishart was immediately taken the short distance to the cardinal’s castle and burned alive. Whether or not Wishart was an English agent, this gruesome spectacle finally sparked the Scottish conspirators into action. In the two months that followed the execution, Wishart became a martyr to the Protestant cause, and Beaton set off on a progress to Perth with the governor, intent on repressing heretics.

On May 28, soon after the cardinal had returned to his castle, Norman Leslie and the laird of Grange’s son, William Kirkcaldy, met with James Melville and a host of other

---
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reform-minded individuals in St. Andrews. Early the next morning, Leslie and the rest stormed the castle and murdered the cardinal in retaliation for the death of Wishart.\(^5\)

Yet, Gordon Donaldson surmises that the murder was not entirely based on revenge or religious fervor, for personal motives may have led the conspirators to kill Beaton before he took repressive action against them.\(^5\) Money was obviously a factor in the killing, but the action itself may have increased anti-Catholic sentiment throughout the country, for over the next few months various churches were desecrated or looted. Yet the assassins did not seem to have a broad base of support, and there were no risings against members of the Scottish clergy. In fact, Knox contends that some of the murderers were in Protestant eyes "men without God," and represented radical elements which even conservative reformers would have found distasteful.\(^5\) At any rate, the man who had controlled Scotland was dead, and there was no one equally skilled to take his place. As the cardinal himself muttered as he died, "fy, fy: all is gone".\(^5\)

Beaton's murderers barricaded themselves inside the castle and for the next twelve months St. Andrews became a refuge for prosecuted Protestants. John Knox himself joined the group in April of 1547, and first began to preach from the pulpits of St. Andrews. The murderers looked to England for aid in fleeing Scotland, but the English privy council refused to become involved in what would surely become an international incident. Arran also hesitated to take action against the conspirators, mainly because his


\(^{57}\) Donaldson, James V-VII, pp.74-75.

\(^{58}\) Ibid., p.75.

son had been under Beaton’s protection and was now a hostage. Finally, in July 1547
French ships under the command of Peter Strozzi bombarded St. Andrews castle and took
the survivors prisoner. Knox was enslaved in French galleys for the next two years
before he returned to Scotland in 1549.

Although Beaton did not unify Scotland politically or religiously, he at least had
the diplomatic ability to keep the various personalities, feuds, and factions in check.
Upon Beaton’s death, Scottish politics again revealed the internal dissention that had
marked it in 1543. As Gordon Donaldson stated, “the coalition which Beaton’s
astuteness had built up had disintegrated.”60 A parliament was hastily convened in
Edinburgh on June 11, 1546 with the intention of keeping Scottish politics united under
Governor Arran and the queen dowager. On that day parliament issued three important,
telling statements. The first formally overturned the band concerning the marriage of
Queen Mary to Prince Edward of England, reiterating that even with the cardinal gone,
the Scots refused to ally with King Henry.61 The second was a proclamation prohibiting
communication with Beaton’s murderers in St. Andrews castle, which suggests that the
conspirators were receiving aid from the outside.62 Similarly, the third was a
proclamation forbidding additional “outrage” toward ecclesiastical buildings and
demanded restoration of the places seized or desecrated.63 In late July, the governor and
queen dowager worked together to charge Norman Leslie with treason; a month later

60 Donaldson, James V-VII, p.76.
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they ordered St. Andrews Castle besieged. Yet, Arran and Mary of Guise were allied out of mutual necessity and by the summer of 1546 "the Governor and Dowager again began to strain in their several directions." 

On July 31, 1546, the Scottish Parliament accepted the comprehension of Scotland in the Anglo-French Treaty of Campe, but the Scots were left at war with England and with no word of French aid should Henry decide to continue his Rough Wooing that autumn. The former provost of Edinburgh, Sir Adam Otterburn, was hastily sent to London. The ambassador's instructions indicated the underlying differences and vague intentions of the Scottish government, for Otterburn was one of the dowager's men, but was supposed to work closely with David Paniter, Arran's secretary. On September 26, Otterburn was summoned "to cum to Sanctandrois: and the effect was to pas in Yngland, and the secreter and I to be in comissioun and gif we agre nocht, he to pas in France to know the Kyng of Francis mynd." Not surprisingly, the Scottish emissaries could come to no agreement with the English, but they at least helped convince Henry to withhold aid to St. Andrews (the prospect of English interference was widely rumored in Scotland and greatly feared by the Scottish government). In any case, by late January 1547 everything changed when Henry VIII abruptly died at the age of fifty-five.

The Rough Wooing was over, but the fires of Anglo-Scottish hostility were not
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estinguished by the deaths of Cardinal Beaton and Henry VIII. Edward Seymour, the earl of Hertford, gained the titles duke of Somerset and Lord Protector of England, and carried with him a much more systematic plan for the control of Scotland than Henry had ever considered. Otterburn received no better results with Somerset than he had with Henry, and his own government’s conflicting agendas made his task nearly impossible. He wrote accusingly to Arran that “I repent sair that ther is sa grete respect to particular proffeit and na respect to the common wele.” His words rang true, for the new Admiral of Scotland, Bothwell, was warded at Blackness that July for “trafficking with England.” Before leaving England, Otterburn wrote Arran in alarm that “I saw afoir my eis verray gret preparation of weir,” and added that Somerset admitted he had failed to discover “better wayis to be had than the effusion of blude and distructioun,” in dealing with the Scots. The ambassador declared to Arran that the Scottish government was “sufficientle advertist” of the imminent English invasion, and hence should hastily do everything possible to prepare their defenses. By March 17, the Scottish privy council noted the "disturbed state of the country."

On “Black Saturday”, September 10, 1547, the Scots were handed their second crushing defeat of the decade at the Battle of Pinkie. Among the primary causes of the debacle were the lack of trust between the Scottish lords - particularly between Arran and Angus - poor military leadership, and a non-confident and ill-prepared Scottish army.
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Somerset finally had the chance to implement his policy of garrisoning Scotland with English troops in order to secure Scottish acceptance of Edward VI as their overlord and protect the assured Scots. As M.L. Bush stated, “Somerset’s obsession dictated affairs: the garrison policy was maintained,” even when it became unworkable with the arrival of large numbers of French soldiers in June, 1548. England’s policy of controlling Scotland by military force led the French king, Henry II, to send ten thousand troops to the Firth of Forth in order to repulse the English and garrison the kingdom for France. Scotland thus became the prize in a military tug-of-war between England and France for the remainder of the 1540’s. Foreign intervention meant the loss of Scottish political independence, signified by the removal of Queen Mary to France in late July, 1548.

---

Conclusion

‘Why think you that this treaty will be performed?’ ‘Why not?’ said Sadler. ‘I assure you,’ replied Otterbum, ‘it is not possible, for our people do not like it.’ Sadler said he could not understand this, ‘these two realmes, being knytte and conjoyned in one, the subjects of the same, which have always been infested with the warres, myght live in welth and perpetual peas.’ ‘Well,’ said Otterburn, ‘if you had the lass and we the lad, we could be well content with it, but I cannot believe that your nation would agree to have a Scot be king of England. And, likewise, I assure you that our nation, being a stout nation, will never agree to have an Englishman to be king of Scotland; our common people and the stones in the street would rise and rebel against it.’

Somerset's overthrow in October 1549 ended England's policy of controlling Scotland by force, and since Mary Queen of Scots had been removed to Paris, Scotland in the 1550's almost became a province of France. Without the young Queen in his possession, Governor Arran could not prevent the increase of French influence in Scottish politics that resulted in Mary of Guise assuming the regency in 1554. Yet, just when Anglo-Scottish relations had reached a standstill, the spread of reformist ideas in Scotland pushed the Scots away from their "auld" ally and towards England. By 1560, Scottish Protestants under Knox had overturned the powerful Scottish clergy, and France lost her power base in Scotland. Knox and his followers, with English assistance, had effected not only a religious reformation, but a political one as well. The resulting Treaty of Edinburgh ended the four-century old Auld Alliance and marked the beginning of a new alliance with England. Still, there remained much distrust and misunderstanding between the two kingdoms, which only a long period of peace and open negotiations
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could change. The 1540's had revealed that future relations would have to be made on even terms or positive results would be few in number. "If Scotland was to take up house with England it must be as a sister, not as a bondswoman. Henry never understood that." Although Henry's "gentle" and "rough" wooing was never meant to effect a union between the two realms, the intense politics and complex diplomatic situation did lead to a few new ideas concerning a mutually beneficial alliance.

The burgher and assured Scot James Henrisoun, for instance, was one of the first writers to use the term "Great Britain" to promote Anglo-Scottish amity. Henrisoun felt, like many other merchants, that an alliance with England would benefit Scottish trade. He also noted that the two kingdoms shared ties of language and blood, as well as a commitment to the reformed faith. Likewise, in 1542 a highland "redshank" named John Elder presented Henry with a tract which villified Beaton and the Roman Church, denounced the French alliance, and argued for union between the two realms for religious purposes. Whether the attitudes of these two very different Scotsmen were shared by very many of their countrymen in 1543 remains unknown. Henry in particular wished to exploit the idea of religious reform which caused so many Scots to support the pro-English party. Were it not for the reformist influence from across the border and Queen

---

Elizabeth I’s intervention in 1560, Knox and the other Scottish reformers would have been less likely to defeat the bishops, and in turn, French control. Thus, Anglo-Scottish amity in the future was to go hand-in-hand with reformist sentiment, a fact that Henry had recognized and worked to exploit through Sadler's embassies and the assured lords.

Nonetheless, Scotland was felt by most Englishmen to be, "a poor shabby sort of place whose ill-clad inhabitants turned a dishonest penny by robbing one another, harrying the borders, and making dishonourable raids upon England in the interest of France." It seems that the failure of Anglo-Scottish rapprochement in the 1540's partially rested on the fact that English policy was too patronizing toward the Scots. If Henry and Sadler truly regarded the Scottish leaders as nothing more than uncivilized buffoons, they grossly underestimated the political skills and resolve of their northern neighbors. Sadler in particular seemed to view the Scots only in religious terms, trusting those who appeared to be reformists and suspicious of all the rest. This attitude adversely affected his mission for he was too quick to believe Arran's promises and prone to disregard Beaton and the conservative earls. Because he felt the Scots would naturally want to align with England and the reformed faith following the death of James, Sadler was blind to the fact that the Scots felt independence to be more important than friendship with England and misjudged the attitude of a nobility that would support an English alliance but not English political control. Sadler was simply not practical enough to use the personal divisions between the Scottish nobles to his advantage. But the failure of

\[\text{\textsuperscript{5} Mackie, "Henry VIII and Scotland", pp.112-113.}\]
the "gentle" wooing was not his alone, for even if he had recognized how much the Scots desired political freedom, it is doubtful he could have persuaded Henry to alter his demands. Sir Walter Scott once wrote of Sadler that "he had to contend with the prejudices which centuries of war had engraved in the bosom of the Scottish nation," and "the impatient, haughty, and furious temper of King Henry, added to the obstacles which the ambassador had to encounter."6 In the end, Sadler was simply an unfortunate prisoner of his king's poorly-designed foreign policy.

Governor Arran, on the other hand, was a prisoner to both the factionalism of his own countrymen and the political and military advances of the two powers who wished to exert their control over Scotland. Over the course of eight months in 1543, the governor swung from advocating pro-English relations and religious reform to allying with a hated enemy and placing the kingdom under papal protection. Since Arran had in fact capitulated to Rome three months before turning his back on Henry and Sadler, it appears as though he was working in France's favor long before he defected to Beaton. Yet that was not the case. Arran had worked closely with the assured lords in early 1543 to initiate religious reform and block the French and papal influence that he and many other Scottish nobles believed had contributed to the debacle at Solway Moss. For a time, Arran challenged the ingrained Scottish enmity toward England even as Henry made his condescending demands. However, the governor felt it more important to maintain his position as regent, which meant doing what he could to retain the support of the nobility.

6 SSP, p.xi.
and bishops after the reformist backlash of Solway Moss had been forgotten. Margaret Sanderson perhaps put the enigma of Arran best when she wrote, "Aware that he was being used, he spent his time evading commitment to policies that might in any way threaten his interests." Arran's primary interest was protecting young Mary from any outside threats, thus preserving both the independence of Scotland and his governorship. When he realized that Henry's inflated demands and the assured lords were turning the country against him, he without remorse switched to the faction which would better allow him to remain governor of Scotland. Even after his capitulation to the Pope in May, 1543, Arran continued playing off all sides in the hope of gaining as much as he could without being forced into any one particular course of action. His actions are more comprehensible if it is realized that he had little political experience and was not committed to follow one political path or another. Arran certainly stalled the English for time in 1543, but that was the most politically practical thing for him to do, and his reputation as a weak and indecisive man actually helped him to achieve that purpose. History has given Arran a questionable if not outright soiled reputation as a foolish and unfit leader at a time when the Scots most needed a strong presence in Holyrood. Yet one has to consider that in 1543, Arran kept England from obtaining the young Queen and thus gaining political control of Scotland, while at the same time preventing a devastating English invasion. He could have easily accepted Henry's proposal of a kingship, or invited an English army into Scotland to defeat Beaton, and that he did neither shows he

7 Sanderson, *Cardinal of Scotland*, p.160.
was competent enough to lead Scotland but not wise enough to hold his own power.

After Sadler, Arran, the king and the cardinal, perhaps the most intriguing figures in Anglo-Scottish diplomacy of the 1540's were the Scots nobility; both assured lords and conservative earls. A traditionally factionalized group in normal circumstances, both the Anglophile and Francophile lords were quick to place self-interest over loyalty to kings and religion. They refused to act as pawns for others if they were not substantially rewarded with profit or position. As Stephen Wood shows in his study of the Auld Alliance, the problem "which had always dogged Franco-Scottish relations, was that the Scots nobles...had fairly consistently resented the fact that the alliance always seemed to work for France's advantage and rarely that of Scotland." 8 The Scottish nobility attempted to maintain the kingdom's political freedom against both the Francophile clergy and Henrician demands for it was in their best interests to do so. Casillis, Glencairn, Huntley, Argyle, and the rest, no matter which side they espoused, shared age-old suspicions of England and the Scottish bishops, and would rather themselves have controlled Scotland. The Scottish nobles were very proud men, and under the blanket of political practicality there can be found an underlying amount of national sentiment in many of their actions, the most significant of which being their united refusal to deliver young Mary to England. No doubt the willingness of the Scots nobles to take sides in the 1540's was based on calculations of profit, but they were always much more inclined to fight for political control amongst themselves and often turned on objects of French or

English authority in Edinburgh.

As always, Henry VIII was liberal with his advice and instructions to Sadler and the assured lords in 1543, but simply never grasped the complexity of the situation north of the border. If Scotland had been foremost on his mind, the king doubtless would have laid out a more sound and successful long-term policy. Yet, Eustace Chapuys noted that the privy council had informed him "how Henry thought of nothing else, night and day, but the invasion of France." At any rate, a lengthy political strategy (other than assuring common Scots to England) would have been contrary to the way in which the old monarch had come to rule by the second half of his reign, when "foreign policy became a matter of day-to-day tactics rather than of long-term planning."

Possibly the most pertinent question is what Henry hoped to gain from his Scottish policy. Why did the Scots not submit to his demands? Clearly, Henry was not at all interested in union with Scotland, or even an alliance, for all he required was the immediate assurance that the Scots would remain on their side of the border during his invasion of France. The support of reformist Scots, the marriage treaty, the assured lords, Hertford's two invasions, and the propagandistic claims of English sovereignty were short-term tactics designed to make the Scots submit. In reality, the Scots interpreted Henry's "gentle" tactics as humiliating threats of English domination, while his "rough" strategy only united the Scots through fear and anger into greater resistance to his wishes.

---

Ironically, while the "Rough Wooing" helped make Henry's chief antagonist, Cardinal Beaton, the sole ruler of Scotland, his murder with Henry's approval in 1546 eventually opened the door to an increased French presence in Edinburgh after the king's death. At any rate, Anglo-Scottish relations from 1543-1546 were in the end determined by the diplomacy and personal agendas of the handful of individuals identified in this essay. The individual ruthlessness of everyone from Henry to Mary of Guise to achieve his or her respective personal and political goals cannot be overemphasized. Religion and popular national sentiment played a large part, but the often unpredictable actions of the main political figures in England, Scotland, and France decided the final course of events. It was ultimately their complex personalities which made the diplomatic circumstances so complicated in the period before, during, and after the "Rough Wooing".
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