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Abstract

The Observant Franciscan Order was the last religious order with late-medieval origins to found houses in Scotland before the Reformation. Most likely invited to come to Scotland in the 1450s by Mary of Gueldres, the Dutch wife of James II of Scotland, they were to found nine houses by the first decade of the sixteenth century. The first group of Observants in Scotland came from the Dutch dependencies of the Duke of Burgundy, who at the time was Philip the Good, uncle of Mary of Gueldres. Yet as much as the fortunes of the Scottish Observants reflected the experience of the order elsewhere in Europe, especially that of the Observant Franciscan Province of Cologne, to which the Scottish Observants belonged, the Scottish situation was also quite distinct. Unlike elsewhere in Europe, the Observants in Scotland never supplanted their Conventual brethren. In addition there is some evidence that the two branches of the Franciscan Order in Scotland were in competition with each other: there were no attempts by their respective Scottish patrons to reform any of the existing Conventual houses to the Observance. In fact there is some indication that in Scotland the two orders tended to share patrons. It is also very striking that no Scottish Observant house was founded in a burgh with an already established Conventual house – though it should be remembered that while the Observants managed to found nine houses in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, only three of the sixteen Conventual houses were founded in that same period – after a hiatus of more than a century.

The Observants settled in Edinburgh, St Andrews, Aberdeen, Glasgow, Ayr, Elgin, Stirling, Perth and Jedburgh, which put them in six royal burghs and two important ecclesiastical burghs as well as all three of the Scottish pre-Reformation University centres – although the foundation in Aberdeen pre-dates that of the university there. With the exception of Glasgow and Ayr these were all east coast burghs, most of which had well-established trade links with the Low Countries, Flanders and Northern Germany. Traditionally it has always been assumed that the Observants occupied an influential role at court – they supplied confessors to two successive kings of Scots, James IV and V – but at the same time, this influence appears to be tied to certain locations, not necessarily the order as a whole in Scotland. An investigation into patterns of royal patronage suggests that it was most prominent in those royal burghs where the Observant house had most likely been a royal foundation, while it was markedly less consistent for foundations undertaken either by ecclesiastical or burghal influence.

Overall, the thesis aims to shed some light on the role played by the Observants in later-medieval Scotland; how they were perceived by their contemporaries; and what actual influence they had both at court and within the burgh community. In so doing, it also aims to dispel some of the myths that surround them: myths very often based on conjecture due to a dearth of primary sources, which often put the Observants in a better light than they might have deserved. At the same time, recent historiography has shed light on some aspects of the Observants’ experience in pre-Reformation Scotland within the framework of other studies, but hardly any attempts have been made so far to link these different strands of scholarship into one comprehensive study of the Observant Franciscan order in Scotland up to the Reformation.
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Chapter 1
From Europe to Scotland:
An Introduction

In March 2005 the Scottish media brought back onto the stage of public interest a religious order that had been evicted from it almost four and a half centuries beforehand. The occasion had been the discovery of a number of graves during archaeological excavations on a site that had, for almost ninety years, been occupied by a community of Observant Franciscan friars. In the wake of the Reformation of 1560, every effort had been made by the Protestant Reformers to eliminate these friars and their mendicant brethren from the minds of the faithful. In some ways the study of Scottish history has still not recovered from this act of wilful amnesia. John Moorman prefaxes his *A History of the Franciscan Order* with an optimistic statement on how easy it would be to expand his bibliography as

> for the last hundred years books and learned articles have been pouring from the presses of Europe and America, as libraries have been combed and more and more literature has come to light. This great wealth of material is some indication of the vitality and originality of the sons of Francis.1

This is quite enough to make the historian of pre-Reformation Scotland jealous. It is no surprise that Scotland is mentioned only three times in this monumental study – one charting the Franciscans’ initial progress into Scotland in the 1230s, the second a brief description of the Observants’ arrival, and the third an even briefer statement on the Scottish province’s establishment.2

The study of the Observant Franciscans in Scotland is dogged by a lack of historical record as much as it is by its historiography. Very few primary sources of the Observants have survived, and these are not always helpful either; none of their architecture has survived, no church decorations that might have given an insight into their spiritual environment. We are left to glimpse their presence through incidental

---

2 Moorman, *History*, pp. 175, 491, 493.
secondary documents, when they interact with society or society interacts with them. What is perhaps most surprising is that the sources in which one would suspect mention of the Observant friars and their activities – sources, which have, in fact, provided ample evidence for Janet Foggie’s recent study on the Dominicans in Scotland – are conspicuously silent on the matter of the Scottish Observants. There are no comparable rental books such as Foggie has found for the Dominicans of Edinburgh, and there is little record of endowments or mortifications. Despite the fact that the Observants were by their very nature based in areas of urban settlement, they are only seldom mentioned in the main categories of urban record (such as town council registers, burgh court books or burgh accounts) and they occur only occasionally in protocol books. This is even more unfortunate since protocol books can, to some extent, show patterns of piety or give a record of mortifications and endowments by individuals, most of them to altars in the burgh church or to religious communities. The National Archives of Scotland are similarly largely starved of documents that would provide an insight into the Observants and their activities. The occasional charter where a witness list incorporates an Observant friar, a letter of confraternity, and a charter of mortification in the Dalhousie Muniments are the meagre spoils of the archival search – rather depressing if one compares that to the Papers of the King James Hospital of Perth which incorporate the records of the Dominican house in Perth. And need one mention the Register of the Great Seal, which was approached with great hopes, only to find a similar void of Observant activity. There was, however, one category of documents that was unavailable for consultation during the search of the NAS, and those are testaments. Prayers for the dead were an important source of income for the mendicant orders and one would expect this to be documented in the testaments; Foggie certainly found evidence to that effect for the Dominicans.

3 NAS GD79
4 Although access to testaments was barred at the time of research, staff in the NAS were not confident that they would yield much information on the Observants. At the same time, Kimm Perkins-Curran of Glasgow University has been as unsuccessful in securing evidence for beguinages in Scotland during her research for her thesis, which was nearing completion. As Sabine von Heusinger has shown for Basle (S. von Heusinger, Johannes Mulberg OP (+1414); Ein Leben im Spannungsfeld von Dominikanerobservanz und Beginenstreit, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens, Neue Folge, Band 9 [forthcoming, Berlin]), beguinages were a vital part of the mendicant network in towns and would have been overseen by one or other of the

1: From Europe to Scotland: An Introduction
If Moorman bemoaned the fact that there is so much material that his bibliography can hardly do it justice, then we must lament the fact that in Scotland at one time material of proportionate magnitude might have existed, but what there was did not survive. There are a number of charters and sasines which throw some light on the circumstances surrounding the foundations of some of the friaries (mostly the earlier foundations), but once again these are fragmented and allow for enough speculation that it is often impossible even to narrow down the date of foundation to more than a span of several years. Aberdeen is the notable exception here, and one should mention P.J. Anderson’s seminal work on the four orders of friars in Aberdeen, which has made the relevant sources accessible. Besides, these, however we are left with mostly incidental sources: an inscription on the flyleaf of a book, an entry in the St Giles Register, entries in the Treasurers’ Accounts and Exchequer Rolls, an account given by the Spanish ambassador to Scotland on the piety of James IV, a religious banner now displayed in the new Museum of Scotland with a motif that suggests a Franciscan connection, or – and this is quite possibly the richest if also the most problematic source – a poet’s highly subjective musings on the subject of the later-medieval church, often satirical in nature. At the same time, a number of Observant friars often entered the order after having studied at the Scottish and European universities, and they can be traced through university records and matriculation or graduation rolls – unfortunately this information becomes more sparse once these men have entered the order and it becomes once again difficult to assess whether the Observants as an order had any impact on the Scottish universities as, for example, the Dominicans undoubtedly did.

Rarely do we have the opportunity to assess material produced by the Observants themselves: one exception is the Obituary Calendar of the Aberdeen Observant friary, which, besides giving a record of the deaths of the Aberdeen friars and guardians as well as notable benefactors, also provides some anecdotal evidence. Next to the Obituary stand only Adam Abell’s The Roit and Quheill of Tyme, a

history of the world from the beginning of time to the year 1537, and William of Touris’ penitential poem *The Contemplacioun of Synnaris*. There is some archaeological evidence that allows us to estimate the location and size of the friaries. Even here the evidence is not yet complete, as the recent discoveries in Glasgow have shown.\(^7\) That is not to say, however, that these sources are any less valuable; physical and secondary evidence is always used in all studies of the medieval friars.\(^8\) Unfortunately, there is often very little biographical information about the Observants attached to these sources, and, in the case of the satirical literature, it is not always reliable. Nevertheless, the kaleidoscope of the material available to us will allow for certain conclusions to be drawn about a friars’ career in the order and his affiliation to and position in the various houses through which he can be traced.

What distinguishes the Scottish evidence – what little of it there is – from that which is available elsewhere in Europe, is that there is little or nothing else to corroborate or qualify it, which leaves us with a sketchy picture at best: ‘any account of the medieval religious houses in Scotland must be partial and incomplete because a reconstruction of their development is based on imperfect knowledge’.\(^9\) Thus we are told with some authority in a volume entitled *Ecclesiastical Annals of Perth, to the Period of the Reformation* that there had been a Franciscan settlement in Perth as early as 1358, a statement based on an entry in the *Exchequer Rolls*. What the author did not realise was that the Franciscans (Observants in this case) had arrived in Perth only in the late fifteenth century and that the *Exchequer Rolls* entry would have pertained to the Dominican friary, which had been founded sometime before 1240.\(^10\)

At the same time the sources are conspicuous in what they do not report: there is evidence that English troops which invaded Scotland during the 1540s (the time of the so-called ‘Rough Wooing’, signifying the period of Anglo-Scottish hostilities

---

\(^7\) The excavations in Glasgow were undertaken by Headland Archaeology Ltd on behalf of Scottish Enterprise Glasgow. The final report of the excavations, along with a computer reconstruction image of the site will eventually be published on the Headland Archaeology Ltd website (http://www.headlandarchaeology.com).


\(^10\) R.S. Fittis, *Ecclesiastical Annals of Perth, to the Period of the Reformation* (Edinburgh and Perth, 1885), p. 267; Cowan and Easson, *Religious Houses, Scotland*, p. 116. We also find the doubtful claim in Fittis’ *Annals* that the Observants had been invited to Scotland by James I and that the Perth Observantine friary had been founded in 1460, which are also found in Bryce.
after the break-down of marriage negotiations between the Scots and Henry VIII on behalf of the infant Mary, Queen of Scots and the future Edward VII, did extensive
damage to both the Observant and Dominican friaries of Edinburgh, however, there
is only one entry in the Treasurers’ Accounts for 1548 to hint that the Edinburgh
Observants suffered during these raids, besides an exaggerated pamphlet of 1544.\textsuperscript{11}

Our problems in assessing the Observant Franciscans in Scotland do not solely stem from the sources; it is also a problem of historiography. The last great study of the Franciscan Order in Scotland was published in 1909: William Moir-Bryce’s \textit{The Scottish Grey Friars}, which dealt with all three orders of Franciscans, the Conventuals, the Observants and the Capuchins.\textsuperscript{12} It is an extensive work, and its collection of sources is invaluable and unrivalled, but it is in need of revision. Many of Bryce’s conclusions with regards to the Observants were based on John Hay’s \textit{Chronicle of the Observantine Province of Scotland}, written in 1586, which was to be included in a History compiled by Francis Gonzaga, ultramontane minister general. The \textit{Chronicle}, however, was based mostly on hearsay, which makes any conclusions drawn from it alone problematic at best. There is some attempt at critical analysis of the \textit{Chronicle} by Bryce, but by no means extensive enough, despite his collection of sources (which is as comprehensive as it could be) that sometimes contradict Hay’s account; as far as Bryce was concerned, Hay was the authority on the Observants in Scotland. Bryce used the sparse primary evidence to construct a narrative that presents a misleading picture of completion. Thus he inferred from the report of Pedro de Ayala, Spanish ambassador to Scotland, that James IV would not receive the English ambassador, because he spent Holy Week 1513 at the Stirling Observant friary, that every year it was James’ custom ‘to withdraw from all state business and to remain in this friary in strict seclusion’. James may well have withdrawn from all state business during Holy Week, but there is no further record to tell us whether he did so every year, nor whether he secluded himself at the Stirling Observant house every time. Bryce saw further proof of the king’s special favour


\textsuperscript{12} W. Moir Bryce, \textit{The Scottish Grey Friars}, 2 vols (Edinburgh and London, 1909). As Bryce will be cited frequently throughout the thesis, references will be simplified to: Bryce, i/ii.
towards the Observants of Stirling in a poem by William Dunbar, *Dunbar’s Dirige to the King*, which laments that the James IV spent much time in Stirling and is told - from the point of view of an Edinburgh burgess - that he has traded heaven (i.e. Edinburgh) for purgatory (i.e. Stirling), while Bryce dismissed Dunbar as a failed Franciscan, a former novice of the St Andrews friary.13

While both theories - that the purgatory described in *Dunbar’s Dirige to the King* (usually referred to as the *Dregy*) was a direct attack on the Stirling Observants and that Dunbar had been a novice in an Observant house, perhaps even a friar - have long been accepted by scholars as fact, a number of recent studies have thoroughly disproved them, as well as other theories that Bryce established, based on Hay’s *Chronicle*, most particularly the evidence he presented concerning the foundations of the various houses. Here, I.B. Cowan and D.E. Easson’s detailed history of the medieval religious houses in Scotland and John Durkan’s article on the Observant Franciscan Province in Scotland, have proved invaluable, and it has become clear that Hay’s account is often little more than storytelling.14

None of the evidence detailed above could be described as what Cowan and Easson have termed ‘intimate’; historiography has latched on to what was available with little scrutiny. Beggars, after all, cannot be choosers. At the same time many of the contemporary sources that deal with the Observants were created at a time when Protestant sentiment began to spread in Scotland and the Church and its members came under sustained criticism, leaving us often with biased and distorted accounts. Thus certain myths have developed around the Observant Franciscans: like the Dominicans they were vilified by the Reformers. The impact of that criticism has been long lasting; one result was the drive for some hint of rehabilitation, which was launched among their modern sympathisers, a trait which permeates Bryce’s work on the Franciscans in Scotland, *The Scottish Grey Friars*, resulting in a decidedly uncritical agenda. Although the Scottish sources are very problematic, the Franciscan friars in their time had been prolific and in other parts of Europe, at least, their magnificent churches and the many documents in which they tried to expound on the

---

nature of their faith have been preserved. It is this evidence which allows us to search for parallels with how later-medieval ‘Franciscanism’ would have presented itself in Scotland.

The ‘European Connection’, if we may call it that, can be traced throughout the Observants’ history in pre-Reformation Scotland. The first group of Observant friars came to Scotland from Zeeland, in the Dutch dependencies of the Duke of Burgundy, who at the time was Philip the Good, uncle of Mary of Gueldres, wife of James II of Scotland. The Scottish province was administered through its mother-province of Cologne (or Lower German province). As John Durkan has pointed out, this was quite a large province, 'stretching from Antwerp in the west to Hesse and Westphalia in Germany in the east and from Leeuwarden in Friesland in the north to Sint Truiden in Belgium to the south.'15 The rather extensive geographical area also meant that it incorporated a very diverse devotional landscape, which we may assume the Observants brought with them. They have sometimes been described as one of the ‘many channels through which the cultural and religious influences of Flanders, the Rhineland and France flowed into Scotland’.16

It was most likely Mary of Gueldres, or Maria van Gelderland, niece of Philip the Good of Burgundy and wife of King James II of Scotland (1437-1460), who brought the Observants to Scotland, ‘at the request of certain merchants’ who had no doubt encountered the Observants through trade with the Low Countries and Germany.17 Mary of Gueldres herself would have been familiar with the Observantine friars from her adopted home of Burgundy, where they were beginning to exert great influence. Mary of Gueldres was not the only connection of the House of Stewart to the Low Countries; her sisters-in-law were all married to European nobility or royalty. Mary, the third sister of James II, for example, married Wolfaert van Borselen in 1444, strengthening the Scottish position in the Low Countries. Mary’s father-in-law was Henric, lord of Veere, Sandenburg, Flushing, Westkapelle,

---

Domburg and Bronwershaven as well as admiral to Philip the Good. However, this does not mean that the Scottish Observants were a mirror image of the parent-province. On the contrary, we will find that there were circumstances and practices quite peculiar to the Scottish situation and the Scottish psyche even. But first we need to take a few moments to look at the origins of the Franciscan order – and why, alone of the mendicant orders, this order split over the issue of observance in the early fifteenth century.

The Franciscan 'story' began in 1204, when a young man called Francesco Bernardone from Assisi in Umbria had a vision: in the church of San Damiano he was told by the crucified Christ to 'go, Francis, and repair my house'. For Francesco it would be a life-changing event, and for the church it would be the beginning of a movement that would reach into its farthest corners. The man soon became known as Francis of Assisi and would go on to found the order that bears his name. Five years later Francis and the eleven friars who had by then joined him travelled to Rome to present his first Rule to Pope Innocent III. According to Francis' hagiography, Innocent sanctioned both the Rule and Francis' community after a dream in which Francis appeared as the force that would hold up the church of St John Lateran – essentially the home and symbol of the medieval popes – and prevent it from collapsing, a most auspicious sign. The Rule of St Francis was, incidentally, the last new rule that was admitted to the canon of the church. By decree of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, all subsequent orders would have to choose for themselves a Rule already established.

The Franciscans were not the only order of friars founded at this time: four main orders of friars can be distinguished, Franciscan, Dominican, Augustinian and Carmelite. Associated with each of these major orders of friars is usually a Second –female – Order (the Poor Clares, for example, were the Franciscan Second Order), and also the so-called Third Orders, which are fraternities of lay men or women.

---

18 C. McGladdery, James II (Edinburgh, 1990), p. 43.
19 Throughout the thesis, the term observance/Observance will be spelt deliberately in lower case when referring to the general phenomenon rather than the Franciscan Observance movement, which resulted in an independent order.
20 Thomas of Celano's biography of Francis was commissioned by Pope Gregory IX in 1238-9 and is generally referred to as the First Life, which was supplemented in 1247 as the Second Life. These formed the basis of later hagiographies.
21 Moorman, History, pp. 4-19; Brooke, Coming of the Friars, p. 88, 161.
Essentially the mendicant orders were an expression of a new ideal; members of the church remembered that, historically, Christ and the apostles are depicted as ‘bearded and barefoot’, that they had led a life of wandering not contemplation and, above all, a life of poverty. Most of these orders appeared early in the thirteenth century and represented a new and revolutionary version of the religious life. To the more perceptive leaders of the Church, like Pope Innocent III, they seemed to be a providential response to a spiritual crisis that was afflicting western Christendom. Reduced to its essentials, this crisis was a confrontation between traditional assumptions about the nature of the Christian life and the religious needs of a newly arisen urban and secular culture...It seemed that these needs could not be met by the established forms of religious organisation.

Until that point, religious orders would have followed the example of the early hermits and settled outside the towns or major settlements the more secluded the site for their monastery the better. The Friars, in what was perhaps the most significant departure from established religious life, and one which would be the cause of much suspicion about them, returned to the world, as it were, and settled in the towns – in effect they brought the monastic cycle of life to a wider population that was more than prepared to adopt it. They soon became known as confessors, preachers and sometimes inquisitors and were used by the church to combat the threat of heresy, which it perceived as lurking everywhere. The role of inquisitors seemed an obvious one, as those responsible for setting up the Inquisition were closely linked to both Dominic and Francis. On the other hand, this was just one more issue that would cause the friars to be regarded with suspicion, if not fear, an issue that would be dredged up by their critics at every opportunity.

Francis’ Rule had its foundation in ‘the recorded sayings of Christ’, that is the gospels, to the point that he felt no need to elaborate further than to admonish his

---

22 Brooke, Coming of the Friars, p. 40.
followers ‘to follow the teachings and footsteps of Christ’ as revealed therein, thus founding the idea of the vita apostolica. But the central element of his Rule was a vow of complete poverty, which was based on the theory that Jesus and the apostles had lived in poverty and that, in order perfectly to emulate their example, it was necessary to emulate that poverty.²⁵ Poverty became a spiritual exercise to facilitate, as Habig put it, ‘a complete renunciation of self in the deepest humility’ and mendicancy became a new way of religious life, one that would be paired with the vocation to preach. Quite unlike the other mendicant orders emerging at this time, the Franciscans saw poverty as a raison d’être, not just a means to an exemplary life or, as the Dominicans saw it, a means to better fulfil their primary mission of preaching. As Rosalind Brooke pointed out, mendicant orders were governed by a set of constitutions in addition to the Rule, but the Franciscans would take decades before these constitutions became anything more to them than further commentaries on the Rule of St Francis. This was in stark contrast with the Dominican order, for which the Rule of St Augustine was a requirement and the essence of their order was protected through the constitutions.²⁶ It also became the focus of many impassioned debates on how to administer poverty and how to apply it in a community that was growing steadily. It was one thing for a group of eleven hermits and their founder to live in poverty, it was quite another to stretch this over a larger and far-flung community on both sides of the Alps. Questions of how to house the communities, who would take ownership of the friaries’ buildings, even the kind of sandals the friars were to wear all became the subject of existential debates within the order that would at times engulf the entire church.²⁷

Neither Francis nor his early followers seemed concerned with these all-too-worldly problems arising from their ideal. Francis himself may not have realised quite how much his movement was going to explode in numbers and it has been suggested that Francis himself was not interested in the administrative issues of

²⁵ M.A. Habig (ed.), St Francis of Assisi: Writings and Early Biographies: English Omnibus of the Sources for the Life of St Francis (Quincy, 1991), p. 6-8 and p. 6 note 4; Moorman, History, p. 3.
²⁶ Brooke, Coming of the Friars, p. 97. Dominic (Domingo de Guzmán) was in fact a Spanish contemporary of Francis, founding his order in 1216, after the papal restriction on Rules for religious orders set out in the Fourth Lateran Council (Dominic chose to follow the established Rule of St Augustine), which could explain the difference as to how the Franciscans and Dominicans perceived the role of the Rule versus the constitutions.
²⁷ Moorman, History, pp. 53-4.
founding an order. However, it had become apparent by 1219 that the 'primitive Rule' was no longer sufficient to administer a growing order which by this point had already grown into several provinces. Thus on the advice of especially Cardinal Ugolino (the Cardinal Protector of the young Franciscan order) Francis first expanded on the Rule of 1209 in 1221, a document usually referred to as the 'First Rule of 1221', and then a 'Second Rule of 1223' neither of which, as Habig has argued, were Rules in their own right, but simply elaborations on the Rule of 1209. What both the Rules of 1221 and 1223 did was to alleviate some of the strictness of the first Rule, especially on the subject of poverty, and as a result they have sometimes been seen as countermanding Francis' initial vision.

The struggle of Francis' devoted followers to follow their founder's example as strictly as he would have wished in turn led to a certain suspicion towards the Rule, especially in view of the so-called Testament of St Francis, composed shortly before his death on 3 October 1226. This Testament was a further admonition to observe the Rule without compromise; Francis strictly forbade his friars to interpret either the Rule or the Testament: 'God inspired me to write the Rule and these words plainly and simply, and so you too must understand them plainly and simply, and live by them, doing good to the last'. This admonition would haunt the order for centuries to come and inflamed a dispute within the order over how strictly the vow of poverty was to be observed. The more zealous elements within the Franciscan order understandably felt justified by the words of Francis and this dispute would, eventually, lead to a series of successive rifts within the Franciscan order: the Observants in 1415 (becoming the dominant branch of the order in 1517) and in 1529 the Capuchins, the most uncompromisingly observant of the three.

Franciscan foundations were usually linked to royalty, the nobility in general and the inhabitants of the towns, often with the support of the episcopate, a trend that can be followed throughout the Franciscans' history in Europe. This served them
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28 Marion Habig goes so far as to suggest that 'the Little Poor Man of Assisi [...] sought only obscurity', Habig, Omnibus, p. 5. See also Moorman, History, p. 53.
29 Habig, Omnibus, pp. 20-1, 30, 54; Moorman, History, pp. 47. For the full text of the Rules of 1221 and 1223 as well as the Testament, see Habig, Omnibus, pp. 27-70, esp. pp. 65-6 on the background to the Testament.
30 Habig, Omnibus, p. 69. Brooke points out in this context – and correctly so – that this Testament is hardly a document in the usual (legal) sense of the word, as Francis had given up all possessions, Brooke, Coming of the Friars, p. 24.
rather well when they first arrived in the thirteenth century in countries which were already dominated by the long-established religious orders. Towards the end of the thirteenth century, however, a climax was reached in foundations of Franciscan houses in France and it was not until the Observant movement of the fifteenth century that this stagnation was reversed.\(^{31}\)

The more the order grew, the more difficult it became to administer the ideal of poverty, and almost a century on a certain status had been acquired that caused the harsher aspects of the Rule to be relaxed in what Moorman described as a move ‘from vagrancy to security and from simplicity to learning’, which met with severe criticism from the more idealistic and zealous members of the order. This resulted in a number of reform movements, the earliest groups being usually referred to as Spirituals, or Zelanti. The Spirituals re-interpreted the earliest ideals and proceeded to distinguish themselves from the rest of the order by, among other novelties, wearing a shorter habit, which they thought to be ‘more primitive and more austere’. They became a powerful enough movement that a split from the order became a possibility and eventually their refusal to bow to what a papal bull of 1317 referred to as ‘common practice’ defined them as heretics by canon law.\(^{32}\)

One should of course bear in mind that the movement for stricter observance of the founding Rule was not a Franciscan phenomenon, but rather a mendicant one. The most obvious parallel in Scotland was the Dominican order, whose reforms in Scotland under their provincial John Adamson (appointed in 1511) led to the closure of several friaries, notably at Cupar and St Monans, both not far from St Andrews. They were considered ‘unsuitable places for religious, whereas St Andrews, as a university town, was a place where a sufficient number of friars might live according to rule’.\(^{33}\) For the Franciscans, it was only when coupled with the vision of Francis for his order that this issue became volatile enough to force the ‘old order’ and the

---


\(^{32}\) Moorman, History, 307-11. It would go too far beyond the remit of the present discussion to go into any greater detail where the more unorthodox and often heretical splinter groups within the Observants are concerned. One such group, a rather important one, were, of course, the Fraticelli, and for full details on the background of both the Spirituals and the Fraticelli I would refer the curious to Moorman, History, esp. pp. 307-338.

reform movement apart. The roots of the Franciscan Observance go as far back as 1334, in a small hermitage in Brugliano in Italy, to where John de Valle had retreated with four companions to observe the Rule as laid down by Francis as strictly as possible. About ten years later they were joined by a layman called Gentile of Spoleto, who is generally credited with getting the Observant movement off its feet, for it was he who petitioned Pope Clement VI for permission – which he was eventually granted – to take over four small Franciscan hermitages in Italy, one of them near Assisi. From there, this small movement managed to attract a number of socially influential men whose initiative effected a steady spread of the Observance movement into other parts of Italy. One of them was Bernardino of Siena, one of the men who are now generally referred to as the ‘four pillars of the Observance’; the other three were John of Capistrano, Albert of Sarteano and James of the March, all of whom joined the Observants in the early fifteenth century. The rest, as they say, is history.34

The Rule of St Francis had laid down seemingly very simple aims and ordinances, but experience over the centuries had shown how difficult either in practice or in theological terms mendicancy was, if taken to the uncompromising lengths demanded by Francis. The decree of the Council of Constance in 1415, it might be said, implicitly admitted as much by dividing the Franciscans into two orders: one branch, who came to be known as Conventuals, would be permitted to forego the harshest of Francis’ decrees. A new branch of the order, termed the Observants, was given institutional independence from their unreformed brethren by granting them the right to elect vicars for each province, as well as a vicar general who acted as commissary for the Observant houses on behalf of the Minister General, and was thus provided with the opportunity to show whether the Rule of St Francis could indeed be followed to the letter. This was followed by a century of disputes and a fight for supremacy between the two, which was eventually resolved when the Observants were granted institutional supremacy in 1517; that is, the Conventuals were excluded from the election of the Minister General. The Conventuals were given the opportunity to elect a Master General for themselves

34 Moorman, History, pp. 369-77; for a detailed discussion of Bernardino of Siena, John of Capistrano, Albert of Sarteano and James of the March, see pp. 457-78.
and, if they did so, they were to be regarded as separate, but the Observants would take precedence.³⁵

Although the papal bull (Omnipotens Deus) regulating further relations between Observants and Conventuals clearly stated that ‘no outside power may transfer any convent or monastery from one Order to the other’ (a majority of two-thirds within a community had to be obtained), outside powers very often forced a reform within the friaries under their patronage. Sometimes this was done by riding roughshod over the wishes of the friars, resulting in endless appeals to the responsible bishop. At other times it was achieved through economic pressure; very often testaments were very specific that a grant to a certain friary would be considered only if the friary were reformed.³⁶ Scotland was different: here we are essentially dealing with two separate orders. When discussing Franciscans after the 1450s, it is important not to confuse the Observant Franciscans with the Conventuals. The Franciscans had maintained a presence in Scotland since the early thirteenth century, but none of these long-established friaries had been supplanted by the reformed Observants, as was happening all over Europe, although the Observants’ bull of foundation specifically allowed them to reform a number of Conventual friaries. This was quite out of keeping with general practice in the rest of Europe: usually if Observant friars were invited into an area it was with the intention by an influential patron (usually royal patrons) to reform the Franciscans friaries there according to the Observance.³⁷

The first Observant friars came to Scotland from Flanders in the late 1450s in what Cowan and Easson called ‘the last phase of the active history of the Scottish religious houses’. Throughout the coming century, the order was to maintain close links with Flanders and Germany, especially with the headquarters of the Scottish province based in Cologne; a Scottish Observant province was not established until

³⁷ Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, pp. 124-125, 130; P.L. Nyhus, ‘The Observant Reform Movement in Southern Germany’, in Franciscan Studies, 32 (1972), pp. 163f. It is interesting to note at this point, that the English experience was similar: there did not appear to have been an immediate desire to bring the Observance to England in order to reform the Conventual friaries there. See J.R.H. Moorman, The Franciscans in England (Oxford, 1974), pp. 82-6.
1470. The Observant presence in Scotland received official sanction in 1463, when Pope Pius II issued the bull Intelleximus te, which authorised the erection of ‘three or four houses’ and gave them permission to reform – essentially take over – a further ‘two or three’ Conventual houses. Mary of Gueldres’ initiative in this field is specifically mentioned in the bull of 1463, in which Pope Pius II gave this sanction ‘in accordance with the devotion of our dearest daughter in Christ, Mary, illustrious Queen of Scotland’. Four houses of the Observants were established in the reign of James III (both during the minority as well as the personal reign), while another five were established during James IV’s reign.

This welcome to an order which placed great emphasis on severity came at a time when the established church in Scotland was already coming under pressure from increasing calls for reform. It was in this context that the Observants had their first foundations in Scotland. A number of initiatives were put in motion in the third and fourth quarters of the fifteenth century, including the re-foundations of collegiate churches in the burghs, and the foundations of the Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen. At the University of St Andrews new colleges were founded, such as the College of St Leonard’s in 1512, ‘a college of poor clerks’ (eventually there were to be twenty), which was based on a similar college in Paris and was to cater only to arts and theology. It was founded by Archbishop Alexander Stewart, who was concerned with ‘discipline more than doctrine, order rather than wisdom’. This was followed by the foundation of St Mary’s College, first envisaged in 1525 by Archbishop James Beaton, who revived his initial idea in 1537-8, and was finally achieved in the early 1550s by Archbishop John Hamilton, one of the foremost Catholic Reformers in Scotland, who tried throughout his career to address increasing issues of discipline, poorly educated clergy and the growing threat of heresy, a concern which became ever more urgent from the late fifteenth century

38 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 51; Durkan insists that there was an unconfirmed acknowledgement of a Scottish province by the chapter general of Montlucon in Burgundy in 1467.
41 For a full list of the Scottish secular colleges, see Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, pp. 213-28.
onwards, when the first Lollards emerged in Kyle and the Protestant movement gathered momentum throughout Europe. But the foundations of the university colleges were only one facet of the reform that was to combat the issue of uneducated clergy: in the 1540s and 1550s these efforts would culminate in the provincial councils of the Scottish church, driven by men like Archbishop Hamilton. Among other things, these councils would address once again the education of the clergy, hoping to improve the poor intellectual state of its members by decreeing that monasteries were to send some of their monks to universities.43

The Observants’ establishment in Scotland, however, was complete by 1505, well before the problem of Protestantism became immediate. By then (i.e. 1505), nine houses had come into being which were to last until the Reformation. They were, in their order of foundation, Edinburgh, St Andrews, Aberdeen, Glasgow, Ayr, Stirling, Elgin, Perth and Jedburgh.44 This placed the Observants in six royal burghs and two important ecclesiastical burghs as well as all three of the Scottish pre-Reformation University centres – although the foundation in Aberdeen pre-dated that of the university there. With the exception of Glasgow and Ayr, these were all east coast burghs, most of which had well-established trade links with the Low Countries, Flanders and Northern Germany. Their founders were invariably the king, a bishop or burgesses, or any combination of the three. The location chosen for the friaries was on the periphery of the medieval town, to allow for the building of a friary (if there were not already buildings included in the original grant) and for expansion. At the periphery of the ‘built up’ area there was still enough land if needed. But even in such a peripheral location the friaries were always just outside the immediate centre of the town.45

Very soon after their arrival, the Observants managed to recruit native Scots rather than continue to ‘import’ friars from the Netherlands, where the original group around Cornelius of Zierekzee had come from. But despite the fact that the Scottish

44 Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland (see n. 6), pp. 116-117, 130 (see also the ordnance map included in this edition). The friaries are listed here chronologically by their dates of foundation, while Cowan and Easson list them alphabetically.
45 See also J. Schofield and V. Alan, Medieval Towns: The Archaeology of British Towns in Their European Setting (London and New York, 2003), p. 200 for examples of the locations of friary throughout Britain.
province was recognised as such from the 1470s onwards, the Scots did not sever their ties to the mother province of Cologne. The very ease with which friars like John Hay or John Paterson managed the transition into the administrative structure of the mother province after the Reformation in Scotland forced them into exile would testify to this. John Hay had been a junior friar at the time of the Reformation, when he left for the mother province of Cologne, where he eventually became provincial and wrote the *Chronicle of the Observantine Province of Scotland*; while John Paterson, also an exile at the Reformation, spent the remainder of his life at the convent of Louvain, after having been incorporated into the Lower German Province.

The Scottish Observant Franciscans as they are presented in the present study are a strictly pre-Reformation phenomenon. Although some houses may have survived the turmoils of 1559-60, these were no longer active friaries, no longer recruiting and eventually died out. The next stage of Franciscan history, that of the Irish Mission of the 1570s, will not be included here, since there is a noticeable hiatus. Furthermore, the Irish Franciscans had different origins than the Scottish Observants, both in terms of personnel and the influences they would have been under, and links between the two would have been small. The Irish Franciscans started as an offshoot from the English Franciscan mission of 1224, and initially their personnel was predominantly English or Anglo-Irish, although they eventually pushed into the Gaelic territories of Ireland. The Irish Observance, in turn, emerged from within the existing Conventual houses, stirring as early as 1417 and fully established by 1460, but with a heavy concentration in the Gaelic territories. Apart from the head-start they had on the Scottish Observants, the Irish Observant province was also larger: added to the ten houses founded specifically for the Observance were a further twenty-three which had been reformed (while twenty-four remained Conventual). Of these houses some had twelve or more friars at any one time. Ó Clabaigh believes that most of the reformed houses had actually applied the clause laid out in the bull *Omnipotens Deus*, stating that a house may be turned over to the Observance only if two-thirds of its friars vote accordingly, although in other cases, the same external pressure, which the European benefactors and patrons exerted, was brought to bear in order to force a reform. The Irish patrons were found among the Irish nobility, which can undoubtedly be explained by the fact that Ireland was

---

1: From Europe to Scotland: An Introduction
governed from London and the king would have had little interest in Irish mendicant settlements. Unlike the Scottish Observants, who had been introduced from outwith the Scottish Conventual community, their Irish counterparts were far more successful in taking over established friaries and reforming them according to the Observance, although this did not cause the Conventuals to go into decline; on the contrary, they continued to expand in the fifteenth century, albeit moderately. Overall, despite a number of similarities, the Irish province would have had a rather different appearance from the Scottish province: the latter had been introduced externally, with a strong northern European orientation, just like the burghs in which they settled. There were no Observant settlements in the Scottish Gàidhealtachd, and it is not surprising that the Irish Mission of the 1570s did not retrace the steps of the Scottish Observants, as the burghs they had been driven from would have been quite alien to the Irish friars.

The opening paragraphs of this thesis have outlined the problem we are facing with the primary sources. Unfortunately, this problem is not entirely restricted to the historical record, but to historiography as well; there have been no studies of the Observants in Scotland since Bryce’s book was published in 1909. The Observants have been included in a number of monographs and articles on the later-medieval Scottish church, but they have not been the primary subject. And we still find Bryce’s conclusions perpetuated in these studies. Even a book of such great authority as Moorman’s History of the Franciscan Order has fallen prey to this: one of the three entries concerning the Scottish Observants, which deals with the circumstances surrounding the arrival of the Observants in Scotland uses Bryce as a basis and has since been shown to be doubtful. As a result any study of the Observant Franciscans in Scotland must be as much about setting the record straight as it is about analysing the primary evidence.

This thesis attempts to fill this void; it is the purpose of this study to draw the fragmented pieces of scholarship together into a whole and revise, where possible, the problems apparent in Bryce’s work as far as it concerns the Friars Minor

---


47 Moorman, History, p. 491. Bryce endorsed John Hay’s claims that the Observants had been invited to come to Scotland by James I in 1436 and had eventually arrived in 1447; Moorman used this information without further analysis. For a full discussion see Chapter 2, pp. 25-26 and note 19.
Observant. It aims to shed some light on the role the Observants played in later-medieval Scotland, how they were perceived by their contemporaries and what actual influence they had, both at court and within the burgh community. In so doing it aims to dispel some of the myths that have grown up around them, often due to a dearth of primary sources which has led previous scholarship to conjecture, very often in the Observants’ favour. At the same time, recent historiography has shed new light on some aspects of the Observants’ experience in pre-Reformation Scotland within the framework of other studies, but hardly any attempts have been made so far to link these different strands of scholarship into one comprehensive study of the Observant Franciscan order in Scotland in the period leading up to the Reformation.
Chapter 2
The Observant Franciscans in Scotland: Location and Personnel

The Observant Franciscans had nine houses in Scotland: Edinburgh (c.1457-1463), St Andrews (1463-1466), Aberdeen (1469), Glasgow (1473-9), Ayr (1488-1497), Elgin (c.1494), Stirling (1494), Perth (c.1496) and Jedburgh (c.1505).1 Geographically the Scottish Observants were confined to the main urban centres of the south and southwest (Glasgow and Ayr being the furthest west, Jedburgh the furthest south) and on the east coast river systems as far north as Elgin. Of these Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Ayr, Stirling, Perth and Jedburgh were royal burghs while St Andrews and Glasgow were ecclesiastical burghs; Elgin was a baronial burgh.2 What is most interesting in the Scottish context is that, although the 1463 bull of Pope Pius II allowed for the reception of two or three houses of the reformed Observance, none of the existing Franciscan houses in Scotland was ever reformed by the Observance. In fact, as we shall see, there was even some movement from the Observants to the Conventuals around the time of the Reformation.

This separation was also borne out geographically: no Observant friaries were founded in burghs that already supported a Conventual house – although there may have been some commonalities in patronage. Furthermore, the Conventual friaries were concentrated in the burghs along the Forth-Clyde line and the Borders; they had houses in Berwick, Roxburgh, Dumfries, Haddington, Inverkeithing, Lanark and Kirkcudbright. Inverkeithing and Dundee were the only houses north of the Forth, with Dundee being their northernmost settlement.3 The Conventual houses of Kirkcudbright and Dumfries were the only Franciscan houses of any order (Observant and Conventual) in Dumfries and Galloway. Most of the Conventual houses (at least four out of seven) were thirteenth-century foundations. Lanark was

---

1 For a full explanation of these dates see below. As is obvious from the elusive nature of – especially the later foundation dates – the chronological sequence is difficult to establish.
3 This does not take into account the Conventual settlement in Elgin, which had been very short-lived: see Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 127.
an early fourteenth-century foundation while the date of foundation for the Inverkeithing friary, although uncertain, was no later than 1384. Kirkcudbright was the only Conventual house that was founded in the fifteenth century (Cowan and Easson give the date as 1449-56), nevertheless it pre-dated the arrival of the Observant friars by between one to eight years.4

Comparing the spread of the Observant houses with that of the Dominicans, there was a much greater convergence, greater also than that between Conventual and Dominican houses. Only Berwick, Haddington and Dundee had both a Conventual and Dominican house (although Dundee would not support a Dominican house until 1521), while virtually every other burgh that supported an Observant house also had a Dominican settlement; Jedburgh was the only exception here. The Dominican houses were usually thirteenth-century foundations and thus founded before an Observant house was established in the respective burghs. St Andrews was the only exception as there appears to be some doubt over whether the Dominican house there was a thirteenth-century foundation or whether it actually post-dated the Observant house that was founded there in 1463-6.5

Thus although the Observants and Conventuals may have shared some patrons there seems to have been little further interest in founding more Conventual houses once the Observants had arrived in Scotland. This tallies to some extent with the European and particularly the Burgundian experience where it has been observed that towards the end of the thirteenth century Franciscan settlement had reached a climax and further foundations would only come about through fresh impetus provided by the advent of the Observance in the fifteenth century.6 Nevertheless, despite a stagnation in foundation of Conventual houses they did not disappear and certainly were not taken over by the Observant friars as happened elsewhere in Europe. The idea behind the Observance had, after all, been one of reform of the existing houses, and not many were able to resist, especially once institutional supremacy was given to the Observants.

4 Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, pp. 124-28 and map “Houses of Friars in Scotland”.
The origins and early years of the province

When looking at the foundations of the Observant friaries in Scotland, the most significant of the surviving documents is the bull *Intelleximus te* by Pope Pius II, dated 9 June 1463 and addressed to the vicar-general of the ultramontane Observant province. According to the bull, the pope had learnt that the ultramontane vicar-general of the Observant Franciscans had ‘lately sent [his] brethren to Scotland’ – where there were as yet no houses of the Observance – ‘on account of the devotion of Mary, illustrious queen of Scotland, and of that people, at the request of certain merchants’. The pope thus granted the Observant Franciscans the right to ‘found and build and likewise to receive three or four houses, if you find any who graciously proffer a foundation or erection of this sort.’ At the same time the bull also stipulated that the Observants may also receive two or three Conventual houses.

It is generally accepted that the ‘three or four houses’ which received official sanction in this bull were the Observant friaries of Edinburgh, St Andrews, Aberdeen and Glasgow, the first four friaries to be founded in Scotland and whose foundations were in turn confirmed by James III on 21 December 1479. The remaining friaries were covered by a bull by Pope Sixtus IV, allowing the foundation of ‘two or three other houses’, though there is no further bull that might relate to the foundation of the Jedburgh friary. It is difficult to confirm the chronological order in which the individual friaries were established. In some cases there is a discrepancy in dates of foundation of up to eleven years, as is the case with the Ayr friary, which has some bearing on the sequence of foundation of the friaries founded during the reign of James IV. The first settlement of Observant Franciscan friars in Scotland was at

---

7 Bryce, ii, p. 276.
8 ‘Intelleximus te nuper, ob devotionem carissimae in Christo filiae nostrae, Mariae, reginae Scotiae illustris, et populi illius, ad requisitionem quorundam mercatorum, tuos fratres, causa praedicandi, ad ipsum regnum misisse, in quo nulla domus observantiae tui ordinis constructa est, cum tamen et hoc summe utile videcretur et populo gratum et acceptum. Nos igitur, qui omnium salutem desideramus, per praesentes concedimus tibi, ac tuo pro tempore successori, facultatem in dicto regno erigendi, fundandi et aedificandi, pariter et recipiendi, tres aut quatuor domos, si inveneris qui gratiose ad hujusmodi fundationem et erectionem se offerant; ac etiam recipiendi duas aut tres domos Conventualium tui ordinis, ubi sanior pars aut major consenserit, de consensu tamen ordinariorum. Et insuper, per praesentes concedimus quod fratres in dictis domibus aedificandi et recipiendi sub Observantia pro tempore commorantes uti et gaudere possint et valeant omnibus et singulis gratias et privilegiis ac indulgentiis tuo ordini, aut etiam tuae familiae, concessis et concedendis, non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus Apostolicis caeterisque contrariis quibuscumque.' Bryce, ii, p. 276; Cowan and Easson, *Religious Houses, Scotland*, p. 129.
Edinburgh, although there has been some dispute about the date, which, in turn is tied up with the identity of their royal founder in Scotland. In this context, one person has much to answer for: Father John Hay, author of the *Chronicle of the Observantine Province of Scotland*, which was transcribed and translated by Bryce in his *Scottish Grey Friars* and from which Bryce drew much of his information.  

According to the *Chronicle*, Hay was professed at the Stirling Observant friary on 1 April 1551 ‘in the presence of her most serene highness, Mary of Guise, widow of James V, and the chief nobles of the kingdom’, and John Durkan describes him as ‘a very junior friar’ in 1559. He went into exile in 1559 and made his way to Cologne where, as provincial minister of the Cologne province, he wrote the *Chronicle of the Observantine Province of Scotland*, addressed to Friar Franciscus Gonzaga, Minister General of the Observant order. As Durkan laments, Hay made little or no use of the archives of the Cologne province, to which he would undoubtedly have had access – instead his *Chronicle* seems to be based on hearsay; certainly much of what Hay asserted can no longer be taken as accurate, as the subsequent discussion aims to show. According to Durkan, there was ‘pious exaggeration’ in the number of friars that were, according to Hay, accommodated in the individual friaries, just as he possibly understated the number of Observant apostates at the Reformation. Considering that the *Chronicle* was written for a history of the ‘Seraphic Order’ which Gonzaga compiled in 1586 one would naturally expect a certain woeful romanticism – dare we call it patriotism? – in Hay’s account, looking back on what one might call the ‘good old days’ in his homeland, which was by then firmly in Protestant hands.

The reason why Hay’s information has been accepted for so long is the lack of alternative or additional sources. In *The Scottish Grey Friars*, Bryce based many of his conclusions on Hay’s work. Only occasionally did he question Hay’s evidence, and *The Scottish Grey Friars* was by no means a re-evaluation of Hay’s *Chronicle*. Bryce’s relationship with this particular source was still ultimately one of trust – he

---

10 J. Edwards, ‘Greyfriars in Glasgow’, *SHR*, iii (1906) p. 181; Bryce, ii, pp. 173-94. In order to avoid confusion the subsequent references to Hay’s *Chronicle* in Bryce will refer to the English translation unless there is a specific issue arising in the Latin original.

11 Bryce, ii, p. 188; for the preface see ii, pp. 183-4; Durkan, ‘Observant Franciscan Province’, p. 53-4.

12 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 54.
took the information of the *Chronicle* to be correct in principle, except when refuted by other extant sources, which, as we are continuously reminded, are not many. Almost a century on, however, our attitude to Hay’s *Chronicle* has changed to one of scepticism, and we approach the evidence he collated with much greater caution than Bryce would have done. There are two recent studies that have greatly contributed to our understanding: Cowan and Easson’s *Medieval Religious Houses* and John Durkan’s article on ‘The Observant Franciscan Province in Scotland’.13 Unfortunately and for too long, Bryce’s has been the only study that dealt specifically and comprehensively with the Franciscan order in Scotland (Conventuals, Observants and Capuchins) and has therefore been the first port of call for anyone looking for information on the Scottish Franciscans.14

The inconsistencies in Hay’s account are most readily identified when comparing his account of the foundations of the various Observant houses in Scotland with Cowan and Easson’s study on medieval religious houses. Hay’s account of the Observant foundations in Scotland differs from that presented by Cowan and Easson in terms of foundation dates but also chronological order. According to Hay, Perth was the third friary to be founded, whereas Cowan and Easson suggest it was in fact founded sometime before 1496, which would make it sixth at best, and possibly even the second-last house to be established.15

In his very first sentence Hay stated that the Scottish province was founded in 1224 ‘when it owed its prosperity to learned men dwelling in fourteen convents’.16 Bryce noted that 1224 incorrectly referred to the first Franciscan mission to England, but has nothing more to say about Hay’s claims of there having been fourteen convents, although Bryce himself dealt with only eight houses. Cowan and Easson offer a further four: Elgin as an incomplete foundation (the Observants would later move into Elgin) and Banff and Forfar as supposed foundations that were at one time claimed to have been Franciscan houses (by the Franciscans themselves). These claims arose from confusion with a Carmelite house in the case of Banff, and a misinterpretation of documents from the reign of Alexander III in the case of Forfar.

---

14 A prime example of this is Moorman and his easy acceptance of some of the circumstances and dates surrounding the foundation of the Edinburgh friary: see Moorman, *History*, p. 493.
16 Bryce, ii, p. 184.
The fourth ‘ghost-foundation’ was Inverness, which Cowan and Easson attributed to confusion with the Dominican house there.\(^\text{17}\)

It took Hay no more than two sentences to chart the rise of the Franciscan order in the thirteenth century and its subsequent moral demise, before he moved on to the Observants’ arrival in Scotland. He credited James I as the individual who first became aware that ‘the Order of the blessed Francis had been restored to its early splendour’ and extended an invitation to the province of Cologne. There is no further information as to the exact circumstances, except that this took place some time after 1430 and that the first friars, led by Cornelius of Zierekzee, were dispatched on their mission in or around 1446.\(^\text{18}\) In general, Bryce found no fault with Hay’s account, although he did elaborate: James I, ‘our poet king ... in view of the existing racial antipathy which was acutely reflected in the independence of the Scottish Vicariate, and of the continental sympathies of the nation’ had been only too eager to invite ‘a colony of continental Observantines’ to Scotland. According to Bryce, the initial invitation had been made in 1436, a year before James was assassinated, and Cornelius eventually arrived in Scotland in 1447. Bryce did display some concern over Hay’s chronology, pointing out that James could not have contacted the Observantine Province of Cologne as it was only founded in 1443 (six years after James’ death). He also refutes subsequent claims by Conrad Eubel (which would have corroborated Hay’s account) that the bull by Pope Martin V of 1429 to ‘a King James to erect two houses for the Claresses’ had been addressed to James I of Scotland. Interestingly enough, the other historian of the Scottish Observants, Adam Abell of Jedburgh, has very little to say on the matter, although he did remark that James I ‘fundit the Charturis moniis of Sanct Ihonistone [the yere of God 1433]’. The first time he mentioned the Observant presence at all in his history (the \textit{Rota Temporum} or \textit{Roil and Quheill of Time}) was in the reign of James IV as an already

\(^{17}\) Bryce, i, p. 5 note 3; Cowan and Easson, \textit{Religious Houses, Scotland}, pp. 124-8. According to Cowan and Easson, the alleged convent at Banff was in fact a Carmelite house and the claims of the Franciscans in 1296 that there had been a friary in Forfar were shown to be a misunderstanding of sources from the reign of Alexander III; the convent in question had been Dundee.

\(^{18}\) Bryce, ii, p. 184.
established order in the reign of James IV, but no mention is made as to the nature of their advent to Scotland.\(^{19}\)

Since two of James’ daughters, Margaret and Isabella, were ‘members of the Third Order of St Francis’, Bryce had no doubt as to James I’s connection with the Observant movement. He suggested that the invitation had been extended to ‘a colony of Observantines in France or the Low Countries’, possibly one connected to the friary of Mirabelle in Picardy. Unfortunately he offered no further explanation as to how James would have become aware of the Observants other than that this happened after he returned from captivity in England. Bryce attributed the lapse in time between the first contact and the actual arrival of Cornelius and his companions to the fact that this matter could not be deliberated on until the provincial chapter of Gouda was held in 1447, where the first Dutch Observant provincial was elected.\(^{20}\)

What he did not explain was why James would extend an invitation that would bring Dutch friars to Scotland.

Bryce’s referral to James I’s daughters seems irrelevant in this context, as the marriages that would provide the Stewart connections with other European royal houses took place after James’ death: Margaret married the dauphin in 1436, while Isabella was married to Francis count of Montford (the second son of John, Duke of Brittany) only in 1442. A Dutch – and in the present context even more importantly a Zeeland – connection was formed only in 1444 when Mary Stewart married Wolfaert van Borsselen, son of Henric, lord of Veere, Sandenburg, Flushing, Westkapelle, Domburg and Bronwershaven. Bryce’s suggestion that James II made a request to the Gouda chapter in 1447 (although he sees it as a renewal of James I’s request, rather than an original one) would make much more sense.\(^{21}\) On the other hand, there is always the possibility that either James I, or his son for that matter, could have become aware of the Observants through the Council of Basle (1431-49), to which the Scottish church had sent regular representatives. The dispute between the

\(^{19}\) S. Thorson, ‘The roit and quhill of time: a critical edition’ (St Andrews Ph.D., 1998), p. 218; Bryce, i, pp. 50-1. The one date Bryce corrected was in connection with the Cologne province: John de Maubert’s vicariate is dated to 1446 in the Chronicle, however he was appointed in 1443, Bryce, ii, p. 184 and note 2. See also Moorman, History, p. 451. Moorman in his History of the Franciscan Order accepted these dates, 1436 for the initial invitation and 1447 for the Observants’ arrival in Scotland; unsurprisingly, his source was Bryce: see Moorman, History, p. 491 and note 2.

\(^{20}\) Bryce, i, pp 51-3. See also Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 131, who state that the dates given by Hay and Bryce are ‘unsubstantiated’.

\(^{21}\) McGladdery, James II, pp. 41-4; Bryce, i, p. 53; see also Chapter 4, p. 135.
Observant and Conventual Franciscans for institutional independence and eventually supremacy had been on the agenda of every church council of the fifteenth century since the Council of Constance in 1415, until being finally resolved in 1517.22

As far as the circumstances of the Observants' arrival in Scotland, however, Bryce's and Hay's accounts conflict with one of the few documents concerning the Scottish Observants that have survived: the bull of foundation for the first Observant houses in Scotland (Intelleximus te, 9 June 1463), which introduces a different name to the discussion: Mary of Gueldres, wife of James II. The bull is quite clear: it states that the Observant friars had been dispatched to Scotland 'ob devotionem carissimae in Christo filiae nostrae, Mariae, reginae Scotiae illustris, et populi illius, ad requisitionem quorundam mercatorum'.23 Bryce, however, dismissed this as a simple 'narrative clause' which must be treated with 'utmost caution'. But his own citing of the Exchequer Rolls is problematic: he was convinced that a sum amounting to £150 and 'granted by the friars of Edinburgh conclusively disprove the ... statement'.24 There are two issues here: firstly the question of whether the bull could be taken at face value, and secondly, that the bull was a confirmation after the fact, issued at least six years after the first friary at Edinburgh had been established. When Cornelius and his companions arrived in Scotland, James II was still alive. When Pius II issued Intelleximus te the king had been dead for three years and it might be expected that Mary of Gueldres as Dowager Queen, who certainly played a prominent role in national politics, would be named. However, the unexpected prominence given to 'certain merchants' in the bull might indicate that the document was less abstract than Bryce thought.

Unfortunately any further evidence we have that would support Mary as the initial patroness is not contemporary. Mary's grandson, James IV, stated in a letter to Pope Julius II, written in 1507, that she had been the driving force behind the

---

22 Moorman, History, pp. 448-50. For a full account of the Scottish embassies to the Council of Basle, see J.H. Burns, Scottish Churchmen and the Council of Basle (Glasgow, 1962).
23 Bryce, ii, p. 276.
Observants’ arrival, and James V, again in a letter, called her their ‘cordial friend.’ Nevertheless, Mary of Gueldres as niece of Philip the Good of Burgundy would have had the perfect links to the Observance movement in the Low Countries that Bryce sought to explain through the daughters of James I. If we continue this train of thought and suppose that the ‘certain merchants’ were not simply Scottish merchants trading with the Low Countries but perhaps members of the Flemish and Dutch merchant community that had taken up residence in the Scottish burghs because of their trade links, then the attribution in the bull may not be simple rhetoric after all.

There is a further clue that would support a later date than that suggested by Hay and Bryce, and it lies in the almost larger-than-life figure of Cornelius of Zierekzee, the person at the centre of the group that was dispatched from the Low Countries in response to the Scottish invitation. He was a member of the Cologne province, but it is not entirely clear exactly which friary he would have been dispatched from, since the friary of Zierekzee in Zeeland was not yet reformed according to the Observance. As for the date of his arrival, John Durkan has put forward a convincing argument that Cornelius may have been the ‘Cornelius, son of Peter, scribe of a manuscript owned by the Louvain Franciscans, the Speculum Perfectionis.’ This manuscript was written by him on 9 February 1454 and he was reported to have been a novice at the time. In this case he would not have had the necessary authority to lead a group of friars to Scotland. Therefore Durkan suggests that the date be re-adjusted to c. 1457, certainly within two years of that date, since by 1459 David Crannoich, royal physician to James II and Mary of Gueldres in 1457 ‘and after’ had joined the Observants in Scotland. This would also explain why Bryce, too, could not find any documents pertaining to the Edinburgh friary earlier than the late 1450s.

**Immigrants and early recruits**

It is extremely difficult to gauge the amount of personnel that constituted the Scottish Province, and even more difficult to establish any kind of information about their

---

25 *James IV Letters*, No. 76, pp. 54-5; *James V Letters*, p. 231.

26 For a full discussion on Mary of Gueldres and her patronage of the Observants, see Chapter 4, pp. 134-6, 137-8.

27 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 52-4; Bryce, i, p. 263.
social background and origins. Foggie in her study on the Dominicans has found them to be mainly of local urban origin; very few friars were recruited from the landed classes. Like all mendicant orders, the Observant Franciscans were made up of a largely itinerant community. With so few reliable sources we have only glimpses of their movements through the different houses, and it is often impossible to tell exactly when an Observant friar was resident at a certain house, and whether he had connections to the community of that burgh. Without further supporting evidence, even the friars’ surnames are of little help, except on those few occasions where a surname denotes a craft, as was the case with Simon Maltman, associated with the friaries of St Andrews, Glasgow and Aberdeen, and two friars called John Litstar (junior and senior), one associated with St Andrews, the other with Aberdeen, although it is entirely possible that they may have been related. In the case of John and Walter of Leiden, two brothers who were both carpenters and joined the Aberdeen friary during its early days, we can assume that they were mostly based at Aberdeen (since they died there), although they were involved in the construction of Elgin. Nevertheless, most craftsmen or other manually trained friars (such as the scribes) would also have been itinerant, just like all the other friars; it was part of the mendicant lifestyle.

In Aberdeen (the only friary with an in-house source on its friars, the Obituary Calendar of the Aberdeen Observant friary) a pattern emerges of connections between the landed and urban elite. Unlike the Dominicans, the Observant Franciscans do appear to have recruited friars from among the nobility: Robert Keith (allegedly a son of the Earl Marischal, a family with most of its lands to the south of Aberdeen) or Jerome Lindsay (allegedly a son of the Earl of Crawford) would appear in this category, as would Robert Stewart, of whom Hay claimed that he was a member of the royal house of Stewart. All of them are discussed in detail below. Despite the uncertainty surrounding their exact connections to these families, one might suggest that the Observant Franciscans drew their personnel from a wider social spectrum than the Dominicans did, but that (like the Dominicans) most of these friars would have come either from the burghs in which there were Observant

---

28 See J.P. Foggie, *Renaissance Religion in Urban Scotland: The Dominican Order, 1450-1560* (Leiden and Boston, 2003), Appendix 3 (pp. 256-322) for biographical information on Dominican friars.
settlements, or would have some other connection with these houses, perhaps by coming from a family of patrons. Another connection – and in this case a veritable recruiting ground – was the universities. Among the personnel of the Scottish Observant province we find a number of Cologne and Paris graduates, though these mostly date from before the time that the province was founded. The Observants went native rather quickly, and we begin to find more Glasgow and St Andrews graduates once the province was established. If, however, friars had been recruited into the order while at university, it is even more difficult to determine where they had originally come from, since we are often lacking additional evidence.

We encounter the same problems when trying to gauge the actual size of the province. There are claims that some of the friaries may have had communities as large as thirty friars; this is the number supposedly residing at Jedburgh. John Hay in his Chronicle stated that ‘twenty worthy priests generally resided in [Glasgow] with the special duty of hearing the confessions of the students’, while a grant by Rolland Blacader, subdean of Glasgow, for twenty-two masses to be celebrated on his obit day led Bryce assumed that at least ten ordained priests resided in the Glasgow Observant friary, as they were to be paid for ten of those masses. What is most significant about these claims is that these two friaries are now the only ones about which we have reliable information, based on relatively recent archaeological excavations, which bear out that, physically, these friaries had been large enough to accommodate this number. Anthony Ross, however, suggested a much lower number: according to his estimation, the Scottish Observant province comprised between eighty and ninety-five friars in 1520-40, and between seventy and eighty in 1559. This would make an average of no more than eleven friars per house. The Observant Franciscans, however, were an itinerant order, which meant that few of the friars would have remained in the same friary for long. Aside from the fact that some houses would have been smaller than others, we should also consider that the friaries were not necessarily filled to capacity. In 1559, John Knox reported that only

29 Bryce, Grey Friars, i, p. 346; ii, p. 187.

A word should be added at this point about the means that have been left to us to trace the members of the Observant friaries in Scotland, considering – yet again – that there are so few sources left. Hay’s Chronicle incorporates a list of provincial ministers, which is, however, incomplete. Bryce’s study also contains a transcript of the ‘Obituary Calendar of the Observantine Grey Friary at Aberdeen’, an invaluable source, since it provides us not only with a record of Observant friars who died at Aberdeen, as well as a number of notable benefactors, but also accompanying information, such as whether a certain friar was a lay brother or a priest, or if he had been a guardian of the Aberdeen friary. These documents are complemented by a number of surviving testaments, in which friars sometimes appear as witnesses, as well as the Treasurer’s Accounts and Exchequer Rolls, where we can also find the occasional mention of an individual friar. John Durkan and Anthony Ross have provided us with a further treasure trove in Early Scottish Libraries, where, particularly in the section on individual owners of books, we find a number of Observant friars. The books they owned carry additional information inscribed on the flyleaf that makes it possible to trace a certain book in the possession of several friars, or friaries for that matter, and even allows us to trace friars’ movements through certain houses.

Little is known about the rest of the group that came to Scotland under Cornelius of Zierikzee’s leadership, although there is quite a substantial amount of information on hand about the Scots who joined Cornelius once he had established a presence in Edinburgh. The ease with which Cornelius’ movement managed to recruit Scots could be some indication that there may have been pre-established connections formed in the mother province, and it is more than likely that some of Cornelius’ companions would have been Scots recruited there; this would be in keeping with long-established practice, ever since the first Franciscan missions in the early thirteenth century.\footnote{After the initial missions to Germany and Hungary had failed, the Franciscans ensured that when dispatching friars to a potential new province, the mission included natives of those countries, see 2: The Observant Franciscans in Scotland: Location and Personnel 31} Some of what we know, especially about the early recruits
to the province, has become distorted by the same kind of reverent myth that has become associated with the figure of Cornelius of Zierekzee. But what is noticeable is that not only did the Observants very quickly attract native Scots to their cause, but also that the most important of these were men who themselves had links to the Low Countries or the Rhineland, very often to the universities there. And it was these learned men that would take up important positions within the Observant province.

One of the men who came with Cornelius from the Low Countries was Gerard of Texel, an arts graduate at Cologne in 1455, and the date of his graduation is seen by Durkan to be yet another indication that the Edinburgh foundation has to be placed after that date. Bryce claimed that by 1461 Gerard and John Richardson (another of Cornelius’ companions) had made their way to Aberdeen to oversee the settlement of the Observants there. It is not quite certain how Bryce arrived at this date, since Aberdeen is perhaps the one friary for which we have the most comprehensive account of its foundation, and these documents all date from 1469. The Aberdeen Obituary, when recording Gerard’s death in 1473 (he was vicar of the Aberdeen friary then), stated that he had worked ‘in this Province for twelve years’, though why Bryce should date this as Gerard’s arrival in Aberdeen rather than his arrival in Scotland is unclear. Either way, 1461 is a questionable date for both occasions. According to Bryce, Gerard became the first guardian of the Aberdeen friary in 1471.

According to the Aberdeen Obituary, John Richardson, too, was one of the companions of Cornelius, as he is given the same acclamation as Gerard of Texel: ‘one of the first friars who brought the sacred Observance to this kingdom.’ Although he has been credited with being a ‘main driving force’ behind the foundation of the Aberdeen friary, he can have been involved only in the early stages of the foundation, as he died at Aberdeen in 1469 and was buried ‘near the high altar’ in the parish church of St Nicholas, because the friary church had not been completed

Brooke, Coming of the Friars, p. 109. The experience of the initial expansion of the Irish Franciscans is slightly different. Colmán O Clabaigh has shown that this was driven mostly by English friars, and therefore many of the subsequent settlements in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries centred on the towns of the Anglo-Irish colony; see O Clabaigh, Franciscans in Ireland, p. 35.

at that point. Durkan is convinced that John Richardson was the same ‘Jo. Rychardi de Scotia’ who was among the arts graduates at the University of Cologne in 1453 and may have taught there until 1460, though this would negate the statement in the Obituary. The confusion is easily explained: Durkan identified a ‘Jo. de Scotia’ in the Cologne University records, while Lyall also identified a Dominican John Richardson, who was permitted ‘to transfer to the Austin Friars to become a brother of the hospital of the Holy Ghost in Sassia, near Rome’. Lyall also added further dates for the Observant Franciscan John Richardson: he matriculated on 15 August 1450, determined on 30 June 1451 and proceeded to the license in May 1453, first under a master of the Laurentiana and then under Johannes de Berka of the new Bursa Kuyck. This John Richardson then taught from May 1457 until he left Cologne in 1460 ‘for an unspecified destination’, only to return in 1476. The obvious problem here is that the Observant John Richardson was reportedly dead in 1469, which would suggest that the John Richardson returning to Cologne in 1476 would have been the Dominican friar, which leaves some doubt over the remainder of the dates, so that the Observant Richardson may very well have left Cologne by 1457 to come to Scotland with Cornelius.

Once again it is becoming evident how crucial it is to the foundation dates of the friaries that the dates pertaining to the individual friars are also analysed as fully as possible. According to the Aberdeen Obituary Richardson was present during the foundations of the friaries of Edinburgh, St Andrews and Aberdeen. Bryce claimed that Richardson and Gerard of Texel had arrived in Aberdeen in or shortly after 1461. This is problematic in view of the fact that Cowan and Easson placed the foundation of the St Andrews friary well after that date. Similarly, Bryce’s chronology would suggest that Richardson and Gerard spent eight years in Aberdeen before any formal mention of the friary there.

There are two more friars of the early community at Edinburgh of whom we have records: David Crannoch and Robert Keith, both recruits to the Observants,

36 Cowan and Easson, Medieval Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 130; Bryce, i, pp. 307, 330 and index; ii, p. 323. The index in Bryce lists Richardson as guardian of Aberdeen, although the entry in the Obituary does not mention this at all, just as this would not tally with Bryce’s claim that Gerard of Texel was the first guardian of Aberdeen, and Richardson died before him.
rather than members of Cornelius’ group. David Crannoch is a very fascinating character and not just because, as Bryce suggested, he may have been Cornelius’ direct successor, but also because of his career before he joined the Edinburgh Observant community: he had been royal physician to James II and Mary of Gueldres until at least 1457, and had joined the Observants by 1459. This made him one of the first, if not the first, native Scot to be recruited by the newly arrived Observants. It would also suggest that they must have been prominent in the sphere of the court, if they managed to attract the attention of the royal physician. His medical career had begun in 1447, when he had been determined at Paris; he had been licensed in 1448 or 1449 and went on to be procurator of the German nation there in December 1453, until at least January 1454, soon after which he was licensed in medicine at Paris.37

According to Bryce it was during Crannoch’s guardianship of the Edinburgh friary that the Chapel of St John the Baptist, outside the West Bow ‘under the wall of the castle upon the west side of the track that wound down the north slope of the valley to the Grassmarket’, was transferred to the Observants for their use, although this chapel had been abandoned by 1490. It is curious that in the text Bryce gave the date for this transferral as 1464, while the charter of confirmation by Sir John Tours of Inverleith is dated 2 September 1458. At the same time there is a grant by William Forbes, canon of Aberdeen and vicar of St Giles, dated 18 November 1464 and confirmed by James Kennedy, bishop of St Andrews on 20 November 1464 ‘of the church of St John the Baptist extra burgum’. There is another discrepancy in the date of Kennedy’s letter of reception, in which Kennedy confirmed the grant and also incorporated it into the patrimony of the Holy See to allay the fears of the Observants that the houses granted to them were too splendid for their use. In the text Bryce states the date of this letter to be 26 November 1464, while in the preface to the actual printed letter he states it to be 20 November 1464.38

Crannoch was also connected to the Aberdeen friary, this time in his capacity as provincial minister (though, surprisingly, Hay did not list him among the

37 Burns, Council of Basle, p. 58 note 117; Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 52; ER, vi, pp. 309, 496; Bryce, i, p. 271 note 3.
38 Bryce, i, p. 271 and note 4, p. 272 and note 2; ii, pp. 200-1. According to the charter Forbes had been ‘earnestly besought’ by ‘the venerable Father, Friar David of Carnok of the Order of Minors’, that they wished ‘to war for God in the church or chapel of St John the Baptist’.
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provincial ministers in the *Chronicle*), when he accompanied Alexander Vaus, Official of Aberdeen, on his return journey to Aberdeen, ‘to assist at the opening of the friary on the forenoon of 12th July [1471]’. Alexander Vaus had come to Edinburgh around 8 May 1471, where, according to Bryce, he resigned ‘the lands and writs into the hands of John de Mitia’[39] [Nucia], on which the friary buildings had apparently already been erected. During the ceremony mentioned above, the Bailie John Vaus granted to ‘Father Crannok, as the Superior of the Observantine Province’, ‘sasine and the symbols of corporal possession’.[40]

He is listed in the *Aberdeen Obituary* as ‘Fratris David Crannoth’ and the date of his death is given as 1472 with the additional information that he died in England:

Provincial Vicar of this [the Scottish] Province and also Commissary of the Reverend Father, the cismontane Vicar General, died in England. In early life he was a physician, especially of James II, King of Scots, and his Queen, Mary, by whom he was held in high repute, and thereafter he took the habit and became a doctor of souls, 1472.[41]

There is a reference in Bryce which refers to the filling of the medicine chest of ‘Warden Crannok’, for which purpose a portion of the Aberdeen friary garden had been set apart, as well as for the medicine chests ‘of the infinite number of friars, who are referred to by Father Hay as practising the healing art by the laying on of hands’. He probably meant the ‘chest of medicines from Flanders for the use of the king’, which he received in 1457.[42] This would suggest that Crannoch continued in his profession even after entering the Observant order.

In Crannoch’s case, like that of John Richardson, there is an instance of confused identities: one of the Scottish institutions represented at the Council of Basle in February 1437 included a David Crannoch, Dean of Brechin and brother of

---

[39] For comments on the name ‘Mitia’, see John of Neuss (Nucia).
[40] Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 54; Ross, ‘Some Notes’, p. 228; Bryce, i, p. 310-11; Bryce, ii, pp. 215-21. In the document his name is twice given as ‘Crannoch’.
[41] Bryce, i, p. 328; ii, p. 319. In his translation Bryce does not use the form ‘Crannoth’, but rather reverts to ‘Crannok (Carnok)’.
[42] Bryce, i, pp. 474-5. Durkan suggests that Cornelius of Zierkzee was also regarded as a saintly faith-healer and wonder worker, but it is not clear whether this was a contemporary view or whether this is from Hay’s *Chronicle*; see Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 53. A.I. Dunlop, *The Life and Times of James Kennedy, Bishop of St Andrews* (Edinburgh, 1953), p. 416-17; *ER*, vi, p. 309.
the bishop of Brechin. This ‘Master David Crannach, brother of the Bishop of Brechin’ was licensed at St Andrews in 1437, and matriculated in law at Cologne in 1443. This would be the same David Crannoch as mentioned by Lyall in connection with the University of Cologne as ‘former student and colleagues from Cologne’ of John Athilmer. A number of historians, among them Dunlop, have taken the Dean of Brechin and the Observant Crannoch to be the same person, not the least because the surname Crannoch was geographically rather confined. However, Burns in his study on Scottish Churchmen at Basle was adamant that these two David Crannochs must be distinguished, and he called the Observant David Crannoch ‘the younger’.43

Another early convert to the Observants, and one just as intriguing, was Robert Keith, who was allegedly a son of the Earl Marischal, a status that would imply that the Observants had connections not just among the house of Stewart but also the nobility from a very early stage. Unfortunately, Balfour Paul’s Scots Peerage only lists one Robert Keith around that time, who died c.1446 and was married to Janet, daughter of Sir John Seton.44

According to Hay he was the first guardian of the St Andrews friary, so he must have entered the Edinburgh friary as a novice not long after their arrival, and he would eventually move on to become provincial minister twice. Like Richardson, Keith had studied at Cologne: he had been matriculated there as a theological student in 1439 under the name Robert de Keth. Hay further credited Keith with having been the driving force behind the foundation of the St Andrews friary by James Kennedy, archbishop of St Andrews. He made much of Keith’s humility and the example he set to the students at St Andrews, for he prompted ‘the flower of the youth of the sacred University ‘to desert the allurements of the world’ and join the Observants. There is an entry in the interleaved copy of Durkan and Ross Early Scottish Libraries, kept at the NLS, which records a Robert Keith, rector of Dysart, as being in possession of a copy of Jean Gerson’s Alphabetum divini amoris (Cologne, c.1466), signed ‘Robertus Ketht’. Depending on exactly when this book was published and when Keith entered the order, and if he had already been a member of the clergy he could have entered the order without having to go through a novitiate. However, he would

---

43 Dunlop, James Kennedy, pp. 416-17 and 417 n. 1; Keussen, Köln Matrikel, p. 462; Lyall, ‘Cologne and Louvain Students’, p. 62; Burns, Scottish Churchmen and the Council of Basle, p. 58 n. 117
44 Scots Peerage, vi, pp. 40-3.
not have signed the book without noting his affiliation to the Observants. The spelling of the surname as Ketht, however, again appears in an act of St Andrews University for a Robertum Ketht, Rectorem Universitatis on 3 November 1495, who could, conceivably, be the same person as the rector of Dysart.45

The Edinburgh friary
The picture that emerges of the foundation of the Edinburgh friary would suggest that Cornelius of Zierekzee and his companions had arrived there c.1457 – not earlier than 1455, but also no later than 1459, by which time David Crannoch had joined the community. The first time the Edinburgh friary appeared in official records was in an entry in the Exchequer Rolls, 27 July 1462 - 26 July 1463, and a year later there is a second entry for payment made to them for the repair of their house.46 By this time, however, they were still referred to as living outside the burgh, at the church of St John the Baptist, and had moved inside the burgh only after they had been given a site for their friary by James Douglas of Cassillis ‘and the citizens’, some time before 21 December 1479. This is the date at which James III confirms them as being ‘in possession of their place and property’.47 The site to which they eventually moved is still known as ‘Greyfriars’ in Edinburgh today, made famous by the exploits of a little terrier dog. The site is at the top of Candlemaker Row off present-day Forrest Road, but the building that occupies the site today, known as Greyfriars’ Church and Graveyard, dates from the 1620s and occupies only a portion of the land that would have been used by the Observants – but not as their property – in the 1460s. The original cloister church was situated at the bottom of Candlemaker Row while the

45 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 53; Bryce, i, pp. 56-7, 288-9; ii, p. 185, 191; Keussen, Köln Matrikel, i, p. 531; J. Durkan and A. Ross (eds), Early Scottish Libraries (Glasgow, 1961, and annotated copy in NLS, Shelfmark SU.37 (D.11.I Dur)), facing p. 120. According to Hay, Keith was twice provincial minister although Bryce in his translation of the Chronicle changed it to ‘thrice elected provincial minister’ without giving a reason for this change. For Robertus Ketht, see A.I. Dunlop, (ed.), Acta Facultatis Artium Universitatis Sanctandree, 1413-1588 (Edinburgh and London, 1964), p. 253. There is a precedent among the Dominicans of Paris when John of St Giles, a secular master preached in the Dominican church during which he was ‘invested in the habit of a Preaching Friar, and then continued his sermon as a mendicant’, thus gaining the Dominicans a second chair in theology at the university. See Moorman, History, p. 125.

46 ER, vii, pp. 211, 284.

47 Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 131.
present-day Greyfriars Kirk was built on what was the upper yard of the Observant friary grounds.48

There appears to have been some uncertainty among the friars over whether or not they could accept the buildings that went with the site they were granted. They were uncomfortable living in ‘fine buildings’ when their rule explicitly required them to live in poverty.49 Both Bryce and Dunlop mention this circumstance which, so Dunlop claimed, was resolved only after James Kennedy, bishop of St Andrews, ‘incorporated the friary into the patrimony of the Holy See’, i.e. it was no longer their property, it was the property of the diocese of St Andrews. It is interesting that Bryce attributes this need to follow the rule properly to the fact that the Observants were still a young order, rather than simply seeing this as proof of how seriously they followed their rule.50 But it would indeed suggest that the early Observants in Scotland were determined to do things properly, notwithstanding that, eventually, they too would become over-comfortable in their rule; and we can observe certain lapses in discipline which Bryce is strangely silent on.51 Furthermore there is evidence that the Observant friars of Edinburgh enjoyed royal patronage, as James IV in his letters claimed they did. In 1489 and 1490 there is mention in the Exchequer Rolls that the friars received a weekly allowance of bread, beer and kitchen provisions ‘by his majesty’s special command’.52

Unfortunately, despite a number of maps that might be expected to give us some depiction of the Edinburgh friary – or at least the friary grounds – we have no cartographic evidence for it, or for any other friary, except St Andrews. Sir Richard Lee’s map of Edinburgh of 1544, although contemporary, does not depict the friary buildings of the Observants, although it prominently shows the Dominican friary just off the Cowgate. This is most likely due to the fact that the map in question was drawn for military purposes: the English army attempted to enter Edinburgh through the Netherbow Gate, where they were repelled. As a result, the mapmaker was most

48 Bryce, i, p. 369.
49 ‘The friars must be very careful not to accept churches or poor dwellings for themselves, or anything else built for them, unless they are in harmony with the poverty which we have promised in the Rule; and they should occupy these places only as strangers and pilgrims’. Habig, Omnibus, p. 68, this quote is taken from Francis’ Testament.
50 Dunlop, James Kennedy, pp. 297-8; Bryce, i, pp. 263-4.
51 See below on Aberdeen and Glasgow.
52 Bryce, i, p. 272.
interested in the eastern part of the city, and the immediate vicinity of the Netherbow Gate. Everything beyond this area was drawn in significantly smaller scale.53

We encounter a similar problem with the ‘Plan of the Siege of the Castle of Edinburgh’ (May 1573), in which once again only the area of interest to the mapmaker – an English military engineer – was drawn in any detail. Therefore the immediate surroundings of Edinburgh Castle, which was the objective, were depicted complete with troops and cannons. If the mapmaker’s agenda had in any way included an actual layout of Edinburgh, rather than just a typified one, the map would have given us some indication as to the layout of the former Greyfriars’ property between Grassmarket and Candlemaker Row. Instead a certain repetition is noticeable in the depiction of the buildings in the Grassmarket, which would suggest that only the layout of the streets would be reliable and that unlike, for instance, Geddy’s ‘Bird’s Eye View of St Andrews (see below), there was no attempt to represent actual buildings.54

In addition to Crannoch and Richardson, there were a number of other friars connected to the Edinburgh friary who we are able to track through historical record. Towards the end of the fifteenth century, a friar appeared who would be just as intriguing as the early members of the Edinburgh friary. Born in 1475, friar Lewis Williamson was ordained priest at the Greenwich Observant friary in 1501, but returned to Scotland and became provincial minister of the Scottish Observants twice. He died and was buried in Edinburgh in 1555, having ‘attained his jubilee in the order’. His ownership of a copy of Nicholas Herborn’s Enarratioines Evangeliorum (Antwerp, 1533), which had initially belonged to Peter Chaplain, provost of St Salvator’s College, might suggest a connection to the St Andrews friary as well, especially since the three other friars who had been in possession of this book – Andrew Cairns, John Tullideff and Anthony Baldowy55 – had also been at St Andrews at some point in their careers. Hay’s Chronicle suggests a Stirling

54 Barrott, Atlas of Old Edinburgh; G. Donaldson, All the Queen’s Men: Power and Politics in Mary Stewart’s Scotland (London, 1983), plate 8 (facing p. 59): ‘The Last Stand of The Queen’s Men, Edinburgh Castle 1573’. Although not strictly contemporary, this map still gives an idea of the general layout of Edinburgh at the time.
55 Durkan and Ross, Libraries, pp. 73, 82. The entries under the names in Durkan and Ross do not specify whether a Franciscan is Conventual or Observant, but the inscription in the book makes it clear. The date 1533 is, of course, the date of the book, the only date which can, at this point, be applied to Baldowy.
connection as well. As provincial, Williamson was also the author of a letter of confraternity to Sir Patrick Hepburn of Wauchton, dated at Edinburgh 1542.56

Another friar whose name we encounter throughout the Scottish province was Andrew Cairns, who was originally from Glasgow and who graduated at St Andrews in 1514. In 1521, while guardian of Edinburgh, Cairns was part of a controversy involving Observants and Conventuals, which resulted from the recent papal endorsement of the split between the two parts of the Franciscan order. In this incident the Scottish Observants were attempting to force the Conventuals to wear a distinctive mark, one of the few recorded instances of friction between the Observants and Conventuals in Scotland. Cairns and friar Robert Stewart represented the Observants in this dispute; their opponents on the Conventuals' side were John Convalson, provincial master (no longer allowed to be called 'minister') and John Ferguson, guardian of the Conventual house of Dundee. He appeared again as witness in the will of Thomas Ramsay, regent of St Andrews of 1 November 1530, in which Cairns is styled 'guardian', presumably of the St Andrews friary.57 The inscription in Nicholas Herborn's Enarrationes Evangeliorum, which had also belonged to Robert Keith, described him as 'frater andreas cayrnis gardianus aberdonensis'. In 1531, as provincial, he mediated in the dispute between James V and the Earl of Angus. According to Bryce he, like others (including George Lythtone, who died at Edinburgh in 1499 and who also filled the office of guardian in several friaries), 'abandoned the guidance of the province in [his] extreme old

56 Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 53-4; Durkan and Ross, Libraries, pp. 82, 160; J. Durkan and J. Kirk, The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577 (Glasgow, 1977), p. 163 note 14; Bryce, i, pp. 80, 277, 281, 318, 329, 375; ii, p. 266, 288. Bryce amends the Obituary entry in square brackets with 'Observantine Chronicle, 1553, since the Latin text of Hay's chronicle 'Ludovicus Gulicmi' is recorded as having travelled from Stirling to Edinburgh in 1553 (though Bryce amends this in the translation to 1555, apparently giving greater credence to the Obituary), presumably shortly before his death, resigned his position as provincial and 'summoned the magistrates to his bedside in this [Edinburgh] friary', warning them of failing support for the 'spiritual as well as [...] temporal head' of the realm and admonishing them to 'remain steadfast in the old faith'. See Bryce, ii, p. 192. Considering that the letter of confraternity to the Hepburns was dated at Edinburgh might suggest that he might have been in Edinburgh as early as 1552, as the Hepburn family was located there.

Donald Gilbert was another Scot associated with the Greenwich foundation: he was its first recorded guardian and may have been 'the Scottyshe doctor and ffrece of Grenewych', whom Sir Thomas More heard in his youth, attacking the abuses attached to pilgrimages to Marian shrines, see Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 157 and note 14; G.M. Little, 'Introduction of the Observant Friars in to England', Proceedings of the British Academy, x (1921-3), pp. 455-71; M. Sinclair, 'St Thomas More's "Good Scottish Friar"', Moreanna, iv., pp. 53-4; Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 53.

57 Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 55. Along with Cairns, the will was witnessed by friar Finlay Ramsay who had been regent at St Andrews in 1514 and became a member of the St Andrews friary.
The entry for Andrew Cairns in the Aberdeen Obituary tells us that he was an ‘expert’ in theology and canon law and was four times provincial minister, which is contradicted by the entry in John Hay’s chronicle who lists him as having been provincial minister only three times, having ‘advanced the affairs of the kingdom’ (alas, he did not elaborate on what these ‘affairs’ may have been). He died in Edinburgh in 1543 and was buried before the high altar.59

The St Andrews friary
A settlement of friars in St Andrews was first populated by friars of Edinburgh, and although the exact date is difficult to pin down, it must have taken place sometime between 1463 and 1465. Like Edinburgh, it is one of those friaries thought to be covered by the terms of the papal bull of 9 June 1463. If so, it is unlikely that the foundation took place much before then.60 We do know, however, that the friary of St Andrews was founded by James Kennedy, bishop of St Andrews, and since he died on 24 May 1465 it must have been founded before then. Dunlop in her book on Kennedy gives the date as c. 1458, with the papal sanction being received in 1463, but Cowan and Easson find this unlikely, referring to an ‘alleged bull of foundation of Pope Pius II’ dated November 1458 as ‘spurious’.61 According to Cowan and Easson, the foundation was not complete by the time of Kennedy’s death, so that his successor, Patrick Graham, had to make an additional benefaction. On 14 March 1466, the vicar and friars petitioned that ‘the place called Bethlehem in the city of St Andrews’ be confirmed to them. This appears as having originally been a site where a Carmelite Friary should have been built, but was then intended to be converted into a house of the Friars Minor or Conventual Greyfriars.62

Bishop Kennedy’s foundation of a house of the Observant Franciscans in St Andrews followed after his foundation of the College of St. Salvator in August 1450. St Salvator was founded as ‘a notable college of theologians and artists, dedicated to the Holy Saviour and endowed for thirteen persons, like to the number of the

59 Bryce, i, p. 328; ii, pp. 181 [192], 316; Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 173.
61 Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland p. 131; Dunlop, James Kennedy, p. 297.
Apostles’. Property was mortified to the use of a college ‘to be founded for the souls’ weal of the late King James and Queen Joan, the Bishop’s kinsmen and his predecessors in the see of St Andrews, his brothers, sisters and benefactors, and of all the pious dead’ According to Dunlop the Franciscans had similar aims as those Kennedy laid down for St. Salvator’s College. These must have been very similar to the virtues James IV elaborates on about forty years later in a letter to Julius II. According to him the Observants engaged in the salvation of souls, administered the sacraments and proclaimed Christ’s word faithfully. Dunlop goes even further, in that she describes Kennedy and the guardian of the St Andrews friary as kindred spirits. We have already met this guardian, Robert Keith, formerly novice of the Edinburgh friary as according to Bryce, being instrumental in setting up the St Andrean friary, although John Richardson, too, was associated with that foundation. Bryce described Keith as an ‘ideal Franciscan’, and it is likely that both he and Dunlop draw this conclusion from Father John Hay’s account of him.

Yet as far as their connection with academia goes Dunlop believes that they were less involved in the academic side of the University and the College of St Salvator, while acting more as confessors to students, ‘evangelists rather than scholars’. Bryce adds the rather flowery note that their impact on the students of the university was such that they ‘deserted the allurements of the world and became followers of the holy father in his profession’. But they maintain that a connection in whatever form, especially with St. Salvator’s College, cannot be denied, as its mace bears the figures of a king, a bishop and a Franciscan Friar.

What makes St Andrews even more fascinating is that this is the only Observant Franciscan friary of which we have pictorial evidence, in the form of a map which was added to the National Library of Scotland’s map collection in 1958 and is designated NLS MS.20996, but generally referred to as the ‘Bird’s Eye View’

---

63 Dunlop, James Kennedy, p. 274; James IV Letters, No. 76, p. 54.
64 Father John Hay, Chronicle of the Observatine Province of Scotland (Cologne, 1586), as cited in Bryce, Scottish Grey Friars; Dunlop, James Kennedy, p. 297; Bryce, i, pp. 288.
65 Bryce, i, p. 289; Dunlop, James Kennedy, p. 297. In addition, Dunlop also detects a certain influence from the Council of Basle in St Andrews. For instance, Kennedy recruited teaching staff from Cologne in the 1440s, a university that had been heavily associated with Basle. Foremost among these was John Athlimer, who had been heavily involved in new realist ideas at the time, and had played an important role in promoting these at St Andrews, see Dunlop, James Kennedy, p. 273; Lyall, ‘Cologne and Louvain students, pp. 56, 58.
of St Andrews by John Geddy.\textsuperscript{66} Geddy was a citizen of St Andrews and student of St Andrews University and entered the service of James VI in the 1570s. The plan itself was most likely produced in the 1580s; however, the information it was based on was very probably collected before the Reformation of 1559-60, probably in the mid-1550s.\textsuperscript{67} As a result, it shows all the major and essentially medieval buildings of the burgh of St Andrews, a number of which did not survive St Andrew’s overnight Reformation. Recognisable even to the modern observer is the basic layout of the burgh as well as the major buildings such as the Cathedral and the Bishop’s Castle. It further shows the three university colleges, St Salvator’s, St Leonard’s and St Mary’s (the latter two being sixteenth century additions to the university) and the Dominican friary, of which parts of the church still survive. There is some evidence that the Dominican church continued for a time after that.\textsuperscript{68}

Most remarkably and most interestingly for the present study is its depiction of the Observant Franciscan friary of St Andrews which was destroyed in 1559 and of which nothing is left in present-day St Andrews except a street name, Greyfriars Garden. This is the only surviving pictorial evidence of any Scottish Observant friary. The digitalisation of the ‘Bird’s Eye View’ in a recent project by the NLS has also made it possible to view this map in great detail, including the Observant Friary, and we become aware of certain features that should not be there. Although the initial resolution of the first Franciscans to use small temporary structures was soon rejected in favour of more robust structures built from stone, the Observants returned to the original design of the smaller churches. The scale of Geddy’s map is, of course, problematic for determining the actual size of the friary buildings. He favoured buildings that were important in his view: the Cathedral and the harbour section of the burgh dominate the eastern end of the map, while a number of buildings stand out among the smaller scale houses of the burgh. A.R. Martin has

\textsuperscript{66} See Appendix 1, p. 251.


\textsuperscript{68} Smart, ‘Bird’s Eye View’, p. 11.
found evidence that the Observants both in England and Scotland soon realised the advantage in larger structures, and that 'the normal type of Observant church in Scotland was a conscious copy of the earlier Conventual churches.' On Geddy's map one feature certainly stands out which is - according to Observant ideas - not supposed to be there: the tower of the friary church, which looks as though it could be a bell tower. The friary churches of the Observants in their simplicity were not supposed to have bell towers, although there is a distinct possibility that as the Observants moved to copy the Conventual style, most of them would have incorporated a bell tower in the structure of the friary church; there is definitive evidence that the Elgin Observant friary had a 'knok and bell'.

St Andrews inquisitors and defectors

The Observants’ lack of involvement with the academic side of the University is borne out, at least to some extent, when looking at the friars who lived at the St Andrews friary. Unlike Glasgow - as we shall see in a moment - there are far fewer of them actually found in documents pertaining to the University; rather they are found much more often in the pre-Reformation debates raging in St Andrews. But this in itself would suggest that we are dealing with learned men, and never more obviously so than in the case of Alexander Arbuckle, for whom Ross in his article on religious orders has much respect. Arbuckle can be connected to at least two of the Scottish friaries, Edinburgh and St Andrews. He was a student at St Andrews in 1525/6, and in a typically Brycean inconsistency, he was listed as having been the only Observant who studied at St Andrews (he was on ‘the list of Determinants of the fourth class under the year 1525’); but there were others, such as Jerome Lindsay, who was associated with the Perth friary, Andrew Cairns from Glasgow, or even John Litstar, a graduate of St Andrews in 1487 who, in October 1487 ‘was excused delivering the customary lectures in arts since he had entered the Observant Friars Minor’.

In 1539 and 1547 Arbuckle again appeared in St Andrews, where he was

70 Ross, ‘Some Notes’, p. 199.
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involved in a heresy trial and a dispute with Knox respectively. An inscription in one of his books would suggest that he was guardian at Edinburgh in 1542; in fact the inscriptions in two of his books link him to the 'Edinburgh Franciscans', one of them a gift to him by the Scottish historian John Mair. Another of his books, St Hilary of Poitiers' Opera, was also among the books belonging to the Aberdeen Observant friary, while his copy of Antonius Broekweg's Concordantiae Majores was also at some point in the possession of friar William Symson, who was connected with the house at Elgin. Incidentally a number of his books came into the possession of Clement Little and were among the books which Little left to the town in 1580, which ended up as the earliest benefaction made to the library of the 'toun college'.

According to Hay, Arbuckle died abroad in 1562, 'in the household of a certain Catholic bishop', who remains un-named, while Bryce suggested that he died in the Netherlands.72

Arbuckle's entry in Hay among the provincial ministers (he was elected to the office three times) states him to be 'without his equal in the kingdom' in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, involved in disputes with the Protestant 'heretics' on a number of occasions, 'from which he always emerged victor'.73 It is this involvement in the 'inquisition upon heresy' which seemed to have been his primary role when at St Andrews, especially during David Beaton’s tenure as cardinal. In 1539 he was part of the interrogation of Thomas Forret, vicar of Dollar, who was eventually burnt with five others in Edinburgh in the presence of James V on 1 March 1539. And in 1547 he was spokesman for a convention of Franciscans and Dominicans, who were engaged in a dispute with Knox concerning his 'heretical and schismatical doctrine' in St Leonard's Yard at St Andrews University (according to Bryce this was the last record of the Franciscans as 'active inquisitors').74 Although Hay gave Arbuckle the distinction of being undefeated in this disputation, Ross' verdict was less sanguine:

Litstar appears in Hay’s list of provincial ministers, not to be confused with John Litstar, junior, with whom he shares his entry, see Bryce, ii, p. 192. This is not the John Litstar alias Henrison listed by Foggie, Renaissance Religion, p. 286.
72 Durkan and Ross, Libraries, pp. 71-2; Bryce, i, pp. 290, 294, 296; ii, p. 193; Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 55.
73 Bryce, ii, p. 193.
74 Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 173. Bryce, i, pp. 100, 102-3, 292-4; History of the Reformation, i, 36-41, 191-201; Pitcairn Criminal Trials, vol. i, pt. i, pp. 213-15. Durkan sees the 'inquisitorial zeal' to be the result of the defections to Protestantism in both Franciscan and Dominican orders, rather than an inherent quality of the Franciscan order as Bryce seems to do.
for him, the encounter was a mismatch, between a scholar pedantically arguing his case and a firebrand preacher.\(^7^5\)

Durkan and Ross, in their collaboration on Glasgow University, linked Arbuckle in his role as inquisitor to a number of other prominent Observants: John Paterson, Wardens Tullideff (‘Dillidaff’) and Maltman, and friar Scott.\(^7^6\) John Paterson was guardian of the friary at Ayr in 1520 and at Glasgow friary in 1531, and provincial minister in 1540 when he sat on a tribunal with John Tullideff, guardian of St Andrews, passing ‘judgement in absence’ over Sir John Borthwick in 1540. According to Durkan he had been ‘on record from 1520 at least’, taking him to be the same person as Joannes Patricii, although Bryce translates this name as John Patrick rather than John Paterson. He was provincial minister twice and, according to Hay, celebrated his priestly jubilee sometime before he went into exile with ‘eighty priestly fathers’ in 1559; an epitaph of 1573 states that he had spent the intervening years at Louvain and had by then been in the order for fifty-three years. Apart from his activities on the tribunal in 1540, he also attended the provincial council of 1549 (in the company of Andrew Cottis,\(^7^7\) of St Andrews, James Winchester of Perth and John Scott of St Andrews), which was held in the Dominican friary of St Andrews, and appeared as witness to a deed of indenture of the ‘Prentesichip of Patrick Dunlop of the saydlar craft’ on 24 October 1531.\(^7^8\)

James Winchester, guardian of the Perth, Aberdeen and possibly St Andrews friaries, appears as guardian when witnessing the will of Provost Peter Chaplain on 6 February 1551, along with James Peebles, ‘his vicar in the friary’. In 1549 he appears to have been guardian of Perth, at least according to Bryce, when he attended the Provincial Council held in the Edinburgh Dominican house. Bryce also reports that shortly after the 1549 council Winchester ‘migrated to Aberdeen’ and died there ‘while acting as warden of that friary’ in 1553 while on a mission in France (though

---

76 Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 173; the form ‘Dillidaff’ is given in Bryce.
77 Who was involved in the pater noster controversy, see Chapter 5, pp. 187-8.
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he does not elaborate on the purpose of that mission). His death is recorded for 20 August 1553 in the Aberdeen Obituary, where he is described as 'warden and custos'.

John Tullideff was a 'theologian at St Andrews in 1541', as well as guardian of the friary there, and there is some evidence that he may have been at Elgin and Aberdeen, too. He was in the possession of Thomas Aquinas' *In beati Pauli epistolas* (Paris, 1529) which bears inscriptions detailing it to be both for his use as well as that of the Aberdeen convent and includes an inscription 'pro communitate fratum minorum conuentus elgenensis'. He had also been the first owner of the above-mentioned *Enarrationes evangeliorum* by Nicholas Herborn, donated to him by Peter Chaplain, canon of St Salvator's, who was regent in the Pedagogy, professor of theology and finally provost of St Salvator's College between 1550-1 (when he died).

He was, presumably, the same person whom Bryce called 'Warden John Dillidaif', when he was one of the judges at the heresy trial of Patrick Hamilton, Abbot of Fern, who had been accused by the Dominican Prior, Alexander Campbell in 1528.

The third 'inquisitor' was Symon Ledgerwood, also referred to as Maltman, who was styled guardian of St Andrews in 1539, when he was involved in the 'trial and martyrdom' of Friar Jerome Russell at Glasgow, who was burnt at the stake there in 1539, despite the 'entreaties of the amiable Archbishop Dunbar'. Bryce believed that Russell may have been a member of the Conventual house at Dumfries (within the diocese of Glasgow, thus explaining the intervention of Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow) and the 'only Franciscan in Scotland who paid the last penalty rather than sacrifice his Lutheran convictions'. Ledgerwood himself may also have preached a sermon in the Abbey Church of St Andrews 'which preceded the trial of Walter Myln, the last Protestant martyr in Scotland'. On 10 October 1539 he witnessed a deed of presentation by the Earl of Bothwell to 'prebend Hauch in the Collegiate Church of Dunbar' (his name here is given as Lydzartwood), while there

---

79 Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 55; Bryce, i, pp. 281 and note 5, 301-2, 317, 329; ii, p. 322; Patrick, *Statutes*, p. 87. The Latin entry in the Obituary reads: 'Obit autem vicesimo Augusti, anno Domini 1553'. See also John Paterson and John Scott. Presumably he is not the same person as James Winchester, college chaplain, whose will is witnessed by friars Herbert Carneill, John Geddy, John Burrell and John Knycht on 21 August 1558.


81 Bryce, i, pp. 100-1, 291; *History of the Reformation*, i, p. 64; i.
is a reference to 'Simon Ledgerwood, Franciscan' as having been a 'friar at Glasgow, Aberdeen and St Andrews' in Silvestro Mazzolini di Priorio's *Aurea rosa* (Lyons, 1528).82

John Scott, the fourth 'inquisitor' mentioned by Durkan and Ross, was a member of the Edinburgh, Aberdeen and St Andrews houses and one of the Observants present at the 1549 Church Council.83 According to Durkan and Ross, he was 'first heard of in 1546', though they thought it possible that he had been a student at St Andrews in 1531. A Johannes Scot, however, was determined at St Andrews in 1540 and licensed in 1541. These entries also suggest that he was one of those students who were recruited to the Observants while at university, for when he was licensed, he was described as *pauper*.84 Durkan and Ross found him to have been the owner of seven books, the biggest number of books they have found belonging to any one Observant. Franciscus Lichetus' *In libris Sententiarum Scoti* (Partis, 1520) is inscribed 'ex dono domini Abbatis de Cambuskynnetht alexandri myln ex usu ordinis minorum' and 'ex libris fratris johannis socit (franciscani)', and the two volumes of Hugh of St Victor's 'Operum' are inscribed 'pro conuentu fratrum minorum Conuentus edinburgensis'. Two further books state that Scott was a member of the Aberdeen convent as well as the Edinburgh friary (though he is not mentioned in the extant *Aberdeen Obituary*), while Durkan suggests that the 'French-owned books' in Scott's possession could indicate that he had studied at Paris.85

Most notorious, however, at least as far as the Protestant reformers were concerned, was his involvement in the martyrdom of George Wishart: Knox reports that Scott was one of two Greyfriars who invited Wishart 'to confess to them before

---

82 Bryce, i, pp. 100, 107, 291 and note 4, 292, 295-6 and note 1; ii, pp. 202-3; Knox, *History*, i, p. 64; J. Dowden, *The Bishops of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1912), p. 348; Bryce states that the resignation took place on 18 May 1559; Durkan and Ross, *Libraries*, (NLS interleaved copy, facing p. 122. The inscription reads: 'usus huius libri conceditur fratri Symony lidzartwod/franciscus'.

83 Patrick, *Statutes*, p. 87. Scott presumably attended the convents in that order, since Lorenzo Valla's *Elegantiae* was printed in 1528 (inscribed 'pro conuentu aberdonensi') and Epiphanius' 'Contra Octoginta Haereses' in 1543 (inscribed 'pro Conuentu fratum minorum Edinburgensi'). Valla's *Elegantiae* was also owned by Thomas Hutchinson, member of the Aberdeen friary, gifted to him by Alexander Hepburn. Hepburn in turn was a 'benefactor of the Aberdeen Franciscans' and according to Durkan and Ross, may have been Alexander Hepburn, schoolmaster of Elgin, who is listed elsewhere, 'for bukis yat he gef to me with plesour of his varden ye quhelk foir said varden gart ye said broder send for ye bukis to ye sam effek', see Durkan and Ross, *Libraries*, p. 119; for Alexander Hepburn see p. 116, both entries under that name.


85 Durkan and Ross, *Libraries*, pp. 56, 132, 141-2; Durkan, 'Cultural Background', p. 281. Alexander Myln was himself at St Salvator's College in 1494 as president of the College of Justice.
he was burned on the Castlehill' in St Andrews in March 1546 (his trial had been in February 1546). Bryce believed that Scott may have revealed confessions made to him as well as posing as a convert on a number of occasions in order to incriminate suspected heretics.86

The 'inquisitorial zeal' that seems to be rife among the Scottish Observants, may not simply be an extension of their role in the continental Inquisition (as Bryce would have us believe). Durkan proposes it to be the result of the defections to Protestantism from both Franciscan and Dominican orders, so presumably the Scottish Observants showed little interest in the Inquisition before these defections, although George Buchanan would blame them for the activities of their Continental brethren in the 1530s. One such 'defector' was James Melvil, the earliest recorded case of an 'apostate' Observant. He was a member of the St Andrews friary and converted to Lutheranism c. 1526. In a misrepresentation of his case, he appealed first to the archbishop of St Andrews (in August 1526) and then the Curia, that he be allowed to join the Conventuals – presumably because they were either less strict or less involved in inquisitorial activity. When the Curia was made aware of the full circumstances regarding his wishes to change orders, the dispensation was rescinded and James V was charged with his 'imprisonment or expulsion from the country'. Melvil spent his exile in Germany until his return in 1535, to further spread Lutheran teachings. James V had to petition the pope not to re-instate Melvil 'to his position as a Grey Friar, as he was “infected with Lutheranism which he attempts to spread among the ignorant people”'.87 A sharp contrast to Melvil's journey into heresy is provided by the example of friar James Peebles, vicar in the house of St Andrews in 1551, when he witnessed the will of Provost Peter Chaplain on 6 February 1551 with guardian James Winchester. In 1574 “freir James Peblis” and others, including Ninian Winzet' were 'denounced by the Council as “rebels abroad.”88

86 Bryce, i, pp. 100, 292-3; Knox, History, i, pp. 90, 92168, 196; Durkan, ‘Cultural Background’, p. 315.
87 Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 173; James V Letters, pp. 137-8; Bryce, i, pp. 100, 102-5, 291-4. Bryce suggests that there is a slight possibility that Melvil may be the same James Melvil who was rector of St Catherine's at Rome (presumably during his exile) and appointed Apostolic Preacher in 1534 and described in a 1543 correspondence as ‘a Scotsman beneficed in Rome, abhorring the Bishop's part’. See Bryce, i, p. 106.
88 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 55; Durkan and Ross, Libraries, p. 135. Ross, ‘Some Notes’, p. 200; RPC, iv, p. 334. James Peebles is also listed by Durkan and Ross as having owned a copy of
But the St Andrews friary was not only home to the Observant inquisitors of the Reformation struggles. In the late fifteenth century a rather intriguing name became associated with both the St Andrews and Elgin friaries: Robert Stewart. Hay reported him to be ‘a kinsman of James V’, which would provide us with striking evidence of the importance the Observants played in the house of Stewart, comparable to the French court. At the same time it is entirely possible that he could have been a distant kinsman from an illegitimate line. According to Hay he was born in 1475 and died at St Andrews aged eighty, which would make the year of his death c.1555, although the gift of a book to him by Thomas Hay, dean of Dunbar (Denys Carthusian’s *In IV evangelistas*) suggests that he may have been in Elgin as late as 1554. In the controversy with the Conventuals of 1521, in which he stood with Andrew Cairns, he was styled ‘guardian of Moray’ (Elgin).  

Surprisingly little, however, is made of him by Bryce; a brief mention in relation to the 1521 controversy is the only reference to him in Bryce’s study apart from an entry in Hay’s chronicle: after Pope Leo X had granted the Observants supremacy over the Conventual branch of the order, the Scottish Observants had secured a bull that required the Conventuals to wear a ‘distinctive mark,’ which was naturally disputed by the Conventual provincial master. According to Hay, Stewart foretold ‘a national disaster’ (dare we suggest the Reformation) on his deathbed. In the Latin of Hay’s chronicle it is also stated that Stewart had been provincial minister twice, although this is omitted in Bryce’s translation.

The Aberdeen friary
The third house of the Observant friars was founded in Aberdeen. Hay listed it as the fourth house, although according to the *Aberdeen Obituary* entry for John

---

Angelo Poliziano’s *Virorum Illustrium Epistolae* (Paris, 1526), which is inscribed ‘frater jacobus peblys me utitur anno domini 1549’.

89 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 54; Durkan and Ross, *Libraries*, p. 112; Bryce, i, p. 60 and notes 1-2. Bryce has Robert Stewart (or Stuart) as guardian of Elgin, see Bryce, i, p. 60 note 1.

90 Durkan, ‘Observant Franciscan Province’, p. 54; Bryce, ii, p. 181.

91 Bryce, ii, p. 181 [192-3]. In Hay there is a note after the name stating ‘de quo supra’, although there does not appear to have been any previous mention of Stewart in the chronicle, at least as it appears in Bryce. Hay, Bryce p. 181, *de quo supra*. 
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Richardson, it was the 'tertii loci'. It was in fact the last religious house to be founded in Aberdeen before the Reformation. Bryce suggested, in conjunction with friars Gerard of Texel and John Richardson (though neither appears in any of the documents Anderson put together concerning the Grey Friars of Aberdeen) that they had come to Aberdeen as early as 1461 to settle there, but the year of the actual foundation is given as 1469 in Cowan and Easson, when we have charters of Richard Vaus of Many, giving land to the Observants. This is confirmed by James III and Thomas, bishop of Aberdeen, on 9 May 1469.

The work of P.J. Anderson is of great help at this point. His collection of documents relating to all the orders of friars resident in Aberdeen provides a very useful starting point for an investigation into the foundation of the Observant friary in Aberdeen. According to his notes, the community in Aberdeen started with the arrival of Friar Gerard de Taxalia in 1461. This friar, however, is not mentioned again until August 1473, when his obituary states that he had been warden of the Aberdeen friary since 1471. Also Kennedy does not find any further evidence of the Observant friars' activities as a whole in Aberdeen until May 1469, when Richard Vaus of Many, a burgess of Aberdeen, intended to grant land on the east side of the Gallowgate to the 'Friars Minors of the Observance of St. Francis'. This is confirmed eight days later by the king. It seems that in Aberdeen the initiative to establish a friary of Observant Franciscans came from the burgh community rather than king or bishop. Nevertheless, the bishop, Thomas Spence, gave his approval for a friary to be set up in Aberdeen. There is evidence that relations between the Observant friars and the episcopate in Aberdeen were good ones. Certainly William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen from 1484 until his death in 1514, acted as a patron to the Observant friars. On 16 November 1514 Thomas Myrton, archdeacon of Aberdeen, was confirmed as the executor of William Elphinstone's estate, and authorised 'to spend 80 merks on a yard and tenement for the Friars Minors'. Anderson's account is incomplete though, since he fails to mention that the sum of 80 merks is to be shared with the Dominicans of Edinburgh, in whose house Elphinstone's viscera had been

---

92 Bryce, i, p. 299 note 2; ii, pp. 186, 323.
93 Bryce, i, p. 307; Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 130; Anderson, Aberdeen Friars, p. 40; Kennedy, Annals of Aberdeen, p. 75; This is corroborated by the evidence in Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, pp. 61, 135, 116, 108.
buried. The sum was to be bestowed upon 'the provincial and the [Dominican] order for the building of a convent within the university of St Andrews. Elphinstone had been a student at Louvain, in a way the academic counterpart of Cologne, a university much less European in its orientation, but it influenced the Scottish universities as much as Cologne or Paris had. The fact that the Aberdeen Observants were in possession of a book that had been passed to them by the Dominicans of that burgh would suggest general amiable relations.95

By 1471, according to Bryce, the friary was 'ready for occupation'.96 On 7 February 1471 the Vicar General of the cismontane Observant Franciscans (i.e. the head of the Observant Franciscan province south of the Alps97) sent a friar to Scotland to act as Vicar General. The friar in question was John de Nucia, warden of the Convent of Limburg which belonged to the province of Cologne.98 That the choice fell on a friar of the Cologne province argues for the close contact the Scottish Observants kept with their mother province, something that will make for interesting further investigation. It was to Friar John de Nucia then, in his position as acting Vicar General, that the land in the Gallowgate was resigned. Once again we find evidence for the 'proprietary scruples' both Bryce and Dunlop mention, especially in connection with Edinburgh. The solution this time was the resignation of the lands to a representative of the vicariate itself.99

Finally, on 12 July 1471, the land in question was ceded to Friar David Crannoch, the Scottish Vicar General, and this, according to Kennedy, represented the 'original foundation' of the Aberdeen friary. Yet he goes on to say that this was the only property the Observant friars of Aberdeen acquired. This appears to be

95 Ibid, p. 71; J. Foggie, 'The Dominicans in Scotland: 1450-1560' (Edinburgh Ph.D., 1997), p. 36; Abdn. Reg., i, p. 310; Dowden, Bishops, p. 130; Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 120; Lyall, 'Cologne and Louvain Students', pp. 58-9; Durkan and Ross, Libraries, (NLS interleaved copy), facing p. 164. The book was St Anthoninus' Secunda pars totius summe maioris beati Antonini (Lyons, c. 1516).
96 Bryce, i, p. 310.
97 Durkan, 'Observant Franciscan Province', p. 51.
98 Bryce, i, p. 310; Anderson, Aberdeen Friars, p. 41; Kennedy, Annals of Aberdeen, ii, p. 76.
There are discrepancies between Bryce's report and that of Anderson. For one Anderson identifies Friar Francis Blonde as the Vicar General of the cismontane Observants, while Bryce has him as the ultramontane Vicar General. Furthermore there is some disagreement over the name of the warden of Limburg. Bryce has his name as John de Mitia, while Anderson has him as John de Nucia. He does give a reference to the spelling of the name in Bryce, but gives no explanation as to why there are two different forms of that name. Kennedy also uses the form Nucia.
99 Anderson, Aberdeen Friars, p. 41; Bryce, i, p. 310; Dunlop, James Kennedy, pp. 297-8.
wrong, since both Bryce and Anderson cite evidence for a grant made some time before 1479 of land bordering on land granted by Richard Vaus of Many. Bryce even states that an enlargement of the original property was necessary, since the friary had been planned too small from the start for ‘so important a centre as Aberdeen’. He does not, however, explain this statement any further. The subsequent grants were first the above mentioned, made by James Bisset before 1479, and another one by David Colison in 1481. In fact Colison ‘granted … his land bounding on the north that previously granted by Vaus’. The land granted by Bisset was actually purchased for the friars by Walter Bertram, a burgess of Edinburgh, apparently from Bisset’s estate. Additional ground was granted to the friary in 1504, when Anthony Vitali, a visitor was ‘appointed by the chapters general as commissaries of the ultramontane vicar’ and active in ‘both Aberdeen and St Andrews’. This grant was regulated by a notarial certificate dated 12 February 1504, in which Vitali received a grant of additional ground for the Aberdeen friary on the ‘east side of the Gallowgate’. Vitali’s activities in Scotland that year also extended to a letter of confraternity dated 20 April 1504 to Thomas Maule of Panmure, his wife and children.

But it is not only the circumstances of the foundation that are remarkably well documented. There is also some noteworthy information about the early friars of the Aberdeen friary after its foundation. We know of two brothers, John and Walter of Leiden, lay brothers and carpenters by trade, who were reported to be among the first converts John Richardson attracted to the friary. According to Bryce they practised their trade of carpenters in the Aberdeen burgh community before renouncing
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100 Kennedy, Annals of Aberdeen, ii, p. 76; Anderson, Aberdeen Friars, pp. 41, 46-47, 53; Bryce, i, pp. 310-312; ii, p. 221. For Walter Bertram: see Chapter 4, pp. 148-50.
101 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 53. Durkan states that both forms of the name, Vitali and Witalleris, are used in documents but that Witalleris was more correct, see Durkan, p. 56 note 15 and Anderson, Aberdeen Friars, p. 62. It should be noted that Stewart in Registrum de Panmure; Records of the Families of Maule, de Valonis, Brechin, and Brechin-Barclay, united in the line of the Barons and Earls of Panmure, 2 vols, ed. J. Stewart (Edinburgh, 1874), ii, pp. 268-9 used the form ‘Vituli’, a form also used by the NAS catalogue entry. Bryce, i, p. 311; ii, pp. 223-5, esp. p. 224; The entry for the notarial certificate is not listed in the index under ‘Anthony Vitali’, but under ‘Friar Anthony’, though both entries are given the same title and clearly the date is too similar to apply to two different vicar-commissaries. The date is slightly problematic. Apparently Bryce means February 1503-4, as is made clear from the text, though in his introduction to the document he does not amend the date. It should be noted that Bryce states him to be a commissary of the cismontane vicar general in the entry in the index, see Bryce, ii, p. 535 although throughout the text he identifies him as commissary of the ultramontane vicar general. This might stem from the problem identified by Durkan that Scottish documents use ‘cismontane’ where ‘ultramontane’ is meant, see Bryce, ii, p. 264. See also NAS, GD45/27/11 and Bryce i, Grey Friars, i, p. 291 note 1; ii, pp. 265-6
citizenship to join friar Gerard [of Texel] and John of Leiden was involved in the construction of the Elgin friary and 'in the repair of others'.

His death is noted in the Aberdeen Obituary with the entry of 'layman and carpenter' for the year 1459, though Bryce gives the year 1479 in brackets with a question mark, his opinion being that the Obituary is a transcript of an older register and that some entries have been post-dated. Walter of Leiden is recorded to have died in 1469, a 'carpenter, who faithfully constructed a belfry for this convent, and cells for the friars'.

In 1517, the Aberdeen Obituary records the death of friar John Strang, who had been a skilled glassworker and, according to the entry in the Obituary, worked on the buildings of the Aberdeen, Perth, Ayr and Elgin friaries, though Bryce notes that, having died in 1517, he was not involved 'in the glazing of the great south window in Aberdeen or any of the windows on the west side looking out into the Gallowgate'. The recruitment of labourers was nothing unusual for the Franciscans. Besides members of the higher ranks of society, such as knights, burgesses, merchants, university masters and members of the clergy and minstrels, Brooke has reminded us that the early Franciscans had even accepted 'illiterate laymen, peasant labourers and men of little or no substance'. What was surely attractive in having craftsmen join the order was that their skills could supplement the daily income of the friaries by hiring out their labour. Skilled craftsmen would have been greatly in demand in urban centres.

Another early member of the Aberdeen friary was Alexander Merser, 'son and heir of the deceased Robert Merser, laird of Innerpeffray in Strathearn', whose death is recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary as 1469. When entering the order he renounced his title as laird of Innerpeffray, which could be seen as proof that the early friars, at least, took the Observants' ideal of poverty quite seriously. Yet this is contrasted with Dennison's discovery of evidence in the burgh records of Aberdeen that there was a 'Jowal house' attached to the Aberdeen Observant friary, which had been a 'nether house which [was] entered by the small south gate of the east side of

---

103 Bryce, i, p. 330; ii, p. 326; Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 52.
104 Bryce, i, pp. 318, 330, 352, 363, 477; ii, p. 293. Not surprisingly there is also a mention of Strang in Creamer, Franciscans, p. 30.
105 Brooke, Coming of the Friars, p. 107.
the church, beneath the choir, commonly called the Jowal House'. MacGibbon and Ross are also full of praise for the rather large traced window in the east end of the church, a work of unrivalled 'size and elegance' in Scotland, but 'pure and simple in design' – perhaps a concession to Observant simplicity in an otherwise impressive piece of work.

The circumstances of the foundation of the Aberdeen friary differed from St Andrews in more than one way. As has already been pointed out, the Aberdeen friary had only indirectly been founded by the bishop. Another difference was the connection with the University. The Observant friars came to St Andrews after both the University and St. Salvator's College had been set up, it would be another twenty-six years after their arrival in Aberdeen before King's College was founded. The actual bull of foundation of the university by Pope Alexander VI is dated 10 February 1495. Kennedy makes an unwitting connection between the Observant friars and King's College, by describing them as 'the principal teachers of theology at Paris', but does not follow this further. We know, however, that King's College itself was set up following the example of Paris and Bologna.

The situation of the sources for Aberdeen is in many ways extraordinary. Besides those collected in Anderson's remarkable work, the Obituary Calendar of the Aberdeen Observant friary recorded the names of friars, who we would otherwise not have known about. In this way, we have records for friars William Marschel (died c.1469), Duncan Alexander (1483), Patrick Stalker (1486), William Lesle (1523), Alexander Van (1523), Alexander Marchel (1526), Alexander Redy (1529), Alexander Blair (1549), James Elphinstone (1553), William Gilruif (a 'priest who

---

106 E.P. Dennison, D. Ditchburn and M. Lynch (eds), Aberdeen Before 1800: A New History (East Linton, 2002), p. 25; Bryce, i, pp. 307, 330; ii, p. 332. See also ibid., p. 283 and note 5 on the problem with his date of death in the Obituary. The 'neither house' could quite conceivably have been a similar structure as the 'vaulted undercroft' of the Lincoln Franciscan friary, which Martin found to be the only such surviving structure in England, though he did suspect this to be a relatively common feature 'in other early Franciscan churches', see Martin, Franciscan Architecture in England, p. 15.


108 J. Dowden, The Bishops of Scotland (Glasgow, 1912), p. 131.

109 Kennedy, Annals of Aberdeen, ii, pp. 75, 358; Dowden, Bishops, p. 132.

2: The Observant Franciscans in Scotland: Location and Personnel 55
died in the flower of his youth' in 1555), Francis Jamesone (1557) and Walter Leche and John Thomson (a carpenter), for whom no date of death is recorded.  

As far as guardians are concerned, we can trace as one of the early guardians John Litstar, who moved on to being provincial minister by April 1482, when he acted as collector for the crusade against the Turks; he died c.1505. According to Durkan he could also be synonymous with the 'man from Aberdeen recorded at Cologne in 1475', and it is possible he was also the same as John Lystar, priest, of the diocese of Brechin, who was recorded in a supplications to Rome on 2 September 1479. His death is recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary, though without a date. In the early sixteenth century, we find James Childe, who was styled guardian of Aberdeen in a minute of Agreement dated 2 April 1505 between him and Gilbert Menzies, burgess, in order to settle a dispute over the southern boundary of the Aberdeen friary. According to Bryce, Childe was succeeded by Robert Baillie, whose death is recorded in the Obituary Calendar in 1510.

A less well documented guardian was Thomas Gray. The only source for him appears to be Dempster's Historia, which claims that he had been 'at one time warden' of Aberdeen, who left the country in 1560. According to Dempster he, and a friar John Patrick of Banff (whom Dempster mentions in connection with Francis Gonzaga), were among those friars who left the Netherlands for Rouen in 1579 and was supposedly the author of an Admonition to Novices, 'a treatise on the Universal Philosophy of Aristotle, and a Commentary on Four Books of the Sentences'. Bryce was rather suspicious of this information, as Gray would have had to attain 'the ripe age of 137 years, in full enjoyment of an active memory, unimpaired sight and digestion, while and infirmity of the feet alone betokened physical debility'.

110 Bryce, i, pp. 307, 318, 320, 330-2, 477; ii, p. 299, 309, 312-3, 317-8, 326, 328-9, 333, 335. There is a problem with the dates of death for William Marschel, the friars Leydes, Alexander Merser and John Richardson, Bryce, p. 283 and note 5. For William Leslie, Bryce noted in the text of Scottish Grey Friars that no date of death is given, while in his transcript of the Obituary the date of 1523 is given. A friar Anderson's name is tacked on to an entry Bryce translates from the Aberdeen Obituary Calendar of Walter Leche, 'to these may be added [...]', though it is unclear where Bryce adds them from, since they do not seem to appear in his edition of the Calenar. Anderson shares his entry with Friar Towris.


112 Bryce, i, pp. 312, 317, 329; ii, pp. 225, 315. Childe was not recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary.

The last guardian of the Aberdeen friary was John Roger, who, on 29 December 1559 resigned the friary into the hands of the magistrates and then proceeded to lead ‘his brethren into their long exile’. An entry in the Treasurer’s Accounts concerning a John Roger might suggest that he was the son of Alexander Roger in Drumfarg.114 Bryce listed an entry in the Exchequer Rolls for 1550, where ‘John Roger, junior’ is paid by the Comptroller ‘in name of the Friars of Observance of Perth, receiving annually £5 in the Feast of the Circumcision of our Lord, during the will of the Governor, £10’. He was also the owner of two books (by Franciscan authors): Angus de Clavasio’s Summa de casibus (Strasbourg, 1491) and Nicholas de Lyra’s Quinta (-sexta) pars Biblie. Glossa ordinaria (Lyons, 1529). The first has an inscription stating that the book was given to the Franciscan convent, presumably of Perth, by John Paterson, dean of Dunkeld, in return for prayers to be said for his well-being, in 1553. Another inscription made by John Roger himself states that this book had been given to him by Paterson and that it is now to remain in the convent of Stirling for the community. The inscription in the second book is, according to Durkan and Ross report, overwritten and scratched, but Roger appears to be signed here as ‘guardiano fratrum minorum de perth’ and there appears to be ‘an Aberdeen convent inscription’ (presumably the Aberdeen Franciscan convent). The book was given to him by John Hepburn, dean of Dunkeld, ‘usque ad reuocacionem’, and signed by Hepburn and Roger.115

There are several problems in using these inscriptions to try to retrace Roger’s movements. Durkan and Ross are unsure about Perth in the inscription in the

---

114 TA, xi, p. 145: Et de £10, ‘compositionis bonorum eschaetorum quondam Andree Lumisdene in Tullochirwy et Alexandri Roger in Drumfarg interpectorum ut supra, concessorum uxori et prolibus dicti quondam Andree et Joanni Roger filio dicti Alexandri respective’. It would appear that they were killed at the battle of Corrichie in 1562: see other adjacent entries.  
115 Bryce, i, pp. 305, 317, 322-3; ii, pp. 233-4. Bryce adds him to his transcript of the Obituary, but does not have any information on his date of death. ‘Et eidem in decem libris per solutionem factam frati Johanni Roger, minori, nomine Fratrum de Observantia de Perth, percipientium annuatim quinque libras anuatim in festo circumcisionis Domini, durante voluntate dicti domini gubernatoris, £10’, ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 142. ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 142; Durkan and Ross, Libraries, pp. 139-40. The Latin reads ‘placet nobis’, and not quite who is meant by the ‘us’, either John Roger himself, or John Roger and the community at Stirling, or John Roger and John Paterson. The Aberdeen Obituary recorded the death of friar Alexander Gray in 1560, who had been a member of the Aberdeen friary before 29 December 1558, when its guardian, John Roger, resigned the friary. He died on 10 January 1560 ‘at the house of his brother, John Gray’, and was ‘buried in his habit in the Cathedral Church before the altar of St Catherine’, see Bryce, i, pp. 322-4, 331; ii, p. 286. His wording could suggest that Bryce attributes his death so soon after the vacation of the friary to the shock of the ‘severance’.
Summa de casibus, otherwise this would place Roger at the Perth friary in 1553. If this were indeed the case then one must assume that he took the book with him to Stirling and left it with the community there. But if the 'nobis' in Roger's statement refers to himself and Paterson then one would assume that the initial gift in 1553 would have taken place in Stirling as well. Added to this is the fact that Durkan and Ross's entry on Paterson is unclear as to whether he himself was based at Perth or at Stirling (one assumes that this is tied up with the inscriptions in the Summa). At the same time the inscription in the second book would suggest that he was also guardian of Perth when receiving it, but that the book then ended up in Aberdeen nonetheless. But again, the reading of this passage is difficult.116

What makes John Roger even more fascinating is the fact that he was perhaps the only Observant friar whose official activities as a religious did not cease at the Reformation – or if they did they were only briefly interrupted. Despite Bryce's protestation that he led 'his brethren into their long exile', he returned (although the entry in the Treasurer's Accounts for 1562 would suggest he never left) in 1565 to be appointed alongside John Black, Andrew Abercromby and George Clapperton as 'Catholic men of learning', by Mary, Queen of Scots in accordance with Tridentine decrees.117

Like St Andrews, Aberdeen must have had its share of disruption in the pre-Reformation unrests. According to Bryce, friar Alexander Dick adopted Protestant views in 1532 and subsequently fled 'for protection to some of his friends in Dundee, where he exchanged his habit for secular garments', being supported by high-ranking members in that burgh, such as Provost James Scrimgeour, hereditary 'Constable of Dundee' and his bailies. Demands that he be handed over either to Friar Lang (presumably the royal confessor, see below) who had arrived from St Andrews or the

116 Durkan and Ross, Libraries, pp. 135, 139-40.
117 M. Lynch, Mary Stewart: Queen in Three Kingdoms (Oxford, 1988), p. 17; Knox History, ii, p. 175; Papal Negs., pp. 492, 495; Ross, 'Some Notes', p. 315; Durkan and Ross, Libraries pp. 66, 76, 139; Ross, 'Notes on Religious Orders, p. 199. John Black was Mary's Dominican confessor who would be murdered in Edinburgh on 9 March 1566 (the night of the infamous Riccio murder) and Andrew Abercrombie, also a Dominican had been prior of the Aberdeen friary at the time of the Reformation prior of the Aberdeen friary (when Roger, too, was in Aberdeen). There is some doubt about the fourth member, but it seems likely that he was the 'provost of Edinburgh's Trinity College and perhaps also a minor poet'. Knox lists John Roger as a Dominican, but as has been pointed out by Laing in his edition of Knox's History, this is clearly a fault.
Bishop of Brechin were thwarted by the townspeople in a bout of anti-fraternal sentiment.\textsuperscript{118}

The Glasgow friary

If Aberdeen provides us with some of the best documentary record, then Glasgow becomes our Grail when it comes to archaeological evidence. Recent archaeological discoveries have given us an intriguing new insight into the Glasgow friary: it would appear that the windows had been made with stained glass. This is quite a departure from the Edinburgh community’s protestations when being offered buildings that were considered too luxurious. This is different from the archaeological findings at the Jedburgh friary. Dixon, O’Sullivan and Rogers believed that only a very small amount of the friary’s windows may have included stained glass. Since, according to Dixon \textit{et al}, the Observants ‘enjoyed royal patronage’, and the Jedburgh friary was certainly an impressive building, ‘had they wished more decorative glass’ they could have easily obtained it; not entirely convincing, since Jedburgh (like Glasgow) was not a royal foundation, nor is it convincing that plain glass was somehow more ascetic, for, as Dickson in his preface to the \textit{Treasurer’s Accounts} pointed out, glass had been used in the ‘houses of the rich’ and was still costly. But a reference in the \textit{Exchequer Rolls} for 1501 (£9, paid for three crates of glass to the repair the windows of the friary church in Stirling) demonstrates that glass in the church windows must have been a common enough feature for the Observant friaries. Statistically it is therefore unfortunate that the two friaries that provide us with any indication as to the nature of the buildings were an Episcopal and a burghal foundation.\textsuperscript{119}

In addition to the glass shards, however, an even more exciting discovery was made: archaeologists uncovered a total of eighteen graves within the cloister walk. Unfortunately, it is thought that these findings do not constitute the discovery of the friary’s burial ground, which was usually located to the south of the friary church,

\textsuperscript{118} Bryce, i, pp. 106-7; ii, p. 226-8. The fervour with which Dundee inhabitants allegedly protected Alexander Dick is seen by Bryce as a display of their Protestant sympathies, while the arrival of the St Andreaen complement is a sign for the ‘inquisitorial zeal’ displayed especially by friars of this house., see Bryce, i, pp. 225, 291.

not within the buildings; the discovery of the friars' graveyard could have provided us with an estimate of just how large the Glasgow community may have been. The skeletons were all adults, aged between 18 and 45 or older. But the most crucial discovery was that as many as seven of these skeletons had been women, which would suggest that the Glasgow Observants had allowed benefactors to be buried within their friary. This is not unprecedented: a papal decree of 1312 re-confirmed the right of the Franciscan order to admit laymen for burial within the friary cemetery, as long as the friars gave the parish priest a quarter of the burial dues collected, which had been a further source of resentment between the friars and secular clergy, as yet another source of income was taken from the parish church and appropriated by the friars. Notable benefactors were also known to have been buried before altars in the friary church.\textsuperscript{120}

The early Observants, however, attempted to stop the practice of burying laymen, at least within the friary buildings. There are records in a number of European friaries of disputes between benefactors and friars of recently reformed convents in which the benefactors insisted that established practice be continued. In the German town of Nuremberg, whose Franciscan friary had had an Observant reform forced upon it by the town council in 1446, town families continued to use the friary's crypts as burial places, complete with the display of their families' coats of arms and much to the dismay of the Observants who had moved in. An attempt to remove those coats of arms led to a papal order that these remain in their accustomed location, since their display was justified through 'the family tradition of benefaction of the friary', and although this contravened Observant practice, they had no choice but to comply with the wishes of their benefactors, and it would seem that later-medieval Observants had accepted this as a general practice, as the discovery of female skeletons in the Glasgow friary grounds would seem to corroborate. The burial of patrons within friary grounds finds parallels in the practices of the Carmelite (or White) friars: excavations at Aberdeen, Linlithgow and Perth (three of the twelve Scottish Carmelite friaries) have also discovered male and female skeletons, and at Aberdeen children had been buried as well. As Audrey Beth Fitch has pointed out, the choice of burial site was an important one to the later-medieval

\textsuperscript{120} Bryce, Grey Friars, i, pp. 317, 430.
Scot: it had to be in consecrated ground, and the wealthier the patron, the closer to a patron saint’s altar it would be – in some cases even the high altar, which would also be the most expensive burial place available.\textsuperscript{121}

Still this departure from the Observant ideal did not mean that general immorality was rife among the Scottish Observants. Bryce noted a friar James Baxter as an example that the vow of poverty was still being observed. When he entered the order in he gave up his ownership of lands which he had rented from the Archbishop of Glasgow ‘in early life’. He still remained rentaller ‘\textit{ex facie} of the register’, but on 19 June 1560 he resigned an inheritance received from his recently deceased brother Robert Baxter as well as the lands mentioned above in favour of his kinsman Robert Herbertson, which led Bryce to conclude that Baxter had not drawn the rents, but that another member of his family had done so. Furthermore, the fact that in 1560 Baxter still held to the ideal of poverty as well as not drawing the ‘pension of £16 granted to recanting friars’, suggested to him that Baxter remained a member of the order even after 1560.\textsuperscript{122}

The foundation of the friary took place in the 1470s, some twenty years after the foundation of Glasgow University, and a connection between the Observant friary and the university can be traced much more directly, especially through the friars stationed there, than was the case in St Andrews. Glasgow University had been founded in spring 1451 with William Turnbull, bishop of Glasgow, as its first rector.\textsuperscript{123} Whereas in St Andrews the friars appear mostly in connection with inquisitorial duties rather than the university, in Glasgow they appear much more frequently in university documents. There was also a certain exchange of personnel

\textsuperscript{121} Headland report, pp. 3-4, 52-3; Dixon, \textit{et al}, \textit{Excavations at Jedburgh Friary}, p. 87; A. Turner Simpson and S. Stevenson, \textit{Historic Jedburgh: the archaeological implications of development} (Scottish Burgh Survey, 1981), p. 32; Nyhus, ‘Observant Reform Movement in Southern Germany’, pp. 164-7; A.B. Fitch, ‘Religious Life in Scotland in the Later Middle Ages’, in C. MacLean and K. Veitch (eds), \textit{Scottish Life and Society: A Compendium of Scottish Ethnology}, vol. 12 (Edinburgh, 2006), pp. 75-6; J.A. Stones (ed.), \textit{Three Scottish Carmelite Friaries: Excavations at Aberdeen, Linlithgow and Perth}, 1980-86 (Edinburgh, 1989), pp. 112-4. The suggestion has been put forward that the fact that children were buried at the Aberdeen Carmelite friary may indicate that young boys were admitted as oblates, but there is no evidence that this was ever in practice among the Scottish Observant Franciscans. Generally, burials within friary grounds in Britain tended to follow a pattern where lay burials were spatially separated from burials of friars, either by a wall dividing the cemetery, or, if lay burials took place within the friary church, there tended to be clear zoning: see Schofield and Alan, \textit{Medieval Towns}, p. 203.

\textsuperscript{122} Bryce, i, 348-9, and note 4; see also ii, 246-8.

\textsuperscript{123} Dunlop, \textit{James Kennedy}, p. 276; Lyall, ‘Cologne and Louvain Students’, p. 59.
between the university and the friars, validating Bryce's claims for St Andrews that their impact on the university was such that its students and staff (alas, he is not more specific as to how many) 'deserted the allurements of the world and became followers of the holy father in his profession'. It is interesting to note that this claim finds echoes in mid-fifteenth century reports on the activities of John of Capistrano, one of the four Observant friars often described as the 'pillars of the Observance'. Reputedly, a series of lectures Capistrano gave at the University of Leipzig in 1452 resulted in seventy members of the university joining the Franciscan order.\(^{124}\)

James Pettigrew and John Whiteford were two such friars: both had been Glasgow University regents, who joined the Observant order. John Whiteford died at Aberdeen, since his death is recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary* as 'Friar John Quhifurd, priest preacher and confessor', though unfortunately without a date. James Pettigrew became provincial minister of the Scottish Observants; he was present in this function at Glasgow on 22 March 1512, when 'two strips of land' were transferred to the Glasgow Observants. His death is recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary* in 1518. Also listed as a witness was one friar William Pettigrew, lay brother of Glasgow. Considering that both he and James Pettigrew were attached to the Glasgow friary at the same time, one might suspect a familial connection here.\(^{125}\)

Despite his status as provincial minister in the 1512 document (he is styled 'provincialis ordinis Minorum'), Pettigrew does not appear in Hay's *Chronicle*. There is also a difference of opinion between Durkan and Bryce concerning the *Obituary* entry: Durkan takes this to read that only late in his career was Pettigrew actually styled 'provincial minister', since prior to the bull *Omnipotens Deus* they would have been styled as 'vicar'. As a result the *Obituary* entry would suggest he had been provincial minister/vicar three times. Bryce, however, has a different theory: he reasoned that the 'thrice ruled' refers to Pettigrew holding the office of 'provincial' of the 'wardenry or Custody of Aberdeen, comprising Elgin and Brechin, distinct from the Observantine Province of Scotland', which he held before he ruled the

---


\(^{125}\) Durkan and Kirk, *University of Glasgow*, p. 172; Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 55; Bryce, i, pp. 329, 345; ii, pp. 245-6, 285.
Scottish province.  

If Bryce were correct then this would mean that Pettigrew must have become provincial of the Scottish Province before 1512, otherwise he would not have had a reason to be at Glasgow for the ceremony involving transferral of ownership of additional grounds for the friary.

A friar who was made famous through his literary activities, most notably the Contemplacioun of Synnaris, a penitential poem composed for James IV during one of his Lenten retreats, was William of Touris, who was also connected with Glasgow University. He was provincial minister twice and Durkan believed him to be a member of the family of Touris of Inverleith, patrons of the Observant friary at Edinburgh, a connection which Bryce did not make. William of Touris studied at Paris in 1469-1472 and was at the Glasgow Observant friary in 1494, where Durkan believes he wrote his poem. It is there that he appeared as a witness alongside Patrick Ranwick (confessor to James IV, see below) in a university document of 21 February 1495; he was also at St Andrews in 1504. An entry in the Exchequer Rolls for 1502 recorded him as the recipient of a gift of salmon for the Franciscan nuns at Veere. According to Durkan he is most likely the Friar William whose death is recorded for the period 1505-8.

The Observant friary itself was founded in the 1470s, but once again it proves difficult to determine the exact year. On 21 December 1479 James III issued a charter confirming a grant by John Laing, bishop of Glasgow, of lands in an area known then as Ramshorn and Craignaught. Alongside Laing, Thomas Forsyth, canon of Glasgow cathedral and rector of Glasgow is listed as donor. There have been suggestions that the friary had been founded as early as 1472, attributing the foundation to William Turnbull, bishop of Glasgow, but Cowan and Easson find this unlikely. Despite the insecure dating of the foundation, there is still a clear link between the friars and the episcopate, as is also to be found in St Andrews. Furthermore, through the bishop there is an inherent link to the university.

126 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, pp. 52, 55; Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 172; Bryce, i, p. 329 note 2, 331; ii, pp. 246, 308.
127 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 53; Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 172; Ross, Some Notes’, p. 276; ER, xii, p. 87; Lynch, ‘Religious Life’, pp. 118-9, 122; MacDonald, ‘Passion Devotion’, pp. 118-9, 120; On the family of Touris of Inverleith see also Bryce, i, p. 271 note 4. Bryce omitted Tours’ name from his list of ‘Royal Bounties to the Sisters of St Martha at Campvere in the Netherlands’, though he does list the 1502 entry.
Universities were in a sense church institutions, erected by the authority of the pope. Therefore the head of the diocese must be involved in university affairs. Anything else, however, is speculation at this point in research, since evidence that would show as clear a connection between the friars and Glasgow University (as we have seen for St Andrews) has been as yet elusive. We do know, however, that the Black and Greyfriars' houses were in close vicinity to the University, indeed like St Andrews.129 But the presence of the rector in the original foundation of the friary could provide a point to start looking for such evidence. Bryce certainly sees Glasgow as the western counterpart of St Andrews, in ecclesiastical terms, both being a metropolitan see and a university town. Interestingly he cites friar John Hay, who wrote that the archbishop of Glasgow was ‘imbued with an earnest love for the Order of Observance’, whose friars had the ‘special duty of hearing the confessions of the students’. This is much the same as Dunlop writes about the Observant friars of St Andrews, emphasising the special relations between bishop and friars and emphasising their role as administrators of pastoral care to the students.130

The friary was situated to the west of the High Street, between present-day George Street in the north, Shuttle Street (known then as Greyfriars Wynd) in the east and Albion Street in the west. The southern boundary of the friars' lands probably coincided with present-day Ingram Street. This would again place it in a central location, not far from the High Street and Market Cross, the centre of the medieval town. To the present-day observer it is difficult to imagine the High Street as the centre of the medieval burgh, since the modern commercial centre is now located further west, around George Square, Buchanan and Sauchiehall Streets. But to the medieval citizen the High Street was the heart of Glasgow. One must not forget, however, that while this location is in the city centre today, in the sixteenth century the friary would have been on the edge of what has been called the 'built up' area of medieval Glasgow. Most friaries were found in places like this, since they needed to be close to the centre to interact with the community and of the burgh and proceed with their 'evangelical work', while on the other hand there was enough

130 Bryce, i, p. 343; Dunlop, *James Kennedy*, p. 297.
space for the friars to build their convent, with church and domestic buildings.131 The original site of the Glasgow friary was indeed extended in 1511, when Archbishop Beaton and Robert Blacader, parson of Glasgow, gifted adjoining parts of Ramshorn and Craignaught to the Observant friars, to extend their garden. In 1512 there was a further extension to the friary grounds, overseen by the provincial minister James Pettigrew and the guardian if the Glasgow friary, John Johnson, through lands granted by Rolland Blacader, canon and prebendary of Glasgow.132

John Johnson also appears elsewhere in our records: Durkan mentions a friar John Johnson in a footnote alongside Franciscan post-Reformation recusants as having ‘probably joined the Reformers early’. On 9 April 1513 John Johnson, along with friars Tenand, Thomas Bawfour and Alexander Cottis, were listed as witnesses ‘to the renunciation of his offices by the moribund Alexander Inglis, Treasurer of the Church of Glasgow’; friars Tenand, Bawfour and Cottis were lay brothers in the Glasgow friary.133

There is a further aspect to this particular site that is worth noting. John Edwards points out that the Franciscan friary was only a ‘stone’s-throw’ away from the other friary in the town, the Dominican house. The Dominicans had had a house in Glasgow by 1246, also founded by a bishop of Glasgow. It was situated on the east side of the High Street, really just across the street from the Franciscans, and both houses appear to have engaged in ‘friendly rivalry’, as Edwards describes it.134 This situation bears some resemblance to St Andrews, where Franciscans and Dominicans were on parallel streets in the same general area of the town. St Andrews also proves Farmer’s point that friaries tended to be at the periphery of the ‘built up’ area where there was still enough land to expand if necessary.135

---

132 Farmer, ‘Franciscan Friary in Glasgow’, p. 14; Edwards, ‘Greyfriars in Glasgow, 183-4; Bryce, i, p. 344; ii, pp. 245-6. The date given is the date in the document cited in Bryce, ii, p. 245-6, though in the actual text he gives a date of 1511.
133 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 56 note 22; Bryce, i, p. 346.
The Ayr friary

The fifth Observant friary to be founded in Scotland was Ayr, another possible royal foundation. In this instance the dates of foundation given by different historians vary by as many as twenty-five years. The earlier dates supplied by Hay and Spottiswoode are taken as unlikely by Cowan and Easson. Hay's date is 1474, while Spottiswoode has it as two years earlier, 1472. Both agree on the founders having been the inhabitants of Ayr, who state in a charter to the Vicar-general of the Observants that they had founded a house by October 1472 (which is the date of the charter). This appears to be confirmed by a bull by Pope Sixtus IV, sanctioning the foundation in June 1474. Cowan and Easson, however, believe that it is more likely that the foundation was one of those sanctioned by a later bull of Pope Sixtus, which was obtained by James, bishop of Dunkeld in 1481-2, which also probably sanctioned the erection of the Perth and Elgin friaries. Thus they argue that the actual foundation was undertaken by James IV himself, and could therefore not have been earlier than his ascension in 1488, but also not later than March 1498, when the friary appears in the Treasurer Accounts as having received 15s 'be the Kingis command' on 7 March.136

It was erected on the site now occupied 'by the Old Parish Church, on the south bank of the river Ayr.' Unsurprisingly this location is again at the edge of the medieval town, but separated from the High Street only by a small distance, down a lane called the Common Vennel. As was the case in Glasgow, the houses of the Franciscan and Dominican friars were in close vicinity, and we can probably assume that a similar 'friendly rivalry' existed between the two communities. Rather discouragingly for the historian, however, Dunlop informs us that they have left little local records behind, except place names and mention of them in sources that primarily deal with matters other than the Observant friars. This is not made any easier by a complete lack of physical evidence, most notably surviving buildings. Dunlop relies on Father Hay's Chronicle as a source, but unfortunately there is not much to be gained from this, since we have already seen the discrepancies in his work.137 This friary, too, appears to have enjoyed royal patronage, as entries in the

136 Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 130-1; Bryce, i, p. 352, ii, p. 250; TA, i, p. 381.
Exchequer Rolls for 1542-3 suggest. This goes beyond gifts of food; in addition contributions to church furnishings and items such as chalices appear in the Treasurers Accounts as having been paid by the king. Dunlop even calls James IV 'Protector of Observance self-styled' in this context. This practice of royal gifts to the Ayr friary can be traced right up to the 1550s, when it is continued by Mary of Guise.\(^{138}\)

In the context of the Ayr friary, Dunlop points out a rather interesting fact about the Observant friars. It appears that it was customary at the time for merchant families to conduct their business through the friaries (and not just the Franciscans). Thus the warden of the Observant friary of Ayr was entrusted with many business-related documents by these families and who considered the documents to be 'in safe hands'.\(^{139}\) John Paterson has already been mentioned in the context of inquisitorial activities at St Andrews, but while he was warden at Ayr he had received 'charters and evidents in a certain box' for a 'more secure custody'. Another guardian, Arthur Park, was part of a similar transaction, when he was mentioned in a decree of court of 26 June 1529 as having taking into his custody the 'sum of twenty merks in a closed purse' from Margaret Crawford, widow of William Hebburn of Lowis, and Janet Crawford, widow of William Cathcart of Drumsmuddan, 'for the use of David and Margaret Cathcart, children of the said William Cathcart'. According to Bryce this is one of a number of examples that the Ayr friary was favoured by the 'ancestors of the Earls of Cathcart'.\(^{140}\)

This matter was continued by his successor, a 'Friar Rae', guardian of Ayr in the 1530s. It should be safe to assume that this was the same person as Thomas Ray, student at St Andrews in 1511 and the 'Thomas Ray from Louvain' who had been a regent at St Andrews in 1514. He owned a copy of Angelus de Clavasio's Summa angelica (Paris 1506).\(^{141}\) Sometime before June 1530 the local court at Ayr deliberated on the matter of whether he would have to produce the Letters of

\(^{138}\) Bryce, i, p. 355; Dunlop, Royal Burgh of Ayr, p. 100.

\(^{139}\) Dunlop, Royal Burgh of Ayr, p. 101.

\(^{140}\) Bryce, i, pp. 352-3, 486; Protocol Book Gavin Ross, nos 417, 1027.

\(^{141}\) Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 55; Dunlop, Acta, pp. 307; see also Durkan, 'Cultural Background', p. 321; Durkan and Ross, Libraries, pp. 79, 137. The inscription reads 'ad usum fratris thome ray usque ad reuocacionem Jo. bothwell manu propria'. John Bothwell is listed by Durkan and Ross as a Franciscan, with no indication as to whether he was Observant or Conventual. The fact that this book had also belonged to Thomas Ray would suggest Bothwell, too, had been an Observant.
Reversion, which had been placed 'in the hands of the friars for safe custody' by Sibilla Cathcart and her sister Margaret. On 21 June 1532 the guardian was again ordered to produce the documents and had subsequently to appear before the court in order to ascertain the authenticity of the grant of sasine to Sibilia Cathcart. There is also an entry in the Treasurer's Accounts for 15 June 1532 pertaining to this matter, when David Purves, Masur, was given 20s to carry letters 'fra the Lordis to the Wardane of the Gray Freris of Air, anent ane instrument pertenynge to the sisteris and airis of Carleton.' Other than that, we know very little of the friars at Ayr. Only one other appears in the records available to us now, friar John McHaigh, who was summoned to Stirling as a witness on 7 March 1502 in an 'action against James Kennedy of Row'.

The Elgin friary

The situation is rather similar for Elgin, the sixth house of Observants in Scotland. This was the only burgh where a possible cross-over between Observant and Conventual houses could be detected – though it is separated by several centuries. There had been a temporary settlement of Conventual friars towards the end of the thirteenth century. Elgin had a flourishing ecclesiastical community, it was the site of the Cathedral Church of the diocese of Moray. According to Father Hay's Chronicle the foundation of the Observant house is supposed to have taken place in 1479, by John, laird of Innes. Cowan and Easson, however, can find no substantial evidence that this was indeed so. They find it much more likely that this friary, too, was among those sanctioned by Sixtus IV on the petition of the bishop of Dunkeld, and that it was founded by James IV. The Elgin friary appears in the Exchequer Rolls for the first time for the term June 1494-August 1495 as receiving alms and was mentioned again in 1497, 1499, 1501 for receiving wheat and barley. This continued throughout the period up to 1559-60. The Elgin friary was also the only

---

142 Bryce, i, pp. 352, 353-4, 359; see also Bryce, ii, pp. 251-4 for documentation of the lawsuit involving guardian Rae. Bryce gives no name for the guardian involved in 1530, but I take him to be the same as the guardian of 1532, i.e. friar Rae.
143 Bryce, pp. 352, 485.
145 Bryce, i, p. 362; Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, 131; Anderson, Aberdeen Friars, p. 46.
Observant house listed in Durkan and Ross’ Libraries under institutions rather than the individual owners; Elgin had been in possession of a copy of Thomas Aquinas’ In beati Pauli epistolas, which had also been owned by John Tullideff, sometime guardian of St Andrews.

Quite uniquely, the friary church of Elgin was the only one that survived the Reformation, until it was demolished in 1905, which is why we have reports of its features available to us. We know that it was one of the friaries which, quite against Observant ideals, had a ‘knok and bell’. According to the information provided by MacGibbon and Ross, who were writing when the building still existed, the friary church was a ‘simple oblong structure, 110 feet in length by 22 feet in width internally’, lighted by ‘two large traceried windows in the east and west end walls’ and six side windows in the north and south walls. The public would have entered through a door with a wooden porch in the north wall, while the friary buildings would have adjoined the south end of the church. There were signs that, close to the rood screen, there must have been altars placed against the side walls.146

That is, unfortunately, the extent of our knowledge as far as the foundation of the Elgin friary is concerned, and very little is known of its roughly sixty-year existence. We know of only a small number of friars who had lived at Elgin at one point in their careers. One of them was Robert Stewart whom we have already encountered at St Andrews, but all we know of his connection with Elgin is that in 1554 Thomas Hay, dean of Dunbar gave a copy of Denys Carthusian’s In IV evangelistias (Paris, 1536) to the Elgin convent. This book has two inscriptions pertaining to Elgin (one simply reading: ‘Liber conventus elgenensis fratrum minorum ex dono domini decani de dunbar’) while the other was a little more specific: ‘ad usum fratrum minorum conventus elginensis ex industria venerandi patris fratri Roberti steward anno domini 1554’. This would suggest that Robert Stewart was at Elgin at a late point in his life before returning to St Andrews, since Hay’s account of Stewart’s deathbed vision would suggest he died before the Reformation.147

146 ER, xi, pp. 14, 177, 179, 350-1, 355-6; Bryce, i, pp. 364-5; MacGibbon and Ross, Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland, iii, pp. 356-8. See also Appendix 1, p. 254.
147 Durkan and Ross, Libraries, pp. 112, 150; Bryce, ii, p. 193. Thomas Aquinas’ In beati Pauli epistolas then appears to have passed to M.A. Gordone Cancellarii moriuiensis, ‘ex dono fratrum minorum de elgin a.d. 1560’.
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Another friar of the Elgin Observant house was William Symson, who was recorded in the Thirds of Benefices as having received the pension provided for recanting friars at the Reformation. There are two entries, for 1562 and 1566 respectively: the first listed him among the ‘Blak and Gray Freiris of Elgin and Inverness’, while the second listed him simply among the ‘freiris of Elgin and Inverness’. Inverness had a Dominican friary, while Elgin was home to both a Dominican and an Observant house. Fortunately there is additional evidence: Symson at some point owned a copy of Antonius Broekweg’s *Concordantiae Maiores*, which had also been owned by another Observant friar: Alexander Arbuckle, some-time guardian of the Edinburgh friary. The book was inscribed ‘usuarius huius libri frater willelmus symson ordinis minorum’; unfortunately this does not tell us when either friar had owned it. Since the book had passed into the possession of Clement Little, presumably at the time of the Reformation, it would have been in Edinburgh at the time, so we might assume that it had passed from Symson to Arbuckle, or that Symson had at least spent some time at the Edinburgh friary. But the entry in the Thirds of Benefices would suggest that he had experienced the Reformation while at Elgin.

**The Stirling friary**

This brings us to Stirling, perhaps the most significant of the royal foundations, as it appeared to have had the closest connections to the house of Stewart; not only was it the friary from which both James IV and V drew their confessors, it was also used by James IV as a Lenten retreat. Hay, of course, would like us to believe that Stirling was extremely important to the royal family. After all, he claimed that Mary of Guise attended his profession there, and we cannot assume that he was important enough to warrant such attention as a junior friar. The obvious explanation – if Mary and the ‘chief nobles’ had indeed attended – would be that she made a point of attending professions in the Stirling friary. But there is no supporting evidence that she was a

148 Thirds of Benefices; Ross, ‘Some Notes; Bryce, ii, pp. 345, 365. Rather curiously, the copy of Bryce’s *Grey Friars* in the Edinburgh University Library (Shelfmark 2713(41)Bry) is annotated with a number of footnotes in handwriting identifying a the greater number of the names listed in the 1562 entry as Dominicans of Elgin or Inverness. Williame Symson is in this case footnoted as having been a ‘Black Friar (Elgin)’

patroness of the Observants, which is why this statement should be treated with caution at this point.

The situation is a little clearer as far as the royal confessors are concerned. James IV’s confessor was Patrick Ranwick, who, according to Hay also appears to have been confessor to a young James V; the only source for the latter is once again Hay’s Chronicle, although two entries in the Exchequer Rolls for 1506-7 suggest that he was at least still active.\(^{150}\) Ranwick was witness to the same document as William of Touris of 21 February 1495; he was provincial minister three times and guardian of the Stirling friary, and there is a tradition that states that it was him who advised James IV to wear an iron girdle as penance for the part he played in his father’s death in 1488.\(^{151}\) Bryce lists Ranwick as ‘first warden’ of Stirling, which can probably be accepted, since for once his and Hay’s foundation date is not too far removed from that agreed upon by more recent scholarship.\(^{152}\)

Then there was Walter Laing, a member of both the St Andrews and Stirling friaries, who has quite a career in the records. There is some confusion over the correct spelling of his name: some secondary sources will sometimes refer to him as William Lang, but they were most certainly the same person.\(^{153}\) According to Bryce, James V confessed with him in or after 1531, although it is not clear from Bryce’s wording whether he believes the 1531 mention in the Treasurer’s Accounts to apply to Walter Laing or a different confessor altogether. According to Bryce, he was also the same friar Lang who went to Dundee in 1532 in order to effect the arrest of

\(^{150}\) Bryce, i, p. 374; ii, p. 192; TA, iii, pp. 72, 289; ‘Item, the xviij day of Aprile, giffin to Schir Johne Hartneis to dispone be Frere Patrik Rannikis counsell, £14’, ‘Item [the v day of Aprile], to Johne Loksmyth to dispone, be the Kingis command, and Frere Rannikis, £20’. Historians tend to list him under two different surnames: Ranwick and Ranny; in the Exchequer Rolls he is listed as Patrick Rannikis. The Latin form of the name as given in Hay’s chronicle is Ranus (see Bryce, ii, p. 181) which Bryce translates as Ranny, although more recent scholarship (probably based on Durkan) uses the name Ranwick. Not surprisingly, Creamer, too, lists him as friar Ranny.

\(^{151}\) Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 172; Bryce, i, pp. 64, 366; ii, pp. 188, 192.

\(^{152}\) Bryce, i, p. 64; Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 133; Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 172. Bryce / Hay have the date of foundation as 1494, while Cowan and Easson place it more carefully in the late 1490s.

\(^{153}\) Bryce, Grey Friars, ii, pp. 507, 508; Calderwood, History, i, p. 137; Knox, History, i, p. 74 and note 4, 75 note 1; J.P. McGinnis and A.H. Williamson (eds), George Buchanan, The Political Poetry (SHS, 1995), pp. 185, 321, no. 57/4 note 2; See Bryce, p. 78 note 4 on the confusion of the name; Calderwood has him as Walter Laing, Knox and Bryce as Walter Lang (though Bryce uses the form Walter Laing in the index, although the actual entry in the text refers to Walter Lang), while McGinnis and Williamson claim that William Lang was the correct form of the name, and that Glencairn in his Epistle (as given in Calderwood) was in error. Perhaps the best explanation of the different entries for the name in the sources is given by the editor of Knox’s History, i, p. 74 and note 4.
Alexander Dick. He was also involved in the ‘martyrdom of Henry Forrest (1532-3)’, who believed in the ‘goodness of Patrick Hamilton, in the truth of his articles and in the injustice of the sentence’ (meted out by, among others, the St Andrews guardian John Tullideff); Laing allegedly passed details of Forrest’s confession to Cardinal James Beaton.\textsuperscript{154} The ‘career’ in the records that has been alluded to above concerns his appearance in a number of anti-fraternal texts of the 1530s, the only Observant, and one of only very few friars who were ever mentioned by name in the satirical literature of the pre-Reformation period.\textsuperscript{155}

The Stirling friary was founded by James IV, most likely in 1494, or so Cowan and Easson suggest, although they do not supply any evidence for this date, while Bryce explains that 1494 was the year when Observant friars arrived in the burgh for the first time, despite the fact that a bull of foundation by Pope Alexander VI was not issued until January 1498. Once this was issued, however, the king did not take long to provide for the building of the house. Apparently the friars had already appointed a ‘provisor’ (as they had done in Glasgow), in order to handle matters of finance for them, in this case a burgess of Stirling, who received the grant towards their building on their behalf.\textsuperscript{156} Bryce at this point makes much of James IV’s remorse at the death of his father in which he was involved, and he is convinced that the king became a supporter of the Observant friars because he sought ‘spiritual consolation’ with them. Be that as it may, the king certainly appeared to have a special interest in this particular friary. As we have already mentioned he would spend Holy Week 1513 there, not allowing himself to be disturbed even for matters of state. Furthermore he does not cease to bestow gifts upon the Stirling friary, as continuing entries in the \textit{Exchequer Rolls} show.\textsuperscript{157}

The Observant friary of Stirling, like all the others we have looked at so far, was located at the edge of settlement at the point of its foundation. It was built on the hill leading up to the castle, below the Church of the Holy Rude, near the head of Spittal Street. Once again it is not at all far from the Market Cross and Broad Street, and would have been convenient for royal visits, since the distance to the castle is


\textsuperscript{155} A full discussion of this matter is presented in Chapter 5, pp. 158-205.


\textsuperscript{157} Bryce, i, p. 366, 370.
minimal. Again the Franciscans moved into a burgh where there had already been a Dominican house since the reign of King Alexander II. In 1854 the land was used for the building of the High School, the Free South Church and the Trades’ Hall, and this piece of land is still called Greyfriars Yard.158

Apart from the royal confessors, we are aware of a number of friars attached to the Stirling friary. An enigmatic reference in the Treasurer’s Accounts to the ‘monk that castis the gardin in Strivelin’ was perhaps Friar Cauldwell.159 Alexander Paterson was guardian of Stirling in the 1540s, when he was appointed as overseer of the executors of Robert Wemes, Vicar of Stirling, who was also buried in the Stirling friary as requested in his testament of 18 April 1544, an indication that the practice at Glasgow (of burying benefactors in the friary grounds) was more widespread than it should have been.160 Both Robert Veitch, (possibly) Thomas Aitken and friar Leitch become a nuisance to the Reformed Kirk. This is evidenced in several entries, one of 1572 for both Veitch and Aitken for papist activities while under the protection of Robert Crichton, bishop of Dunkeld, and again in 1583 when Robert Veitch, former guardian of Stirling, refused to cease his recusant activities and was eventually excommunicated. Friar Leitch in 1585 ‘was recorded in 1585 as haunting the Master of Gray’s household’.161

The Perth friary

This brings us to the last two pre-Reformation Observant friaries, Perth and Jedburgh. According to Hay’s Chronicle, Perth was the third foundation, after Edinburgh and St Andrews, founded in 1460 by Laurence, Lord Oliphant and established under the supervision of one Jerome Lindsay, son of the Earl of Crawford

---

159 ‘At this time there are payments in the Exchequer Rolls, such as – “Et Fratri Johanni Cauldwell, pro laboribus suis factis in gardino castri de Striuelin de mandato domini regis, ut patet per literas suas manus sua subscriptas ostensas super compotum, de anno compoti, xx s.” (1496-7). – ER, xi (1497-1501), p. 18; T4, i (1473-1498), p. cclxvii
160 Bryce, i, pp. 372, 452.
161 Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 54; Ross, ‘Some Notes’, p. 200; J. Kirk (ed.), Stirling Presbytery Records, 1581-1587 (SHS, 1981), pp. xxxvi-xxxvii. For the full account see also pp. 176-9, 180, 183, 185, 187-9, 199. See also Calderwood, History, iv, p. 399. There was also a friar Robert Liech listed among Dominicans at the 1549 Church Council, although there is no further indication who he was and if there is another case of mistaken identities here see Patrick, Statutes, p. 87.
(though Bryce believed him to be a kinsman rather than a son, which is compounded by his omission in the Scots Peerage), and doctor of civil and canon law at Paris, who is later mentioned in the list of provincial ministers as having held that office three times. Durkan points out that the Perth friary was not in existence this early and that ‘Lindsay did not graduate at St Andrews till 1489, when he was among four “nobles”’ (among them yet another Robertus Keith). Hay further described him as a convert of Cornelius of Zierekzee and such a gifted and pious preacher that he ‘stirred the hearts of the citizens and people to good works’ that he was directly responsible for the foundations of Dominican and Carmelite friaries in Perth. This is quite a striking claim, considering that the Dominicans had had a house at Perth since before the 1240s, while the Carmelites had no house there at all. In fact, it is possible that Hay had confused them with the Charterhouse in Perth.162

This would place Perth’s foundation around the time of the foundations of Elgin, Stirling and Ayr, though it is doubtful that it would have been founded earlier than the Glasgow friary. Bryce is nevertheless convinced that Father Hay is correct in placing the foundation in the 1460s, when Jerome Lindsay was allegedly sent to the friary that had been founded by Lord Oliphant. Bryce’s argument here is rather perverse, as he explicitly refuted the record in the Aberdeen Obituary for John Richardson, which stated that Richardson had been involved in the foundations of the first place, Edinburgh, the second place, St Andrews and Aberdeen ‘et istius, tertii loci’. Since the Obituary was clearly concerned with Aberdeen this would make Aberdeen the third house. Nevertheless Bryce goes to considerable effort to explain away this evidence (‘doubtless meaning that Aberdeen was the third convent in which this friar was interested’), in order to accept Hay’s statement. Furthermore he is not surprised that the 1479 charter of mortification by James III does not mention Perth at all. Apparently he assumes that Perth was one of those friaries that were founded by the bull of Pope Pius II of 1463. Cowan and Easson, however, take the absence of this particular house from the Charter of Mortification as an indication that it was indeed founded later than the date of the 1479 charter.163

For the Dominican house of Perth, see Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, pp. 86-7, 119, 135. Although Cowan and Easson have not evidence of a Carmelite house in Perth, Bryce claimed that there had been one. See also Scots Peerage, vi, p. 540-1.
163 Bryce, i, p. 299 and note 2; ii, p. 323; Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 132.
It was founded before 1492, which is when it appeared in the Treasurer's Accounts of November 1496 as receiving a gift of 40 shillings from James IV to say masses.164 Seeing that this house is mentioned in official documents only in 1496, it does not seem likely that it would have been overlooked by its royal patrons for thirty years, especially since James IV took so much interest in the order of Observant friars. This friary, too, was located at the edge of the medieval burgh, near the exit from the burgh at the south end of the Speygate.165

The same suspicion about a high standard of living that we have encountered for the Glasgow and Aberdeen friaries was levelled at the Perth Observants. When the Reformation mob incited by John Knox in 1559 entered the friary, he reported that they found fine furnishings and a full larder – not entirely in keeping with the Observant ideal, although Knox has been known to get over-excited. The records are once again silent as to the fate of the friars at the Reformation. The Perth Registers of Baptisms and Deaths, transcribed by John Scott, minister of the East Church in Perth, do not record any friars, perhaps not too surprising; Verschuur suggested that those few clerics and religious who remained in the burgh after the Reformation riots did not engage in careers that ‘warranted attention’. But there is a trail that allows us to follow a different kind of inhabitant of the Perth Observant friary: there is some anecdotal evidence that one of the bells was transferred to the Parish church of St John’s after the demolition of the Observant friary.166

The Jedburgh friary
The last foundation was Jedburgh, founded sometime before 1505 and the home of Adam Abell, one of only two Observant literati known to us. The friary at Jedburgh was the only Observant friary located in the Borders: there were only few mendicant friaries in the Border burghs, and most of these tended to be Conventual Franciscan. In this context it is again significant that these Conventual houses (all of which were thirteenth century foundations) were not reformed according to the Observance, but that the one Observant friary in the Borders was established in a burgh that did not

164 TA, i, p. 304, 372.
already have a house of mendicant friars, which made Jedburgh the odd-one-out in the Scottish context.\textsuperscript{167}

Jedburgh is also the friary that Bryce has the least to say about, yet it is the only other friary apart from Glasgow which has been extensively excavated. The friary was located between the Friars Gate and the High Street, in a lane called The Friars, which ran parallel to the High Street. Like St Andrews, the name ‘Greyfriars Garden’ has been adopted to mark the site of where the friary used to be. The excavations have determined that the friary church comprised the south range of the complex, although Dixon \textit{et al} suggested that this may have been a secondary building and the north range may have housed the original church, as this would have been the usual position. Watson, a local historian, claimed that the friary housed about thirty Observant friars, which is difficult to verify, although the reconstruction drawing in Dixon \textit{et al}, like that for the Glasgow friary, would suggest that this number could have been housed there.\textsuperscript{168}

It appears that this friary was founded in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, but definitely before 1505, since it is mentioned in the \textit{Treasurers Accounts} of March 1505, when the Observant friars of Jedburgh received two barrels of beer.\textsuperscript{169} Historians are once again divided when it comes to the question of who had been the founder of this particular house. Father Hay and Watson agree that it was the inhabitants of Jedburgh, who were dissatisfied with the ‘luxurious life of the Black Canons, dwelling in the wealthy abbey’, and therefore ‘invited the Greyfriars’. They do not, however, agree on the date, since Watson has found the mention in the \textit{Treasurers Account}, which refutes Hay’s statement of the foundation having been as late as 1513. Yet he is unable to supply an exact date of foundation and the same goes for Cowan and Easson.\textsuperscript{170}

Very little is known of the fate of the friary; there are virtually no records other than four entries in the \textit{Treasurer’s Accounts} and the fact that Abell wrote his \textit{Quheill of Tyme} that would give us any indication as to how this friary fared,
especially since we would assume that it shared in the fate of the Border monasteries during the frequent English raids, especially during the Rough Wooing. Three entries in the Treasurer's Accounts for October 1526, July 1527, and again in 1541 which record payments to the Jedburgh Observants for the repair of their house, confirm this suspicion. Other than that, the Jedburgh friary disappears from record until 1571, when the burgh of Jedburgh acquired the friary yards and buildings.  

In the course of the excavations at Jedburgh, Dixon, O'Sullivan and Rogers have found some evidence that the friars may have obtained some of their glassware from England, and some Siegburg and Beauvais pottery, similar to items found in both Edinburgh and Newcastle and in the recent excavation at Glasgow. Unlike the house at Glasgow, there was only very little evidence of stained glass found, most of the window fragments retrieved were plain glass, most likely assembled in diamond lattice windows. Since the friary as a whole was a rather impressive building, with some of the stone from ‘distant quarries’ and a slate roof, Dixon and his colleagues take this to mean that the plain glass was deliberately chosen to ‘reflect the ascetic simplicity of the order as a whole’. As far as the buildings’ fabric is concerned, there is some evidence in England that the Franciscans realised early on that small temporary structures would not serve their needs, and more ‘imposing’ and robust structures became the norm. The Observants then returned to the original design of the smaller churches, although it would seem that they, too, could not resist a certain embellishment.  

As far as the friars of Jedburgh are concerned, there are only two friars we have records of. Adam Abell is prominent, of course. In many ways Jedburgh is best known for the fact that he wrote his Roit and Quheill of Tyme there, although it has little to say about Jedburgh in particular. Abell transferred to Jedburgh from the Augustinian Abbey of Inchaffray sometime after 1510. According to MacDougall, he was born around 1475 and entered Inchaffray in 1495. He was still there in 1510, when he is listed among the canons in a petition ‘of the prior and convent of Inchaffray to John Lord Oliphant’ dated 20 June 1510, although there appears to be evidence that as early as 16 June 1508 Abell tried to get papal permission to leave

Inchaffray, either for another house of Augustinian canons or a house of the regular Observance.\textsuperscript{173} He was related to Robert Bellenden, Augustinian abbot of Holyrood. His own abbot, Laurence Oliphant, abbot of Inchaffray, was killed at Flodden in 1513, though MacDougall thinks it likely that by that time Abell had already transferred to the Observants of Jedburgh. He ascribes this to the lack of detail with which Abell describes the Battle of Flodden in his chronicle, assuming he had not been there, as he might have had he still been a member of Inchaffray. His uncle, too, eventually transferred to an order of stricter Observance than his own Canons of Holyrood. He became a member of the Carthusians of Perth in c.1500.\textsuperscript{174}

There is some conflicting evidence concerning the lands granted to the friars for their use. The Acta Dominorum Concilii contain an entry according to which the land may have belonged to Adam Abell, stating that a property on the Kelso road (‘Calsagate’) was located between the properties of Adam Abell and Robert Moscrop. There is, however, also a record in the Great Seal that the grant for the Jedburgh friary had been made by Andrew Ker of Fenihurst.\textsuperscript{175} Dixon and his colleagues do not elaborate if one or the other struck them as more likely. If Abell had been the owner this would suggest that he had been somehow made aware of the Observants, and it would certainly explain why he would have chosen to join Jedburgh rather than any of the other friaries.

The other friar of Jedburgh who appears in our records is a friar Homes, guardian of Jedburgh and ‘one of the Homes’, who preached at Norham in 1524, though Bryce finds the statement that the guardian was a brother of the two executed members of that family as coming from an insecure source.\textsuperscript{176} The excavations at Jedburgh have also revealed graves within the friary cloister, but it was only possible

\textsuperscript{173} MacDougall, James IV, p. 295; J. Anderson (ed.), The Oliphants in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1879), p. 50, no. 108; Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 55 and p. 56 note 33. See also A.M. Stewart, ‘Adam Abell’s “Roit or Quheill of Tyme”’, in Aberdeen University Review, 44 (1972), especially his extracts in the notes for information Abell gives about himself in his chronicle. Note also that Stewart sets Abell’s date of birth between 1475 and 1485. For Inchaffray Abbey, see Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{174} MacDougall, James IV, p. 295-6. MacDougall believes that Bellenden affiliation to the Augustinians might explain Abell’s choice of order. Stewart proposes that Abell moved to Jedburgh after 1513, but this hinges on his assumption that the friary had not been founded until after Flodden, which would make Abell one of its earliest friars. See Stewart, ‘Abell’s “Roit or Quheill”’, p. 381 and 391 note 7.

\textsuperscript{175} Dixon, et al, Excavations at Jedburgh Friary, p. 4; RSS, ii, no. 932 (1548).

\textsuperscript{176} Bryce, i, pp. 76, 379.
to fully identify four skeletons. As was the case in Glasgow, there is now no way of knowing if these had indeed been friars. However, unlike the Glasgow evidence, all four of the skeletons at Glasgow were male and the age range was not as varied: all four had been relatively young, possibly within their mid to late twenties.\textsuperscript{177}

**Conclusion: The Observant Franciscan Province in Scotland**

This essentially concludes the overview of the Observant friaries and their personnel in Scotland. As might be expected with what was an order largely made up of itinerants, there are a number of ‘miscellaneous’ friars, of whom little more is known than their names or, in some cases a possible affiliation to a particular friary. There is William Fleming, a member of the Aberdeen friary, whose death is recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary* for the 1530s (the date is incomplete). According to the *Obituary* he had spent ten years in Edinburgh and St Andrews, before coming to Aberdeen where he lived for thirty-four years, which would suggest a certain uncharacteristic and rather unmendicant settledness.\textsuperscript{178} John Louthon was presumably an Observant of Aberdeen and St Andrews, whom Bryce described as ‘one of the itinerant scribes of the province’. His death is listed in the *Aberdeen Obituary* for 1473, ‘specially devout and exemplary, who did much writing for the community here and also at St Andrews’.\textsuperscript{179} Robert Hay may have been a member of the St Andrews friary, since on 29 June 1527 he and friar William Martin ‘witnessed the foundation of Mr Robert Davidson in St Salvator’s college’, and then there is John Wadlock, one of the friars for whom the only reference Bryce could find was Dempster’s *Historia*. According to Dempster, Wadlock was a mathematician of the reign of James V (the date he gives is 1541), supposedly residing ‘for the most part’ at St Andrews friary wherefore Dempster seems to infer that he may have been an Observant.\textsuperscript{180}

In the fourteenth century John of Fordun in his *Chronicle* was the first to remark upon a cultural divide between Highland and Lowland Scotland. To the modern reader this is nothing unusual; however, one should keep in mind that the dispersal of religious foundations of any kind broadly mirrors this divide.

\textsuperscript{177} Dixon, *et al., Excavations at Jedburgh Friary*, pp. 55-9.
\textsuperscript{178} Bryce, i, 318, 331, ii, 311.
\textsuperscript{179} Bryce, i, pp. 318; 330; ii, p. 327.
\textsuperscript{180} Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 55; Bryce, i, p. 290 and note 4; Dempster, *Historia*, p. 664.
Foundations of Franciscan houses in general tended to stay well to the east and south of that divide, with only Aberdeen and the problematic case of Elgin as the exceptions. The Conventuals tended to have most of their foundations concentrated in Lothians and the Borders regions, while the Observants had only Jedburgh in the Borders and tended to aim further north and west towards the Strathclyde region. On the whole, with nine houses and their geographical concentration, had the Observants been left to their own devices they would not have been able to exert influence over a sizeable portion of Scottish society. But, as often, it is not quantity, but quality, and the quality in this case lay in the burghs in which the Observants settled and the patronage network – if one may call it that, which will be discussed in a moment.

There is a surprising wealth of information on the personnel of the Scottish Observant province – surprising considering the problematic sources available to us. At the same time, much of the evidence is either incomplete, anecdotal or at times so distorted by the historiography of the last 450 years that it is still impossible to confidently pin down the movements of individual friars. What does emerge is that the Scottish province was very 'native' in its personnel. After the first group of friars had arrived from the Low Countries in the late 1450s, the Scottish friaries relied entirely on Scottish recruits. There were visitations by general ministers or their commissaries, but other than that it would appear that Scotland’s relatively remote location restricted an exchange of personnel from other European countries, although such an exchange commenced once Observant friaries had been established in England. Still, when the Scottish Observants chose to go into exile, the mother province was more than prepared to welcome them and integrate them. Ironically it is John Hay who provides us with the strongest testimony of this, the very man whose evidence has proved so unreliable, when he – an exiled Scottish Observant – became minister of the Cologne province in the 1580s.
Once the Observant Franciscans had established a presence in Scotland, one would expect them to try to extend their influence through the different levels of Scottish society. The paradox of the mendicant orders was a life of poverty on the one hand, and the need to attract patrons and benefactors on the other; this was the means to be able to exist as a religious order or institution, which was especially vital for an order that had departed from the practice of the great monasteries to accept grants of land attached to their monasteries in order to maintain a certain level of self-sufficiency.1

As a result, the mendicants had to attract patrons, ideally from every level of society; this was accomplished by being visible. Some of this visibility was achieved as a matter of course, by going about their business of preaching, often in public places, just as Bernardino of Siena had preached in the market place. Patronage, however, was a commodity and the Observants, like the other mendicant orders, must have been aware that they were part of a greater ‘market’. This meant that they had to make themselves as attractive as possible to prospective patrons, as a merchant would lay out his wares, if we remain with the metaphor. The only difference was that this market was concerned with rather more intangible matters, namely the soul and its salvation. It was the order that would offer the most promising way to achieve this salvation that would become the focus of a laity that was becoming more and more concerned with the state of their souls. As Audrey Beth-Fitch has pointed out, this became an increasing source of worry for the later-medieval burgh dweller (with whom her study was concerned, although surely the general trend would be traceable throughout Scottish and even the wider European society); there was a mounting sense of spiritual unworthiness and susceptibility to evil and the fear that one was not at all prepared to meet one’s creator at death, hence (although Fitch does not pursue

---

1 This had, in fact, created some contention when the Poor Clares had first been founded: Clare had wished to follow the example of the First Order and live on charity, but the church in the thirteenth century was not prepared to allow a female order to pursue a vagrant lifestyle, it was unheard of.
the thought), the need for ‘competent’ confessors, thus creating a ready market for the mendicants.²

Looking to the welfare of one’s soul was a vital part of medieval life and could take a number of forms; the one that is still the most accessible to us would be the exercise of certain devotions, not the least because many of the medieval devotions are still being practised today in Catholic areas – one need only think of the devotion of the rosary, which has its origin with the Dominican friars. Later-medieval devotions have also been the cause for a great outpouring of art and literature, and the European examples at least have survived, even if many Scottish items have not. Books of Hours, devotional poems (often of a meditative nature), paintings and icons are all part of this. In connection with the Franciscan order, a devotion that immediately comes to mind is the devotion of the Holy Name, developed by St Bernardino of Siena, one of the pillars of the Observance and which he always used as a meditative tool during his sermons.

Devotions like that of the rosary or the Holy Name were usually brought to the lay community under the tutelage of one or other of the orders of friars. It is here that their special status within that community – not secluded like the members of the older orders – really came into play. For it was the friars more than anyone else who brought the devotional life of the religious to a laity which now hungered for the kind of devotional experience that the religious practiced in the seclusion of their monasteries. An obvious example would be the feast of Corpus Christi, which originated with a mystic, Juliana of Cornillon, in Liège. She was a member of a beguinage which was under the supervision of the Dominicans, and it was they who first made the devotion popular. The feast of Corpus Christi did not remain an exclusively Dominican one for long as, by its very nature, it encompassed a number of distinctly Franciscan elements.³ Fleming suggested that this need of the laity for this kind of spirituality came with the problem of ‘mercantile morality’. The friars were prepared to deal with the ‘moral problems of a commercial society and a money economy’ in their sermons, so that, for example, the sin of avarice was moved out of

formal moral theology and into the marketplace, where those who were in danger of it now received a manual of sorts by which to be guided.\(^4\)

One extremely important development of this were the third orders, attached to the Dominican and Franciscan orders, established for one purpose: to make it possible for those who could not desert the world to live according to the principles of the friars. If Francis’ hagiographer can be believed, the origins of the third order (or Order of Penitence) of St Francis, can be traced back as early as 1210, as a direct reaction to Francis’ preaching. Like the first and second orders these tertiaries had to be given a Rule by Francis, since the church felt that they had to be brought under ‘proper’ ecclesiastical supervision (the fear of heresy being ever-present), a Rule which gave them a standard of discipline and required that the fraternities in which they were organised in the burghs were placed under the supervision of a religious. This, however, gave the Tertiaries a special status: they were no longer subject to the civic or feudal courts, but to ecclesiastical courts, in effect removing them from the society in which they lived.\(^5\) These confraternities provided ‘funerary services and relief to members and their dependants’, organised dinners and feasts and could even provide legal support; like guilds, they had banners, insignia and dedicated altars; in Scotland, and in the context of the present study, the most significant of these was the confraternity of the Holy Blood, which had an altar in St Giles and with whom the Fetternear Banner was associated, to which we will come in a moment.\(^6\) By ‘admitting lay people to confraternity with the friars’, the friars entered into a ‘symbiotic’ relationship with their patrons. The few documents that have survived in Scotland are, significantly, letters of confraternity to a number of noble houses, namely the Maules of Panmure and the Drummond family, and a member of the

---


\(^6\) Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, pp. 233-5. On the development of the beguinages, see Moorman, *History*, pp. 562f. It should be noted that, despite the fact that Scotland tended to adopt most trends that were developed on the continent, we have as yet no evidence that there had been beguinages here, that is, houses in which members of the third order would live in a community like to that of the first and second orders.
Scrimgeour family, one of whose members had been provost of Dundee.\(^7\) Like the processions of Corpus Christi, there was status involved in receiving such a letter, for it was done to honour notable patrons, and if one was part of such a confraternity one was part of an elite club, as it were.

In time the third orders, especially the beguines (the female form of this life), produced a significant number of what can only be called mystics, who were responsible for a significant number of devotions. The feast of Corpus Christi was one such devotion, centred on the Eucharist and first promoted by Juliana of Cornillon, a beguine attached to the Premonstratensian house of Mont Cornillon in Liège, and eventually established as a feast by the bishop of Liège in 1246. It was neglected by his successors so that it did not enter the universal liturgical sequence until the mid-fourteenth century, when it came into the purview of the Dominican order, who included it into their observance in the Lyons chapter of 1319, with the liturgy most likely written by Thomas Aquinas. The imagery of Corpus Christi soon became an essential part of Books of Hours (private psalters used by the rich) with scenes from the Last Supper or the Washing of the Feet. Increasingly the emphasis of the imagery shifted from investiture of the sacrament to the devotional image of the Man of Sorrows, especially in Italy and Germany, and the image in the Books of Hours became that of the Mass of St Gregory, with the Man of Sorrows appearing on the altar. Thus the feast and devotion of Corpus Christi incorporated an element of the devotion of the Passion within it – besides the fact that the Franciscans were the guardians of the Holy Places, thus also guarding the site of the Last Supper, the caenaculum. As we shall see in a moment, the Passion was strongly dominated by the Franciscans, but beyond that, the feast of Corpus Christi would have touched something in the Franciscan mind, for Francis himself had always required a deep veneration of the Eucharist.\(^8\)


\(^8\) Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, pp. 297-8, 299, 300; Habig, *St Francis of Assisi: Writings and Early Biographies*, p. 67. Fleming found that in literature there are certain ‘Franciscan characteristics’ recognisable, which tend to centre both on ‘Marian piety’ and a ‘schematic contemplation of the physical Passion of Christ’, as well as ‘an insistence on penance’, see Fleming, *Franciscan Literature*, pp. 241, 250-1.
It is necessary to remind ourselves that the devotions, like the confraternities tended to be overseen by one or other of the mendicant orders, and their particular influence would be traceable through their very own spirituality, which would find its expression also (and perhaps especially) in the literature associated with these devotions. For this purpose a word must be interjected about the spirituality of the Franciscans, a spirituality which, like so many things in the order, revolved around St Francis and his legacy. Franciscan devotional practice was intuitive, meditative, and linked to what Fleming described as the advent of the imagination in literature, associated with a certain ‘vernacularisation’, which also affected the devotions. It is impossible to separate devotional literature from devotional art, as this kind of literature was itself extremely visual. Books of Hours would combine the written word – and this may be liturgy, or it may be a meditative piece like the Contemplacioun of Synnaris by the Scottish Observant William of Touris – with so-called Andachtsbilder (devotional images). These images would distil the text to a single image which was then used as a meditative tool. But Andachtsbilder were not restricted to the written sphere. Audrey-Beth Fitch argues that there was a high level of ‘sacralisation’ of the secular sphere in the form of such images. Despite the zeal of the Reformers to destroy as many of these as possible, we know that they were applied in the private sphere to decorate, for example, items of furniture, as well as the public sphere, for example, with the image of Mary and the baby Jesus carved on the market cross in Banff.9

Fleming’s main example of typically Franciscan devotional literature was the Meditationes Vitae Christi, written in the early fourteenth century as a devotional exercise for a Poor Clare nun. Its central piece of advice to the reader was that she must ‘assimilate the scenes from Jesus’ life if she is fully to profit from them’, it is vital to ‘experience the events’ while meditating on them and to ‘transport’ herself into the story. It appeals to what Fleming calls ‘felt experience’ or ‘eyewitness reporting’ which was also at the core of a movement called the devotio moderna, a movement that had emerged in the Netherlands in the late medieval period, centred

9 Van Os, Art of Devotion, p. 87. A most impressive Scottish example of Books of Hours is, of course, the Book of Hours of James IV and Margaret Tudor, see L.J. MacFarlane, ‘The Book of Hours of James IV and Margaret Tudor’, Innes Review, xi (1960), pp. 3-20; Fitch, ‘Religious Life in Scotland’, pp. 61, 73.
on Gerard de Groote and his Brethren of the Common Life. This kind of literature aimed to invite the reader to fully engage in the imagery and to experience through one’s own imagination aspects of Christ’s life and passion. This idea could be traced as far back as St Francis himself and his perception that to follow Christ was to ‘crucify himself with Christ’. There was no formulaic and abstract reasoning behind this attitude, it was purely intuitive. Francis had been a mystic, not a theologian, and his own peculiar style of mysticism centred on the ‘devotion to the person of the incarnate Christ and its self-identification with him, especially in his sufferings.’

That is why the Meditationes were such a ‘Franciscan’ piece of devotional literature, and it would only be the beginning of a tradition, which would, in turn, also be embraced by the Observants, for this is perhaps the one issue where the Observants could not have found much fault with their Conventual brethren. This is true of devotions in general; despite the fact that the presentation of devotions to the laity in order to attract lay patrons to the order created a devotional marketplace where each order had to ensure that their ‘wares’ were the most attractive, it is on the matter of devotions where the Observants would have been least antagonistic towards the practices of their Conventual counterparts, for the general themes would always lead back to Francis and his devotional expressions.

There are certain devotions that were inextricably linked with the Observants, while others can only be inferred as being connected with that order, by identifying certain elements that were peculiar to Franciscan devotions. Francis’ own Stigmata, and the insistence that only through meditation of Christ’s passion could salvation be achieved, ensured that the cult of the passion in its different guises usually bore at least a trace of Franciscan spirituality even if not specifically promoted by them. Linked to the passion was the image of Mary as the Schmerzensmutter, the ‘mother of sorrows’, who joined her dying son under the cross and who received her dead son into her arms. In Scotland this finds elaborate expression in the writings of the Observant Franciscan William of Touris and his penitential poem Contemplacioun of

10 Van Os, Art of Devotion, p. 12; Fleming, Franciscan Literature, pp. 242-8; Raby, Christian Latin Poetry, p. 419; Moorman, History, p. 542.
11 Fleming, Franciscan Literature, pp. 245-8; Habig, Omnibus, pp. 7, 19-20; Moorman, History, p. 256.
Synnaris, which is dealt with in detail below. Incidentally, Fitch argues that the cults of Jesus and Mary were considered the most potent for intercession.12

It is not surprising, therefore, that each of the mendicant orders would have their very own versions of these – the Dominicans' version of the cult of Mary found its most popular and enduring expression in the devotion of the Rosary, and it is perhaps characteristic that the Dominican devotion was meditative by repetition (a fixed number of Hail Marys repeated and interspersed with the Our Father), while the Franciscan versions were meditative by intuition and introspection. The devotee was given the image and then left to his imagination. But aspects of the cult of the passion were found not only in the cults of Mary and Jesus, but other devotions as well, such as the cult of the Holy Family (including St Anne and St Joseph), the Five Wounds of Jesus, the Holy Blood (which was linked to the cult of St Gregory, and which will be dealt with below) and the devotion of the Holy Name, which originated with the Observant Franciscan Bernardino de Siena and his practice of displaying a panel inscribed with the letters IHS at his sermons, for his listeners to meditate on.13

In Europe, the devotions of the Holy Blood and the Five Wounds, both elements of the cult of the passion, were linked to the devotion of the sacred heart, a devotion very much associated with the Franciscans from the very beginnings of the order. The devotion itself can be traced to the late twelfth century and is, therefore, not Franciscan in origin; nevertheless it is an example of how Franciscans embraced already existing devotions and gave them their particular characteristics. The rise of the Observance appears to have caused a brief interruption of the order's dedication to this cult, but once the Observance was firmly established in the fifteenth century, the Observant friars in turn continued to propagate the devotion of the Sacred Heart. Richstätter argues that the Stigmata or Five Wounds which Francis himself displayed made it a natural devotion for the Franciscans to 'appropriate': a typical Franciscan depiction of the Five Wounds put the wounded hands and feet on the cross, with the wounded heart in their centre.14

The question that needs to be asked about these devotions and associated cults is whether they stimulated urban collective piety or whether the two were coincidental. The last quarter of the fifteenth century and the first quarter of the sixteenth century in Scotland saw a re-organisation of urban society into incorporated guilds, craft associations meant to protect the privileges of its members, which included spiritual welfare. Among the Scottish burghs, Edinburgh had the largest number of incorporated trades, fourteen in total, while Glasgow had twelve, among them Hammermen, Goldsmiths (who were responsible for the procurement of a statue of Our Lady of Loretto in 1526)¹⁵, Tailors and Masons. The incorporation of the crafts into guilds, meant that ‘lesser folk’ were now able to afford the spiritual benefits that came with the endowment of a chaplainry, such as prayers requested for ‘benefactors as well as ancestors, the “faithful [Christian] dead”, immediate family members and themselves’. Sometimes, kings and their families were named, too. These pious activities were essential to the later-medieval Christian, for they improved his chances at attaining a state where his soul was worthy of salvation. With the incorporation of the craft guilds into religious societies came the possibility to make these endowments collectively as a craft, as ‘the substantial expense involved in the endowment of a chaplainry or anniversary exceeded the means of all but the most prosperous, yet the demand for the benefits of intercession extended alike to lesser folk, and were duly met by pious fraternities’. Even so, a distinction needs to be made between pious fraternities and craft fraternities: the former were of an entirely charitable or religious nature, while the latter were specifically associated with their particular craft and thus rather exclusive.¹⁶

This gave rise to a number of altars in the parish churches dedicated to the specific saints associated with certain crafts (in the same way that the Edinburgh Holy Blood confraternity was associated with the merchants’ guild). Iain Fraser counts some thirty-four altars in the burgh church of St Nicholas in Aberdeen alone, among them altars to the Holy Blood, founded in the mid-fifteenth century, St Anne (which, in St Giles was one of the altars situated behind the rood screen), founded in

the mid-fourteenth century, and St Salvator, which appears from the early fifteenth century. No altar of St Francis is to be found in St Nicholas, however. The position of a guild’s altar within the parish church also signified statues, just as the position in the Corpus Christi processions did, as we shall explore in a moment. The closer to the high altar and rood screen an altar, the greater the importance of the guild it was associated with: in this manner, the altar of the hammermen (dedicated to St Eloi), who comprised the largest guild in Edinburgh, was close to the rood screen, while the altar dedicated to St Severin could be found near the back of the church, as it was associated with the weavers, a craft much lower in rank. But it could hardly get more prestigious than the altar dedicated to St Anne, associated with the tailors, or, for that matter, the altar associated with the fraternity of the Holy Blood: both were situated behind the rood screen, a space not accessible to the general worshipping public. They shared this space with the altars dedicated to St Francis and St Denis.17

The status of the parish church in Scotland was a significant one, as in Scotland an urban parish comprised the entire burgh and also at times a substantial portion of its hinterland, thus focussing a huge amount of pious attention on one building, which was the ‘centre of the civic and religious life of the town’, which brought with it a sense of responsibility on behalf of the civic authorities for ‘spiritual and ecclesiastical matters’. The exercise of control over religious matters by the town council was an extension of their existing role as overseers of the fabric of the church, such as repairs, and the supervision of regular church services, that is, those not associated with the guild altars. Their intervention in certain aspects of the corpus christianum (the sense of the burgh community as a religious community) is then to be expected, and certainly not unheard of in the European context: in Nuremberg, it was the town council that had forced the local Franciscan friary to reform according to the Observance, presumably once again from a position of economic power over the friary, as one would expect the members of the town council to have been benefactors and patrons of the Nuremberg Franciscans. It is therefore not surprising to find that in Aberdeen the burgh council maintained a hold over two of the three known chaplainries invested by Aberdonian craft guilds: the

altar of St Eloy founded by the Hammermen, and the Cordiner's service of SS Crispin and Crispinian. This is indicative of the situation in other burghs, although the Aberdeen burgh council went further than most, when the burgh council took over support of the weekly Holy Blood mass from the mid-fifteenth century onwards. In return, there was a certain expectation that maintenance of the Holy Blood altar was a burgh-wide responsibility: in 1548 a decree was passed in Perth that all new burgesses and guild-brethren in Perth had to pay £20 'to the common good' and £4 'to the maintenance of the Holy Blood altar'; and in 1526 James V 'confirmed to the gildry of Dundee a series of levies to be raised to the support of their altar of the Holy Blood. Nevertheless, in most burghs the Holy Blood altars were maintained by a fraternity associated with the merchant guild.18

This sense of a civic body responsible for and involved in pious matters found expression not only in the maintenance of the parish church and the altars therein, but in ever more elaborate pageants associated with religious festivals. The most elaborate of these was arguably the feast of Corpus Christi with the ensuing procession through the town a display of civic status. In England towards the end of the fourteenth century, Corpus Christi fraternities ranked in popularity only behind dedications to the Virgin and the Trinity. The earliest reference to a Corpus Christi celebration in Scotland was in Aberdeen in 1440, where by 1497 'each craft was to have its own standard'; while in 1533 'the council ordained that the craftsmen should attend the processions of Corpus Christi and Candlemas, each craft behind its own banner', to conform with not only the traditions of Aberdeen, but also of Edinburgh (where we have evidence for Corpus Christi processions as early as 1498). These processions would have been celebrated in most of the Scottish burghs at some point and played a vital part in the psyche of the burgh community, the 'body politic' being signified by the body of Christ, which was processed through the town. The Corpus Christi procession itself was a means to display status: the most important

18 Hay, 'High Kirk of St Giles, Edinburgh', pp. 243, 251; Schofield and Alan, Medieval Towns, pp. 175, 180; B. Moeller, Imperial Cities and the Reformation: Three Essays (Philadelphia, 1972), pp. 469; Fitch, 'Religious Life in Scotland', pp. 63-4; Nyhus, 'Observant Reform Movement in Southern Germany', pp. 164-7; McFarlane, William Elphinstone, p. 271; Fraser, 'Later Medieval Burgh Kirk of St Nicholas', pp. 113-6. It would appear that most of the Aberdeen craft guilds were content to use the high altar as the focus for the devotions, rather than founding altars themselves, although Fraser does not state whether this might have been due to the control exercised by the burgh council over the existing craft guilds' altars.
guild would be close to the Sacrament, and from then on each craft guild would have its allocated place within the procession – a position that was jealously guarded as guilds were frequently vying for a ‘better’ place in the procession.19

One question that must be asked in the context of these cults and devotions is whether any can be associated with a particular religious order, if one is to answer the question of how strong the friars’ (and in our case the Observants’) influence was in the Scottish burgh communities in which they settled. Naturally, the order most closely associated with a devotion as prestigious as, for example, Corpus Christi would also be seen as instrumental in conferring the status given to each member of the procession, which would in turn give them considerable social influence within the burgh community. The feast and cult of Corpus Christi, however, had at this point become too ‘popular’ (in the sense that it was all-pervasive in the later-medieval burgh) to be able to associate it with any particular order at this point. The liturgy was Dominican, attributed to Thomas Aquinas, and it was the Dominicans who had themselves taken over from the Cistercians and brought it to a wider audience. The devotion as such, however, would also have appealed to the Franciscan mind (who were guardians of the caenaculum, the site of the Last Supper, in Jerusalem), as it included an essential element of the cult of the passion, and devotional images associated with the feast often depicted the Mass of St Gregory and the Man of Sorrows, both strong images in Franciscan devotion.20

That a link between the incorporated guilds and the friars existed can be gleaned from some of the literary evidence we have from the early sixteenth century. Sir David Lindsay’s Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, which bears a strong anti-clerical and in parts anti-fraternal sentiment accuses the merchants to be masters of the friars (who, in the play, are the three vices Falsehood, Flattery and Deceit dressed up in friars’ habits), while Falsehood claims that as a friar: ‘I will leif the lustie lyfe/

---


Withoutin ony sturt and stryfe,/ amang the men of craft'. 21 And indeed, the fraternity of the Holy Blood in St Giles collegiate church in Edinburgh provides us with the strongest evidence for a connection between the Observants and the merchant guild in the burgh of Edinburgh, in the form of its banner, the so-called Fetternear Banner, one of the few items later-medieval Scottish devotional practice that has survived the Reformation. The cult of the Holy Blood, one of the many facets of the cult of the passion, was centred on the relic of the Holy Blood in the Chapelle du Saint-Sang in Bruges, which claimed to have drops of Christ's blood collected by Joseph of Arimathea. There is some evidence that Scots visiting Flanders were exposed to the spectacular ceremonies associated with the cult of the Holy Blood in Bruges (for a time the Scottish staple port), which would account for its popularity within the Scottish burgh communities. One of those was the archbishop of St Andrews, James Kennedy, who took part in the annual procession in Bruges in 1451. The earliest Holy Blood altars in Scotland were founded in the late fourteenth century, but the elaborate cult associated with it was probably imported in the mid-fifteenth century. By 1500 there were at least fifteen altars dedicated to the Holy Blood in Lowland churches, a number that rose to at least thirty-seven by 1560. The connection with Flanders and Zeeland is an important one, as a number of devotions, among them the Five Wounds and the Name of Jesus, were brought to Scotland via the trade routes and incorporated into the liturgical calendar. Like Bishop Kennedy, William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen, brought with him similar influences: a journey to Bruges at Easter 1495 resulted in the parish of Old Aberdeen being dedicated to Our Lady of the Snows, a confraternity founded in Bruges some fifty years earlier by the craft guild of the tailors. There were Holy Blood altars in the parish churches of Edinburgh, St Andrews, Dunfermline, Dundee, Montrose, Aberdeen, Haddington, Linlithgow, Perth, Lanark, Irvine and others, most of which were the focus for Holy Blood confraternities organised by the merchant guilds. But most remarkably, this devotion provides us with a unique connection between the Observants in Scotland and the House of Stewart, which will have an impact on the issue of royal patronage.

21 Sir David of the Mount Lindsay, Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, ed. Lyall, Roderick (Edinburgh, 1989), lines 1529, 1537-9. For a full discussion of Lindsay’s Satyre, see Chapter 5, pp. 181-7.
and the question of what role the Observants played in the milieu of the court and just how strong the connection was between them and the Stewart kings.22

Arguably the most prestigious of these Holy Blood confraternities was the one based at St Giles Collegiate Church in Edinburgh. The Holy Blood altar (associated with the ‘merchants and guild brothers’) there was located near the old north door until it was moved to the newly constructed Holy Blood Aisle at the southern wall of the church in 1518, next to an altar dedicated to the Ascension.23 The reason for this distinction was one of its members, who was none other than James IV, grandson of Mary of Gueldres, the first patroness of the Observants in Scotland. As far as we are aware he took an active part in the activities of the confraternity and frequently assisted at Holy Blood Masses, which were celebrated in St Giles on Wednesday mornings. It was by no means unusual for third order confraternities to have members of high social standing, while at the same time also attracting merchants and craftsmen with their promise of a certain moral and social status, as was expressed in the Corpus Christi processions. An early example from Flanders were Count Guido and his family, who, in 1259, had been taken into the Gebetsbruderschaft of the Franciscan order by St Bonaventure.24

But not only did the Edinburgh Holy Blood confraternity have distinguished members; the banner which would have been displayed at the altar in St Giles is the only one of its kind that has survived the Reformation and is still accessible to us: the so-called Fetternear Banner.25 Its centrepiece is Jesus as the Man of Sorrows with blood trickling from his wounds, a common depiction of the Passion, or at least of this one aspect of it, which was called the Image of Pity. The image is surrounded by the instruments of Passion, which are traditionally the Lance, the Cross, the Crown of Thorns and the Nails. In addition to these the centre panel depicts among others the sepulchre, a scourge, the ladder and the reed and sponge; the inclusion of Judas’...
head, hanging from the neck by a cord was a very distinctive part of Flemish and German iconography, again suggesting that the Scots kept close devotional ties to northern Europe and the Rhineland. But it is the middle border that is of particular interest to us, for its basic motif (surrounding a large rosary divided into decades of five) is the cordelière, the knotted cord worn with the habit of Franciscan third orders and confraternities. This could be sufficient proof that the Edinburgh Holy Blood confraternity was overseen by the Observants, and with the king as a prominent member this bears witness to just how influential the Observants must have become in the devotional landscape of later-medieval Scotland.26

The confraternity of the Holy Blood was the subject of an indenture of 10 July 1522, made between the Edinburgh burgesses Nichole Carncoars, William Symson, Andro Baroun and Alexander Grahame, who were also ‘kirkmaisteris of the confrary and altrare of the Haly Blude’ and Sir Thomas Ewin, chaplain, who had founded a chaplainry at that altar to which the kirkmasters would minister. An anniversary mass would be said every year, which included a dole to the poor and which was composed of seventy-six portions of bread and cash, and of those thirty-six portions went to the Greyfriars, four to the Sisters of St Mary Wynd, three to the leper hospital at St Ninian’s Chapel and the remainder to ‘honest pure personis that hes maist myster’.27 It is also significant that offerings for anniversary masses in St Giles, in so far as they included alms to the poor, would also include a portion given to the Observants of Edinburgh. In this context it should also be noted that the altar dedicated to St Francis in St Giles Kirk (attached to which was the altar of St Patrick) was in a rather more prominent position, located beyond the rood screen and behind the High Altar, arguably the most important place in any medieval church building, an ‘inner sanctum’ reserved to a clerical and secular elite. It was first mentioned in 1477 and shared this prominent position only with the altar of St Denis.28

---

27 St Giles Register, no. 126. I am most grateful to Helen Brown for pointing out these references to me. Her forthcoming thesis will deal with ‘Lay Piety in Later Medieval Lothian’, and I keenly await her thoughts on the St Giles anniversaries.
28 Hay, ‘High Kirk of St Giles, pp. 251, 257. For a full plan of the altars and their dedications see p. 255. In his forthcoming book ‘The Emergence of a Capital City: Edinburgh, 1450-1603’, Michael Lynch deals with this rather obscure figure of St Denis, suggesting that he was in fact ‘an obscure French bishop who had been conflated with the scholar Dionysius the Areopagite’.
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The link between Observant devotions and James IV is again borne out in the *Contemplacioun of Synnaris*, the penitential poem written by William of Touris. It is once again an expression of the devotion of the passion and has been preserved in a British Library manuscript, ‘Arundel 285’, a sixteenth-century prayer book, printed in England at a time when James IV had already been dead for three decades. According to Durkan, it was not unusual for Scots authors of the early sixteenth century to come into print abroad, simply because foreign printing presses could handle large volumes of what he calls ‘international business’, while the Scottish market was severely affected by the political situation from Flodden onwards.²⁹

The Arundel MS was a prayer book rather than a Book of Hours, but the *Contemplacioun* still follows the standard structure for the Books of Hours. It is organized into seven sections (one of them dealing with the Passion), with devotions for each day of the week, a reflection of liturgical practice. Each section is introduced by an illustration, immediately providing a focus for the content of the following section.³⁰ There is an interesting pre-occupation with the Passion in the Arundel MS as a whole; the three opening pieces all deal with the Passion, which is hardly surprising, considering that the Passion was the most natural of all the devotions of the medieval church. It was part of the liturgy and was re-enacted at every celebration of the Mass. By contemplating the Passion of Christ, the faithful are ‘being cleansed from the dregs of their sins by the salvific blood of the Redeemer applied to them in the mass’ – a clear link to the Holy Blood cult.³¹ Or as one of the prose texts in the Arundel manuscript on the Remembrance of the Passion puts it, ‘meditacion of the passion exedis uthir gud werkis’.³² Thus the Passion found an expression in the sacraments of the Eucharist and the sacrament of penance, two sacraments which theologians at the time believed to be inextricably linked.³³ Still, as Alasdair MacDonald has pointed out, the complete Arundel MS cannot be connected with any specific religious tradition, since the authors of the different elements came from rather different backgrounds. As a result only the *Contemplacioun* can be attributed to late-medieval Observant Franciscan devotion.

---

³³ MacDonald, ‘Passion Devotion’, p. 112.
through its author. Most of the remaining pieces contained in the manuscript are English material, all of which deal with the theme of the Passion, with two poems dealing explicitly with the Name of Jesus, the devotion which originated with St Bernardino de Siena, while others contain aspects thereof, linking it with the Passion. One such example is the Jesus Psalter. All pieces were tightly structured devotional exercises, either, like the Contemplacioun structured by the days of the week, like a Book of Hours, or by repetition of certain phrases or prayers.

The Contemplacioun itself followed a wider medieval tradition in its narrative of the Passion, especially in its structure which mirrors that of the Meditationes. In the Contemplacioun as well as the Meditationes the meditator is guided through an ordered sequence of meditations, usually by being addressed directly. Touris, however, also appears to have employed a more distinctive approach by being less concerned with abstract themes, with the Contemplacioun giving specific advice on how one can gain salvation. He explains that the reader should ‘anchor his heart on the rock of renown’, i.e. of the Passion, so as to weather the stormy sea of life and to find Paradise through observance of the Passion. Indeed the Passion is seen as the remedy to all ills, and the proper way to meditate on it is to attempt to feel the Passion of Christ, as if the meditator were himself living it. This advice was also given by the author of the Meditationes, who advised to ‘let every scene of Christ’s Passion be an occasion for prayer’. It is remarkable that this command became more urgent when the image of the Pietà was summoned in the poem, the image of the Schmerzensmutter (‘Mother of Sorrows’) who receives her dead son into her arms, with the meditator praying for her to ‘pierce my hard hert with thy sharp luflis lance’.

William of Touris is one of only three authors in Arundel who are mentioned by name. This would almost certainly be an illustration of his popularity in the

---

34 MacDonald, ‘Catholic Devotion’, p. 68; van Os, Art of Devotion, p. 12.
35 Bennett, Devotional Pieces, p. 125, lines 890-896.
36 Bennett, Devotional Pieces, p. 127, lines 930-36.
37 Van Os, Art of Devotion, p. 114.
38 Van Os, Art of Devotion, p. 137, line 1086.
39 The prefance to the Contemplacioun reads: Heir begynnys the contemplacioun of synnaris compilite be frer William of Touris of the ordour of the frer minouris’. Of the remaining authors in Arundel, only two of the English poets are known to us by name, both clergy, one a Benedictine monk of Bury St Edmunds, Lydgate, and the vicar of St Stephen’s Norwich, Richard of Caister, a secular priest. The latter was the author of one of the two poems dealing with the Name of Jesus, a prominent Observant.
literary world of sixteenth-century Scotland and possibly even England, as this was where the Arundel manuscript was printed. It is all the more surprising then that his literary exploits received no mention at all in Bryce’s *Scottish Grey Friars*, he had very little to say about William of Touris. He was an Observant with a university background: he had studied at Paris and later appeared again in connection with Glasgow university. His activities in the Scottish province – he was provincial minister twice – would certainly suggest that he was a well-known figure there. He also moved in the milieu of the court and it would appear that William of Touris created a poem representative of the ‘mirror of princes’, the *speculum principis* genre, which was so aptly portrayed in David Lindsay’s *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*. This is hardly surprising, considering that Touris reputedly wrote this piece for James VI during one of his Lenten retreats. The fact that one of the other representatives of this genre in Scotland was Sir David Lindsay of the Mount is, however, worthy of some note, since Lindsay produced some scathing anti-fraternal satire, which was levelled quite specifically at the Observant Franciscans and their influence over the person of the king.

And there is indeed much advice given in the *Contemplacioun*; in order for the king to be a just ruler he must concentrate on the ‘king of heaven and on the mercy of Christ’. This was exemplified by using royal figures, biblical as well as classical. With the Passion being a devotion geared towards the salvation of souls, it would have appealed to James IV who was himself pre-occupied with the salvation of his own soul, spurred by the role he played in the events of 1488, leading to his father’s death. It would also provide us with further proof that, as was the case with the Holy Blood confraternity, James favoured Observantine devotions.

The Arundel MS affords us with a further interesting connection between the poets of sixteenth-century Scotland: like David Lindsay, William Dunbar was one of

---

Franciscan devotion. See also MacDonald, ‘Passion Devotion’, pp. 115-118, 121-2; Bennett, *Devotional Pieces*, pp. 194-204; MacDonald, ‘Catholic Devotion’, p. 71.

40 It should be noted that Bennett in his edition of the Arundel and Harleian MSS, which both contain a version of the *Contemplacioun*, was sceptical about the person of William of Touris, despite the fact that he is identified thus in the Arundel MS version of the poem as the author, since Wadding does not list him among the Franciscan writers. Bennett does, however, rely heavily on Bryce’s patchy account of William of Touris, see Bennett, ‘Devotional Pieces’, pp. v-vii and vi note 4, p. 64; Bryce, i, pp. 269-270, 332.

41 See Chapter 5, pp. 181-5.

the most prolific Scottish examples of anti-fraternal satire. What is quite remarkable is that he was also known to have penned devotional poetry of an orthodox manner, with his work included alongside that of William of Touris. Compared to his satires, his devotional work can only be described as entirely conventional.43 Bawcutt identified Dunbar and his ‘Passioun’ as contemporary to the Contemplacioun, but she never made the connection to a possible Franciscan influence on Dunbar’s devotional writings, although the ‘Passioun’ could certainly be seen as making use of Franciscan imagination as was defined by Fleming, with imagery that, although ‘highly traditional’, was just as physical as that inaugurated by the Meditations. This is hardly surprising, considering that Dunbar was keen to adopt and try out the literary styles accessible to him.44

Adam Abell, author of the Roit or Quheill of Tyme, shares the fate of William of Touris, in that he finds only small mention in Bryce, though at least Bryce recognised that he was the ‘reputed author of the Wheel of Time, a chronicle of small historical value written about 1533’ and that he is the only Scottish Observant other than John Hay ‘whose literary activity is now vouched for by credible evidence’, one of only two Scottish Observants ever engaged in ‘literary activity’. Bryce’s omission of the man now acclaimed as the foremost poet of the cult of the Passion is surprising.45 And as with William of Touris it is surprising just how little attention Bryce paid to a chronicler (Abell) sometimes cited alongside chroniclers such as Hector Boece and John Leslie (his chronicle was first published in 1575-8, under Leslie’s supervision during his stay in Rome), and whose account stands out as the ‘first [account] of any length to survive’ of the reign of James IV. It is a morally inspired account, and we find inserted in it the author’s own opinions commenting on historical events and figures, which is why Bryce’s aside on ‘historical value’ was rather unproductive.46

43 The two pieces by Dunbar that were included in the Arundel manuscript were the Tabill of Confessioun and The Passioun of Christ.
It does indeed deal with the legendary beginnings of the Scottish kingdom and does not miss such characters as Gaythelos whom we encounter in the origin myths recounted in Bower’s *Scotichronicon* and other such episodes which Stewart describes as anecdotes, interspersed in what is, history told from a moral point of view. But although Abell had already joined the Observants by the time he wrote the *Roit and Quheill* historians disagree over whether this was the work of an Observant friar or the account ‘of an Augustinian canon of Inchaffray, recollected in tranquillity at Jedburgh in 1533’. Abell did display a certain pre-occupation with St Augustine, but this is more than balanced by the prominence of Francis and the Franciscans. Abell spends almost an entire folio recounting the death of St Francis and the circumstances surrounding his death, while other saints and founding fathers (Dominic among them) are mentioned almost in passing. The *Roit and Quheill*, although it initially ended in 1533, was expanded in 1537 to include that most momentous (and in Abell’s view heretical) event, Henry VIII’s divorce of Catherine of Aragon and the resulting split with Rome. Abell must have felt compelled that this be recorded; incidentally it is here that Abell had the most to say about the Observants (the English ones in this case), for it was them who ‘prechit agains this error’, resulting in two of them being martyred, and that a number of English Observants fled to Scotland.

The *Roit and Quheill* was dedicated ‘in nayme of the Blissit Trinite, Our Lady and Sanct Francis’, and in his conclusion Abell described himself ‘ane pure brothir of the brethir minoris of observance in our place of Jedwart’. It is slightly surprising then that, although he dealt at length with Francis’ exploits in Europe, he would have so little to say about the Observants in Scotland. They were first mentioned in the reign of James IV (James was ‘ane nobill prince and pecebillie gidity the kinrik for he wsit wisemennis consall and principallie of Brethri Minoris of Obseruance’). This could be explained by what MacDougall called Abell’s concern

47 Stewart, ‘Abell’s “Roit or Quheill”’, p. 387, f.
to 'tell a moral tale and glorify the order which he had eventually chosen to serve', and one would expect Abell to still make use of his background as an Augustinian canon – after all, he had been a member of that order for quite some time. But his emphasis on moral history would be in keeping with the Observants' preference for moral theology, as evidenced by their libraries, certainly in Europe.  

Therefore it may be in the structure and outlook of the Roit and Quheill rather than its content that Abell displayed and Observant friar's outlook on the world. His main concerns were not just historical facts but also moral paradigms that could be gleamed from history. He was in effect using historiography to reveal a divine pattern and to provide the lay reader with moral guidance. Although it is a different genre from the Contemplacioyn of Synnaris, it displays a similar level of moral guidance, very concerned with paradigms. Abell certainly did not hesitate to criticise the ills of his time, such as secular control of religious establishments or the practice of recognition of baronial lands introduced by James IV. Because he had a moral agenda the king’s vices had to be mentioned, too.  

Yet his attitude towards James IV is interesting. In Abell's eyes the king could do no ill, that even such evils as recognition or the fact that he took part in the rebellion against his father were only due to the king listening to bad counsel. The chronicle almost gives the impression that Abell felt as if he had been commissioned to write this for the king and therefore had to omit the embarrassing details. Of course the chronicle was not written by the instigation of the king, but it is quite possible that Abell saw the king as his patron and as patron of the Observants; he had founded 'ownt place at Striwiling', and Abell hints at the king receiving 'wise counsel' from the Observant friars.  

Works like those of Adam Abell and William of Touris, however, would not have been possible without education. It may not necessarily have been an academic
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50 Thorson, 'Roit and quheill of time', pp. 1, 224; Adam Abell, The Roit and Quheill of Tyme (Transcript, School of Scottish Studies, University of Edinburgh), folios 1b, 119v; N. MacDougall, James III: A Political Study (Edinburgh, 1982), p. 314; MacDougall, James IV, p. 296. Above all it should be mentioned that the Observant order in Europe produced any number of historians, which means that Abell was in the best company, see Moorman, History, p. 545-7; Roest, History of Franciscan Education, p. 213.
51 Stewart, 'Final Folios', p. 230.
54 Thorson, 'Roit and quheill of time', p. 224; MacDougall, James IV, p. 296.
education (alas, we have no record of Abell's education): thus Bonaventure's education had been both 'at the feet of men who had walked the dusty roads of Umbria with [Francis]', but also at the University of Paris in the early thirteenth century, the 'golden age' of the medieval university, the 'springtime of the Franciscan order, and the great heyday of an exuberant Gothic style in art and life'.

But the university as a medieval institution was also at the heart of the debate over observance. The Franciscans had always had an ambiguous relationship with education, unlike the Dominicans, whose founding ideal had been to be a force against heresy; this required good preaching, which in turn required education. Francis, on the other hand, had, if not condemned it, then warned against it, as 'not in itself evil', but nevertheless an unnecessary and dangerous pursuit as it lent itself as a 'source of pride'. But a succession of general ministers who were themselves highly educated had changed the outlook of the order; in fact the Franciscans were as attractive to university graduates and university masters as the Dominicans ever had been. The issue of studying was first addressed in 1223, when studies – 'teaching and learning' to be precise – were classed as 'work in general' for the friars, alongside begging and physical labour, but only for those 'gifted with knowledge and talents'. And how ironic that Francis' own misgivings echoed the charges that would be brought against both the Franciscan and Dominican orders by their critics from the mid-thirteenth century onwards, critics that would emerge in the milieu of the university.

Whatever Francis' reservations towards learning, they would soon discover what the Dominicans already knew: good preaching required a good education, something that, eventually, even the Observants would have to recognise. But this led to the expectation that the Observants would naturally steer clear of academic education, because it had been at the heart of the controversy between Observants and Conventuals. Universities and their environment were partly blamed for the order's moral decline and detachment from Francis' Rule; blame was also placed on academic ambition. In a way the Observants picked up on a matter that had turned

---

55 Fleming, Franciscan Literature, pp. 192-3.


into ammunition in anti-fraternal literature, the friars’ desire to be called ‘masters’ with clearly academic overtones to this title. A study on the English Observants, however, has shown that while they rejected the lifestyle of the universities as well as the studia attached to them, they still recognised that in order to fulfil their preaching mission, the Observants, too, would need well-educated and learned men. This has often led to the assumption that their role at the universities had been a spiritual one. As Bryce was so fond of pointing out, the Observants would minister to the students as ‘pastors and confessors’ and by their example draw many of the students to their way of life. But in attracting university graduates to the order, the Observants invited themselves into the sphere of the universities, for how could they frown at learning and still seek the vicinity of the medieval universities? Many of the early members of the Scottish Observant community were, as we have seen, graduates from the great Continental universities, while in Scotland the Observants soon attracted patronage from prominent members of the Scottish universities of St Andrews and Glasgow.

Education was still a necessary part, and, as we have previously seen, many of the members of the Scottish Observance were university graduates – at home as well as abroad. It became quickly apparent that not only did they need educated preachers, but also that ignorant friars were in much greater danger of falling prey to heretical views, a charge that the Observants had to avoid at all cost for they had the fate of the Spirituals and the Fraticelli still fresh in their memory. Besides, the paradox applied that those already educated in either the Franciscan studia or the university were much more susceptible to the lure of the Observant way of life, just as the early friars had been to university graduates, in effect diluting the fervour of the movement.

The ‘original’ Franciscans had been an order which had played a prominent part in medieval university life, certainly from the mid-thirteenth century onwards. They set great store by educating its members so that they could properly follow their task of preaching and educated preachers became an ever more important
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58 As opposed to the biblical meaning of the term ‘master’, i.e. rabbi: for a full discussion, see Chapter 5, p. 163.
60 Bryce, i, p. 289.
commodity. However, in Scotland the Conventuals did not appear to have been drawn to either St Andrews or Glasgow, when these were founded in the early to mid-fifteenth century. It is possible that the Observant Franciscan houses fulfilled different functions for the different places they settled in. Thus, in a diocesan centre with a university, their efforts might have been much more concentrated on the university and its students, and, as a consequence, they would have attracted Episcopal rather than royal patronage. However, in places like Edinburgh and Stirling, both royal burghs with royal residences, they would have been much closer to the king and his family, and this would have made them obvious choices when looking for instructors in spiritual devotions.

The early Franciscans in the thirteenth century had been very quick to establish their houses of study in all the major houses close to the European universities (most famously the studium generale at Paris), alongside which they created a network of ‘more elementary theological schools’ in the larger friaries. In fact, all the mendicant orders had sought out the university towns, and Paris had been especially popular – in fact every order of friars (not just Franciscans and Dominicans) had had a studia there. In England, too, we could find the Franciscans at Oxford and Cambridge (the studia of the latter set up by a delegation from the Oxford friary in the mid-thirteenth century), drawn no doubt by the universities there. But they did not just settle there to educate their friars; the medieval university was an incredibly rich recruiting ground.62

The Observants’ involvement in education was two-fold: directed at the order itself, i.e. the studiae meant to educate their own members, but the devotional sermons of St Bernardino, for example, were meant to educate the laity, those who would come to the market place where he would be preaching. Bernardino was also the one who dealt with the issue of educational institutions within the Observant order, an issue that was then taken further by John of Capistrano, two of the ‘four pillars of the Observance’. Capistrano demanded that all clerics and friars be properly educated, with a view to a ‘thorough grounding in the science of the Sacred

Scripture’, the ‘humanist sciences’ and the ‘practical sciences necessary to govern the household and the state’.  

The relationship between the Observant Franciscans and humanist ideas is yet another problematic one, for it once again involved the issue of study; worse, it was study of ‘pagan learning’ that was promoted through humanist teaching. Nevertheless there were a number of Observant preachers whose eloquence caught the attention of contemporary humanists. The Scottish Observant Alexander Arbuckle would have been included in that group, since he was renowned as a classical scholar. There is also no doubt that the Scottish Observants had access to the right kind of books to suggest that they were at least perusing humanist ideas; Durkan suggested that books and schools were the tools by which humanist learning was disseminated, but also via the Scottish students abroad who would return with these new ideas. But the possession of books, like everything else connected to learning and study, posed its own delicate problems. The Franciscans never instituted the strict rules which were applied by the Dominicans to administer the books that were part of the inventory of each convent, rules that even dealt with storage and care of the books, after all they were valuable commodities. It would appear that the Franciscan collections started haphazardly and were mostly of a liturgical nature, and only with the growth of the *studia* would they build up to include books of a more distinct nature, which did not necessarily form part of the communal library but were given to individual friars to ‘perform their religious or educational tasks’. This would explain why so many of the books that have been identified as having been in the possession of Scottish Observants were inscribed with the individual friars’ names, but also passed on to other friars, which has given us the unique opportunity to trace their movements through the different communities.  

But if the Scottish Observants had access to the necessary books, what about the schools? By the 1450s the foundation of study houses was underway throughout the Observant provinces, including Germany and the Low Countries. This would
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64 Durkan, ‘Cultural Background’, pp. 274-5, 279-80, 289; Roest, *History of Franciscan Education*, pp. 168-71. A number of books that were in the possession of various Scottish Observants have been discussed in Chapter 2. For a full list see Durkan and Ross, *Libraries* (Glasgow, 1961, and annotated copy in NLS, Shelfmark SU.37 (D.11.1 Dur)).  
suggest that the friars dispatched to found houses in Scotland were aware of these activities and would have followed suit. The size of the Scottish province – both the number of houses and the personnel involved – would determine how many studia would be required there. In this way one would have expected perhaps Edinburgh as an important house – the founding house of the Observant province, in fact – to have some kind of studia, even if only the basic theological school. St Andrews and Glasgow would lend themselves perfectly as houses of study and eventually Aberdeen as well, as soon as the university was established there. The Observants’ problematic relationship with the Conventuals (if the 1521 controversy is any indication) would imply that, if the Conventual houses had had studia attached to them, the Observants would not have visited them. This also appeared to be the case in England, where the Observant friars would attend the university, but were cautious about relations with the Conventual studia there, which they perceived to be immoral.66

The three pre-Reformation Scottish universities were St Andrews, Glasgow and Aberdeen. The universities of St Andrews and Glasgow had been founded in 1414 and 1451 respectively, pre-dating the Observant friaries in these burghs, while King’s College in Aberdeen was founded only in 1495, some twenty-six years after the Observants had come to that burgh.67 In all three burghs bishops had been involved in the foundation of the Observant friaries – if not as founders then as patrons. The Scottish universities had been modelled on the continental universities like Cologne and Paris. King’s College in Aberdeen, for example, was set up after the example of Paris and Bologna. Its first rector, Hector Boece, had taught at Paris, while John Duns Scotus had been resident at the Franciscan convent of Cordeliers in 1303 while lecturing on Peter Lombard’s Sentences at the University of Paris where he became doctor of theology in 1305. Two years later he went to Cologne, where he
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67 The foundation of St Andrews University stretched over a period of four years, from 1410-1414, but 1414 has been agreed upon as the date when the university came into existence. See R.G. Cant, The University of St Andrews: A Short History (Edinburgh and London, revised edn, 1970), p. 3. It should be noted that parts of the following study were the subject of a paper given at conference in Münster, which have since been published in M. Gosman and V. Honemann (eds), Medieval to Early Modern Culture: Kultureller Wandel vom Mittelalter zur Frühen Neuzeit, Vol. 6: Erziehung, Bildung, Bildungsinstitutionen: Education, Training and their Institutions (Frankfurt am Main, 2006), pp. 267-84.
died in 1308. Among the first Observant friars after their arrival in Scotland were more of those who had connections with European universities: friar John Richardson, one of the companions of Cornelius of Zierekzee, had graduated in arts in Cologne in 1453 and had most likely taught there until 1460. And friar Robert Keith, one of the first friars at St Andrews and later guardian of that friary, had also been studying theology at Cologne from 1439.

As always the scarcity of records in the medieval period inhibits a full understanding of the role the Observants played at the medieval Scottish universities, and we must once again avail ourselves of possible parallels, in this case the Scottish Dominicans, whose activities in both St Andrews and Glasgow have been the subject of recent study. Foggie suggests that the Dominicans initially had only a small house in St Andrews which fulfilled ‘an entirely liturgical role’, and at least up to 1476 there is no suggestion of a connection with St Andrews university. This is ascribed to the infrastructure of the university as a whole and the faculty of theology in particular, with the strong presence of the Augustinian canons who were attached to the cathedral. They dominated the faculty of theology in its early days; the Augustinian prior was dean of theology and the faculty itself was part of the priory.

It has been suggested that the University of St Andrews was the main attraction for both the Observants and the Dominicans to settle there; in fact, the Dominican house was the last one to be founded in Scotland and post-dated the foundation of the university, and its foundation was prompted by the university’s foundation. The establishment of the Dominican friary at St Andrews had been the result of an amalgamation of the two Dominican houses of St Monans and Cupar, both considered ‘unsuitable places for religious, whereas St Andrews, as a university town, was a place where a sufficient number of friars might live according to rule’. The Dominican’s involvement in the early days of the University of Glasgow are much better documented: the first general chapter of the university met in the
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Glasgow Dominican convent in 1451, and although no Dominican friars were listed among those present at the meeting, Foggie rightly says that it would seem unlikely that the friars would show such a lack of interest in the goings-on in their convent. From 1460 onwards their chapter house was also used to teach Canon Law.\textsuperscript{71}

The Observant friary in St Andrews was the second Scottish house to be founded and as with the Dominicans there is some evidence that in their early days in the vicinity of the university the Observants’ role was liturgical in nature, mostly as pastors and confessors – ‘evangelists rather than scholars’. There is, at least initially, no evidence to suggest that it was the university that drew them to St Andrews, at least not beyond the fact that the founder of the St Andrews friary, James Kennedy, bishop of St Andrews, was an important figure in the life of the university. Bryce states rather extravagantly that their impact on the students at St Andrews was such that these ‘deserted the allurements of the world and became followers of the holy father [i.e. St Francis] in his profession’, a claim reminiscent of reports on the activities of John of Capistrano in the fifteenth century, whose series of lectures at the University of St Andrews reputedly led to seventy members of the university joining the Franciscan order.\textsuperscript{72} The similarity of these reports might suggest that this was the aim of an Observant presence at the later-medieval universities and altogether in keeping with Observant ideals, as opposed to seeking academic advancement as their Franciscan forerunners had done and Conventual brethren were still doing. It would certainly fit the theory that the Observants in Scotland, as indeed elsewhere in Europe, were so concerned with differentiating themselves from their Conventual brethren that they made a conscious effort not to get involved with academia to the extent that the order had done previously, but were still aware of the universities’ potential for recruitment. The Observants concentrated instead on the spiritual well-being of the students – yet what better way than recruiting them into the order? Still, we might interject here that William Dunbar, too, took his master’s degree at St Andrews and still avoided recruitment into the order.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{73} This is despite the persistence of the idea that Dunbar’s poem \textit{How Dunbar was desyrd to be ane Freir} was supposedly autobiographical and he had been a member of the Franciscan order early in his life; see Chapter 5, p. 178.
The attitude of the Observants is also borne out in their relationship with the founder of the Observant friary at St Andrews, Bishop James Kennedy, who was also the founder of St Salvator’s College, a seminary attached to the university. Its foundation pre-dated his foundation of the Observant friary by slightly more than a decade. Its charter, dated August 1450, describes it as a ‘notable college of theologians and artists, dedicated to the Holy Saviour and endowed for thirteen persons, like to the number of the Apostles’. Property was mortified to the use of a college ‘to be founded for the souls’ weal of the late King James and Queen Joan, the Bishop’s kinsmen and his predecessors in the see of St Andrews, his brothers, sisters and benefactors, and of all the pious dead’. It has been argued that the Franciscans had similar aims as those Kennedy laid down for St Salvator, which are perhaps best described in the words of James IV in his letter to Pope Julius II, wherein he stated that they ‘have stood for the salvation of souls: they have remedied neglect by others: the sacraments are ministered and Christ’s word is faithfully proclaimed’. It has also been claimed that the guardian of the St Andrews friary, Robert Keith, was a ‘choice spirit’ whose character greatly appealed to Kennedy. This was the friar Robert who had been matriculated at Cologne as a student of theology in 1439 as Robert de Keth. He was a doctor of theology and became the first guardian of the St Andrews friary, whom Hay described as an ‘ideal Franciscan’, by which he presumably meant that, if he had indeed been a member of the Marischal family, he had renounced title and possessions.

The Mace of St Salvator’s College was commissioned by Bishop Kennedy in 1461 and was, for a time, seen as a clear link between the Observants and the College. This mace is an impressive piece of medieval silverwork, which had been commissioned by the college’s founder in 1461 and is still being used at University of St Andrews ceremonies. The head of the Mace is the part in question, depicting a shrine with the Holy Saviour in its centre and surrounded by angels holding the arma Christi. Below the figure of the Holy Saviour are three figures surrounding the shrine, facing outward: A king, a bishop and a third figure, which both Brook and

74 Dunlop, James Kennedy, p. 274.
75 Dunlop, James Kennedy, p. 297; James IV Letters, no. 76, p. 54.
76 Dunlop, Kennedy, p. 297; Bryce, i, p. 288, ii, p. 175; Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 52; For Robert Keith, see Chapter 2, pp. 36-7 and Appendix 2, p. 268.
Cant took to be the Observant Franciscan.  

This would provide us with unique evidence of the importance, in whichever function, of the Observants within the University of St Andrews. Unfortunately this would also be far too easy, since if one actually looks at the mace, it becomes far less clear how this could indeed be an Observantine Friar. He does not look to be an ecclesiastical figure at all, certainly not a member of an order. Besides, the mace had been commissioned in 1461 and as we have seen above the friars were not endowed with a place in St Andrews before 1463. We do not know when the Observants had first come to Bishop Kennedy’s attention, but he was involved in the foundation of the friary at Edinburgh which was within his diocese. There appears to have been some uncertainty among the friars over whether or not they could accept the buildings that went with the site they were granted. They were uncomfortable living in what were described as ‘fine buildings’, when their rule distinctly required them to live in poverty, but accepted them when Bishop Kennedy ‘incorporated the friary into the patrimony of the Holy See’.  

David McRoberts suggested in 1976 that the figure in question is most likely a burgess, dressed in similar garb as ‘merchants and well-to-do townsfolk’ are seen ‘wearing in Flemish altar-pieces, French manuscript miniatures, or in Italian frescoes’ from the fifteenth century. It would certainly make much more sense to have the three estates on this mace, rather than two estates and a friar. There is one flaw in this theory, however. The university and the burgesses did not get on well in St Andrews. Also we are looking at an item playing a significant role in University ceremony. We have already identified the two figures on this mace that had a definite connection with St Andrews University, or indeed with any medieval Scottish University: the king and a bishop. So why not take the next logical step and assume that the third figure, rather than representing a burgess or a friar, represents the one group of university life still missing, the student? If this is indeed the case then only the presence of the initials JH surmounted by a crown in the decoration of the staff would point to a Franciscan element in connection with the mace, referring of course to the devotion of the Holy Name which originated with Bernardino de Siena and his  
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practice of displaying a panel inscribed with the letters IHS at his sermons, for his listeners to meditate on.80

The only provable connection between the Observants and St Andrews university was with St Mary’s College, which had been planned by Archbishop James Beaton in the 1520s ‘for the teaching of Theology, Law, Physic, and other liberal disciplines’, apparently with the intention of ‘recruiting secular clergy within his own diocese’. The foundation was completed in 1544 under the supervision of Archbishop John Hamilton (author of the Hamilton Catechism of 1552), who played a pivotal role in the established church’s reform movement. It was he who decreed that a body of seven praesentatores was to carry out annual visitations of the college and had the right ‘of appointment to the office of Provost or Principal’. These seven included the provincials of both the Observant Franciscans and the Dominicans of St Andrews.81 So it seems that, on the eve of the Reformation at least, the friars in St Andrews had moved from being ‘pastors and confessors’ to being involved in the administrative side of the university as well.

This leaves Glasgow, the second Scottish university town, which also had its university established before it added the Observantine friary to its religious inventory. This was the fourth Observantine house to be founded in Scotland, following Edinburgh, St Andrews and Aberdeen by roughly a decade. Glasgow University had been founded in the spring of 1451, with William Turnbull, bishop of Glasgow, as its first rector. Turnbull, like William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen, had both been students at Louvain82 The Observant friary itself was created through a grant by John Laing, bishop of Glasgow, of lands just to the west of the High Street. Alongside Laing, Thomas Forsyth, canon of Glasgow cathedral and rector of Glasgow, is listed as donor. There have been suggestions that the friary had been founded as early as 1472, attributing the foundation to William Turnbull himself, but the standard reference work on Scotland’s religious houses suggests that this is

80 I am very grateful to Rosemary Hayes and Anne Sutton for sharing their knowledge of the issues surrounding this mace. McRoberts, ‘Bishop Kennedy’s Mace’, p. 168; van Os, Art of Devotion, p. 170; Pfaff, New Liturgical Feasts, p. 62.
81 Cant, University of St Andrews, pp. 34-9; Dunlop, Acta Facultatis, p. 5. Dunlop refers to a document brought to her attention by Dr John Durkan, in the Public Record Office, London, a petition to the pope: PRO 31/10/17, transcript of Reg. Supp., 1870, fols. 124v-125r.
82 Dunlop, James Kennedy, p. 276.
doubtful. Unlike St Andrews and the obvious link to Bishop Kennedy, it is not yet possible to clearly link Turnbull, a senior figure within Glasgow University, with the foundation of the Observantine house. Either way, their connection with the bishops of Glasgow is traceable and both the Black and Greyfriars' houses were in close vicinity to the university, as was also the case in St Andrews. But the presence of the rector in the original foundation of the friary could provide a point to start looking for evidence which would define their relationship with Glasgow University.

Father John Hay, the sixteenth-century chronicler of the Franciscans, wrote that the archbishop of Glasgow was 'imbued with an earnest love for the Order of Observance', and its friars had the 'special duty of hearing the confessions of the students'. In view of this the situation in Glasgow was much the same situation as at St Andrews, where the special relations between bishop and Observant friars and their role as administrators of pastoral care to the students have been emphasised.

Although it has been pointed out that 'few names of consequence are associated with the Glasgow Greyfriars', those that have been identified suggest once again that the Scottish Observants were as keen on educated friars as their forerunners had been on the continent. Among these was John Paterson, described as a 'theologian'. He was superior or warden of several houses, most notably Glasgow in 1531 and St Andrews in 1540, two of the three Scottish university towns. In his capacity as superior of the Scottish Greyfriars he also attended the provincial church council of 1549. Paterson left Scotland in 1559 to live as an exile in yet another university town, Louvain, where he died in 1573. It might be interesting to note that the discussions about the intellectual state of the clergy, which were the subject of the Scottish provincial councils as well as the Council of Trent, led to yet another Scottish Observant being employed by a Scottish monarch more than five years after the Reformation: in accordance with Tridentine decrees, Mary Queen of Scots

85 Bryce, i, p. 343; vol. 2, p. 187.
86 The council of 1549 was the first of the provincial councils for which any records survived.
87 Winning, 'Church Councils', pp. 331, 334, 337; Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 172; Durkan, 'Observant Franciscan Province', p. 54; Ross, 'Some Notes', pp. 199-200 and note 58.
appointed four ‘Catholic men of learning’ in December 1565 for public preaching. Among these was John Roger, the last guardian of the Aberdeen friary.88

Besides John Paterson, another notable member of the Glasgow Observantine friary was Andrew Cairns, who was qualified in canon law and theology and was involved in a controversy with Scottish Conventual Franciscans in 1521, and two friars who shall be encountered later: Patrick Ranwick, guardian of the Stirling friary and confessor to James IV, and William of Touris, author of the penitential poem Contemplacioun of Synnaris. Both appear in university documents as witnesses, towards the end of the fifteenth century.89

This then brings us to the last university to be founded before the Reformation, and in many ways the odd one out as far as the Observants are concerned, since they were already present in the burgh some twenty-five years before the university was founded in 1495. As in St Andrews and Glasgow, there is evidence that relations between the Observant friars and the episcopate in Aberdeen were good. Certainly, William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen from 1484 until his death in 1514 and founder of King’s College, acted as a patron to the Observant friars. On 16 November 1514, Thomas Myrton, archdeacon of Aberdeen, was confirmed as the executor of William Elphinstone’s estate, and authorised ‘to spend eighty merks’90 on a yard and tenement for the Friars Minors’. This was to be shared with the Dominicans of Edinburgh, in whose house Elphinstone’s viscera had been buried. The sum was to be bestowed upon ‘the provincial and the [Dominican] order for the building of a convent within the University of St Andrews’, ‘as a centre for higher study associated with the university. It has also been suggested that, when undertaking the foundation of the University of Aberdeen, Elphinstone ‘turned deliberately to the Black Friars of Aberdeen to commit them at an early stage to his venture’. This would suggest that Elphinstone, too, did not necessarily see the

89 Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, pp. 172-173; Durkan, ‘Observant Franciscan Province’, p. 54.
90 In Scotland (as in England) merks was also used as a unit for reckoning currency. One merk was 13s. 4d (2/3 £), but from 1367 onwards the Scottish sterling had a lower value than the English, so that in 1501 one English merk was worth 3 mk.10 s. Scots. See P. Spufford, Handbook of Medieval Exchange (London, 1986), pp. 198, 211-212.
The Observants in an academic role. Elphinstone himself had been a student at Louvain, as well as a student of canon law at the University of Glasgow in 1473 and rector of Glasgow in 1474. Louvain was in many ways the academic counterpart of Cologne but, unlike Cologne, it was a ‘new’ university, founded in 1425 and ‘much more local in its orientation’, drawing the greater part of its students from the Netherlands. Nevertheless, it influenced the Scottish universities as much as Cologne or Paris had.

In conclusion then we have to admit that much more is known about the Observants’ involvement in later-medieval Scottish devotional practice than we know about their role in education and educational institutions. On a purely geographical level, their influence on later-medieval Scottish society could be expected to be restricted to the burghs; the medieval town was, after all, their chosen purview. Their founders, Francis and Dominic, had taken the rather provocative step of sending their followers into the busiest part of medieval society, the towns, instead of seeking seclusion, as religious orders would have been expected to do up until this point. The question and element of seclusion was still there – as religious and members of an order they had to be apart, but they brought the devotional practices of the religious to the marketplace, as it were, and made it accessible to a laity that desired to be involved in them. And just like their European and mendicant counterparts, the Observants’ role in the Scottish burghs, too, was a prominent one, as would be suggested by the 1503 entry into Edinburgh of James IV and his young bride, Margaret Tudor, where they were greeted by a delegation of Observants immediately before entering the burgh (the full significance of which will be dealt with in the context of royal patronage of the Scottish Observants).
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3: The Observants and Society: Education, Devotion and Literature
With the Scottish evidence as patchy as it is for the later-medieval period, we
find that it is rather difficult to attribute specific influences within the spiritual life of
the Scottish burghs to the Observants. As can be deduced from William of Touris’
devotional poem, the Scottish Observants were – just like their European brethren –
active contributors to the cult of the passion. But there is not enough evidence to
specify exactly which of the different expressions of that cult in the parish churches
of the Scottish burghs the Observants were actively involved in, either through
fraternities which they oversaw, or through very specific Franciscan devotional
elements incorporated in, for example, altar trappings. The only evidence we have
that this must have happened is the Edinburgh confraternity of the Holy Blood,
whose banner gives such prominence to the Franciscan image of the cordelière – one
can only lament at how many others might have been lost, for, as always in the study
of later-medieval Scottish History, we must conclude that a lack of evidence does not
mean that this evidence did not exist at some point.

The same is true of the Observants’ involvement in the Scottish universities.
The evidence, scarce as it is at this stage, seems to suggest that the Observants,
although clearly linked to these universities in some ways, showed a certain initial
reluctance in getting involved in their academic side. The Observants were known to
have shunned certain European universities, especially Paris, because they perceived
them to be corrupted and therefore detractive to the Observant way of life. Francis’
own attitude to learning was one of mistrust; he recognised the inherent danger of
ambition within it. Nevertheless one should beware of applying too romantic an
element to the Observants’ reticence in academic matters; they were not immune to
transgressions, or how else could one explain the Aberdeen ‘jowal house’ or the
stained glass windows in the Glasgow friary, after the Edinburgh community had
created such a fuss about accepting buildings that were perceived as too luxurious to
house Observant friars. Although the Observants had been formed out of an ideal, it
might be wise not to assume them to be idealists, but rather pragmatists, acutely
aware of the difference between ideal and necessity. Education was necessary, as
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long as one avoided the ‘pride’ that had so dogged the Paris masters. And the many Observant friars that appear in university documents were never part of the Scottish universities’ hierarchy – although they may have moved from within it to the Observants.

Besides, the Scottish universities were relatively young in comparison to the great European universities, and, one would hope, still uncorrupted; still it is evident that the Scottish Observants did not share the same academic prominence at the Scottish universities as their Franciscan forerunners and Continental brethren had at continental universities. That is not to say that the Scottish Observants were uneducated: on the contrary, a significant proportion of friars had studied either at European universities (mainly Paris and Cologne) or could be found enrolled at the Scottish universities. Friars Anthony Baldowy, Andrew Cairns, Jerome Lindsay, John Litstar (junior), Thomas Ray and John Scott had all been students at St Andrews, while David Crannoch and William of Touris had been students at Paris (Touris has also been linked with Glasgow university), and Gerard Texel, Robert Keith, John Richardson and John Litstar (senior) had studied at Cologne. What is most unfortunate, however, is that for most of these friars it is impossible to determine whether they were students at these universities before the entered the order or after, which would have meant that the order would have encouraged them to study, although none of them appears to have pursued an academic career beyond graduation. That is not to say that they did not continue their studies in some way, as the St Andrews friary was especially renowned for housing friars involved in inquisitorial activities, such as Simon Maltman, who presided at the trial of Jerome Russell, who was burnt at the stake in 1539 for his Protestant views. But we can assume that a number of the above-mentioned friars would have been recruited to the Observant order while at university.

There was no great tradition of Observant mendicant masters at European universities (certainly not on the scale as there had been in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), yet the Observants eventually warmed to academia, possibly more than was compatible with the ideals of the early Observants. The fact that there is so little evidence of the Scottish Observants’ involvement in the universities that were all on their doorsteps, so to speak, may be for as mundane a reason as has been
suggested for the Dominicans of St Andrews, that the university there was so clearly dominated by the Augustinian canons attached to the university. Or, as in Glasgow, it may be the case that the Dominicans had settled in the burgh in the mid-thirteenth century and were well established by the time the university was founded, that they were a natural choice to involve in its foundation – were it not for the suggestion that in Aberdeen Bishop Elphinstone specifically involved the Dominicans rather than the Observants. Although we are not given a reason for his choice, it cannot have been for a lack of prominence of the Observants within the burgh of Aberdeen, as Elphinstone himself was a distinguished patron. As such, he would have been very much aware of them and their qualities, and it may be that he was also aware that, as an order, the Scottish Observants were more suited (or more willing) to play a pastoral role in the academic world.94

But then education did not need to be only of an academic nature; in its most general form, education encompasses a number of different aspects that can also be of a spiritual nature, instructors in meditation perhaps. Their own literary output, as far as it is accessible to us now, deals with education, both moral and spiritual, always concerned with salvation, and instructing members of the laity in the tools needed to achieve this. In this manner, the Observant Franciscans were far more prominent as spiritual counsellors – not least in the environment of the Scottish royal court, which is where much more evidence is concentrated. A different kind of education perhaps, but at a time when the salvation of the soul was a crucial issue, it was no less important than the more formal education offered by the universities. It is also entirely consistent with the attraction the devotio moderna held for the Franciscans. It seems that while men like Ximenes de Cisneros wholeheartedly embraced the Humanist teachings and put them to use in the milieu of the university, the Scottish Observants once again followed the Dutch example and put their efforts into the more mysticism-informed realm of spiritual guidance and the issue of salvation. In many ways the Scottish Observants’ activities in any of these areas, devotion, literature and education, also had an impact on the question of patronage. The Contemplacioun had been written for James IV, while their activities at the Scottish universities brought them to the attention of not only those they eventually

94 Referring especially to the Spanish Observant Ximenes de Cisneros, who was actively involved in the foundation of the University of Alcalá in the 1490s, see Moorman, History, pp. 537-8.
recruited into the order, but also their families, some of them noble. And some of those families had the means to become noteworthy patrons of the Observant order in Scotland.
Chapter 4
Matters of Money and Patronage:
Benefactors Royal, Noble and Burghal

The contribution of the Scottish Observant Franciscans to devotion, literature and education in late-medieval Scotland has been used as a means to gauge their involvement in the spiritual and devotional life of not only the Scottish burghs and their inhabitants, but also the milieu of the Scottish court and the royal house of Stewart. In order to assess their impact and the actual influence they had through this involvement, we need to look at the situation from the point of view of the ‘customer’, as it were, if we are to continue with the metaphor begun in the previous chapter: the friar as a merchant laying out his ‘wares’ in a marketplace that dealt in spiritual commodities. The ‘customers’ in this case were the patrons of the Observant Franciscans, those members of society who could afford (either as individuals, or collectively as a family, or members of a craft, confraternity, or burgh council) to support the friars with alms and gifts in return for prayers for one’s soul, or the souls of the members of family or confraternity, often including the souls of the ‘predecessors and successors’. As such, these benefactions often also included the monarch and his extended family. This was general practice: when James Kennedy founded his College of St. Salvator in August 1450 in St Andrews, property was mortified to the use of a college ‘to be founded for the souls’ weal of the late King James and Queen Joan, the Bishop’s kinsmen and his predecessors in the see of St Andrews, his brothers, sisters and benefactors, and of all the pious dead’. Likewise, when Walter Bertram, provost of Edinburgh, settled an annual income of £26 13s 4d on the Dominican order, he did so in return for prayers for the souls of James III, Margaret of Denmark, James IV and ‘his predecessors and successors’.1

Brooke in her study on the origins of the mendicant orders asked the question of why – after initial misgivings – these orders took off in such grand fashion in the early thirteenth century, until they had established themselves as reputable. She saw the reason partly in both Francis’ and Dominic’s ‘absolute loyalty and orthodoxy’ to the church and its teachings – incidentally even critics of the mendicant orders would

---
1 Dunlop, James Kennedy, p. 274; Foggie, Renaissance Religion, p. 190.
never question the founders’ sanctity – but more importantly their lifestyle and their return to the world rather than seclusion from it ‘exercised a powerful appeal to the imagination’. At the same time, they managed to arrive in the wake of a new fashion: instead of patronising the large established monasteries, those with the means to do so turned rather to founding hospitals and ‘institutions of social welfare’. Most importantly, Brooke identifies a change in the idea of how salvation can be achieved: no longer through the intercession of others (i.e. the monks in their monasteries), but through one’s own actions, which can be linked to the devotional exercises championed by the Franciscans, as we have just seen.2

As Averkorn has suggested, the friars were in danger of going out of fashion, certainly on the Continent, and it took the Observant movement to inject new vitality into the movement.3 This trend can be traced in Scotland, too, where most of the Conventual houses had been founded in the thirteenth century, and a further two in the fourteenth century, before 1384. Only Kirkcudbright was founded in the mid-fifteenth century, but once the Observants had arrived, there seemed to be no further interest in any further Conventual foundations. However, as we have already said, they were not reformed or supplanted by the Observant friars, despite the fact that this was expressly permitted in the founding bull of the Observants in Scotland; after all, reform of their Conventual brethren was one of the main missions of the Observants ever since their inception. The only Observant house founded with the express desire to pose an example to an order already in the burgh was Jedburgh, but the target of the burgesses’ displeasure was not a Conventual house, but the Augustinian Abbey. In this context, we also need to remind ourselves that reform of a Conventual friary was regulated by papal decree: it was not to be imposed by outsiders, and a majority of two-thirds was required within any Conventual house to allow for reform. In practice this decree tended to be ignored, and the one thing that gave the authority to force a reform on a Franciscan house was patronage.

Patronage was perhaps the most essential aspect of medieval religious life; without it any religious foundation would have found the length and quality of its existence severely restricted. Patronage was paramount to the successful settlement and continued survival of any religious order and any religious foundation. At the

---

same time the level of patronage given to any particular order was also an indication of its appeal, and the competition was fierce. The second half of the fifteenth century brought new fashions in piety: new or stricter sets of devotions became popular amongst certain parts of society. As such, the Observants offered a distinctive cult on the religious landscape and the laity immediately took to them, especially since they brought a renewed spiritual fervour which many had felt the secular clergy lacked.⁴

Patronage of a religious order is, of course, very much linked to the personal experience that prospective patrons associated with the order in question: they must feel a certain affinity to the order on which they wish to bestow alms or gifts, and a number of factors might affect patrons’ decisions. One should naturally give credit to a distinctly personal spiritual preference, an individual’s choice as to what kind of spiritual example they wished to rely on for their souls. Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to gauge this particular motivation. Where medieval kings and queens have left us with a statement of their personal faith, it is almost always possible to detect ulterior motives. Likewise, relying on outside testimony is fraught with the same problems, because patronage of religious orders, like so much else, was subject to fashion and a kind of conspicuous consumption. It had certainly become fashionable in the later-medieval period to show affinity to those orders that adhered to a stricter observance of their founders’ rule and showed a willingness to reform. These traits attracted the attention of princes all over Europe, and, in the case of the Observant Franciscans, gave them the platform from which to launch themselves across the Continent and achieve their desired goal of reforming the Conventual Franciscan houses.

Patronage could take two forms: gifts in kind or in cash. Annual rents from patrons would most likely be in cash rather than kind, which made the friars part of an (urban) cash economy, a fact not entirely in keeping with the Franciscan ideal of poverty.⁵ If a donation was given in cash rather than kind, the benefactor often specified what it was to be used for: Elizabeth Vindegatis, who is listed in the Aberdeen Obituary as a notable benefactress of the Aberdeen friary, left 3000 merks

⁵ Moir Bryce has pointed out that the Observants, unlike the other mendicant orders, did not accept annual rents for prayers for the dead, although they did receive cash payments for them: see Bryce, i, p. 274 and below.
to the Observants with the instruction that the money be used to purchase ‘chalices, ornaments, images, bells, etc.’, while Egidia Blair, Lady of Row, gave 120 merks towards the construction of the second friary church at Aberdeen. She also granted twenty merks ‘to the chaplains and friars on the day of her burial, and forty pounds, two pairs of blankets, three bed-rugs and one bed-cover of needlework to the Grey Friars (the 'Fratres Minimi') of Ayr.6

Francis in his Rule had demanded that the friars not accept money in any form, either personally or through an intermediary (a provisor or nuntius). Yet many of his rules, while highly idealistic, became impractical for an order which had – by its Rule – rejected all means of self-sufficiency. In this manner the mendicant lifestyle created a dependency that left the friars open to external pressure, as we have seen in the reforms of a large number of Conventual houses in Europe, which were forced on them by their benefactors by threatening to withhold further patronage. As far as Francis’ prohibition against handling money was concerned, there is sufficient evidence that it was relaxed even among the Observants – as evidenced by the fact that this practice became yet another weapon in the arsenal of the friars’ critics. In Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales, a bursarius makes an appearance as a ‘sturdy harlot, who bears a sack into which go the receipts of the begging’ in order to allow the friars to maintain their facade of moral purity. The protagonist of the satirical ‘Epistle directed frome the holie Heremite of Larite, to his Brethrein the Gray Friers’ (composed in 1539 by Alexander Cunningham, Earl of Glencairn) tells his brethren (the Observant Greyfriars) that their order ‘handles no money;/ But for other casusalitie,/ As beefe, meele, butter, and cheese,/ Or what I have that ye please’ to send the friars et habite.7 There is evidence from the Scottish records that a ‘provisor’ was used for handling money gifts, especially in Stirling and Glasgow. There are a number of other entries, where a person is delegated to handle alms for the friars, though unfortunately we do not encounter the actual title of ‘provisor’ again.8 Most interesting in this context is the person of Sir Andrew [Schir Andro]

6 Stones, (ed.), Three Scottish Carmelite Friaries, pp. 30-2; Bryce, i, pp. 332-3, 341.
8 Habig, St Francis of Assisi: Writings and Early Biographies, p. 60; TA, i, p. 390: ‘giffin to the Gray Freris prouisour in Striuelin, to the bigging’. TA, ii, p. 69; TA, i, p. 381. On the same day (7 March
Makbrek, who appears several times as accepting alms on behalf of the Observants: in 1503 he is being paid 20s ‘that he laid doun to the Gray Freris of Air’ the previous year.⁹

These examples already show that the Scottish Observants attracted patrons from all levels of Scottish society, burgesses, noblemen and noblewomen, especially those whose families had a particular connection with a particular burgh (or perhaps even a particular friar although it has thus far proven difficult to associate Observant friars to particular noble families)¹⁰ as well as members of the ecclesiastical establishment. In the ecclesiastical burghs of Glasgow, St Andrews and Aberdeen, the main patronage appears to have come from the bishops and the burgesses. Episcopal patronage became a weapon of the friars’ critics: they were accused of having the ‘bishops charitie’ and were thus less inclined to preach against episcopal misconduct – you did not bite the hand that fed you.

This theme could also be found in Adam Abell’s treatment of the reign of James IV: if the great patron of the Observants misbehaved, it was bad counsel that was to be blamed, not he.¹¹ That the Scottish kings acted as patrons to the Observants, most famously James IV, has long been taken for granted by historians, who often emphasise the particular attraction which the Observants exerted on the house of Stewart, but rarely analyse this claim in detail. A convincing theory as to why royal patronage was safeguarded through the discontinuity (both political as well as in terms of personnel at the Scottish court), caused by the often lengthy minorities with which every Stewart king from James I to VI commenced their reigns, has yet to be put forward.

A connection between the friars and the royal houses of Europe was not an unusual feature, and it often went beyond mere patronage. In late thirteenth-century France the Franciscans and Dominicans offered their services to the crown and were used for diplomatic missions, suggesting that they were trusted, but also had

1497-8) he is reported to have been given 15s for the Observants of Ayr and £3 ‘to gif in almous to pur folkis’ by the king. See also TA, ii, p. 75.

Sir Andro Makbrek’ given £3, to ‘gif to preistis in Strivelin to say iij trentales of messis de Sancta Maria de Cruce et de requie’.

⁹ TA, ii, p. 250.

¹⁰ See, for example, Robert Keith, allegedly a member of the Marishal family, or Jerome Lindsay, allegedly a son of the Earl of Crawford.
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enormous influence at the highest echelons of society. The France of Louis IX, one of the most famous patrons of the mendicant orders, saw the employment of Franciscans and Dominicans in diplomatic missions. Lawrence sees monarchs’ attraction to the mendicants, especially Franciscans and Dominicans, as a result of their ‘unique combination of piety, education and detachment’, and because they had ‘opted out of the race for ecclesiastical preferment’. They ‘offered all the advantages of conscientious and sagacious management consultants who were completely disinterested and who would accept no fee’.12

That the Scottish kings showed an interest in the mendicant orders has already been shown in Janet Foggie’s study on the Dominicans. The suggestion that the Scottish Dominicans be granted the right to introduce the Observance into Scotland was made by James II in 1468 – husband of Mary of Gueldres, whose influence is generally suspected behind the arrival of the Observant Franciscans. In 1478, James III set up annual prayers for the soul of Margaret of Denmark, his wife, in the Edinburgh Dominican convent – although it was set up in advance, as Margaret did not die until 1486, and in August that year he settled an annual rent of £10 on the Aberdeen Dominican convent. Foggie suggested that it was through the financial support of James III that the Dominicans were able to establish the Scottish province between 1470 and 1481. The province itself was subject to a ‘stagnation’ in the reign of James IV, but despite his pronounced interest in the Observants, she believes that he, too, was continuing patronage of the Dominican order: for one, he continued to stay in Dominican guest houses, visits which included the usual gifts to them on their altars, and he certainly took enough interest to support the case of their provincial, David Adamson’s, claim to the vicarage of Lundeiff.13

The Scottish kings never favoured historians with a clear statement on their opinion on the Observants; the few instances where they do, their display of support was almost certainly informed by a hidden agenda. It is very rare that we find a king in their own words describing their personal piety. Rare indeed are instances such as Queen Mary’s well-known ‘death-bed speech’, but these public displays of piety were always problematic, for they were for the benefit of an audience. The question of James V’s spirituality is essential if one is to investigate his relationship with the

12 Lawrence, Friars, p. 173.
13 Foggie, Renaissance Religion, pp. 18-2, 28-34.
Observants, which is ambiguous at best. While it is true that he, like his father, chose a confessor from the Stirling friary, there are suggestions that he was involved with anti-fraternal writing which, according to Edington, was born out of the humanist atmosphere at court. She also cites the Duke of Norfolk writing to Thomas Cromwell in 1539 stating that there might be a suggestion that he could be wishing to follow in his uncle’s religious footsteps. Nevertheless, it is quite necessary to bring a king’s personal piety into the scope of this investigation, even if it is a most problematic issue, for entangled in the matter of royal patronage is a question, which is as difficult to answer as it is intriguing: the question of how the medieval kings chose their confessors.

The spiritual advisor of Louis IX was a member of the Grand Couvent des Cordeliers in Paris, as well as the confessor of his wife, Marguerite of Provence. Indeed Averkorn suspected that all confessors of Louis IX had been either Franciscans or Dominicans, and his sisters were also prominent in patronising or founding a convent of Franciscan nuns at Longchamp, which became a place of burial for members of the royal family. His sister Isabelle also had Franciscan confessors. So already we have a connection between royal family and mendicant confessors, something that was to become quite commonplace; there had been mendicant confessors certainly in the family of the Dukes of Burgundy since the late thirteenth century, although in Scotland this trend cannot be observed before the end of the reign of James IV. In both France and England, ‘Franciscan and Dominican friars were retained in constant attendance at court’, primarily in a pastoral role, to provide ‘the king and the royal family with confessors’, to which purpose Henry III even got an indul from Innocent IV, ‘dispensing them from those of their statutes that required the brethren at all times to travel on foot and permitting them to ride horses, so that they could keep up with the court’. This last point is interesting, for if the ‘original’ Franciscans had this in their statutes, then the Observants definitely had it, which begs the question whether James V bothered to get a dispensation for

---

14 C. Edington, Court and Culture in Renaissance Scotland: Sir David Lindsay of the Mount (Amherst, 1994), pp. 47-8.
17 Lawrence, Friars, pp. 168-170.
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his confessor when he had him take a horse to get from Stirling to Falkland as fast as could be.

James I’s confessor was John Fogo, Abbot of Melrose. The confessor of James III was John Ireland, author of the Mirror of Wisdom; in the many stories surrounding the death of James III at the battle of Sauchieburn, it was suggested that James called for his confessor, which allowed a treacherous priest to kill him. Then we have James IV, whose confessor was Patrick Ranwick, an Observant of Stirling, who advised him about the iron girdle, to be worn as penance for his role in his father’s death. And James V’s confessor was Friar Laing, the friar who appears to have been the object of so much ridicule at the hands of the sixteenth century satirists. It would be too much to hope ever to find evidence of the queens’ confessors; only the three confessors of Mary, Queen of Scots, are known to us, all of whom were Dominican. Rene Benoît was a French Dominican, who had come with her from France in August 1561, when she returned to Scotland after the death of her husband, Francis II, and who remained her confessor until he fled with Ninian Winzet in 1562. From 1562 until his death in 1566, the Scottish Dominican John Black served as her confessor. By 1567, her confessor was the Spanish Dominican Roche Marmerot.

Interestingly, Lawrence points out that the friars travelling outside their houses had to be accompanied by a socius, which resulted in friars of both orders forming little communities apart when in attendance at the English court. Rene Benoît, too, was accompanied by another Dominican when travelling in Scotland, Michel Ferré. If the friars’ primary role at court was as confessors, then we would not expect the Franciscans to take up any kind of residence at the Scottish court until James IV chose an Observant confessor. If so, then in Scotland of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there would not be a need for an Observant friar to take up residence at court, since there was an Observant settlement always close to a royal residence. The example of the confessor being summoned to Falkland would suggest that the king’s confessor did not indeed spend all his time at court. But this episode might also suggest that it might have always been the same friar who acted as
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18 Thorson, ‘Roit and quheill of time’, p. 222.
19 Lynch, Queen in Three Kingdoms, pp. 16, 19; Papal Negs., p. 520.
20 Papal Negs., p. 518.
confessor, since he was named in the Exchequer Rolls. This in turn raises the question of what Friars Ranwick and Laing did when the king in question was nowhere near Stirling and needed his confessor. One would assume that a king as notoriously guilt-ridden at James IV would want his confessor close at all times, not just when he was at or close to Stirling. According to Lawrence, in an age where 'contrition and penance were major themes in the piety ... a confessor was ... an indispensable member of every royal entourage and noble household'. He also suggests that kings would go by the example of their predecessors in choosing their confessors. In this way Henry III and his successors had Dominican confessors, a tradition not broken until the English crown passed to the House of Lancaster with the accession of Henry IV. Lawrence also gives us the name of Henry III's confessor, Brother John of Darlington, who also acted as confessor to his son Edward I until his death, upon which Walter Winterborne took over as Edward’s confessor. This is a definite indication that the part of king’s confessor was an office for life, or until the monarch died, or the king deliberately chose another.

That James IV appears to have thought highly of the Observant Franciscans is shown in his letter to Julius II, written in February 1507, when he sent letters both to Pope Julius II and to the Cardinal Protector of Scotland in order to express his opposition to plans to once again unite the Franciscan order, Observants and Conventuals. He is rather indignant in his letters; in his opinion, the Franciscans could not be trusted to keep St Francis’ Rule properly in the past. Therefore the Observants, whose very raison d’être was a desire for strict Observance of the Rule, should not ‘be brought again to a less strict manner of living’. He also explained why the Observants were so important to him: they had been closely connected to his family since their arrival in Scotland, ‘his father (James III) honoured them and his mother (Margaret of Denmark) was their cordial friend.’ James’ protestations of the virtues of the Observants and the role they played in Scotland were his reaction to a gathering convened by Pope Julius in Rome in 1506, which discussed the state of the Franciscan order. Nor was he in mean company: Moorman stated that Julius was

---

21 Lawrence, Friars, p. 170-1.
22 James IV Letters, No. 76, pp. 54-5; Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 52. It should be noted, however, that James IV did not restrict this kind of vocabulary to the Observants alone: in a letter dated 20 July 1507 he expounded on the virtues of David Adamson, provincial of the Scottish Dominicans, as a 'man of proved character and judgement': Foggie, Renaissance Religion, p. 29.
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rather ‘surprised to find out how much support the Observants were getting’ from princes and magnates throughout Europe, who, along with the Scottish king, sent their petitions to him on behalf of the Observants.  

This family connection was confirmed in a similar letter written in late 1532, this time by James V to Frederick I of Denmark, brother of Margaret of Denmark, wife of James III. In this letter he states that his preference for the order of Observant Franciscans did not come as much from following his father’s example as from following ‘that of his grandmother, Frederick’s sister, from whose breast it is no secret that James IV derived a strong sense of duty to God, likewise the example of John, late king of Denmark, [his] great-grandfather and Frederick’s brother’. Considering the difficult relationship between James IV and his father – James III left his sons’ education mainly to their mother, and at one point he even tried to exclude James from the succession because he mistrusted him – it is not surprising that James would dismiss the influence his father had on him. There is no evidence to suggest that James III had any special interest in the Observants. On one occasion, in 1474, he used the Edinburgh Blackfriars’ house to formalise the marriage between his infant son and the five-year-old daughter of Edward IV; there is no record of whether he used the Edinburgh Observant Franciscan house for similar purposes. However, in 1482 there are suggestions that he neglected royal patronage of the Dundee (Conventual) Franciscan house, who were forced to ‘pawn their books and ecclesiastical furnishings to sustain a miserable life’.

James V’s letter, however, is in essence a plea to Frederick to restore the Danish Franciscans to their property and halt the ‘detestation and contempt’ suffered by them at the hands of the Lutherans. It is therefore not surprising that James would emphasise the influence the Danish part of his ancestry had had on him and it is necessary to bear in mind that at least part of it might have been exaggerated so as to have more effect on Frederick and maybe shame him, in the face of the piousness of other members of his immediate family, into action. This had been done before by his father, James IV, concerning the circumstance of the death of Margaret of

23 Moorman, History, p. 573.
27 James V Letters, p. 231.
Denmark. In order to justify the rebellion of 1488 which led to the death of James III at Sauchieburn, propaganda was fed to the then Danish king that Margaret had been poisoned, an act which had been condoned, if not participated in, by James III, her husband.\textsuperscript{28}

There is still a possibility that there may have been some truth in both James IV and V's assessments, but the claim of Margaret of Denmark's involvement with the Observants is problematic at best. There is no other evidence of Margaret's association with the Observants than this one letter by James V. If, as the letter seems to suggest, Margaret had indeed been more devoted to them than her son, the great patron of the Observants, it must have bordered on zeal and should have produced ample evidence. But unlike the portrait of Isabella, Duchess of Brittany, Margaret's portrait on the Holy Trinity church triptych shows her in the company of St George, not Francis.

There were advantages in being close to the king which the friars would have greatly appreciated, despite Lawrence's protestations that they did not seek wealth or patronage; he certainly underestimated the need for patronage. The question is how far this was true of the Observants in Scotland, since they would not have been involved in government to the extent that Louis IX allowed, for example, through participation in council sessions or parliaments, or as 'negotiators of marriages between members of royal families of different kingdoms' and in 'treaty negotiations they were ... communicators of the king's personal wishes as well as keepers of his conscience'.\textsuperscript{29} There is no record of a member of the Observant Franciscan order in Scotland ever being involved in any of these activities. They were not, for example, called upon to attend the marriage negotiations of the marriage of James IV and Margaret Tudor (though they were virtually the first to meet them at the Royal entry into Edinburgh in 1503).\textsuperscript{30} And the Observants would have had an obligation not to seek high office and this kind of prestige, so that we find them once again in a pastoral role at court, as confessors, as we did at the universities. That it was possible

\textsuperscript{28} MacDougall, James III, pp. 246-7; MacDougall, James IV, pp. 1, 26, 39.
\textsuperscript{29} Lawrence, Friars, p. 173-5.
\textsuperscript{30} John Younge, The Fyancells of Margaret, eldest Daughter of King Henry VIIth, to James King of Scotland: Together with her Departure from England, Journey into Scotland, her Reception and Marriage there, and the great Feast held on that Account, in J. Leland, Leland's Collectanea in six Volumes (London, 1770), vol. 4, p. 289.
for friars to attain such a position in Scotland is evidenced by the case of David Adamson, provincial of the Scottish Dominicans, who, after the battle of Flodden in 1513, was called upon to mediate between the Lords of Council and Margaret Tudor, Dowager Queen and mother of James V, when her marriage to Archibald, Earl of Angus, alienated her from much of the political community.31

Another role Lawrence ascribes to the friars at court is that of ‘court preacher’. While once again we have no evidence of this in the courts of James IV and V, there is, nevertheless the matter of Mary, Queen of Scots, who, in 1565 appointed four ‘men of learning’, as required by the decrees of the Council of Trent, one of whom was the Observant Franciscan John Roger. One of John Roger’s books (Angelus de Clavasio’s *Summa de casibus*) had also previously been in the possession of ‘andree duncane seruitoris regine’, but he is not noted elsewhere in Durkan and Ross.32 Interestingly, the employment of friars at court could backfire: Lawrence cites a number of examples in Europe where a friar refused to comply with current opinion or the political situation and was known to even criticise the king. Mary, Queen of Scots’, Dominican confessor Rene Benoît attracted attention during his tenure as a doctor at the Sorbonne for criticising Henry III of France. Subsequently we have friars who fell out of favour or even incurred the king’s displeasure and sometimes anger after having obliged the invitation to preach at court.33

This is interesting in light of Adam Abell’s ‘Roit and Quheill of Tyme’: his moral history, in which he is very careful not to criticise James IV directly, portrayed a king who could do no wrong, and if he acted in a questionable manner, it was because he had listened to unwise counsel. It has previously been suggested that the reason for this might be that Abell is very much aware of the fact that a number of Observant Houses were foundations of just that king and the order had received much patronage from him. It is, however, unclear whether Abell’s criticism was muted out of reverence for the dead king who was such a great benefactor of the Observants, or whether he feared that speaking badly of James IV might lead his son
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32 *Papal Negs.*, 492, 495; Knox, *History*, ii, p. 175; Durkan and Ross, *Libraries*, p. 139; Lynch, *Queen in Three Kingdoms*, p. 16. Mary, Queen of Scots’ confessor John Black was one of those four men of learning, while it should also be noted that her French confessor, Rene Benoît, was also a preacher.
33 Lawrence, *Friars*, p. 171-3; *Papal Negs*, p. 518.
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to review his own patronage of the order or his attitude towards certain members of it.

Apart from the post-Reformation evidence of an Observant as preacher in the monarch’s retinue, the Observants’ presence at the Scottish court seems to have been restricted to a spiritual one: as confessors and spiritual advisors to the king. It did not even extend to a role in the education of the princes, as Louis IX had encouraged in the case of his sons’ education. And they did not have the kind of impact that Matthew Paris criticised in the thirteenth century. In his *Chronica Majora* he noted that the influence of both orders of friars ‘in the houses of kings’ resulted in a new and rather drab dress code. But whatever influence the Observants had at the Scottish court two centuries later it was never as strong as this. The Scottish court was far from suffering ‘base attire’; on the contrary, there is some anecdotal evidence that John Bellenden, Abbot of Holyrood and uncle of Adam Abell, left for the Perth Charterhouse for the opposite reason: Holyrood Palace was having an adverse influence on the manner of the canons’ dress.34 The whole trend of the royal court in the three-quarters of a century following the marriage of James II and Mary of Gueldres was towards conspicuous expenditure, importing the culture, devotions and fashion firstly of the Burgundian court, and latterly that of France.

Louis IX took his involvement with religious orders a little far, perhaps. He intended three of his children to join the Franciscans and Dominicans, as well as the Cistercian nuns respectively, and all three refused, his daughter even involving the pope to avoid being forced to join the Cistercian nuns.35 There are further examples of members of the French royal as well as Burgundian and other Low Country ruling families joining mendicant orders.36 Unfortunately that is one area on which the Scottish evidence is once again silent: we have very little evidence of members of the Scottish royal family taking holy orders except for the bastard sons of James IV and V. As was the case in France and the Low Countries, one would expect patronage of any religious order by the royal family to result in members of that family entering these orders, especially female members of the extended royal family. In relation to the Scottish Observants we have evidence of only one case, and even that is sketchy.

34 Lawrence, *Friars*, p. 166; Averkorn, ‘Landesherrn und Mendikanten’, p. 211.
From 1507 onwards there are scattered references to a 'frere Observant called frere Robert Steward'. The first indication of this friar is in a letter by Henry VII to Sir Gilbert Talbot, deputy of Calais, written around 1507, warning Talbot not to allow passage into England of 'a frere Observant called frere Robert Steward, being a Scottishman'. He also appeared in a document of 1521 in his capacity as guardian of the Elgin friary as having been involved in a dispute between Conventual and Observant Franciscan friars. It is the Observant John Hay's *Chronicle of the Observantine Province of Scotland*, written in exile in 1586 while he was provincial minister of the Cologne province, which is the only source to describe him as a kinsman of James V; here he is styled Robert Stuart (Stuoardt), 'kinsman of James V ... having once put on a woollen under tunic he never changed it till the day of his death, maintaining that it was unworthy that he should avail himself of changes during a solemn penance', though what that penance was for, Hay did not elaborate. Largely based on this source, Hay listed this 'frere Robert' among the provincial ministers and claimed that he was born in 1475 and died at the St Andrews Observant friary at the age of eighty, which would put the year of his death at c.1555.37

A further important aspect of patronage, certainly with regards to continuity of patronage within royal families, is the fact that the friars seemed especially attractive to women. In France the Queen Dowager, Regent Blanche of Castile, mother of Louis IX, was known to be a fervent supporter of the mendicants, to the extent that Averkorn describes her as the first patron of any consequence of mendicants in France. Apparently she was influenced in this by her family, who had been supporters of mendicant orders in the Iberian Peninsula, and although both herself and her son were strongly connected with the Cistercian order (Blanche was buried in the habit of a Cistercian nun in the Abbey of Maubuisson), this did not stop her from supporting the Franciscans; she allegedly received the pillow of St Francis of Assisi after his death. Averkorn suggests that her activities had a significant impact not only on her immediate family, but it also inspired other noble families, sometimes relatives, like the Dukes of Burgundy, once again providing us with a link to Mary of Gueldres, just as Louis IX’s patronage prompted neighbouring and related

37 Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 54; Durkan and Ross, *Libraries*, p. 112; Bryce, i, p. 60 and notes 1-2. Bryce has Robert Stewart (or Stuart) as guardian of Elgin, see Bryce, i, p. 60 note 1.
rulers to do the same. In the same vein it has been suggested that the mendicants’ connection with the Counts of Holland can be traced to Sophia of Thuringia, daughter of St Elizabeth of Thuringia, the famous patroness of the Franciscans; Sophia was the wife of Henry II of Brabant and sister-in-law of Countess Mathilde of Brabant in whose reign fall the first foundations of mendicant convents in Holland. At the most basic level, these examples show that, as in the case of Blanche, close links to one order (Cistercians in her case) did not exclude patronage and equally close ties to one or more of the mendicant orders; Louis IX certainly favoured both Dominicans and Franciscans, or Philippe V of France who was buried in Saint-Denis, but decreed that his heart would be buried with the Franciscans and his innards with the Dominicans of Paris. There could certainly be a suggestion that something similar happened in the later fifteenth century and certainly in the sixteenth in Scotland. An indication would be that Bishop Elphinstone considered both the Observant Franciscans and the Dominicans in his will. Since the king also supported both orders, there is a suggestion that any rivalries that may have existed would not have been tolerated by the patrons of these orders.

But the examples of France and Burgundy also illustrate that the influence of one family was not restricted to just their immediate sovereignty, but had a knock-on effect in terms of patronage, until a pattern can be traced throughout Europe, which, in our case, will lead us to Mary of Gueldres, who, as a member of the extended family of the Dukes of Burgundy would have been exposed to their religious preferences. There is certainly enough evidence of sustained support of the mendicant orders by the family network of the Dukes of Burgundy from the thirteenth century onwards, being expressed in the foundation of churches, burial of members of the ducal family in mendicant convents, as well as mendicant involvement with the ducal family as confessors or diplomats. Still, what is even more significant about European patterns of patronage, especially northern European, is the involvement of the female members of these families. Their influence can be detected everywhere, from Elizabeth of Thuringia through her daughter, Blanche of
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41 This has been documented in great detail in Averkorn, ‘Landesherren und Mendikanten’, esp. pp. 239-74.
Castille to her children and, in the case of Scotland, Isabella of Portugal to Mary of Gueldres.

It is on Mary’s place within these patterns of patronage that the question of who first brought the Observants to Scotland ultimately hinges. Having spent much of her youth at the court of Philip the Good, third Duke of Burgundy, and his wife Isabella of Portugal, she would already have been exposed to the Observants. The Duke was known for his patronage of several Franciscan houses that followed the Observance, and actively promoted the Observance through his relations with John Capistrano, an important figure in the Franciscan Observance known as one of the ‘four pillars of the Observance’.42 This patronage extended into the Duke of Burgundy’s extended family network, reaching into, among others, the Duchies of Cleves and Gueldres.43 His wife Isabella chose Elizabeth of Thuringia as her patron saint, and a codicil to her will ties several grants to convents to the condition that they be reformed after the exact example of the Observant convents of the friars and grey sisters of Saint-Omer, which were centres of the Observance movement in Flanders.44

As a member of the Burgundian court and great-niece of Philip the Good, Mary of Gueldres would have been aware that the bestowing of similar patronage was one of her duties as a great noblewoman. She does not, however, follow the European model – if one may call it that. Usually when a royal figure took an interest in the mendicant orders, it was with a view to reform a certain convent or to further the cause of the Observance and reform movements in any of the mendicant orders, male or female. Added to the ample evidence in the Low Countries and France, there are plenty of examples across Europe where female members of royal houses in particular promoted the Observance to this end. One such figure was Mathilda, second wife of Louis III, ruler of the Rhine Palatinate. Upon her arrival in Heidelberg in 1426, she found the local Franciscan friary lacking in discipline, and, having been brought up under the supervision of the ‘Observants of the Province of Tours’ she proceeded to have her husband ‘import’ Observants from Tours, and

---

42 The others being Bernardino of Siena, Albert of Sarteano and James of the March, see Moorman, History, pp. 375-7.
impose them and the Observance on the local friars. But if Mary of Gueldres found the Scottish Minorites lacking in discipline, she did not take steps to supplant them in this way. In fact, none of the Scottish Observant houses was founded in a burgh that already had a Conventual presence, keeping the two branches entirely separate. That is not to say, of course, that there was no crossover of personnel from Conventual to Observant houses, or vice versa.

That the first Observant friars had come from Zeeland, a province that had been added to the Burgundian territories in 1430, is also unsurprising. In 1444, five years before James II married Mary of Gueldres, his sister Mary married Wolfaert van Borsselen, thus strengthening Scotland’s economic ties to the Low Countries and especially Zeeland. Mary Stewart’s father-in-law was Henric, lord of Veere, Sandenburg, Flushing, Westkapelle, Domburg and Bronwershaven as well as admiral to Philip the Good. Veere was of particular interest to Scotland, as the Scottish staple had been located there, after it had shifted between Bruges and Middelburg between 1347 and 1508, when it settled at Veere. It is worth noting that there is a Franciscan connection in both cases: at Veere there was a house of Franciscan nuns, on whose behalf none other than William of Touris, author of the *Contemplacioun of Synnaris*, received ‘a gift of salmon from the Dee’ in 1502, while Middelburg was home to a community of Franciscan friars. At the same time this provides us with a mercantile connection, if we remind ourselves that according to the bull *Intellleximus te*, Mary of Gueldres invited the Observants to Scotland at the ‘request of certain merchants’. This could mean that these were Scottish merchants who had encountered the Observants in their travels, but it could be just as conceivable that these were expatriot merchants living in Scotland.

But it was not only in the Low Countries where James looked to find husbands for his sisters and a bride for himself. McGladdery believes that this was a result of a precedent set in 1436 by the marriage of Margaret, James I’s eldest daughter with Louis, dauphin of France. In 1442 Isabella Stewart married Francis
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46 *ER*, xii, p. 87: ‘Et eidem per solutionem factam Sroribus Sancte Clare in le Feir, ex eo quod dominus rex donaverant unum barile salmonum annuatim dictis Sroribus, et frater Willelmus Towris recepit solutionem duorum barilum de duobus annis, ut patet per literas domini regis sub signeto et subscriptione unacum litera dicti fratris ostensas super compotum, iiiij li. x s’; Durkan, ‘Observant Province’, p. 53; Averkorn, ‘Landesherren und Mendikanten’, p. 256; McGladdery, *James II*, p. 43.
count of Montford, the second son of John fifth duke of Brittany, while her sister Annabella was betrothed to Louis, count of Geneva, second son of the Duke of Savoy in 1444 but this was broken off in 1456. Nevertheless in 1448 Eleanor Stewart married Sigismund, duke of Austria. All of these marriages placed them in areas and within family networks that would have been under the influence of one or other of the mendicant orders.\(^{47}\)

James’ sisters were themselves known for their patronage of the Franciscan order: according to Bryce, a copy of Pierre de Nesson’s *Paraphrase sur Job* included a frontispiece miniature of Margaret ‘wearing the Franciscan cord’, the hallmark of the Franciscan Third Orders. Isabella, second daughter of James I, had employed a Franciscan, Jean Hubert to ‘write for her a copy of a book known as *La Somme des Vices et des Vertus*’ in 1464. Isabella is best known through her portrait in her Book of Hours that shows the princess kneeling in prayer. The portrait shows the ‘arms of Scotland together with those of Brittany, as a heraldic motif’, and standing behind the kneeling Isabella is St Francis, her husband’s patron saint, holding his left hand up so that the inside of the palm and the stigmata are shown, while his right hand is placed by Isabella’s right elbow, almost touching it, as if to support her.\(^{48}\)

There can be no doubt that the Observants were brought to Scotland because of their assumed ‘holiness’. We assume that their strict Observance had brought them in a position in which they had caught the attention of the Scottish merchants who then requested they be introduced to Scotland as well. They were the fashion of the moment. But unlike Heidelberg, if they were ever meant to teach the Scottish Conventuals ‘a lesson’, this lesson failed, since they were never introduced into existing Conventual monasteries and did not supplant any of them. And despite his protestations, James IV does not show a desire to get rid of the Conventuals, at least not in his letters. So long as the Observants are left alone he is happy. There is almost a sense that he had no influence over the Conventuals. Clearly he disapproves of their way of doing things. ‘What hope of a holier life, if the Franciscans have not in the past respected the laws laid down [presumably the laws of St Francis]?’ It appears as though the ‘professed rule’ of the Observants is the one to his liking. ‘The pious foundations by the Scottish crown forbid alteration of the Franciscan

\(^{47}\) McGladdery, *James II*, pp. 41-44.

\(^{48}\) Bryce, i, pp. 51-2 and plate between pp. 52-3; McGladdery, *James II*, illustrations between pp. 86-7.
observance here: neither the interest of the realm nor the royal authority will allow it.49

Although the bull of 1463 rather vaguely states that Mary of Gueldres acted at the ‘request of certain merchants’, her prominent role in the Observants’ arrival in Scotland cannot be denied. Out of the nine Scottish Observant friaries, five were most likely royal foundations: Edinburgh (the friars arriving at the behest of Mary of Gueldres), while Ayr, Elgin, Stirling and Perth were possibly foundations by James IV. The others were founded in equal parts by bishops or burgesses: St Andrews (Bishop Kennedy), Aberdeen (burgesses), Glasgow (Bishop John Laing), and Jedburgh (Borders nobles or Jedburgh burgesses).50 This would also suggest that the Scottish episcopate shared an affinity to the Observants not unlike that of their European counterparts. The partnership between Mary of Gueldres and James Kennedy, bishop of St Andrews, in the foundation of Edinburgh found echoes at the Burgundian court of Mary’s youth, where Nicolas Rolin, chancellor to Philip the Good, founded the Hôtel-Dieu in Beaune, while his plans for an Observant convent in Autun were eventually thwarted by the local clergy – although his efforts were later taken up by his son Jean, bishop of Autun, whom the pope charged with the reform of the run-down Conventual house.51

The evidence as to whether the five houses (Edinburgh, Ayr, Elgin, Stirling and Perth) were indeed all royal foundations is not always conclusive, but on a purely quantitative approach there appears to be some relationship between royal foundations and entries in the Treasurer’s Accounts and Exchequer Rolls. Stirling, Ayr and Edinburgh have the most entries in the Treasurer’s Accounts, in descending order, with Stirling having the most at over forty-five entries in the period between 1496 to 1552, Ayr around eighteen entries between 1498 and 1560 and Edinburgh with just over fifteen between 1497 and 1558. To these are added a number of entries relating to the friars of these burghs (their orders are not specified), and these are numerous enough to show that there was significant royal interest in these burghs. The pattern is there in the Exchequer Rolls, though in different order. Here it is Perth

49 James IV Letters, nos. 76-7, pp. 55-6.
50 Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses, Scotland, pp. 130-3; MacDougall, James IV, p. 217.

4: Matters of Money and Patronage: Benefactors Royal, Noble and Burghal
that has the most entries with around fifty-five between 1516 and 1550. Stirling has roughly fifty entries between 1501 and 1561 and Edinburgh follows with just over forty-five between 1495 and 1558. Elgin has just over thirty entries between 1495 and 1558. Unlike the Treasurer’s Accounts, the entries in the Exchequer Rolls generally specify the orders, in this case the Observants. There are some discrepancies in both lists. Elgin, which Cowan and Easson believe to have been a royal foundation, has less than five entries in the Treasurer’s Accounts, although it features heavily in the Exchequer Rolls; and Perth – which takes pride of place among the entries in the Exchequer Rolls – only roughly nine entries in the Treasurer’s Accounts. Ayr only has two entries in the Exchequer Rolls, compared to the roughly eighteen in the Treasurer’s Accounts. At the same time the non-royal foundations, St Andrews, Aberdeen, Glasgow and Jedburgh, never exceed the twelve entries St Andrews has in the Exchequer Rolls. But even with these exceptions a picture emerges that suggests that much less attention was paid to the four confirmed non-royal foundations of St Andrews, Aberdeen, Glasgow and Jedburgh in relation to those that are confirmed or at least suspected royal foundations.  

While the entries in the Exchequer Rolls are generally dealing with recurring payments for foodstuffs for the friars such as ale, barrels of salmon, wheat and barley, in one instance even a pig, it is noteworthy – considering these entries are gifts and donations to a mendicant order – that a significant number of royal donations to the Observant Franciscans were in cash rather than kind (sometimes listed as payments, but often as alms), and few of these specified what the money was to be used for. The amounts ranged from 11s to sums as large as £40, granted to the Edinburgh friary twice in 1553, ‘in almous, and to their support and sustenation’ – which puts paid to Bryce’s claim that the nature of the Observants resources was ‘precarious’, since they would not accept annual rents and thus do without a steady income, as required by the Observant lifestyle. This is even outstripped by a contribution of £66 13/4d by James IV to the Observants of Stirling in 1498.  

The friaries of Stirling and Ayr also have a number of larger entries, detailing (in two cases) the vestments and chalices being paid for by the king: thus the friars of
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52 See Appendix 3, pp. 290-337 for a full list of TA and ER entries pertaining to the Observant Franciscans.

53 TA, i, pp. 362, 390; x, pp. 134, 216; Bryce, i, pp. 274.
Ayr received ‘ane cheseb of rede chamlot .. with cors of slight gold’, and ‘vj ½ elne Bertane claith to be ane alb to the samyn’, in addition to the payments for having these vestments made. The entry for the Stirling friary of June 1501 also provided for the making of ‘thre vestimentis of gray damas’; presumably, the friars living in the king’s favourite foundation needed to be well-dressed.54 Overall, the entries for the Stirling friary tend to be specific, and include items of daily use, such as locks and bands for the friary, canvas, caps for torches or a barrel of oil, or, quite curiously, a payment to James Redheuch in 1503, ‘that he laid doun for ane barrell of Hamburgh beir to the Freris of Strivelin’, which had cost him 28s.55

A truly revealing entry, however, appears in April 1503, which details payments to the monks of Culross for books made for the Stirling Observant friary, as well as payments for ‘parchment skinnis of Flandrez ... 4 mes bukis’ and ‘ane buke callit Sermones to thaim’. Also provided for in this entry are payments for chandeliers and ‘ten elne chamlot, blew and grene, to the said Freris, to be frontales to thair altaris’. Payments to the monks of Culross appeared again in January 1504, again for books for the Stirling friars.56

If we remember James IV’s claim that a number of the Observant Franciscan houses had been royal foundations ever since Mary of Gueldres had brought the Observant friars to Scotland, it is rather surprising that the friaries of Glasgow, Aberdeen and St. Andrews do not receive any endowments from the crown. All that can be found in the Exchequer Rolls were alms in the form of barrels of herrings, which were given in 1529, 1538 and 1560; the latter included the Stirling Friary as well. Bryce surmises that the reason for this royal neglect is that these particular houses fell under the ‘Bishop’s charity’. He came across this term, or concept rather, in Sir David Lindsay’s Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, where Flattery states that the friars would never be in need of anything since they could rely on the ‘Bischops charitie’ as well as the ‘gudewyfis’, whose confessors they are, to provide for them. Yet once

54 TA, ii, p. 64; iii, p. 80.
55 TA, ii, p. 256.
56 TA, ii, pp. 250, 257.
again Bryce does not offer any explanation why he sees this line as proof for a practice of 'Bishop's charity' at the time.  

Nevertheless it would seem that the friaries in the three Episcopal centres did not enjoy royal patronage to the same extent as, for example, Stirling did, the friary which the king used as a retreat, or even Edinburgh, where the friars received weekly alms in the form of food-stuffs. But it would be entirely possible that the Observant Franciscan houses fulfilled different functions for the different places they settled in. Therefore in a diocesan centre with a university, their efforts might have been much more concentrated on the university and its students, as indeed both Dunlop and Bryce suggest. As a consequence, they would have attracted Episcopal rather than royal patronage, while in places like Edinburgh and Stirling, which incidentally both had royal castles, they would have been much closer to the king. Still at times the two patrons overlapped, especially since there was a tradition of bishops to be involved in royal administration, for example in the case of Bishop Elphinstone, who was chancellor of Scotland in 1487-8, under James III.  

Patronage of the Observant order by the House of Stewart is present throughout the pre-Reformation period, but cannot be consistently traced through the individual reigns. Some disruption must also be expected from the minorities which began every Scottish monarch's reign throughout this period, and the question must be asked – though it may not be possible to give a conclusive answer – as to who in the royal household ensured the Observants' continued influence at court. One obvious answer would be the influence exerted by the dowager queens over the young kings, which would explain the conspicuousness of both Mary of Gueldres and Margaret of Denmark in the letters of James IV and V.  

Certainly Margaret's influence on her son had been significant. She had been in charge of his education from at least 1478, when she was officially entrusted with all her three sons' education and custody, until her death in 1486, giving her ample opportunity to 'nurture' her son's sense of duty to God, as James V put it. Indeed most of the foreign queens chosen by the Stewart kings had held the guardianship or
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57 Supra n. 9; Bryce, i, pp. 297, 345, 350; Sir David Lindsay, Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, ed. J. Kinsley (London, 1954), 751-2, p. 64; ER, xv, p. 552, xvii, p. 176, ix, p. 142 (the latter gift is shared with the Franciscan friary of Stirling).  
58 Dowden, Bishops of Scotland, 130; Lyall, 'Cologne and Louvain Students', p. 59.
supervised the education of their children at one time or another. This would also correspond with the observation that it was generally women who took up new developments in the European religious landscape; indeed they seemed to be the most attuned to it.

Either way there is enough evidence that James IV was a firm supporter of the Observants. He was the first Scottish king to have an Observant confessor, Patrick Ranwick, provincial and warden of the Stirling friary. The Spanish ambassador, Pedro de Ayala, who stayed at the Scottish court in 1496-7, made special mention of James IV’s ‘conspicuous generosity towards one of the strictest orders of the day’. To an extent this might have been prompted by James’s preoccupation with the state of his soul due to the part he played in the rebellion that brought about his father’s death. Examples of his commitment to the Observants are manifold.

Strangely enough, it is in the realm of education that the friars’ connection to the house of Stewart can best be documented – and this time we are not referring to academic education, but spiritual and devotional instruction, similar perhaps to the role the author of the Meditationes adopted. And this kind of education was as important to the medieval mind as any scholarly education. The Observants’ involvement in the medieval devotion of the Passion in all its forms is one aspect of this instruction in devotion, and it is here that William of Touris is once again prominent.

As we have already discussed, the Contemplacioun was most likely written for James IV during one of his Easter retreats to the Observant friary of Stirling, which he took very seriously – or at least appeared to, when it seemed a convenient reason not to receive the English ambassador. The fact that the Contemplacioun had been written as a preparation for Easter is in itself significant. For most contemporary Scots, as for many elsewhere, Lent was the preparation for their annual celebration of Communion at Easter, the one time of the year when the

60 MacDonald, ‘Catholic Devotion’, p. 70-1; Bryce, ii, p. 177; Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 172.
61 MacDougall, James IV, p. 217.
faithful had to receive Communion, and quite likely the only time for a great number of the adult Scottish population. This preparation, however, centred on ‘populist representations of the Passion’, such as Passion plays, devotional images in churches or the devotion of the rosary. The main purpose of this preparation would have been centred on the salvation of souls, the penitential aspect of the Passion.63

The Contemplacioun has been identified as part of the speculum principis genre, the ‘mirror of princes’ literature, which was so aptly portrayed in David Lindsay’s Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, first performed in 1552.64 There is much advice given in the Contemplacioun; in order for the king to be a just ruler he must concentrate on the ‘king of heaven and on the mercy of Christ’. This was done using examples depicting royal figures, biblical as well as classical.65 The ‘mirror of princes’ literature was applied in literary circles throughout Europe and popular among the literary figures at the courts of both James IV and V, Sir David Lindsay being perhaps one of the foremost. His Satyre was designed to show a royal audience what a king’s role was supposed to be, using the medium of satire, unlike Touris who used the Passion of Christ as a framework.66

With the Passion being a devotion geared towards the salvation of souls, it would have appealed to James IV, who was himself pre-occupied with the salvation of his own soul. In 1488 he had played a major part in the rebellion that brought about his father’s death and he went to great lengths to do penance, most famously, perhaps, through the iron girdle he wore on the recommendation of his Observant confessor. And this Observant confessor was none other than Fr Patrick Ranwick, provincial and warden of the Stirling friary, who appeared alongside William of Touris as witness in the Glasgow University document of February 1495.67 Discernible in these activities is the role of a quiet and withdrawn councillor, as it were. The Observants did not participate in parliament or council sessions as the friars at the court of Louis IX had done, but once again Ayala reported how James IV

64 Lindsay, Ane Satyre (Kinsley); MacDonald, ‘Passion Devotion’, p. 120.
65 MacDonald, ‘Catholic Devotion’, p. 73.
66 Edington, Court and Culture, pp. 69f.
67 MacDonald, ‘Catholic Devotion’, p. 71; Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, p. 172.
had ‘a great predilection for priests and receives advice from them, especially from the Friars Observant, with whom he confesses’.68

This ‘predilection’ extended into James’s public life as well. When in 1503 the burgh of Edinburgh staged a royal entry for James IV’s bride, Margaret Tudor, they were met by Franciscans at the entrance to the capital, possibly at the temporary wooden gate erected on ‘the site of the later Bristo Port’, which is just opposite from Candlemaker Row and close to the Observant friary (the Greyfriars’ lands in Edinburgh were nestled between Candlemaker Row and the Grassmarket). This royal entry is the first of its kind in Scotland for which there is a contemporary account, which was compiled by John Younge, the English Somerset Herald, travelling in the Princess’s entourage. Royal entries such as this would involve the burgesses ‘coming out to meet the honoured visitor’, while at the same time, with the king and queen entering the town, it was a gesture similar to ‘the submission of a conquered town after a siege’.69 For this entry, unlike the ones that were to follow throughout the century, there is no specified route which the royal procession took. Younge describes how prior to entering the town the King and his Bride were met there by a procession of ‘Grey Freres’, carrying ‘the Crosse and sum Relicks’.70

Then there is the Fetternear Banner and the associated Edinburgh confraternity of the Holy Blood, of which James IV was a member. The basic motif of the banner’s middle border is the cordelière, the knotted cord worn with the habit of Franciscan third orders and confraternities, which was also worn by Isabella, Duchess of Brittany, in a portrait in her Book of Hours. As has previously been suggested, the Edinburgh confraternity of the Holy Blood must have entertained some links to the Edinburgh Franciscans for this motif to be included, especially since the altar to St Francis (founded in 1477) in St Giles Collegiate Church held a prominent place, behind the High Altar and close to the Holy Blood Altar in the Holy

68 MacDougall, James IV, p. 217.
70 John Younge, FYancells of Margaret to James King of Scotland, vol. 4, p. 289; Gray, ‘The Royal Entry’, pp. 16-18; A. J. Mill, Medieval Plays in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1927), p. 79; Bryce, i, ‘ground plan of the Edinburgh friary’, facing p. 268. See also G. Donaldson, All the Queen’s Men: Power and Politics in Mary Stewart’s Scotland (London, 1983), plate 8 (facing p. 59): ‘The Last Stand of The Queen’s Men, Edinburgh Castle 1573’. Although not strictly contemporary, this map still gives an idea of the general layout of Edinburgh at the time. The Bristo port is to be found at the bottom of the map, the left of the two gates shown.
Cross Aisle. Only a restricted clerical and secular elite could go there, and, like the Corpus Christi processions, being allowed to go there would confer status in the eyes of society.\textsuperscript{71}

James V is an entirely different matter. While it is true that he, like his father, chose a confessor from the Stirling friary, friar William Laing, he does not appear to have shared his father's devotion to them. He also reminds us of the problem of who was responsible for spiritual continuity through the minorities, especially since unlike that of his father, James V's reign began with a long minority – his father had died at Flodden when he was not even two years old. The minority and reign of James II supply us with a ready example of the discontinuity in religious patronage that would come from such minorities. The Perth Charterhouse, founded and patronised by James I, had repeatedly to petition his son for money; it was not a matter of course for James II to continue his father's patronage.\textsuperscript{72}

By his own account, James V drew his influence from his grandmother Margaret of Denmark, yet Margaret had died twenty-six years before he was born. We have no evidence as to his mother Margaret Tudor's relations with the Observants. If we are therefore to look for a figure from the minority who might have ensured continued patronage of the Observants, we need to move away from the dowager queen and perhaps look at William Elphinstone, Bishop of Aberdeen, who, like Bishop Kennedy before him, took a keen interest in the Observant Franciscans. He had been one of only a few great magnates of the reign of James IV who had survived Flodden, but only by a year. Nevertheless, as there was political continuity, there also appears to have been a continuity of patronage of the bishops of Aberdeen for the Observants there, as the entry of Gavin Dunbar, Elphinstone's successor as bishop of Aberdeen, among the obits of the notable patrons in the \textit{Aberdeen Obituary} suggests. He was the uncle of Gavin Dunbar, archbishop of Glasgow, who supposedly hosted a dinner at which George Buchanan came to blows with a Franciscan friar, which resulted in Buchanan's poem, the \textit{Somnium}. Gavin Dunbar of Glasgow was present at the heresy trial of the Conventual Franciscan Jerome Russell in 1539 and, according to Knox, was 'desirous to spare their lives',


but was outvoted by ‘more eager zealots’, which would suggest that patronage of the Franciscans (though perhaps not exclusively the Observants) was common among this particular family.

Although his support for the Observants was unquestioned, Elphinstone is also an example of how patrons of religious orders in Scotland rarely supported only one of the mendicant orders. He does not appear to have patronised the Conventual Franciscans alongside the Observants (as others did, as we shall see in a moment), but he certainly shared his attention between Observant Franciscans and Dominicans; after his death his viscera was buried at the Blackfriars’ house in Edinburgh, while his body was buried before the principal altar of King’s College.73 The case of William Elphinstone’s will was another matter in which Bryce applied some editorial omissions, in order to emphasise the Observants’ exemplary lifestyle as opposed to that of the Dominicans and presumably also of the Conventuals: their refusal to accept annual rents for prayers for the dead enables us to ‘reflect upon the precarious nature of the Grey Friars’ resources’. The only annual rent Bryce would admit to was granted by Robert Blackadder, subdean of Glasgow, who ‘directed his chaplain to pay six pennies for each of the twenty-two masses to be celebrated on his obit day, ten in the Gray Friary and twelve in the Black Friary’.74

Bryce’s own lists of endowments and gifts to the Observants, however, makes one wonder what he meant by ‘precarious’, as some of the gifts were rather substantial, and the phrases ‘frequent alms’, ‘liberal yearly alms’ and gifts given ‘towards the end of his/ her life’ keep recurring. The latter were quite certainly donations given with the promise that prayers would be said for the benefactor’s soul, while Foggie has pointed out that Bishop Elphinstone’s will did in fact also constitute an annual rent of sorts: 80 merks were to be shared between the Observants and Dominicans of Aberdeen, the former were to receive the money to build a garden and tenement, while the Dominicans received their share (10 merks, leaving the larger sum for the Observants) for an anniversary for Thomas Myrton (the executor of the will) and Elphinstone.75
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When mentioning the Observant Franciscans in Scotland, historians tend to emphasise their involvement with the Stewart kings, and their connection to the court. What we should not forget, however, is that the mendicants also had patrons among the nobility and, of course, within the burghs in which they had settled. Averkorn has suggested that patronage by the nobility and the burgesses was vital for the initial spread of the mendicant orders in Burgundy in the thirteenth century for it was this patronage that gave them a certain security when they first arrived in a country that was already dominated by the established religious orders.\footnote{Averkorn, ‘Landesherren und Mendikanten’, p. 227.}

It is in the matter of patronage where Bryce’s Scottish Grey Friars truly shines. The lists of benefactors and gifts he has assembled is as complete as it can be under the circumstances, but rarely can we trace more than a name, especially among the burgesses, which makes it almost impossible to trace patterns of patronage within families, or even to associate certain friars with families of patrons. Never is this a more immediate problem than in the case of the two friars who are listed by John Hay as members of the nobility: Robert Keith and Jerome Lindsay, the former allegedly a son of the Earl Marischal, and the latter a son or kinsman of the Earl of Crawford. Neither can be verified, and – perhaps tellingly – both families are missing from Bryce’s lists of benefactors (which he compiled at the end of each chapter dealing with the Observant friaries) although members of the Lindsay family do appear among the Conventual friars, and William, Earl Marischal, settled a foundation on the Aberdeen Dominicans in 1514. That a disproportionately high number of benefactors can be identified for the Aberdeen friary, is due to solely to the fact that patrons of the friary were listed in the Aberdeen Obituary. Here, the general observation is confirmed that Scottish patrons of the Observants and their families did not restrict themselves to one Observant house, or even one mendicant order, including the Conventuals. Beatrix Douglas, Countess of Erroll, greatly favoured the Conventual friary of Dundee; her son, William Hay, third Earl of Erroll, provided the Aberdeen Observants with substantial support; while at the same time also patronising the Dominicans of Perth: Foggie reports that in 1542, he ‘confirmed the gift by his ancestor, Gilbert Hay, of £1’, and to which he added £4 ‘for one mass every day perpetually to be celebrated at the altar of St John the Evangelist and St
Nicholas the Confessor and an anniversary annually after his death'. As Foggie points out, this was the altar where members of the Hay family were interred, and where, presumably, William expected to be buried as well. Thus we find once again the typical mixture of personal spiritual preference and family tradition – which carried with it a certain obligation to carry on the gifts of one's predecessors, to ensure the welfare of their souls.

Overall, the benefactors named in the Obituary are drawn from all levels of society, including women. In fact, of the four women mentioned in the Obituary, four were noblewomen; one, Elizabeth Vindegatis, a very generous benefactress, is given without title or further biographical information. Among the men we find holders of ecclesiastical office, most notable among these Gavin Dunbar and William Elphinstone, bishops of Aberdeen, but also gifts from farther afield, for example, Thomas Halkerston, Provost of the Collegiate Church of Crichton in Midlothian, who gave 34 merks. Members of the landed gentry, too, were represented, such as William Chalmer of Balnacrag, and his son Duncan. William provided for the 'needs of the convent and its building' as well as the money towards purchasing a chalice, and who, according to Bryce, was 'buried with the friars', while Duncan gave £20 'in addition to other frequent alms'.

The records of the foundation of, especially, the Aberdeen friary indicate that the burgesses of Aberdeen took a keen interest in this foundation and continued to provide for it. David Colison, burgess of Aberdeen and member of the town council from 1474-7, provided the land on which the cloister was extended in 1481; his son 'built a trance to the choir and gave liberal alms'. John Murray, burgess of Aberdeen, is listed as having provided £20 'in addition to other small alms'. This should not be surprising, for although we lack the same detailed records for benefactors in other burghs, we can expect a certain involvement of the burgesses; with regards to the information given in the bull Intelleximus te we would certainly expect support from among the merchant community that had been so keen for Mary of Gueldres to
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extend an invitation to the Observants. In Sir David Lindsay’s *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*, embedded in which was a strong anti-fraternal element, directed in parts specifically at the Scottish Observants, we also find the merchants called the masters of the friars.82

One such merchant we have already encountered in connection with the establishment of the Aberdeen friary: Walter Bertram, who is quite an intriguing figure among the patrons of the Observants in Scotland. He was a burgess of Edinburgh, who appeared among those who granted land to the Observants of Aberdeen for the establishment of their friary, when he purchased lands for the friars from James Bisset’s estate in the 1470s. He was Provost of Edinburgh in 1482, when James III was under siege in Edinburgh castle during his brother, Alexander, Duke of Albany’s, attempt to seize the crown with English help. Bertram and the ‘hale fallowschip of merchandis, burgesses and communite’ had to stand surety to the duke of Gloucester, who represented Albany’s English military support, to refund the advance instalments of the dowry which had been paid to Scotland since 1474 as part of a marriage contract between the infant James, Duke of Rothesay and Cecily, youngest daughter of Edward IV of England. In October 1482 Bertram received a lifelong pension for his services to restore the king to liberty and ‘compensate for the losses he had incurred on the king’s behalf’, and in December of that year he was sent to France to complain on behalf of the Scottish merchants, who reported that their goods had been seized in French, contrary to the terms of the Franco-Scottish alliance.83

As a benefactor Bertram followed the general Scottish pattern: he did not restrict his gifts to a single friary or order, they can be traced across the mendicant spectrum. On 2 July 1492 he settled the second most expensive foundation on the Scottish Dominicans, allowing for an annual income of £26 13s 4d in return for prayers for the souls of James III, Margaret of Denmark, James IV and ‘his predecessors and successors’.84 He was also a patron of the Haddington Conventual Franciscan friary, where, on 4 February 1495, he founded an altar in honour of St
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Clement in the Franciscan church, 'to be served by a secular chaplain', while also requiring this chaplain to celebrate services on the vigil of St Francis and to ensure that the Franciscans of Haddington continued to perform 'other services' which Bertram's father, George, had endowed there, continuing the pattern we have already observed in the family of the Earls of Erroll, an obligation to provide for foundations made by deceased family members.85

As far as Walter Bertram's foundations in Edinburgh are concerned, the altar of St Francis is a recurring feature. There are a series of dedications and endowments centred around this altar in St Giles' in Edinburgh, the first dated 20 December 1477 which provided 'for the annual distribution of fifty doles among the poor', eight of which went to the Observants of Edinburgh, a charter which was confirmed by James III in August 1478. On 14 March 1495 James IV confirmed a charter by Walter Bertram of 4 February 1495, in which he had endowed the altars of St Laurence and St Francis in St Giles' with the maintenance of one chaplain.86 We can probably assume that this second charter also included a portion to the poor and to the Observants of Edinburgh, as this is also borne out in the activities of the Edinburgh Holy Blood fraternity, which suggested that indentures and anniversaries, insofar as they included gifts to the poor, tended to set aside a portion to the Edinburgh Observants. In fact, there were a significant number of other anniversaries not related to the Holy Blood altar and confraternity, where this practice was also followed.87

As always, it is difficult to determine the motivations behind his choice of foundations. Bertram was already exposed to the Franciscans through his father, and we can only guess at George Bertram's choice of the Conventual house at Haddington: the Observants would not have arrived yet, and perhaps there was a family tradition of patronising the Haddington friary. For Walter – assuming a special affinity existed for Franciscan spirituality – the choice had suddenly broadened with the advent of the Observant friars in Edinburgh. As a merchant, he was part of the community that presumably petitioned Mary of Gueldres, mother of James III, to extend an invitation to the Observants. As a patron of the Franciscans (and his numerous foundations at the altar of St Francis in St Giles' would bear
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testimony to that), he could now participate in Franciscan spirituality closer to home. Since he did not terminate his patronage of the Haddington friary we can probably assume that reform was not a paramount issue in his choice.

Except for Aberdeen, we lack a comprehensive list of benefactors, and, unfortunately, most of them are not as well-documented in historical record as Walter Bertram, burgess of Edinburgh. Still, certain trends can be observed: as has already been said, most benefactors gave to more than one house, while in Perth and Ayr a striking number of benefactors are listed during the period when Protestantism was already on the rise; the gifts to the Ayr friary listed by Bryce date from 1530 and follow right through to 1558, over half of which are municipal charities. In Edinburgh the Observants were supported by the Edinburgh hammermen, a craft which remained largely Catholic after 1560, but this particular aspect will be dealt with in the context of the Reformation. Mostly the Observants received alms or gifts in money and kind. The Edinburgh Burgh Records testify to an annual gift of £6, 13s and 4d 'for thair preaching'. Other items were for the repair of their house, similar to the entries in the Exchequer Rolls and Treasurer's Accounts. Gifts were made either directly to the Observants or through foundations at altars in the parish church. The confraternity of the Holy Blood of St Giles, Edinburgh, endowed an anniversary mass at the Holy Blood altar, which included a dole to the poor made up of seventy-six portions, thirty-six of which went to the Edinburgh Observants, just as most offerings of this kind that included alms to the poor would also consider the Observants.88

In Ayr, as in Aberdeen, there are a significant proportion of noble patrons from families especially associated with the burgh. Besides her contributions to the Aberdeen friary, Egidia Blair, Lady of Row and wife of Gilbert, first Lord Kennedy (a family which, in the early sixteenth century gained the title of Earls of Cassillis), patronised the Ayr friary as well; the latter were beneficiaries in her will of gifts of cash and kind.89 Hugh, Lord Montgomery, first Earl of Eglinton was one of the most notable supporters of the Ayr friary. In his testament dated 23 September 1545, while considering several other mendicant orders as well, he bequeathed the greatest share to the Observants of Ayr 'for prayers and masses for himself and his wife', but also
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apportioned £10 to the Glasgow friary ‘to pray for the souls of himself and his wife during one year’.90 Once again, patronage was not restricted to just one house; in Eglinton’s case he extended his patronage to both houses, which bordered on his sphere of influence, Ayr and Glasgow. At the same time, he also included the local monastery of Kilwinning in his will, which was partly the reason for a feud between the Montgomery family (Eglinton) and the Cunningham family.91

The bloodfeud between the Montgomeries and the Cunninghams, a family with strong Protestant leanings, mainly affected the Cunninghams of Kilmours and thus Alexander Cunningham, fifth Earl of Glencairn, who composed a scathing poem against the Observant Franciscans’ involvement in the hermitage at Loretto near Musselburgh. Thus he chose as the subject for his satire an order which enjoyed the support of his rivals. Bryce does, however, list a member of the Cunningham family of Glengarnok among the patrons of the Observant friaries of Ayr and Glasgow in 1547, donating 20 merks.92 The feud had its origins in the early fifteenth century and would not be settled until 1609, centred around the bailiary of Cunningham (and lands belonging to the monastery of Kilwinning), where both kindreds had been dominant, with the Montgomeries holding the bailiery of Cunningham for most of that time. In the 1480s Hugh had been responsible for the deaths of James Boyd and Robert Crawford of Auchencairn, the heads of two powerful kindreds in Ayrshire. His support for James IV in 1488 – in whose favour he continued to be – meant that the Cunningham family joined James III at Sauchiburn. Especially during the 1490s, royal favour lay quite obviously with the Montgomery family, as they were able to reclaim the bailiary, once again alienating the extended Cunningham family, who eventually managed to secure exemptions from Hugh’s (who was now also Earl of
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Eglinton) jurisdiction in 1508. While we should not exclude the possibility that Hugh chose to patronise the Observants of Ayr for personal (spiritual) reasons, we should not ignore the possibility that he may have seen this as a means to acknowledge royal favour – and what better way than making gifts to the order favoured so greatly by James IV?

The main reason for patrons to be generous to friars was the expectation that patronage of these orders would aid the purity of one’s soul, for if one supported such men of holiness surely their prayers would aid one’s salvation. An added reward would be the admission to a confraternity overseen by the friars, and – depending on the patron’s expectations – burial within the friary grounds or even the friary church, before an altar specially favoured by the patron. It also provided women with an option to join in a spiritual exercise that provided them with a certain spiritual status. Women in the later-medieval period were constantly confronted with the belief that only married women, chaste widows and virgins would reach heaven. In this context, virginity was preferred, but married women who had raised their children were given two options: join a convent or join their husbands in entering into confraternity with the friars and, upon doing so, take a vow of chastity.

Admitting prominent patrons and benefactors to a confraternity was a widespread practice that also conferred a certain social status on the patron, for he would become part of a rather exclusive group, which would have a similar effect as being allowed to worship at the altar of St Giles behind the High Altar, accessible only to a clerical and secular elite and this kind of access was highly coveted. The letters that signified the invitation to enter into confraternity with the friars were issued by the ministers general of the order or their commissaries. Since some of the Scottish examples have survived we have the names of some of the patrons of the Observants, and an interesting pattern emerges here. Two of these examples date from the late fifteenth century; John Grohin, cismontane vicar general, granted a letter of confraternity to Robert Arbuthnot and Marion Scrimgeour in 1487, presumably the Scrimgeours of Dundee, while on 27 May 1496, Oliver Maillard,
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also vicar general, addressed a letter of confraternity to Sir John Drummond of Drummond. Marion Scrimgeour and her husband appear again in 1490, when they request ‘the right to a portable altar to facilitate regular celebration of mass and other divine services’. Apart from the ‘regular celebration of mass, portable altars also allowed for private worship, as did (to an extent) privileged access to certain altars beyond the rood screen.

But it is the addressee of the letter by Anthony Vitali, commissary of the cismontane vicar general, that is the most intriguing. It is dated 20 April 1504, and conferred the right to enter into confraternity with the Observants to Thomas Maule of Panmure, his wife and children. On 22 April 1509, however, we find a charter of mortification by Sir Thomas Maule of Panmure ‘with consent of Robert Maule, his son and apparent heir’ for his soul as well as that of his extended family, ‘and his predecessors and successors, to Brother Andrew Russal, guardian, and the Franciscans in the convent of Dundee of an annual rent from the lands of Skethyn’. Dundee was a Conventual house and this would mean that the Maules of Panmure favoured both orders.

Patrons chose to support the Observants for various reasons, but the one reason that seems to be missing is reform. As we have seen, after the rise of the Observance patronage of Franciscan friaries elsewhere in Europe was often linked very specifically to a demand for reform: patrons quite deliberately linked further support to whether or not a friary was willing to reform according to the Observance, and in order to enforce reform, economic pressure was brought to bear on these friaries. It is undeniable that the Observant Franciscans enjoyed extensive patronage from all levels of Scottish society from the moment they arrived in Scotland. This is hardly surprising, considering that whenever the Observants founded a new province, it was done so at the request of important patrons, pious laymen and women who
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believed that bestowing their favour on a strict and morally incorrupt order was in itself an act of piety. What was entirely surprising about the Scottish experience, was that the Observants were not brought here to reform the Conventual houses. No burgh that already had a Conventual settlement extended an invitation to an Observant community, yet the patrons of the Conventuals did not seem to have any problems in extending their patronage to the Observants. It almost suggests that the Scots had an attitude of ‘covering all bases’. At the same time, the Conventual friaries, too, would have included members of the prominent families in the burghs; Verschuur in her study on the burgh of Perth has shown that there was a general practice that at least one male member of the prominent families (merchant and craftsmen) entered into the service of the church. If this applied to other Scottish burghs as well, then a portion of those men would have been members of the local Franciscan house, Conventual or Observant, whichever was applicable, and it would not do to oust a member of one’s family in order to enforce a reform that was, perhaps, not perceived as necessary.  

This is reflected in the patterns of royal patronage: unlike the members of the extended family of the Dukes of Burgundy, Mary of Gueldres did not stipulate that the Observants came to Scotland to effect a reform of the Conventual houses, although Pope Pius II understood this to be part of the purpose, for he provided for this eventuality in the foundation bull. We can only speculate as to the precise reasons for this, but Moorman has shown that this oddity was also part of the English experience.  

This is in stark contrast to European practice. A prime example was the Franciscan house at Heidelberg: when Mathilda, second wife of Louis III, ruler of the Rhine Palatinate, found the Heidelberg friary lacking in discipline, she remembered her upbringing under the supervision of the ‘Observants of the Province of Tours’ and occasioned her husband to ‘import’ Observants from Tours, to provide a living example to the local friars, against the protest of the Conventual community in Heidelberg who refused to co-operate.  

It is difficult to assess the exact effect the Scottish Observants had within the royal household, and just how extensive it was, although it must have been...
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noticeable, as already in 1459, immediately after the arrival of the first group of Observant friars, Mary of Gueldres and James II found their royal physician, David Crannoich, recruited to the order. One would expect the Observants' influence at court to reach a climax during the reign of James IV: it is during his reign that we have actual evidence that the Observants produced material, such as the Contemplacioun of Synnaris for the king's spiritual guidance. If the reports are correct that James IV wore an iron girdle as penance for the part he played in his father's death on the advice of his confessor, the Observant Patrick Ranwick, then his effect on the king must have been pronounced - James IV would have been firmly in the hands of the Observants as far as the matter of his soul was concerned. We have no indication if Walter Laing had a similar impact on James V, but with a complete lack of reports it would seem unlikely and might signify that while they were still present at court, their grip on the king may not have been quite as firm. Certainly, there is no foundation to the claims that were perpetuated by the friars' critics that their influence could reach into the political sphere. Nevertheless, it was the Observants of Edinburgh who were the first to greet James IV and his bride at the gates of Edinburgh, with a cross and relics.

The fact that the Scottish patrons of the Observants did not force the issue of reform meant that there was an additional mendicant order on the market, as it were, which meant there was harsher competition. The controversy of 1521 between the two branches of the order, in which the Observants insisted that their Conventual brethren be made to wear distinctive clothing that would mark them out as such could have been partly born of a kind of 'professional jealousy'; the Observants were aware that their patrons continued to favour the Conventuals (incidentally, the dispute involved the guardian of Dundee, the convent favour by the Maules of Panmure who also entered into confraternity with the Observant Franciscans), and were perhaps trying to send the message, that they were different and, of course, better at what they did.

Unfortunately, although we have records of gifts made to the Observant Franciscans, it is often difficult to place these gifts in context. Scottish patrons on the whole tended to extend their favour to more than one order, and we must not
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underestimate the prestige that was at stake when the Observants’ patrons were not exclusive in their patronage. The fact that benefactors were buried at the Observant friary at Glasgow would suggest that these were the ones who regarded the Observants above other orders they may have patronised. On the other hand, it would also suggest that these benefactors would have been burgesses rather than members of the nobility, who tended to follow a certain burial tradition. Egidia Blair, Lady of Row, considered two Observant friaries in her will, and thus gained an entry in the Aberdeen Obituary, yet she was buried in St Mary’s aisle in the Abbey of Crossraguel, This is hardly surprising: with the family of her husband, Gilbert, first Lord Kennedy, based in Carrrick and Cassillis she might have followed another family tradition.104

A phenomenon of the mendicant orders was that they tended to attract women and especially noble or royal women. The list of benefactors in the Aberdeen Obituary lists five women as notable benefactresses, some of whom donated substantial amounts of money to the Observants. Isabella of Portugal, Duchess Mathilda and Mary of Gueldres were all instrumental in furthering the Observants’ interests in their respective realms, and as a result their fate was inextricably linked with their royal patrons, for unless continuity of patronage was secured, patronage may well cease; the Charterhouse at Perth was unfortunate enough to find this out after the death of James I. What Scotland lacked were long-lived kings, and it was by no means a given that the Observants would escape the fate of the Charterhouse, which was all but forgotten in the reign of James II. It is their gift of attracting noblewomen and queens as patrons that might explain why they continued to be popular throughout the period, alongside such influential figures as William Elphinstone and James Kennedy, in whose charge the young kings were invariably found. Ironically it was their connection with these two groups of patrons – women and bishops – that would lend itself as a tool to their critics, many of whom emerged from the milieu of the Scottish court. What is almost as surprising as the missing reform of the Conventual houses, is that much of the anti-fraternal literature was

court literature and would have been performed for the members of the Scottish court, for satire yielded the best results when it was performed.
Chapter 5
The Observants and the Critics: Anti-Fraternal Literature in Scotland during the Later Middle Ages

The problem of anti-fraternal literature in later-medieval Scotland is one of perceptions. It is a question of how the friars were perceived by the literary community, and how far these perceptions were justified. It is also a question of how far the concerns of a literary community reflect those of the laity in general. It was an important element of later-medieval church history that the church had to face increasing criticism from without. Reform was no longer something driven forwards solely by members of the church and the religious life – the Observants themselves had been the result of just such a desire for reform from within – it had largely been appropriated by the laity. For the first time, those who were not important political or financial patrons of the church became a force to be reckoned with – a change that would eventually prove to be a stepping stone – albeit unintentional – on the road to Reformation. Criticism of the friars, however, had long been the remit both of theologians and an educated laity whose reasons for criticism were often to be found in the nature of the patrons that have been previously discussed. The mendicant orders' special status within the church made them obvious targets for a clergy who felt their economic standing threatened by these newcomers. They had, as a result, been the subject of criticism almost from their beginnings in the early thirteenth century: criticism which would be based in exegetical discourse by the theologians who practiced it and which would conceive an entire new literary genre soon appropriated and further developed by lay literati; criticism which in turn would even come to serve those critics who, in the sixteenth century, put their efforts to effecting a reformation of the church. Added to this would be continued criticism from the secular clergy, who, in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Scotland, came under increasing financial pressure either as holders of appropriated charges or as underpaid chaplains or curates in the burghs.1

Like any genre, anti-fraternal literature developed a very specific set of conventions and stereotypes, evolving from the initial mid-thirteenth century
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perception of the friars in a very specific context. These literary conventions cause a certain amount of difficulty when attempting to analyse anti-fraternal literature in a historical context. The continued popularity of anti-fraternal literature throughout the later Middle Ages would suggest that there was an audience for it, an audience that welcomed the services of a poet in giving expression to their own grievances, a point that is sometimes used as a gauge by historians to determine the behaviour and conduct of the fraternal orders and to judge whether the criticism levelled at them – especially at the eve of the Reformation – was justified. At the same time, the reformed observant friars – both Dominican and Observant Franciscan – would have claimed that they led an exemplary mendicant lifestyle, a claim readily and often unquestioningly supported by the nineteenth and early twentieth century scholars of these orders, but which sometimes found a grudging echo even in the reports of those medieval writers who were only too happy to pen anti-fraternal literature themselves.

How then is it possible to glean historical fact from literary fiction when the genre presented here was designed deliberately to exaggerate fact – if fact indeed it was? Any literary genre will allow for a certain amount of routine: stereotypes are recycled simply for their own sake and the sake of the exercise, as long as stylistic conventions were observed. The genre and its stereotypes would readily fit – or be made to fit – any order of friars. The literary evidence supports this: rarely will we find reliable distinctions in terms of the friars’ order or colour of habit and when made, these observations might be unreliable and determined by artistic licence and stylistic tools. At times there are slight hints indicating a specific order, but more often we remain in the realm of educated guesswork. These hints are, however, the only way to determine whether the literary composition in question was pure fiction, or whether it contained at least some historical fact.

Normally one would expect a certain amount of historical evidence to support or refute any such hypothesis concerning the lifestyle of the Observant friars in Scotland, but, as so often, we are once again hampered in our investigation by too little primary source material concerning the Scottish Observant Franciscans. And that is why anti-fraternal literature must be considered as a source, unreliable though it may be. Once we move to criticism of the friars we are invariably tied up in the pre-Reformation and pseudo-Protestant realms of blanket criticism. It is here that we
find George Buchanan, one of the great scholars of the Protestant movement in Scotland, railing against the Franciscans because their order was involved in the Inquisitions abroad, something that he himself had been subjected to when he had travelled to Portugal. Scotland did not have an Inquisition in this traditional European sense, yet he still held them responsible for the actions of their foreign brethren, just as friars in the sixteenth century would still be attacked in literary texts that used a language that had been ‘invented’ in the thirteenth century. As we have already seen, the Observants’ experience in Scotland was in many ways a mirror to that on the Continent, but there were also marked differences, and it is with this in mind that Scottish anti-fraternal literature must be investigated, both as the evolution of a tradition that was pan-European as well as being placed in its immediate Scottish context.

Anti-fraternal literature consists of what Penn Szittya defines as two main genres: anti-fraternal theology, composed by theologians and written in Latin; and vernacular anti-fraternal poetry, which is ‘satirical in nature’ and was penned, for example, in England by authors such as Langland or Chaucer, who did not necessarily have to be clerics. The beginnings of this literary tradition take us back to the mid-thirteenth century, to Paris. It is worth reminding ourselves that the friars were an expression of the ever-changing fashions of piety in later-medieval Europe; they had been patronised by the rich and powerful and had encroached on territory – both actual and spiritual – overseen by their fellow priests and religious. The man credited with setting the stage for this hostile literary depiction of the friars was just such a religious: William St Amour, secular master at the University of Paris. The work which Szittya identifies as the literary root (if there is such a thing) of anti-fraternal literature as whole (and anti-fraternal theology in particular) was St Amour’s *Tractatus brevis de periculis novissimorum temporum*, born out of an attempt to list ‘the authoritative passages in divine and canonical Scripture’, which would lend weight to the accusations brought against the mendicant masters at the University of Paris by their counterparts among the secular masters. It was not at first meant for public circulation, nor indeed for the kind of non-religious audience that would, a century later, read Chaucer’s ‘The Friar’s Tale’. It rather belonged to the
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realm of anti-fraternal theological polemic (the first genre identified by Szittya) and was created in the very specific context of the University of Paris in the 1250s. The audience of De periculis was restricted by its very nature: it was a highly scholarly biblical study designed to prove that the friars were the harbingers of the Last Days: heralds of the Antichrist and false apostles, the kind that had been promised in Scripture to presage the end of the world. Although the background to the struggles at Paris was largely economic (the secular masters feared their livelihood was under threat from mendicant masters) their concerns about and hostility towards the mendicant masters came to be expressed through the medium of biblical exegesis centring on the ‘novissima tempora’, the ‘Last Times’.

Expositions on the Last Times were, quite naturally, a well-established tradition within the church, but by the mid-thirteenth century this tradition acquired a new set of ideas. There had been renewed interest in the late twelfth-century writings of Joachim of Fiore (died 1202), writings which were eventually condemned by the pope in 1256 and which are generally summed up as the Evangelium Aeternum: the Eternal or the Everlasting Gospel. Joachim’s writings were an expression of revelations he had had concerning a new way of exegesis – especially of the Book of Revelation – which asserted that history and theology were linked and that the history of the world was in fact linked to the three Persons of the Trinity. Joachim had begun his career as a theologian and by applying his studies to history he identified three stages of the world (stati mundi), each linked to a divine Person and relating to the stages recorded in the Testaments: the first stage was the period covered by the Old Testament, in essence from Adam to Christ and linked with the Father. The second status began with the New Testament and was to last to the present time (from Joachim’s point of view) and was watched over by the Son. Once the second age was completed, Joachim expected the advent of an age ruled by the Spirit; and this age would in turn receive its own testament, a ‘third’ testament, which would follow from the other two and was linked with St Benedict, the ‘founder’ of monasticism. In turn these stati could also be represented by the laity
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3 For the background to the occurrences at the University of Paris see Szittya, Antifraternal Tradition, chapter 1, esp. pp. 11-17; See also Moorman, History, pp. 125, f.
4 Szittya, Antifraternal Tradition, pp. 21, 23-4; Moorman, History, p. 128.
5 It is worth noting that Szittya points out that the ‘novissima tempora’ of St Amour’s writings may also mean ‘the most recent times’, see Szittya, Antifraternal Tradition, p. 24.
(ordo coniugatorum), the clergy (ordo clericorum) and the religious (ordo monachorum).\textsuperscript{6}

What is crucial for our purposes, however, is that according to Joachim the third age would be ushered in by two new religious orders observing apostolic poverty; a statement that appeared to be fulfilled through the foundation of the Franciscan and Dominican orders early in the thirteenth century. Neither the mendicants themselves nor their critics denied this; the mendicants turned it into their raison d'ètre, while their critics began looking at the biblical passages that would reveal them to be the false prophets and heralds of the Antichrist instead, which, according to Joachim, were to appear before the third status mundi could be inaugurated. But the mendicant – and especially the Franciscan – side of the argument was seriously weakened when a number of Franciscans went too far in their attempts to prove their very existence to be presaged by Joachim's revelations. In this they came dangerously close to heresy, especially the Franciscan Gerard of Borgo San Donnino, who in his Introductorius in Evangelium Aeternum of 1254 even went so far as to suggest that the third testament would supersede both Old and New Testaments and that Joachim had meant for the friars to overthrow existing authorities when initiating the third status mundi. This gave the dispute at Paris renewed impetus and almost lost the mendicants the support of the pope during the troubles of the 1250s. But it was in the controversy sparked by Gerard's writings and the way in which the Paris secular masters used it to turn the mendicants from the prophesied inaugurators of a new age into the false apostles that were to signal the end of the second status mundi instead that marks a starting point for many of the stereotypes that were to be so indicative of subsequent anti-fraternal literature.\textsuperscript{7}

Szittya raises the question as to how far St Amour himself drew on Joachimite ideas when composing his de periculis, especially since, as has already been said, apocalyptic writing and ideas were rife in thirteenth century Europe.


\textsuperscript{7} Reeves, Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages, pp. 59-65, see also pp. 187-189; Moorman, History, pp. 115, 128-9; Szittya, Antifraternal Tradition, pp. 15, 26-31; Williams, 'Chaucer and the Friars', p. 501; LaPiana, 'Joachim of Flora', pp. 261-2, see also p. 271 where LaPiana noted that although Joachim's ideas were appropriated by the mendicants, they were not originally meant to be thus. Joachim would have thought in the context of his own order, the Cistercians, when he developed his ideas.

5: The Observants and the Critics: Anti-fraternal Literature in Scotland
Unlike Joachim of Fiore, William St Amour did not really engage with the Book of Revelation, but he used the same tool of biblical exegesis to present his points against the mendicants. The New Testament passages on which the exegesis centred were for the first time applied to the new mendicant orders in William St Amour’s writings – although St Amour himself made sure he never actually named them, thus safeguarding himself against charges of defamation. Through his exegesis he developed three types, which he meticulously applied to the friars in every possible way: ‘the Pharisees, the pseudoapostoli and the antichristi’. Each of these types had certain characteristics: in this way, the main charges against the friars as Pharisees was their desire to be called masters (‘rabbı’), and their hypocritical ‘show of sanctity that they lacked in their hearts.’ The pseudoapostoli were the false prophets whose advent would signal the end of time but the term also hit at the friars’ claim to follow the pure life of the apostles. This left the antichristi, who were the ‘forerunners of the antichrist’. These types and their characteristics would remain in use even as late as the Reformation, part of the standard charges levelled at the friars, usually enlivened with contemporary examples. Thus any piece of later-medieval anti-fraternal literature would be expected to portray the friars as hypocrites, in search of ‘high place and worldly power,’ their aspiration to the apostolic life through begging was portrayed as a cover for laziness, and their craftiness, especially their supposed ability to enter houses and insinuate themselves into the favour of the weak-willed gained distinctly sexual overtones.

These three types and the associated characteristics remained in use until the later-medieval period, and both Szittya’s genres made liberal use of them, to the point where they came to be synonymous with all friars at any time and in any place.

---

8 Szittya, Antifraternal Tradition, pp. 18-19, 25 and pp. 31f, for a full discussion of the biblical passages used and how they were applied to the friars; LaPiana, ‘Joachim of Flora’, p. 267; Foggie, Janet P., Renaissance Religion in Urban Scotland: The Dominican Order, 1450-1560 (Leiden and Boston, 2003), p. 201.

9 Szittya, Antifraternal Tradition, p. 259; the biblical justification of begging is defined by need and in some instances it is even condemned altogether (Ps. 36:25). See also Williams, ‘Chaucer and the Friars’, p. 508. In his talk ‘Shakespeare and Catholicism – the Franciscan Connection’ as part of the Dennis Hay Seminar Series (University of Edinburgh, 2002), David Salter makes an interesting point: the prince of Vienna disguises himself as a Franciscan friar to police his realm, because the guise of a friar gives him licence to access all areas of life. If friars had access everywhere, then no wonder they were resented and mistrusted. It is too easy to abuse that kind of trust, although their patrons, who granted this high level of access to the friars, would not have expected them to abuse this privilege.
and circumstance. A common and rather dramatic expression of the antichristi can be found in William Langland's Piers Plowman, when a friar is given the most spectacular and apocalyptic entrance – leaving little doubt that the friars' would play an ominous role in the impending apocalypse – while the image of the Pharisee was applied in Lindsay's Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis in the guise of the three Vices. Through the image of the antichristi the friars had advanced from being a threat merely to the Paris secular masters to being a threat to the world, harbingers of the last days indeed, although in a different manner than Joachim and the Franciscan Joachites had initially envisaged. It is important to note that all three types developed by St Amour made an easy transition into the second genre identified by Szittya, that of anti-fraternal poetry, composed often in the vernacular by laymen and aimed at, and addressing, a much wider audience than St Amour's eclectic circle of exegetes. One of the main charges levelled at the friars by St Amour, however, was developed further by the vernacular writers, and that was their role as penetrators of houses, based on 2 Timothy 3 and used to great effect by Langland in the person of 'Sire Penetrans Domos'. As Williams points out, the traditional meaning would have been of a spiritual nature: the friars would penetrate consciences by usurping the right of the parish priest to hear confessions, and the seduction would again be a more spiritual seduction, seducing easily-led women to sin. In the vernacular texts this came to mean physical seduction, and symbolised the friars' disobedience of their vow of chastity. On the eve of the Reformation this became a crucial and often graphically explored charge against the friars.

Yet while St Amour and the troubles at Paris provide us with a historical basis for the development of anti-fraternal literature, certain developments within
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10 Szittya, Antifraternal Tradition, pp. 3f; W. Langland, Piers Plowman: A New Translation of the B Text, Schmidt, A.V.C. (transl.), (Oxford, 1992), esp. pp. 242-54; 2 Tim, 3:1-6, which seems to gather up the whole catalogue of misdemeanours accredited to the friars. One passage could even be linked directly to Francis: '[People will be] disobedient to their parents', which could be applied to Francis' break with his father in order to live his life of austerity. The same applies to 2 Tim 3:6, when the talk is of 'silly women who are obsessed with their sins and follow one craze after another'. The friars had indeed been seen as a 'new craze', and had found supporters especially among noblewomen. This calls up images of Mary of Gueldres, the Scottish queen who most likely brought the first Observant Franciscan friars to Scotland as well as Blanche of Castile or Mathilda of Piedmont, wife of Louis III, ruler of the Rhine Palatinate. This even goes back to Hildegard von Bingen, who warned against 'hypocrites' who would insinuate themselves into the confidence of women by replacing their proper teachers (Szittya, p. 59).

medieval literature were necessary for it to become a popular tradition, not confined to theologians. The types St Amour developed were rather academic and lifeless, strictly a theological exercise, but by the fifteenth century they had turned into the fire-breathing demons, conjured by the Scottish poet William Dunbar's poem:

This freir that did Sanct Francis thair appeir,/ Ane fieind he wes in likenes of ane freir./ He vaneist away with styenk and fyrie smowk./ With him, me thocht, all the hous end he towk./ And I awoik as wy that wes in wier."^{12}

In order for this to happen, imagination and realism had to find their way into the repertory of the medieval literati, one result of which was that the *dramatis personae* now contained characters that could, conceivably, be based on actual people as well as appealing to the audience's every-day experiences or prejudices. As Fleming in his *Introduction to the Franciscan Literature of the Middle Ages* points out, one need only look at Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* and — for our purposes — the figure of the Friar, a character with as much depth as any other in this work, and one with a keen sense of humour, no longer an abstract of a biblical text.^{13} Szittya credits Jean de Meun and Rutebeuf with linking St Amour's writings to vernacular anti-fraternal poetry, while Fleming sees Jean de Meun as at least partly responsible for the development of natural characters in medieval literature. This development is also the link between St Amour's almost clinical approach and the incredible visual imagery created by Langland for 'Sire Penetrans Domos' or Dunbar for his demon impersonating St Francis. It allowed anti-fraternal literature to take on a life of its own, divorced from but still reminiscent of St Amour's eschatology. Fleming suggests that this development would not have been possible without the mendicants, particularly the Franciscans, although he cautions that this influence was by no means intentional or even exclusively Franciscan. Instead through their literary activity as well as their way of life — in effect they took their sermons to the medieval marketplace — the Franciscans effected changes that would redefine the idea of what was considered acceptable in literature, and thus expanded the framework within
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^{12} Bawcutt, *Dunbar Poems*, i, 77 lines 46-50, p. 249.
which medieval literature operated. This would be comparable to the Franciscans’ influence on certain devotions and the way Franciscan devotional characteristics could be found even in devotions on which they had no direct influence. When previously the role of imagination – or ‘carnal’ imagery – in literature was confined to tracts that condemned its use and elucidated why the use of imagination was most unsuitable in any spiritual contemplation, works such as the Meditations Vitae Christi made both concepts acceptable as a devotional exercise. This flew in the face of the teachings of, for example, Bernard of Clairvaux who had been adamant that imagination should not be used by ‘those who would be perfect’, i.e. monks, or St Edmund of Abingdon, who, although employing a number of what Fleming calls ‘Franciscan characteristics’ in his works, maintained that ‘imaginative contemplation is both imperfect and dangerous.’ Franciscan writers themselves were aware that imagination could have dangerous manifestations, but imagination used to ‘reduce daily experience to the Christ-life of the gospels’ was ‘explicitly good’. This is not to say that spiritual writings were entirely devoid of imagination or that the Franciscans were the first to use it, but Fleming encounters a marked difference in the type of imagery used: it became much more ‘physical’, appealing to the reader’s most commonplace experiences and transferring them to a meditative context.¹⁴ These conflicting viewpoints also express to a certain extent the tensions between two very different expressions of the religious life. The friars presented a paradox to the medieval – and not exclusively clerical – mind, since they were not secluded like orders of monks had previously been and were placed outwith the ‘natural’ order of things, exempt from episcopal supervision. Instead they settled in urban centres, in the midst of medieval society and its temptations, while their role as religious required that they remained aloof. Instead of secluding themselves from popular religion ‘designed for “a carnal people, incapable of spiritual things,”’ they aimed to bring the devotions of the religious to the laity, and Fleming believes that it is this attention to an urban and largely mercantile society that dictated the need for the inclusion of ‘real’ issues, not just in the Franciscans’ literature but also in their sermons. Ironically, this situation provided the vernacular poets with an arsenal with which to attack the friars; the Franciscans themselves had also created the audience

¹⁴ Fleming, Franciscan Literature, pp. 238-44, 253-4; Szitty, Antifraternal Tradition, pp. 184-90. See also Chapter 3, pp. 86-7 on how this idea can relate to aspects of Franciscan spirituality.
to which the poets then addressed their satires. Chaucer, for example, not only used mendicant vocabulary but also borrowed from 'a penitential sermon closely based on a Franciscan manual' in order to attack the friars. In the same way, Dunbar availed himself of the Franciscan hagiographical tradition when he composed his poem *How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir*. But besides the changes in style, the reader is left with the impression that both Dunbar and Chaucer enjoyed composing their poems and tales; gone is the long-winded exegetical treatise, criticism of the friars acquired a lighter tone, to be presented to an audience that did not have to be qualified theologians.¹⁵

Dipple in his *Antifraternalism and Anticlericalism in the German Reformation* also suggests that just because Langland, Wycliff and Chaucer all had the same things to say about the friars, it does not mean that these anti-fraternal texts were a depiction of actual misconduct on behalf of the friars. Instead he accepts Szittya's point that the depictions of friars in such literature can usually be traced back to St Amour.¹⁶ Williams makes this point quite convincingly when comparing the anti-fraternal elements of the *Canterbury Tales* Prologue and ‘Summoner’s Tale’ to the extant anti-fraternal literature that Chaucer would have had access to, concluding that all the usual suspects (usurping the privileges of the parish priests, begging as the source of their livelihood, hypocrisy, ‘seeking high place and worldly honour’ and a ‘gift of the gab’¹⁷ to name but a few) are present. In Williams’ opinion the reference by Chaucer’s friar to Elijah (‘...because/ There have been friars since Elijah was;/ Elisha too was one (the books record)’¹⁸) suggests that Chaucer intended him to be a Carmelite, presumably alluding to the Carmelites’ claim that their foundation can be traced back to Elijah, which makes one wonder just why he would
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¹⁵ Fleming, *Franciscan Literature*, pp. 245, 250, 256-8, 261; R. Lyall, too, subscribes to this point, that medieval anti-fraternal literature is linked with elements of Franciscan literature, see Lyall, ‘Dunbar and the Franciscans’, esp. pp. 255-6; Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, pp. 303-20. Williams also suggests that Chaucer was rather more ‘traditional’ in his anti-fraternal literature, never taking the criticism as far as, for example, Wycliffe, although the work of both may be traced to St Amour. See Williams, ‘Chaucer and the Friars’, p. 504.


¹⁸ Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, p. 315.
give prominence to this particular order. The stereotypes were perpetuated despite changing circumstances because they had been drawn from a biblical context. At the same time, Szittya remarks that even within the vernacular poetry there are two camps: those who, like Chaucer, do not present the friars as allegories — in effect following Fleming’s argument; while others, such as Langland, remain rather more firmly fixed within the tradition as it was laid down by St Amour. It is the difference between using the stereotypes in the ‘comedic present’, or placing them ‘within Salvation History’ and thus continuing to place greater emphasis on the exegetical foundation of anti-fraternal literature. Satire was increasingly becoming a vehicle in which the types that St Amour had initially developed could be used.

It would, however, do the composers of anti-fraternal literature a grave injustice to dismiss their writings as exercises in literary stereotypes. It will become clear in a moment that this was often done in a spirit of literary expediency, to make a point quickly and sharply to an audience already familiar with the vocabulary, and we must consider that most of these writers had a reason to attack the friars. The reasons could be manifold: there were certainly those who composed anti-fraternal literature for the sake of trying their hand at the genre; others did so for fear of their livelihood, the fear that drove St Amour and the secular clergy at Paris who watched the friars encroach on their territory. In later fourteenth-century England, John Wyclif also saw himself within the anti-fraternal tradition established by William St Amour, but his opposition to the friars was not driven by the same reasons. On the contrary, during his tenure at Oxford as a secular master he was anything but hostile towards the friars; Szittya even felt confident to describe the friars as Wyclif’s ‘friends and supporters’. But in 1379 he applied himself to the development of certain doctrines which the church could not consider orthodox, and were eventually declared to be heretical. It was these doctrines that turned the friars from his ‘friends and supporters’ into fierce enemies, and imbued Wyclif’s general anti-clerical writings to a more specific anti-fraternal strand. Wyclif’s writings, especially on the

19 Williams, ‘Chaucer and the Friars’, pp. 505-13. Williams suggests that the conflict between Friar and Summoner presents in a microcosm the wider conflict between mendicants and seculars that formed the background to St Amour’s writings. One should also note the theory put forward by W. Ginsberg, that the friar’s name, Hubert, was an allusion to St Hubert, patron saint of hunters, see W. Ginsberg, "This Worthy Lymytour was cleped Huberd:" a note on the Friar’s name,” in The Chaucer Review: a journal of medieval studies and literary criticism, 21:1 (1986), pp. 53-7.

Eucharist and certain doctrines held by the friars, were condemned by the English Blackfriars Council in 1382, for in them he ‘denied the authority of the entire “visible” church’ and accepted only the ‘invisible’ church, whose members were already predestined for salvation. In this vein he saw the friars as teachers of ‘signs’, thus perpetuating this ‘visible’ church he so condemned. Furthermore he asserted that even the consecrated bread was still bread, although it was also the body of Christ: in his understanding there could not be a ‘conflict between appearance and reality’ and that the dual nature he perceived in the consecrated host (bread and body of Christ at the same time) signified the duality of Christ himself: both man and God. The friars opposed this on the grounds that such a duality was impossible: their distinction lay in the fact that although the consecrated host was still bread, in figure it was the body of Christ and not merely a symbol for it, placing the emphasis on the act of consecration. At the same time, Wyclif also attacked the friars’ propensity for confessions: the sacrament of penance was once again a sign, which was not needed to achieve true penance and absolution.21

According to the Oxford English Reference Dictionary, the term satire is ‘the use of ridicule, irony, sarcasm to expose folly or vice or to lampoon an individual’; while in a more specifically literary context it has been defined elsewhere as ‘writing which is critical of an individual or a class, which condemns a form of behaviour or a set of values, and which employs some kind of rhetorical ploy or narrative device to persuade us to the author’s point of view’, though the point is made that satire does not appear in its pure form until the Later Middle Ages. Added to it may be complaint, invective and parody, especially in the context of Scottish medieval writers, and it is these that cross over into satire.22

There is little sense in presenting a study of all later-medieval Scottish anti-fraternal literature at this point. There have already been a number of studies dealing with it in its entirety, the most recent being by Janet Foggie.23 Instead, the present
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21 Szitty, Antifraternal Tradition, pp. 152-9; DNB, ‘Wyclif [Wycliffe], John [called Doctor Evangelicus] (d. 1384), theologian, philosopher, and religious reformer’.
study will focus on a select number of authors and poems that can be shown specifically to deal with either Franciscans or Observant Franciscans and attempt to determine just how much historical fact there is reflected in any of these texts. We should keep in mind the extent to which later-medieval Scottish anti-fraternal literature was part of a wider European tradition. The best examples for this are the late fifteenth and sixteenth century writers William Dunbar, Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, George Buchanan and Alexander, Earl of Glencairn. The challenge, of course, will be in separating the real protagonists from the realistic as well as the allegorical or even stereotypical ones; in effect scrutinising whether Szittya’s assertion that both ‘Latin polemic and vernacular poetry’ deal ‘not so much with the friars as with ideas about the friars’ holds true in fifteenth and sixteenth century Scotland.24

A further challenge is added in the Scottish context, where it is necessary to distinguish not only between friars in general and Franciscans in particular, but also between Observants and Conventuals, for, as we have seen, the two were quite distinct in Scotland. Janet Foggie in her recent study on the Scottish Dominicans has already shown that there are a number of texts that use the term ‘friars’ in a generic sense; very often a further distinction is not made. There are even instances where friars were identified by habitual colours which were different from their usual habits.25 It is also often the case that collections of poems sometimes attribute titles to a particular piece of writing which have no foundation in the actual poem. In this way Dunbar’s Ballat of the Abbot of Tungland was given the title Ane ballat of the fenyeit freir of tungland how he fell in the myre fleand to turkiland, which has more commonly been shortened to The fenyeit Freir. Simply as an example of Scottish later-medieval literature, this poem would be a successor to the kind composed by, for example, Chaucer a century earlier, with a historical protagonist, or at least a ‘realistic’ one, since Bawcutt has shown that although the protagonist was quite certainly the self-styled alchemist John Damien de Falcusis, abbot of Tongland, a member of the court of James IV, the actual ‘event’ described may not have occurred

24 Szittya, Antifraternal Tradition, p. 5.
25 Foggie, Renaissance Religion, pp. 204, 206-7, 209. The ‘friars’ which were not friars were the Premonstratensian canons (who themselves often had frequent contact with the populace) in Dunbar’s The fenyeit Freir of Tungland, see Bawcutt, Dunbar Poems, i, no. 4, pp. 56-9.
at all. The occasion for the satire was Damian's supposed da Vincian attempt to fly from the battlements of Stirling castle (a subject Dunbar returns to in *Lucina schynning in silence of the nicht*), but there is no mention in the actual poem that the habit in question is a friar's habit. The advent of realism in literature, therefore, did not mean that this realism became factual accuracy. Like their English and indeed European counterparts, the Scottish poets would not pass up the chance to make their point with less effort by using an image, stereotype or theme already known and easily recognisable to his audience; certainly literal fact would have been an inconvenience easily put aside. Indeed, it has been pointed out that stereotypical imagery was no less powerful than real imagery.

If, however, the Scottish producers of anti-fraternal satire played merry hell with monastic affiliations and identifying markers such as the colour of a friar's habit, then we can hardly expect them to apply scrupulous distinctions between the two orders of Franciscans. This would have an impact on poems such as Dunbar's *How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir*, or even Buchanan's *Franciscan*, in which Buchanan, too, cautions against entry into the order of Friars Minor, where a decision on which of the two Franciscan orders were meant would have to be made from context and background of the poem in question.

There is a further element which must not escape our attention: the Observant Franciscans arrived in Scotland in the mid-fifteenth century, but most of our existing literary evidence of anti-fraternal writings is concentrated in the sixteenth century, Dunbar being the earliest example. The further the sixteenth century progressed, the more we find that Protestant sentiment is availing itself of anti-fraternal literary conventions. The conduct of the clergy was a polarising factor, especially within burgh communities, where the mendicant orders were instantly identifiable scapegoats. Assaults on the friars by members of the burgh community took a number of forms. There were instances when friars were interrupted in the pulpit by members of the congregation as well as numerous incidents when the images and symbols, by which the friars were known, were attacked as happened in Aberdeen and Perth where a number of burgesses were charged for hanging the image of St

---

Francis in the early 1540s.\textsuperscript{28} Since anti-fraternal literature from its very inception had been sensitive to and informed by current affairs and concerns, it would be most surprising if these manifestations of a budding Protestant sentiment in Scotland did not find a corresponding expression in Scottish anti-fraternal literature. Therefore it will be necessary to determine whether and to what extent this extra dimension allowed the Reformers to be much more explicit and aggressive in their attacks and whether their accounts of clerical misconduct were based on actual events or fiction.

The friars’ visibility in the burghs is paralleled by their presence at the courts of medieval Europe, indeed this was one of the charges levelled against them by St Amour. There is some earlier European evidence which suggests that the prominent role of a number of friars at European courts associated them with the ‘exercise of political power in the minds of the people and exposed them to attack by radical movements of protest.’\textsuperscript{29} Incidentally it is this very connection to the Scottish court that will bring them within the immediate orbit of the Scottish poets examined here, beginning with the earliest: William Dunbar. Little is known about his life except what can be glimpsed from official records and – to an extent – from his own poems. Between 1500 and 1513 he appears in the Treasurer’s Accounts as a ‘servitour’ of James IV, and these records also bear out that he was a university graduate, possibly of St Andrews University, c.1479, which would put his date of birth around the time when the first Observant house was founded in Edinburgh; indeed it is believed that Dunbar himself was an Edinburgh inhabitant.\textsuperscript{30} What is also known is that Dunbar was a priest. He celebrated his first mass on 17 March 1504, on the occasion of which he received a donation from his patron James IV. He was also a chaplain either in the royal household or in St Giles’ collegiate church.\textsuperscript{31} What is interesting here is that as a cleric Dunbar would have had the potential to belong to Szittya’s first category of writers who produced anti-fraternal theology, yet Dunbar’s career as a court poet assured him a place among the vernacular poets: Szittya certainly places Dunbar alongside Chaucer and Langland.\textsuperscript{32} As a member of the secular clergy Dunbar could certainly be expected to hold a particular grudge against the friars;

\textsuperscript{28} Calderwood, \textit{History}, i, p. 172; Aberdeen Recs, i, p. 211; Chapter 6, pp. 208-10.
\textsuperscript{29} Lawrence, \textit{Friars}, p. 177.
\textsuperscript{30} Bawcutt, \textit{Makar}, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{31} Bawcutt, \textit{Dunbar Poems}, i, p. 3; MacDonald, ‘Passion Devotion’, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{32} Szittya, \textit{Antifratal Tradition}, p. 183.
however, as we shall see, his poems do not quite reflect their mood. Perhaps this, too, was due to his position as a court poet; the friars did not represent the same economic threat to him.

Thus as a member of the court of James IV and as an inhabitant of Edinburgh (Bawcutt suggested he was a burgess) he would have been very much aware of the Observant Franciscans, probably more so than the Conventuals, although it is never explicit in his poetry exactly which of the two he had in mind when composing a particular piece, or whether he was even aware of the distinction. Dunbar did, however, tend to take his inspiration from the world around him; and so, tentatively, it might be suggested that the Observants would have been more on his mind, since they belonged to his world – the court of James IV and Edinburgh – which would hold true even if he had not been aware of the split of the order, or not cared. Four of Dunbar’s poems mention friars, while a fifth poem, Dunbar’s Dirige to the King (often referred to as the Dregy or We that ar heir in hevynnis glorie) might have a connection to the Observant friary in Stirling, though that is a point now heavily disputed; and the Ballat of the Abbot of Tungland has in the popular mind attained a title that also includes the word ‘friar’.

Despite the fact that nothing in the Abbot of Tungland refers to friars, this poem continues to be included in discussions of the themes of anti-fraternal literature. The abbey of Tongland in Kirkcudbright was a Premonstratensian house of the so-called White Canons, and Abbot Damien, the subject of the poem, was certainly not a friar. We are reminded that this particular poem was part of a ‘well-established satiric genre of the “fenyit freir”’ without referring to the possibility that

---

33 It should be noted that Bawcutt in Dunbar the Makar, p. 220 includes the poem termed K 34, which in the index corresponds with the poem in vice most vicuis hee excellis, among those dealing with ‘the duplicity of friars’, along with The Testament of Maister Andro Kennedy (K 38) and Ane murlandis man of uplandis mak (K 74). However, the poem’s subject is Donald Dubh and events particularly associated with him and the Highland revolts of 1503-6. The only reference that could possibly be said to have any bearing on friars would be the use of the fox imagery, but Bawcutt in Dunbar Poems, ii, p. 350 makes it clear that she believes this to be a description of Highlanders, certainly not friars.

34 The four poems are: Ane Ballat of the Passion (devotion meditation), Ane murlandis man of uplandis mak (satire), I maister Andro Kennedy (or The Testament of Maister Andro Kennedy), (parody) and How Dunbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir (satire). The titles correspond with Bawcutt, The Poems of William Dunbar while the classifications as to the individual poems’ manner are taken from J.A. Glenn, ‘Classifying Dunbar: Modes, Manners, and Styles’, in S. Mapstone (ed.), William Dunbar, ‘The Nobill Poyet’; Essays in Honour of Priscilla Bawcutt (East Linton, 2001), p. 175. For a discussion of Dunbar and to what extent his poems were based on actual fact and actual persons, see Bawcutt, Makar, pp. 39-62.
since there is no mention of friars, Dunbar may not have intended this to be part of the theme of the ‘fenyeit freir’ at all.\(^{35}\) The reason for this persistent inclusion of the misleading title and the poem in the ranks of anti-fraternal works is presumably the image of the fiend – in this case a ‘Turk of Tartary’ – killing a ‘religious man’ and ‘cleid him in his abeit new,’ a theme that we shall return to in other truly anti-fraternal works. This may be an example similar to the ‘friar and nun’ theme, which Croft has shown to have become ‘common property,’ moving away from the initial idea of the ‘friar of order gray’ to be used by anyone with a funny story to tell about any friar.\(^{36}\)

Ane Ballat of the Passioun is also not within the anti-fraternal tradition or indeed the satirical; it is a devotional poem that, if nothing else, shows that Dunbar was capable of a wide range of styles. It should be noted that it opens ‘Amang thir freiris within ane cloister’. Bawcutt partly confirms Fleming’s point, though from an unexpected angle, that here Dunbar operates within a Franciscan-style literary tradition not to satirise them but to write his own devotional poetry. She does point out that it was common to commence such poems by placing them within a church setting, though no explanation is offered as to why Dunbar should have chosen a friary – especially since he was otherwise wont to include them in his satirical writings as the butt of the joke. At this juncture it might be worth recalling that this poem was included in the same later-medieval devotional manuscript (Arundel 285), which also contained the Contemplacioun of Synnaris by William of Touris.\(^{37}\)

With Ane murlandis man of uplandis mak, however, we are once again firmly within the satirical tradition, though the subjects of this poem were the Edinburgh lawyers and their clients. But Edinburgh is also seen as a place where ‘Baith Carmeletis and Coirdeleiris/ Cwmis their to gener and get freiris,/ As is the vse of thair professioun./ The [y]oungar at the elder leiris.’\(^{38}\) The Cordeliers would stand for Franciscans, although it was also used to describe Third Orders, after the knotted


\(^{38}\) Bawcutt, Dunbar Poems, i, No. 2, p. 40 lines 45-8.
cord they wore to signify their connection with the Franciscans. A similar pairing occurs elsewhere when summarising orders of friars in later-medieval poetry, Sir David Lindsay’s *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* being one such example. As for the reason behind this particular pairing, it would appear that Dunbar’s main motive was once again a stylistic device, in this case his love for alliteration, employing a traditional alliterative phrase. There appears to be no historical reason why Dunbar should single out the Carmelites in this way. They did not have a house in Edinburgh until c.1520, when the ‘friars of Queensferry’ were granted a site at Greenside, a settlement that may not even have lasted until the Reformation due to recurrent troubles with the Augustinian canons at Holyrood Abbey. The Carmelites therefore should not have drawn Dunbar’s special attention in a way that the Franciscan Observants most certainly did.

In *I maister Andro Kennedy* we find more of the same. The supposed protagonist cannot be verified as having been a real person. Bawcutt has suggested that this was a means once again to satirise the Kennedy family (*The Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedie* being another such example). As in the earlier Faustus legend, the friars are put on the same level as a devil, although here is a definite sexual connotation when speaking of incubi, the kind of devil who had sexual intercourse with women. It appears to be just like the phrase in *Ane murlandis man of uplandis mak*, a stylistic device, the well-known stereotype of the friar as a seducer of women. Therefore, in this context, it is probably too great an assumption to make to infer any links between the single place reference given to imply Ayr as the setting of the poem and the friars who lived there.

All these, then, read like the usual critique expected from one who was well versed in anti-fraternal literature; indeed Bawcutt has suggested that Dunbar did not draw his inspiration from any one person or any one literary style. She sees him instead as a Jack-of-all-trades, one who knew enough about the different literary styles to try his hand with all. Therefore, in a list of Edinburgh’s vices, the

---

39 *Personal Comment*, Priscilla Bawcutt, 2 November 2005; Lindsay, *Satyre*, p. 95, lines 2620-1.
42 Bawcutt, *Makar*, pp. 24-6, 37-8
'Coirdeleiris' find mention for their duplicity; and Abbot Damien is associated with a stylistic device that is turned into one associated with friars in the Bannatyne manuscript. All this would serve the joke. The parody Dumbaris Dirige to the King (Dregy), however, suffered a similar fate as the Abbot of Tungland, in that it has come to be associated with friars, more specifically the Observant friary in Stirling, although they are never mentioned in the poem itself. Nevertheless this is perpetuated in studies of the Dregy. 43

The Dregy used the Office of the Dead as the setting for a bizarre competition between Edinburgh and Stirling as to which was the more pleasant burgh. Those in Edinburgh who are 'heir in hevynnis glorie' address those living in Stirling as 'you that ar in purgatorie,' although the suggestion has also been made that the poem parodies another office, the Commendatio Animae. 44 The simplest explanation would be that since Edinburgh, too, had enough friaries to turn it into a similar kind of hell from a satirist's point of view this might be a fact better left unmentioned. However, James IV's habit of spending Lent at the Stirling Observant friary, where his confessor was based, and the fact that William of Touris may have written his Contemplacioun of Synnaris for him while on retreat there, makes one wonder at this omission. It has led traditional scholarship to believe that this must have been part of the poem's agenda. It has since been suggested that the timing of the poem could have been advent ('And ye sall cum, or Yule begyn') 45 rather than Lent, and with the connection to the Office of the Dead, Judith Ting suggested November as an added 'influence'. Bawcutt even casts some doubt over whether the king really did retreat

43 J. Kinsley, The Poems of William Dunbar (Oxford, 1979), p. 280 no. 22, 'Dunbar's poem [...] [contrasts] the purgatorial austerities of the Franciscans [of Stirling] with the celestial delights of the court at Edinburgh; J.S. Norman, 'Thematic Implications of Parody in William Dunbar's 'Dregy,''' in R.J. Lyall and F. Riddy (eds), Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Scottish Language and Literature (Medieval and Renaissance), University of Stirling, 2-7 July 1981 (Stirling and Glasgow, 1981), pp. 345 ('It is generally accepted that William Dunbar's 'Dregy' was written on the occasion of James IV's retreat to the convent of Franciscan Observantine Friars that the king had founded at Stirling.').


45 Bawcutt, Dunbar Poems, i, 84, p. 276 line 93.
to the Observant friary during Holy Week, the foundation for this being ‘the unsupported testimony of John Hay’. On at least one other occasion, Easter 1513, however, such a retreat is reported by the Spanish ambassador de Ayala and with further reports of the king’s confessor suggesting to him that he wear an iron girdle to expiate for his role in his father’s death, the connection between ‘purgatorie’ and the Stirling Observant friary could be at least implied. Certainly Dunbar would have been aware of the power the king’s confessor had in spiritual matters, but even that would be too little basis to insist that the Observants were the reason for Stirling’s purgatory, even with Elizabeth Archibald’s reading that the king was numbered among the ‘dead in Stirling, and a dirge is needed to bring him to salvation’ – salvation of course being his main pre-occupation in his patronage of the Observant order.46

Nevertheless, the underlying parody of both the Office of the Dead and the Commendatio Animae would at least provide an indirect link to the lucrative involvement of the friars in masses for the dead. The king is offered ‘ane cairfull sown’ in order to release him from his Stirling purgatory, which could certainly be a reference to the prayers for the dead, meant to speed the souls of the departed through purgatory. Dunbar’s feelings on the friars and the ‘market’ of masses for the dead were made plain in I maister Andro Kennedy. Furthermore, Judith Ting points out that St Giles was ‘not only the patron saint of Edinburgh, but also of beggars’, and this might also be a subtle finger pointed at the Observants. Ting also takes it to be directed at the courtiers who had chosen to relocate to Stirling. She cites several invocations that appear to have been imported from the Commendation Animae, one of which is to ‘Confessouris’, a term which is also used by Dunbar in How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir to address St Francis. Overall, however, the main subject of the poem remains the ‘comic rivalry’ between Edinburgh and Stirling. Judith Ting suggests that this was entirely within the setting of the court, rather than all inhabitants of these burghs; and all these indications that the Observants could also
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be addressed are just that: hints. It seems likely that, had they been intended as part of the joke, Dunbar would have said so, as he did in *Ane murlandis man of uplandis mak*, where he did not fail to include a standard jibe at the expense of the Edinburgh Observants. In this case there is no need for the poem to be set in Lent and the context of the king’s Holy Week retreats. Dunbar would have been more than able to find a humorous way to address them, had they be intended as the subject of the poem.

This brings us to Dunbar’s one poem whose sole subject were the friars and their vices: *How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir*. This was a vision poem and presents the clearest expression of an anti-fraternal streak in Dunbar’s writings. Instead of inserting the token aside at the friars, here is a poem that deals in its entirety with St Francis and his order. There is now a general consensus that this is not supposed to have been autobiographical and that Dunbar was not an itinerant Franciscan friar sometime before 1500, but that Dunbar was composing a more abstract poem, one that finds its catalyst in a more general sense of anti-fraternal sentiment. Bawcutt asserts that ‘it is undoubtedly written within the long and flourishing tradition of anti-mendicant satire,’ while suggesting that the poem is missing certain elements of satirical writing; it fails to make a ‘detailed or devastating indictment of the friars’. However, having dealt with the autobiographical matter, she ignores a matter that is arguably just as intriguing: why Dunbar would single out the Franciscans in this fashion, when the Dominicans and their founder would have served the same purpose. Indeed of all of his poems that include mention of the friars, the *Ballat of the Passioun* mentions friars in general, being also not anti-fraternal, while the other two specify Franciscans: *Ane murlandis man of uplandis mak* singles out Cordeliers in conjunction with the Carmelites, while *How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir* is explicitly anti-Franciscan satire.

The poem begins as a dream, in which St Francis appears and attempts to persuade the dreamer to take up the Franciscan habit. It is not until the last stanza that the saint is revealed as a demon, which – presumably exasperated by the

---

dreamer’s persistent refusal to join the Franciscan order – goes up in ‘stynk and fyrie smowk’. The purpose of the demon was to lure suitable candidates for entry into Francis’ order, and it is left to the dreamer to present the catalogue of the Franciscan friars’ vices in order to repel the offer and the spurious figure that made it. Thus, unaware at first that it is not Francis himself but a demon in saintly guise who addresses him, the protagonist continues to find ever more reasons to turn down the invitation. He even shrinks away from the habit offered him; he would ‘lap thairfra and nevir wald cum nar it.’

This emphasis on the habit and the fiend dressed in the friar’s habit is the very theme of the ‘fenyeit freir’ already encountered above. In this satire on the Franciscan order, however, Dunbar remains entirely traditional. He availed himself of the standard vocabulary, such as addressing Francis as ‘confessour,’ which Bawcutt agrees to be not just as the proper title for this particular saint but also as an aside at the friars’ interference with the secular clergy’s right to confess their parishioners; and the dreamer asserts that ‘off full few freiris that hes bene sanctis I reid.’ Furthermore, the friar’s habit is a means to enjoy oneself (‘I haif in to thy habeit maid gud cheir’ and while being a friar the dreamer asserts that he ‘wes ay reddy all men to begyle’ as well as that in him ‘wes falset with every wicht to flatter’ – two vices often associated with friars. ‘Frere Flatterere’ was one of Langland’s characters, and we shall encounter both Flattery and Falsehood dressed in friars’ habits in David Lindsay’s Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis.

Lyall has also shown that the poem is a perversion of medieval hagiographical writing, especially in the use of dreams and visions. Franciscan reports of dreams in which saints can be tempted by devils in disguise were an integral part of Franciscan hagiography, and it is quite possible that Dunbar was familiar with specific incidents narrated in the Franciscan tradition. The idea of a devil or demon taking on the persona of a Franciscan friar again draws on the earliest version of the Faust legend, the German necromancer who reputedly sold his soul to the devil, with the devil appearing to him

49 Bawcutt, Dunbar Poems, i, p. 249 line 48.
50 Bawcutt, Dunbar Poems, i, no. 77, p. 248 line 10.
52 Bawcutt, Dunbar Poems, i, no. 77, pp. 248-9 lines 20, 23, 33-5, 43, 45, ii, p. 473.
in the manner of a gray frier' – an image which lasted into the post-Reformation period. Bawcutt refers particularly to Dr Faustus' command to the devil to 'go and return an old Franciscan friar/ That holy shape becomes a devil best,' or even once again to Chaucer and the 'Summoner's Tale': 'friars and fiends are seldom far asunder.' Yet when dealing with a different poem by Dunbar, Lucina schynnyng in silence of the nicht, a companion-piece to the Abbot of Tungland, Bawcutt draws our attention to yet another medieval tradition concerning the devil, that the devil would be born of a friar and a nun. There are also other parts of the poem that could be seen as drawing from the general anti-fraternal repertory. A reference to the poet, or rather the dreamer of the poem, as a love poet even indicates that the poet is more than qualified to enter the order of St Francis – again refers to the friars' alleged adulterous motives for their calling.

Dunbar adhered to the practice that the person of the founder – and this was as true of Dominic as it was of Francis – was beyond reproach. The vices displayed by the members of their respective orders were not blamed on the founders; anti-fraternal literature would usually stop short of doubting their sanctity. Even Langland in his Piers Plowman found no fault with either, although this did not stop him from applying to all other friars the entire catalogue of misdemeanours that was at his disposal. Just like his literary predecessors, Dunbar implied 'the decline of the Franciscan order from its first principles.' This trend was to change once anti-fraternal literature came to be used by the Protestant Reformers. This particular poem of Dunbar's was to undergo both a translation into Latin and a quite substantial reworking by George Buchanan in the 1530s, to mark the beginning of a four-poem

54 Bawcutt, Makar, pp. 270, 279-81; R.K. Emmerson, Antichrist, p. 8; Chaucer, Canterbury Tales, p. 303, 'The Summoner's Tale'; Oldridge, Devil in Early Modern England, p. 85; C. Marlowe, Dr Faustus, Roma Gill (ed.), 2nd edn (London and New York, 1989), p. 17: scene III, lines 26-7. It should be noted that some editions of Christopher Marlowe's Dr Faustus still retain a stage direction (missing from the present edition) which directs Mephistophilis entering 'like a Franciscan Friar', Scene 3, between lines 35 and 36. For the image of the 'friar and the nun' see also Croft, 'The Friar of Order Gray' and the Nun'. It might also be worth noting that Lucina schynnyng in silence of the nicht, although dealing with the same subject matter as the Abbot of Tungland, it is shorter and Bawcutt remarks that it has the same number of lines and stanzas as How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir.

55 'Thow that hes lang done Venus lawis teiche/ sall now be freir and in this abbeit preiche.' Bawcutt, Dunbar Poems, no. 77, p. 248 lines 13-14.

56 Bawcutt, Makar, pp. 273-4; Szitty, Antifraternal Tradition, pp. 12, 247; Dipple, Antifraternalism and Anticlericalism, p. 1.
cycle directed against the Franciscans, and the result is a work that is considered to be rather more inelegant in its bluntness than Dunbar’s dream poem.

Despite the fact that one of Buchanan’s anti-clerical poems was so closely linked to Dunbar’s *How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir*, we need to look at Sir David Lindsay of the Mount and his *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* first. Although Buchanan’s four-poem cycle is contemporaneous with much of Lindsay’s writing (they predate the *Satyre*), their style is markedly different from Lindsay’s and even Dunbar’s and places both in a more traditional and perhaps conventional vein. Like Dunbar, Lindsay was a court poet; but while Dunbar was associated only with the court of James IV, Lindsay’s career spans that of three monarchs: James IV and V and the minority of Mary, Queen of Scots, with Lindsay probably entering royal service around 1511. Having been born sometime during the latter years of James III’s reign and having died sometime during Queen Mary’s minority, he experienced three minorities (covering twenty-eight years), which made him a fervent representative of the *speculum principis* genre – not an unusual genre – to which that most impressive piece, *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*, first performed in Cupar on 7 June 1552 and later in Edinburgh on 12 August 1554, also belongs.57

It follows from his personal experience of the minorities and his changing fortunes during these – often for the worst – that he should be rather critical of the recurring minorities that had marked every reign of a Stewart king since James I. Lindsay had appeared as poet at James IV’s court by 1511, and was usher to the king’s infant son before James IV died at Flodden in 1513, and so he remained at court for at least part of James V’s minority. Yet it was this politically unstable situation – the power struggle in the minority – which saw Lindsay fall from grace when the Dowager Queen and her then-husband seized control of the young king and thus government.58 The timing of the *Satyre’s* first performance is similarly noteworthy, since it comes after almost a decade of conflict with England underlying

57 Lindsay, *Satyre*, pp. viii, xiv-xx; Edington, *Court and Culture*, pp. 1, 14f, 69-70. Edington suggests that Lindsay was born around 1486 and died sometime before March 1555, see Edington, *Court and Culture*, pp. 12, 66. For an explanation of the year of his birth see also Lindsay, *Satyre*, p. xiv, f.

Lyall provides a discussion in great detail about the different possible dates of when the *Satyre* might have first appeared, but since this is of no immediate interest for the present discussion, I will take the dates for the two performances as accurate.

which was again a struggle for control of the young queen.\textsuperscript{59} It is impossible to believe that these events would not have played a significant role in Lindsay’s writings.

Although there is a certain amount of biographical information to be gleaned from Lindsay’s works, Edington remarks that he often used ‘archetypal figures’, an essential point when looking at his reactions to the friars in his works. Especially in the \textit{Satyre}, she does not believe that Rex Humanitas can be read as the young James V, contradicting Kinsley’s reading of the work and describing the \textit{Satyre} as ‘allegorical and not mimetic’ in the same way perhaps that the vice-friars in \textit{Piers Plowman} are symbols rather than personifications of living friars.\textsuperscript{60} Edington’s discussion deals mainly with Lindsay and his portrayal of kingship, but if her observations hold true in this aspect, then it is entirely conceivable that they should also be applicable to his depiction of the friars. Similarly, it is possible that since he singles them out even among the Spiritual estate, there is more here than ‘time-honoured platitudes,’ although one does not necessarily exclude the other.\textsuperscript{61}

In its most general form the \textit{Satyre} is certainly part of the \textit{speculum principis} genre, the ‘mirror of princes’, designed to give advice to the monarch, although, repeatedly, a certain Reformist character is detected in Lindsay’s works and particularly in the \textit{Satyre}. Lyall, for example, makes much of the inherent Reformist character of Lindsay’s work in his edition, referring to the list of reforms presented in the second part of the \textit{Satyre} as the solution to deal with the ills presented in Part One, and suggests that had they been implemented in the Scotland of the 1550s: ‘the Scottish Reformation, though different in form from that which actually took place under Knox’s leadership in 1560, would unquestionably have arrived.’ This seems too strong, however, considering that Lyall also frequently insists that Lindsay never actually attacked the doctrine of the established Church, only ever the conduct of its members. Janet Hadley Williams has suggested that at least early in his career, Lindsay’s ‘Reformist’ influence could have come from France and thus he could be

\textsuperscript{59} Lindsay, \textit{Satyre}, p. viii. Lindsay, \textit{Satyre}, pp. xx-xxi.
\textsuperscript{60} Szittya, \textit{Antifraternal Tradition}, p. 284.
\textsuperscript{61} Edington, \textit{Court and Culture}, p. 71.
associated with the ‘rather free thinking attitudes of the French reformers before 1534’.62

Also, as Lyall concedes, Lindsay attacks ‘every social group likely to be represented among the observers’; even the figure of the monarch, portrayed as Rex Humanitas. It is his obedience to his fallible courtiers that causes the ensuing dilemma, and Lindsay portrays a sovereign who is ‘besotted’ by sexual pleasure. The fact that the king does not appear to represent a particular Scottish king, but is rather an Everyman figure, further supports the theory that Lindsay’s criticism was directed very much at a stereotypical cross-section of Scottish society and once the status-quo is re-established, it is not a ‘Reformed society’ that is portrayed. Yet if the dramatis personae are meant to portray a cross-section of the Scottish court and, to an extent, Scottish society, is it so unimaginable that his portrayal of the clergy is realistic rather than real? If he wished to present his audience with a worst-case scenario, one would expect Lindsay to go to a certain level of exaggeration, yet his play is still set in a recognisably Scottish court. Furthermore, Carol Edington in her biography of Sir David Lindsay has documented a certain exasperation experienced by Lindsay’s post-Reformation publishers at the ‘Papist lapses’ evident in a work they would very much have liked to be Reformist before its time. Edington sees him ‘as a man groping toward understanding in an uncertain religious climate’ who fully rejected Luther’s doctrine of sola fide. Rather she places him within the tradition of ‘religious satire’, the practitioners of which she sees as idealists who were all too aware that the church was unable to meet their ideals.63

Speculum principis literature could go hand-in-hand with religious satire, especially for a poet who would be aware that both the king’s and the church’s conduct could have serious effects on the well-being of the kingdom. For Lyall these are two of the three pillars which are at the forefront of all of Lindsay’s major works, the third being the ‘injustices of contemporary society’, though he believes that of

63 Lindsay, Satyre, pp. xxvii, xxix, xxxi; Edington, Court and Culture, pp. 145-7.
the three, Lindsay pays the most attention to the clergy.\textsuperscript{64} This is probably why Lyall makes much more of Lindsay's Reformist leanings, while Edington's main emphasis is on the 'need for good government'. There are certainly plenty of examples, and not just in the \textit{Satyre}. Lindsay's \textit{Tragedie of Cardinall Betoun}, in which he has Cardinal Beaton confess to all the crimes he was accused of by the Reformers who had assassinated him, was written in the late 1540s and was 'condemned and burned by a Provincial Council of the Scottish Dominicans', probably in 1549.\textsuperscript{65}

The \textit{Satyre} portrays a kingdom in which the king is led astray by bad counsel and as a result John the Commonweill suffers at the hands of a church turned greedy. But while dealing out criticism to all and sundry, Lindsay stops short of actually suggesting the king is at fault other than in that he allowed bad advice to distract him, much like Adam Abell when he attributes all that has gone wrong in the reign of James IV to evil counsellors.\textsuperscript{66} But while not one member of the three estates who provide the title of the play comes away unscathed this makes it all the more difficult to determine what is literary exaggeration and what is genuine criticism of actual persons or events. In effect he is producing a worse case scenario. Certainly his attack on the friars finds forerunners in other works, by authors like Chaucer, and there is little doubt that, while he may be addressing actual misconduct, he is doing so within the established framework of anti-fraternal, indeed anti-clerical literature; and we must assume an element of stereotyping. The fact that he seems to use the term friars generically makes it all the more difficult to identify the Observants as possible addressees or in fact to separate once again the historical from the stereotypical. For one, he used the same alliterative device as Dunbar in \textit{Ane murlandis man of uplandis mak}, that of the 'Carmeleits and Cordeleirs', although he added the 'Augustenes' to the list.\textsuperscript{67} It is noteworthy that Lyall in his edition does not take this to be an alliterative device as Bawcutt identified it to be in Dunbar's poem. In a note Lyall takes this rather seriously as a statement by Lindsay as to their corruptness. The fact that the Dominicans were omitted suggests to him that Lindsay 'was better disposed towards them', since in the \textit{Testament of the Papyngo} he has

\textsuperscript{64} Lindsay, \textit{Satyre}, p. xvi.

\textsuperscript{65} Lindsay, \textit{Satyre}, pp. xx-xxi.

\textsuperscript{66} Thorson, 'Roit and quheill of time', p. 224.

\textsuperscript{67} Lindsay, \textit{Satyre}, line 2621.
nothing but praise for the Dominican nunnery at Sciennes. This is echoed by Edington, who finds that Lindsay’s attitude towards the friars in his literature is ‘ambivalent,’ but it seems to become less ambivalent with time; certainly the Satyre seems outright hostile.68

Both suggestions have merit, especially since Lindsay in his Satyre avails himself of devices which others, including Dunbar in the Scottish context, have used before, among them the ‘fenyeit freir’: the friar’s habit as a ‘cover for “gud cheir” and an emblem of deceit.’69 He disguised the Three Vices, Flatterie, Falset and Dissait, in friars’ habits ( alas no colour is given), turning them into Discretioun, Devotioun and Sapience, thus implying that they are really the opposite. Dunbar used similar phraseology in How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be a ne Freir and there is the ‘frere Flaterere,’ who turned into the apocalyptical ‘Sire Penetrans Domos’, in Langland’s Piers Plowman. Szittya suggests that the character of Need in Piers Plowman may also have been both a vice and a friar. Jill Mann takes this to be a direct allusion to the traditional charge against the friars of having a ‘persuasive tongue’, which may often include a sexual intent. It is therefore no surprise that Lindsay used the Vices to introduce the anti-fraternal and ultimately anti-clerical element to his play; anti-clerical, since Sensualitie is not completely expelled, but takes her place among the Spiritual Estate in the Satyre’s parliament.70

This of course means that the Vices are at least in part a stylistic tool that would diminish the immediacy of the criticism levelled at the friars in the play. They, too, become allegories, like the rest of the participants in the play. Certainly a monologue, in which Flatterie explains the choice of friars’ habit to his companions, that becomes a list of all the traditional charges levelled at the friars in anti-fraternal texts since St Amour:

…I can richt weill fleich./ Perchance lle cum [to] that honour/ To be the Kings confessedour./ Pure freirs are free at any feast,/ And marchellit ay amang the best./ Als God [hes lent to] them sic graces/ That bishops put them in thair places,/ Out-throw thair

68 Lindsay, Satyre, p. 196, note 2621; Edington, Court and Culture, pp. 154-5.
69 Bawcutt, Makar, p. 272.
70 Lindsay, Satyre, pp. 30-1; Szittya, Antifraternal Tradition, pp. 267-87; Langland. It might also be worth noting that Chaucer’s Summoner calls the friar ‘a flattering friar’, Canterbury Tales, p. 239.
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dioceis to preiche./ Bot ferlie nocht, howbeit thay fleich./ For schaw thay all the veritie./ Thaill want the bishops charitie./ And, thocht the come war never sa skant./ The gudewyfis will not let freirs want/ For quhy, thay ar thair confessoirs./ Thair heavinlie prudent counsalours -- Thairfoir the wyfis plainlie taks thair parts./ And shawis the secreits of thair harts/ To freirs, with better will, I trow./ Nor thay do to thair bed-fallow.71

Flatterie also claims that ‘freiris will reddie entries get/ Quhen lords ar haldin at the yet’. One might add a later accusation by the character of Gude Counsall that ‘Flattrie hes taine the habite of ane freir,/ Thinkand to begyll Spiritualitie’, i.e. the spiritual estate. Indeed once the Vices are unmasked, Spiritualitie complains that ‘I wyte thir freirs that I am thus abusit,/ For by thair counsall I have been confusit.’72

These charges were indeed rather standard – as are the depictions of other characters – but Lindsay made special mention of becoming the ‘Kings confessour’, possibly an aside directed at the Observant Franciscan confessor of James V, William Laing, an aside that is repeated by Flatterie towards the end of the play. But then Dissait offers to fetch a friar’s cowl which he ‘reft [...] betwix Sanct-Johnestoun and Kinnoull,’ a place he then identifies as Tullilum and which, to Lyall, was a reference to the Carmelites of Tullilum. Falset follows this with the suggestion that ‘thow may be fallow to Freir Gill’, whom both Lyall and Anthony Ross identify as the friar ‘Johannes Aegidii or Gyl’ who appeared in the Treasurer’s Accounts between 1491 and 1508 and again between 1526 and 1538. There is also a later instance where Lindsay singled out ‘Gray Freris,’ when Diligence wonders ‘Quhat gif I find some halie provinciall/ Or minister of the Gray Freiris all,/ Or ony freir that can preich prudentlie?’ without further distinction as to which provincial or indeed branch of the order was meant.73

Ultimately, however, all criticism in the Satyre is put into perspective through its ‘mirror of princes’ theme which is evident throughout the play; and eventually the order which had been threatened by the corruptness of the three estates and the inattentiveness of a youthful king is restored. Even the king, Rex Humanitas as he is called in the play, does not escape criticism; he is made to wear one of the ‘caps of

71 Lindsay, Satyre, lines 741-59.
72 Lindsay, Satyre, lines 776-7, 1653-4, 3781-2.
73 Lindsay, Satyre, lines 760, 767, 771, 3182-4 and notes pp. 184, 200; A. Ross, ‘Some Notes’, p. 203.
folly' (‘folie hattis,’) distributed to everyone by Foly in the final scene. The Vices masquerading as friars are executed, except for Flatterie who, after delivering yet another monologue on perceptions of friars (‘Quhen I had on my freirs hude/ All men beleifit that I was gude [...] ‘Quhat halines is thair within/ Ane wolfe cled in ane wedders skin’) escapes to ‘Gang serve the Hermeit of Lareit,/ And leir him for till flatter,’ a literary attack that follows on from a corresponding entry in the ‘Dialog betuix Experience and ane Courtear.’ Flatterie actually has the last word before the final scene and the entry of Foly. This scene also bears closer inspection, as it has caused some confusion as to Lindsay’s intentions. Foly enters only when the play appears to be already over, as the medieval image of ‘idiocy and moral blindness’ delivering a sermon in which he attacks the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. But MacDonald has suggested that the entire play is a ‘mirror folly’ being ‘held up to the audience’. The friars again receive special attention in that ‘thay sail nocht know weill in thair clouters to quhom they sail say thair Pater nosters’, which is a reference to a controversy taking place between Dominicans and Observant Franciscans at St Andrews in the early 1550s. In this controversy, the Dominicans held the opinion that the Our Father should be offered to God, while the Franciscans maintained that it could be offered to the saints as well. The Dominican responsible for this controversy was Richard Marshall, ‘one of the foremost Catholic reformers within Scotland at the time’ and the Observant who rose to the occasion was Andrew Cottis, warden of St Andrews.

More must also be said about ‘Lareit’, or ‘Allarit’, as it appears in a later poem by Alexander, Earl of Glencairn. Loretto was the site where Thomas Doughtie founded a chapel to our Lady of Loretto near Musselburgh, centred around an ‘ymage of our Lady’ which he had brought with him when being ‘Capitane befoir the Turk.’ This is confirmed by an entry in the Great Seal, where he is styled as ‘hermit
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75 Lindsay, Satyre, p. xxxi, p. 162, lines 4636-4641; MacDonald, Dixit Insipiens, p. 264; Edington, Court and Culture, pp. 187-8; Foggie, Renaissance Religion, pp. 221-3. Lindsay, Satyre, lines 1525-6 has Flatterie making a reference to Pater noster, too (‘Or keip me clesse into sum closter,/ With mony piteous Pater noster’), although the link the controversy is missing. For Andrew Cottis, see Appendix 2, p. 263.
of the Order of St Paul the First Hermit of Mount Sinai.76 The model for this chapel was the Italian shrine of Loreto with its relic of the *Santa Casa*, the house of the Virgin, and received conspicuous attention from the king and his family; both James V and Mary of Guise were known to make pilgrimages to Loretto. But it was also a popular cult with the certain craft guilds: we have records that the goldsmiths of Edinburgh dispatched the deacon of their guild, Thomas Rhind, to Flanders in 1526 to acquire an image of Our Lady of Loretto, and pilgrimages to the Scottish shrine of St Mary of Loretto were popular, especially in connection with births and related illnesses.77

As Andrea Thomas has suggested, it was the attention paid to Loretto by James V and Mary of Guise in particular, that did much to increase the ‘credibility and popularity’ of Doughtie’s cult as well as put it in the path of both reformers and critics like Lindsay, who had much to say about Doughtie’s trickery and false miracles. It would appear that Glencairn’s motivation behind his Epistle was outrage: there had been a cult of the hermit, common to both Catholic and Protestant belief, in the 1520s and 1530s, among others the cult of St Jerome, father of the church, and Glencairn saw Loretto as a perversion of this cult.78 One such false miracle was reported in John Row’s *History* and has been associated with Row’s late conversion to Protestantism; so much so that it was even included in the transcript of the Perth Register of Baptisms by John Scott, minister of the East Church in Perth. In places Scot felt it necessary to provide extra information on persons involved with the baptisms, and the baptism of John Row, first son of the Perth minister John Row, was just such an occasion (although the account appears to have been copied from Row’s *History*). Row had spent several years in Rome and was trained in canon law at the University of Padua under the patronage of Guido Ascanius Sforza, Cardinal of Sancta Flora, but an incident involving the Protestant Robert Colville, laird of Cleishe, who was ‘commonlie called’ Esquire Meldrum, a shepherd boy and ‘St

78 McRoberts, ‘Hermits’, pp. 209-11; A. Thomas, *Princelie Majestie: The Court of James V of Scotland, 1528-1542* (Edinburgh, 2005), pp. 114-5. My thanks to Michael Lynch for his suggestions concerning the cult of hermits. It should also be noted at this point that the collegiate church of St Mary of Loreto and St Anne was founded in Glasgow in 1520, bearing further witness to the popularity of this cult.
Allarit's Chapel near Musselburgh' was enough to cause his conversion. The laird's wife had sent a servant there to pray for 'intercession of the Virgin Mary to whom the chapel was dedicated' for an easy delivery. Her husband, when trying to recall the servant, himself arrived at the chapel and saw some 'Priests and Friars' engaged in a miracle, which involved restoring a blind man's sight. The Laird being an upright Protestant immediately suspected foul play and forced the formerly blind man to tell him the truth about the alleged miracle. It turned out that the man, who was now in Colville's employ, had learnt this particular trick of turning 'up the white of his Eyes in such a manner, that any Person would have thought him to be really blind' while being employed as a shepherd to the sisters of Sciennes. The nuns reported his abilities to 'some priests and friars' who decided to hide the shepherd in the nuns' basement for several years and then bring him out as a blind man and have him led around the country by a guide and eventually, when he got to Loretto, to heal him and impress the assembled crowd.79

Thus, much like the Observants in Scotland, it was royal attention that caused the Reformers and certain critics of such religious expressions, like Lindsay, to take offence. And they were linked in another way, for the hermit of Loretto, whom Flatterie was off to teach how to flatter, was mentioned in an earlier poem by Alexander Cunningham counselled by 'Frier Walter Laing', none other than the confessor of James V. In Lindsay's Satyre it is Flatterie, previously disguised as the friar Devotioun, who is the advisor to the hermit, thus making a connection between Laing and the flattering friar. This reference would suggest that Lindsay must have known the poem. More significantly, Friar Laing also appears in Buchanan's poem Franciscanus as a worker of fake miracles.80

The reason Buchanan has been left till last - although the first of his anti-fraternal poems predates Lindsay's Satyre by almost two decades - is a development in anti-fraternal literature that Lyall associates with the Reformation, what he calls a
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79 J. Row, The History of the Kirk of Scotland, From the Year 1558 to August 1637; With a Continuation to July 1639, by his Son, John Row (Edinburgh, 1842), pp. 448f.; NLS, Adv MS 31.1.5, Perth Register of Baptisms; McRoberts, 'Hermits', p. 212.
80 Lindsay, Satyre, line 743; Calderwood, History, i, pp. 135, 137; Knox, History, i, p. 74; Buchanan, Franciscanus, lines 823f. For a more detailed discussion about William Laing, see Chapter 2, pp. 71-2 and Appendix 2, p. 269.
'change of tone'. Buchanan, too, could be found in the orbit of the court, employed from at least 1536 and in charge of the education of James, illegitimate son of James V by Elizabeth Sauchie; and his anti-fraternal poems, too, are associated with his time at court. Among Buchanan’s possible acquaintances may be counted Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, and although McFarlane concedes that their acquaintance can have been only brief, he notes a similarity in Buchanan’s and Lindsay’s ‘literary outlook … at a time when both were sharpening their satirical claws’, no doubt suggesting Lindsay’s perceived pseudo-Protestant leanings. Intimately linked with the circumstances leading to the composition of the Somnium (and to a wider degree the Franciscanus) is also the question of how much tolerance was given to such anti-fraternal writings at the court of James V – Buchanan himself claimed a relationship between James V and the commissioning of these poems.

Between 1535 and 1538 Buchanan produced four anti-fraternal poems, the Somnium in 1535, the two parts of the Palinodiae (1537) and the Franciscanus in 1538, though they were not published until 1566. McFarlane has cautioned that this lapse in time between composition and publication would mean that Buchanan himself might have modified them to an extent from their original form, as well as taking into consideration that their time of publication puts them beyond the Reformation, perhaps suggesting that a much harsher tone was then possible. His doubts are particularly directed towards the Franciscanus: McFarlane does not believe that this poem, which has survived in a single copy, is as the original. Unlike Dunbar and Lindsay, Buchanan’s language of choice was Latin, which is quite striking with regard to his Protestant sentiments. It has been remarked in the English context – and one would expect the Scottish experience to be little different in this respect – that the most common form of communicating Reformist thought was through vernacular drama. This puts certain restrictions on the audience Buchanan had in mind for these poems; it certainly puts them out of bounds of the wider audience that would have been targeted by vernacular satire.

81 Lyall, ‘Complaint, Satire and Invective, pp. 55, 60.
82 McFarlane, Buchanan (London, 1981), pp. 48-51
84 Buchanan, Political Poetry, nos 54/4, 55/4, 56/4 and 57/4, pp. 168-245; McFarlane, Buchanan, p. 51.
The first of the three, the *Somnium* – the Dream – was borne out of a dispute Buchanan allegedly had with a ‘Franciscan’. Buchanan reports that since the dispute could not be settled to the Franciscan’s satisfaction, he spread ‘many suspicious rumours on [Buchanan’s] account’; therefore he ‘retaliated by translating an old Scots epigram into Latin verse’ and thereafter both ‘bandied about many insults without saying anything derogatory to religion.’\(^86\) At least Buchanan did not, as his derision was reserved entirely for St Francis and his order. This account, which was taken from a letter preface to the *Franciscanus* written in June 1564, differs from an account in his *Vita* from 1582, which claims that he had composed this ‘short elegiac poem’.\(^87\)

The inspiration for the *Somnium* came, according to McFarlane, at a dinner arranged by Archbishop Gavin Dunbar – himself a contemporary of Sir David Lindsay and tutor to the young James V – some time after Buchanan had returned to Scotland from France. Dunbar was a prominent figure in royal government of the reign of James V (as well as the king’s former tutor) who was a supporter of the Observants; at least his death was recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary*, where, besides the friars were listed the notable patrons of the Aberdeen friary. Knox, too, comments on this, when he recounts Dunbar’s attempts to spare the life of a Franciscan friar tried for heresy in Glasgow. But ‘idiot Doctoris’, as Knox calls the Inquisitors that had been sent to aid archbishop Dunbar in his investigation, insisted that Dunbar comply with the guidelines of the church on how to deal with heretics, so that the archbishop finally yielded and ‘adjudgeed the innocentis to dye, according to the desire of the wicked.’\(^88\) The 1564 preface also claimed that James V continuously badgered him to compose something at the expense of the Franciscans since the king himself did not ‘approve of the Franciscans’ behaviour,’ though this ‘behaviour’ appears to have been their involvement in the plot against him surrounding the Master of Forbes.\(^89\)
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\(^{86}\) McFarlane, *Buchanan*, p. 52.
\(^{87}\) McFarlane, *Buchanan*, p. 51.
\(^{89}\) McFarlane, *Buchanan*, pp. 53-4; Bryce, i, pp. 111-2; ii, p. 294. There are indications that the charges of treason on which the Master of Forbes had been tried in 1537 had been carefully selected by the earl of Huntly, who had a more private issue to settle and had failed in his attempts to resolve it.
However, there are English reports that point to a certain fear that James V might follow his uncle Henry VIII’s example in matters of religion. Edington cites a report by the Duke of Norfolk to Thomas Cromwell as representative of a climate of uncertainty as far as the religious future of Scotland was concerned and, more intriguingly, a request by a lawyer, Thomas Bellenden, to the English commissioner to the Border to provide material for the ‘enlightenment’ of James V in matters of religion. Furthermore, Edington suggests that ‘Bellenden and his associates’ accepted Buchanan’s claims that the *Franciscanus* had been ‘written at the instigation of the king’ though she admits that ‘the details of Buchanan’s quarrel with the Franciscans are obscure, and James’s status as patron of anticlerical literature remains unproven’ – we should also remind ourselves that Buchanan did not make his claims until after James V had died.90 This, however, seems far too much like the letter James V sent to Frederick of Denmark and the background to such reports could be simple – so to speak – politicking since James was pursuing a certain agenda with his uncle Henry VIII at the time. While it is true that it is much more difficult to gauge James V’s attitudes towards the Observants (unlike his father), it would be difficult to imagine that James V would suffer an Observant confessor if he had such issues with the Franciscans. There is certainly an acceptance of anti-fraternal literature at court, otherwise Dunbar and Lindsay would have found their activities curbed rather quickly. But Buchanan’s claim that the king was not satisfied with an ‘extremely ambiguous’ poem and insistent on something much more explicit – resulting in the *Franciscanus* – seems far-fetched. There is certainly enough evidence to suggest that his other claims on the origins on these poems were ambiguous at best.91 What is rather intriguing is that here we finally have a poet who identified his targets. While very often we labour with the problem of vague phrasing and the generic ‘friar’, Buchanan leaves no doubt that not only was he singling out the Franciscans, but by naming James V’s confessor in the *Franciscanus* it becomes very clear that we are dealing with anti-Observant satire. Yet despite the fact that he is so specific and even

---

recounts alleged true stories, it is still not as clear-cut as it could be; this especially applies to the incident involving James’ confessor which might be as suspect as John Row’s account of the fake miracle involving the nuns at Sciennes and Loretto.

The *Somnium* was in effect a re-working of Dunbar’s *How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir*, not a translation or an original composition of Buchanan’s, and it is here that we encounter the most striking evidence of a change in tone. It certainly lacks the subtle irony of Dunbar’s original. It is a lot more to the point – often graphically so – and Buchanan left little doubt that he had a case to make, which was true of all his anti-fraternal poems and something that was noticeable in the Reform movements (Lutheran as well as others) all over Europe. There is no sense here that Buchanan enjoyed engaging in a literary genre as was the case with some of Dunbar’s poetry – the point is taken far too seriously for that. One would be hard pressed to find underlying elements of medieval Franciscan literature in any of Buchanan’s poems, as was possible with Dunbar’s poem.92

The standard stereotypes are certainly present: like Dunbar, Buchanan assures the visiting saint that there are few friars who have become saints, which is why he would prefer ‘a [bishops] mitre and a purple cassock’ to the friar’s habit. He does not, however, make a clear-cut distinction between monks and friars: he uses the word ‘monk’ (‘monachis’) instead, which is echoed by John Row’s account of the fake miracle at Loretto, where he reports of ‘priests and friars’ as if this were a proper term. But Buchanan places greater emphasis on the idea of freedom, and the identity of the dream apparition has also changed. This is perhaps the most striking difference to *How Dumbar wes Desyrd to be ane Freir*. It is Francis himself, identified in the sixth stanza by ‘the cord of hemp around his waist, bearing the well-known stigmata,’ something that will be revisited in the *Franciscanus*.93 And the final stanza, the one that redeemed St Francis in Dunbar’s poem is missing here. Buchanan crossed a line that in traditional anti-fraternal literature was taboo; he attacked the person of the saint. Traditionally both Dominic and Francis had been disassociated from the failings of their respective orders; Buchanan used Francis as

---

92 Dipple, *Antifraternalism and Anticlericalism*, p. 7, where he notes that ‘the charges of the Reformers are of unprecedented radicalism.’
his audience: it is to Francis that he recounts all the failings of the Franciscan order.\textsuperscript{94} The protagonists in the two poems are also different: ‘Dunbar’s dreamer awakes in perplexity; Buchanan’s dreamer is self-assured and plain-spoken, professing to bring out the truth from the beginning of his speech.’\textsuperscript{95}

The \textit{Palinodes}, written just after the \textit{Somnium}, were supposedly the ‘betwixt-and-between text’ rejected by James V as not being confrontational enough, the ‘middle course between overmuch offence to the Franciscans and undue mildness in the eyes of James V.’ Their setting suggests them to be parodies. But while McFarlane accepts them to be ‘ambiguous’, McGinnis and Williamson consider them to be a ‘far more damming critique of the Franciscan order and of late medieval piety.’\textsuperscript{96} They believe the initial depiction of the ‘war waged by the giants against the gods’ to be a ridicule of the friars as ‘self-proclaimed controllers of the gates of heaven.’ The stigmata, according to the poems, were caused either by a thorn or the point of a ‘stubborn girl’s’ needle (presumably to shake off Francis’ advances), turning a miraculous sign into something crude and quite insulting, again suggesting that even the founder of the Franciscan order was no longer exempt from criticism. But Buchanan, too, was not above inverting Franciscan literature in his satire, as McGinnis and Williamson suggest a reference to ‘brother flea, or brother louse’ to be an inversion of an instance in the \textit{Life of St Francis} and again later in the second part of the \textit{Palinodinae} where Francis was tempted by the devil.\textsuperscript{97} The second part of the \textit{Palinodinae} also differs from the first in that it changes to becoming a direct address; he now addresses and accuses the Franciscans directly.

This is then followed by the fourth poem, aptly named \textit{Franciscanus}, the climax of his anti-fraternal poems and, according to Buchanan, the one where he finally gives in to the demands of James V to write a satire with bite. If one were to gauge the extant anti-fraternal material by sheer size, then Buchanan’s poem \textit{The Franciscan} would have to be counted as a masterpiece. A far cry from Dunbar’s

\textsuperscript{94} Buchanan, \textit{Political Poetry}, p. 168 lines 17, “By your leave,” I say, “I should like to tell the truth about the Franciscan Order.”


\textsuperscript{97} Buchanan, \textit{Political Poetry}, p. 170 line 9, p. 319 note 55/4:1; p. 172 line 5 has them as gods, see p. 172 note 55/4:5; p. 172 lines 25-6, p. 320 note 55/4:9; p. 178 line 5, p. 320 note 55/4:15 and p. 182 lines 3-6 p. 320 note 56/4:7.
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more compact poems, *The Franciscan* goes on for 936 lines, with its sole subject being the shortcomings of the Franciscan order. It is again very explicit with few of the subtleties that have been observed in Lindsay’s or Dunbar’s satirical works, and in McFarlane’s opinion, it includes all the aspects one would expect to be present in anti-fraternal literature of the 1530s. It would appear that Buchanan drew on experiences gathered in Paris, where ‘traditional satire against the monks’ received a renaissance of sorts in the writings of Rabelais, whose first book appeared in 1532.98
The setting is that of a drama with four characters: Buchanan himself, a prospective recruit thinking of entering the Franciscan order, a monk named Eubulus (‘prudence, good counsel’) and an old monk full of stories for the young monks. Most of the poem is a sermon delivered by the Old Monk, a manual on how to use all the vices the friars were credited with to the best advantage, interspersed with supposed true stories. Once again Buchanan used the term ‘monks’ when clearly the order of St Francis was meant, certainly in the case of the Old Monk, who claims they were ‘made one by the bond of the knotted rope.’ To a certain extent it presents a similar setting as Chaucer’s Summoner’s Tale with Friar John giving Thomas a sermon, but without the eye-twinkling humour. McGinnis and Williamson suggest that many of the *Franciscanus*’ themes were taken from within the Reform movement, as if to suggest that is where they originated.99

In the poem Buchanan is told by his friend that he wishes to join the Franciscan order to lead a ‘holy way of life,’ a decision he applauds although he cautions his friend that in order to lead a this ‘holy way of life’ he may be about to enter the wrong order. Buchanan employs the usual stereotypes, but couches them in a more radical way; the friars are ‘ferocious tyrants, with the soul of a savage, often a robber, a gargantuan appetite, an adulterer’ as well as the same phrase Lindsay used later in his *Satyre*: ‘a wolf in sheep’s clothing’ and it is here that he calls on the aid of Eubulus, ‘wise old white-haired’ who had also helped Buchanan or he, too, ‘would have been trapped.’100 The difference to the *Somnium* and to an extent the *Palinodinae* is that Francis, however indirectly, is given some credit at least, when Eubulus is reported to have said that ‘in times gone by this breed, sprung from holy
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100 Buchanan, *Political Poetry*, pp. 186, 188 and lines 49-52, 57-8; Lindsay, *Satyre*, line 4294.
fathers, was remarkable for its snow-white way of life.' Now it is 'their posterity' that has 'given up on true religion', are only interested in 'sordid gain' and 'collecting legacies' and 'resting on their founders' reputation, they lead astray the ignorant people with a show of holiness.' Essentially, it is only unsavoury characters who are attracted to the Franciscan's way of life now; it is for those fleeing from abuse and the law or the idle. Eubulus goes on at length, using every possible stereotype in the anti-fraternal catalogue. He sees the Franciscans as a gathering place for anyone who is too disturbed, sick in mind or plagued by sin to make peace with himself, 'as if a guilty conscience can be shaved as well as the top of your head, just as if the tonsure will turn us from church-robbers, parricides, burglars, and perverts, all of a sudden into colonists of heaven.' Buchanan does, however, add new stereotypes, circumscribed in classical terms, such as 'those whom the Muses banish from the sacred spring,' although there are familiar characters, such as the friar cheating widows', who will 'go out into the country and work his wiles on the ignorant peasants' who 'draws the fish into his net' with 'flatteries and marvellous little stories, of ghosts and goblins and all sorts of spooks'. And, once again, the abuse of the confessional for their own ends, here coached in advice given by the Old Monk.101

But most of all Buchanan accused the friars of having too much authority, that is, unchecked authority.102 What is also intriguing is that Buchanan sees the Franciscans as a disruptive force in society. The Old Monk even has a section on how to antagonise people against the nobility, a very strange accusation.103 This could only be an expression of resentment against the friars' influence, and of course the most worrying influence in Buchanan's eyes would have been the perceived influence the Franciscans had on the king through his confessor. William Laing, confessor to James V, receives special attention towards the end of the Old Monk's sermon when the story of 'William Lang and the Dysart Exorcism' is re-told. Basically it is an account of another fake miracle, like the one John Row reported in his History in connection with Foretto. Laing is introduced as a 'skilful deceiver of

101 Buchanan, Political Poetry, 57/4, lines 73f, 93f.
102 'the brother said so? That's it! The brothers said no? You'd better not! The brother will be the judge [...] But don't say anything against the holy brothers! They're mad, but the bald heads have all the law on their side,' Buchanan, Political Poetry, 57/4 lines 217-20.
103 Buchanan, Political Poetry, 57/4 lines 676-80.
little old ladies' who (unsuccessfully) counted on the gullibility of the local population of Dysart in Fife. According to the account given by Buchanan, Laing had turned naturally occurring hot springs into an abode of demons and tortured souls, and made a great show of exorcising these, applying all the trappings of his station as priest and friar. This was done with the assistance of a scared youngster, described as 'the egregious accomplice', who later told the truth about the exorcism, though we are not told by Buchanan what that might have been. What is even more interesting about Friar Laing being named here is that Lindsay would not do so. Even after the death of James V, his reference is much more indirect and elegant.

McFarlane takes it as accepted that the Dysart affair took place, since it was 'widely recalled in later Calvinist literature' though he does not comment any further, which is unfortunate. For the next time we encounter the Dysart incident is in 'An Epistle directed frome the holie Heremite of Larite, to his Brethren the Gray Friers' composed in 1539 by Alexander Cunningham, fifth Earl of Glencairn, usually referred to as the Rhyme and recorded both in Calderwood's History and Knox's Works. The Cunninghams' power-base was centred around several lordships and baronies in south-west Scotland, especially Glencairn in Dumfriesshire, Kilmours in Ayrshire, Kilmaronock in Dunbartonshire and Finlaystone in Renfrewshire, and their territorial ambitions brought then in conflict with, among others, the Montgomery Earls of Eglinton in Ayrshire, who were patrons of the Observant Franciscans of Ayr. The family was well known in pro-English and Protestant circles, although in the struggle for control over the lands belonging to the monastery of Kilwinning, another Alexander Cunningham (cousin of William Cunningham, father of the Alexander who composed the Rhyme) held the commendatorship of Kilwinning for a time. William, had been an agent for English border officials since 1516 and his support for an Anglo-Scottish union seems to have increased with the prospect of religious reform in England – he had made his sentiments known when he spoke in support of the Protestant martyr George Wishart. Both William and Alexander were in receipt of English pensions in the 1540s, when Anglo-Scottish tensions were at a

104 Buchanan, Political Poetry, 57/4 lines 823-917; McFarlane, Buchanan, p. 55-6 and 55 note 25.
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107 Sanderson, Ayrshire and the Reformation, pp. 7-10. For more details on the nature of the feud, see Chapter 4, pp. 151-2.
peak after the Scots reneged on the marriage treaty between the infant Mary, Queen of Scots and Henry VIII’s son Edward.\(^\text{108}\)

Shortly after Alexander had composed his *Rhyme*, his younger brother Andrew was tried for heresy but recanted and was acquitted. In the 1550s, Alexander became a member of the Lords of the Congregation and thus played an active part in bringing about the Reformation in Scotland. He remained a prominent political figure as ambassador to England in October 1560 and later as a member of the Privy Council after the return of Mary, Queen of Scots, from France. His efforts during Mary’s personal reign were concentrated on continuing to establish Protestantism in Scotland and he opposed every hint at re-establishing Catholicism, resulting in his exile following his part in the Chaseabout Raid in 1565, although he, too, was subsequently pardoned in 1566. When Mary was deposed in 1567, it was Glencairn who supervised the destruction of the altars and furnishings of Mary’s private chapel at Holyrood.\(^\text{109}\)

In Glencairn’s poem, Thomas Doughtie, the hermit of Loretto and ‘that deceaver of the people’ warns his ‘brethrein the Gray Freris’ to be ‘watchfull and diligent./ For thir Lutherans risen of new, Our Order daylie doe pursue.’ He complains that the Lutherans have set themselves to have people read the ‘English New Testament,’ to show that the friars have deceived them all this time, and ‘therefore in haste they must be stoppit.’ In order to achieve this, he instructs them (tongue-in-cheek) to perform a few miracles so as to deflect the criticism of their enemies by ‘counsell of Frier Walter Laing’, who was to make certain ‘demonstrations’ ‘that practice he proved once before, betwixt Kirkaldie and Kingorne. According to Calderwood, the poem was an attempt to portray the ‘hypocrisie of the friers in ryme’ and it includes similar language and images to those used by Buchanan in his poems.\(^\text{110}\)

The language in the *Rhyme* is reminiscent of Buchanan’s writings: it is a long list of accusations, with the usual accusations and derogatory terms, for example ‘devouring woolves into sheepe’s skinnes’ who seek to devour Christ’s people,

\(^{108}\) Cowan, *Scottish Reformation*, p. 32; DNB, ‘Cunningham, William, third Earl of Glencairn (d. 1548), magnate’.

\(^{109}\) DNB, ‘Cunningham, Alexander, fourth Earl of Glencairn (d. 1574/5), nobleman’.

\(^{110}\) Calderwood, *History*, i, pp. 135, 137; Buchanan, *Political Poetry*, pp. 184-5. McGinnis and Williamson have suggested that Glencairn ‘appears to echo (or replicate) Buchanan’s phrasing’.
'corrupters of the creed' and 'mainteaners of idols and false gods', or the phrase 'professors of hypocrisie' paired with 'doctors of idolatrie.' What is striking, however, is that this time the poet delivers these charges as the friar, and the accusations that have thus far been applied to the friars are turned against those professing Protestantism. In all of Buchanan's poems, the accusations were quite deliberately levelled at the Franciscans and St Francis; Glencairn turns this around and ridicules the friars by showing that they would measure the Protestants by the standards which the Franciscans themselves would not be able to meet, with the intent to unmask them as even greater hypocrites than they were commonly thought to be.

It is still a mystery as to why the connection between the Observants and Thomas Doughtie in Reformist anti-fraternal satire should prove so persistent. A simple explanation for the specific reference to the Greyfriars in Glencairn's *Rhyme* could be the feud between his own family and that of Hugh, first Earl of Eglinton: with Eglinton as a notable patron of the Ayr Observants, Glencairn would certainly extend his displeasure at Eglinton to the Observants. This, however, would only serve as an explanation for Glencairn's poem: Lindsay, too, alludes to the connection between Doughtie and the Observants in the *Satyre* and one barely dares hope that there may have been an actual link, that the Observants had some influence at the Loretto shrine. That would put a whole new complexion on the pilgrimages James V and Mary of Guise undertook there for they would then provide an added link between his confessor and the impetus for these pilgrimages. On the other hand this could be a novel concept, to link the two people already identified as frauds in the minds of the Reformers - Thomas Doughtie and William Laing - and it was then perpetuated in a similar way as the device of the 'fenyeit freir.' The added problem is, of course, that we do not know whether the Dysart incident actually occurred, and to what extent Buchanan had embellished or added to the story. If the story were based on historical fact, it would beg the question why James V would allow such actions from his confessor. Certainly commissioning a satire from Buchanan would seem an unorthodox way of dealing with an errant confessor, especially considering the language used in the eventual product.

Anti-fraternal literature as a genre started with the secular clergy, if we accept William St Amour and the troubles at the University of Paris in the mid-thirteenth century as the origin of such a distinctive genre of anti-fraternal literature – and considering that the stereotypes developed in those first treatises were perpetuated right up to the sixteenth century it is a valid assumption. The secular clergy thus became the natural enemies of the friars, sparked by a fierce competition between them, because, as MacCulloch put it, 'they operated in the same market.' When treatises on the friars moved from the Latin to the vernacular, they became the purview of a wider spectrum of writers – although most of them were still clergy, such as Chaucer, Wyclif, and, in the Scottish context, Dunbar – but also accessible to a wider audience. The reasons, however, for composing anti-fraternal literature generally remained the same. The authors of this kind of literature perceived the friars as a potential threat, not necessarily to their livelihood, but to the spiritual safety of the faithful, perpetuating a myth that captivated the weak-willed.

Of the Scottish writers, Sir David Lindsay of the Mount was driven by these fears: during the minority of James V he had experienced economic duress, and had experienced first-hand the turmoil created by a contest for power in the absence of an adult king. For him, the minorities were a potential source for bad government, which could only be averted by a strong king, free from bad influence. Thus he attacked all those he perceived as exerting that influence on the king, which included the friars. Buchanan, too, had a personal score to settle: he also had experienced personal discomfort at the hands of the friars; he eventually even had to face the Inquisition in Portugal, and he escalated both the stereotypes and the vocabulary to a point where they moved into a realm that was pseudo-Protestant at least. Here he was joined by Glencairn, whose Rhyme may have been motivated by similar personal experiences: the feud between his family and the Montgomeries, which had dragged on for half a century by that point, and the obvious favour Hugh, Earl of Eglinton, showed towards the Observants of both Ayr and Glasgow, would have attracted his ire against them. Dunbar is the odd-one-out: although a clergyman himself, he composed his anti-fraternal writings as a member of the court, and he did not face the

same economic threat from the friars as did the secular clergy, a threat which Lindsay also perceived.

Nevertheless, the fact that ulterior and often personal motives can be detected behind most of the anti-fraternal writings available for us to study, does not mean that some of the criticism within them was not justified. The problematic situation of the sources makes it difficult, for example, to determine exactly how much influence the friars had at court and on the king, and Lindsay’s accusations may well be an exaggerated version of the truth, especially if we consider that Lindsay may not have modelled his *Rex Humanitas* on any particular Scottish king, but on an abstract. If so, then he may well have been thinking of James IV, and he conspicuous patronage of the Observant Franciscans, and their relationship with the king may well have been perceived as dangerously influential by contemporaries.

It seems to be a common theme of Scottish later-medieval anti-fraternal poetry that it was composed in the milieu of the court, but there was very little popular literature composed in this particular genre. Dunbar, Lindsay and Buchanan were all either court poets in one of their capacities or employed at court when composing their anti-fraternal works. The simplest deduction would then be that the Observants must have had a rather conspicuous position at court, which brought them to the attention of these men and caused resentment. Satire yields the best results when the targets are easily recognisable and conspicuous as they would have been to a courtly audience of these poems. In this connection they were charged with both trying to attain worldly influence and ‘high place’ as well as having a kind of access-all-areas pass, their friar’s habit giving them licence to enter any place and any house and thus access to great influence. This made them easy and, even in the milieu of the court, permissible targets, for only in the case of George Buchanan does royal authority (and I use this term deliberately, for in the case of Lindsay at least we are also dealing with minorities) ever take offence at these writings – possibly due to the aggressiveness of the pieces. There appears to have been a tradition among the European princes of allowing in their vicinity, if not in their immediate court, certain individuals or groups such as the ‘goliards’ whose express purpose was to perform
religious satire; although the question remains whether this truly constituted an 'acceptance within established order'.

Both James IV and V must have been aware of this at their own court, and despite choosing Observant friars as their confessors they seem to have condoned this activity, at least to an extent. Janet Hadley Williams presents this point in the context of literary patronage at the court of James V: 'lighthearted transactions between patron and poet' (her example is Sir David Lindsay's Complaynt addressed to James V with the occasional 'audacity') are only possible in a milieu in which literary patronage is firmly established, and she believes that this was the case at James V's court. Buchanan's experience shows that such 'sacrilegious antics', as Norman calls them, were accepted only within a certain traditional framework, and this would include anti-fraternal writings. By the later Middle Ages anti-fraternal literature had become stylised to such an extent that the immediacy within which it was first conceived in the thirteenth century had been diluted to the point where it was acceptable entertainment. However, the budding Protestant movement would have also seen in it a pre-existing tool which could be used to express Protestant sentiment and in the process it changed the language used in anti-fraternal literature. It became much more populist and aggressive. While writers like Dunbar would have been mainly concerned with style, this consideration would have been secondary to someone like Buchanan, who recognised a problem and had a high stake in making his audience aware that he was not interested just in the joke but also in the message. Even Lindsay, who had a message to convey, did not come close to Buchanan's aggressiveness, and that perhaps more than anything could mean that he was not a pseudo-Protestant but both a creature and a critic of the Scottish court. The message he wished to get across was tied up with good government, and for that he did not necessarily need a new church, just a better one.

Despite the marked change in tone and language, however, the Reformers, like generations of literati before them, drew their stereotypes and conventions from the writings of William of St Amour and had their basis ultimately in biblical exegesis and the struggles at Paris in the 1250s. The types he developed and the charges he levelled at them as hypocrites, false apostles, and seducers of the weak-
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willed, to name but a few, remained the basis of anti-fraternal literature for as long as it was composed, with contemporary additions and changes. In this respect, when St Amour spoke of those who *penetrant domos*, he meant an intrusion on the secular clergy’s duties more than anything else; by the time we get to Chaucer, it has a meaning of seduction, they enter houses in order to seduce women. In this way we also find that the poets who composed anti-fraternal literature, although they used long-established stereotypes, were very much a product of their particular countries and time. This is just as true of the Scottish poets and it is in this that we may have some hope of gleaning historical information from their anti-fraternal poetry. One of the questions that remain is the reason for the continued popularity of anti-fraternal literature. The audience had become so familiar with these types (which is why Dunbar uses the image of the ‘fenyeit freir’ in his *Abbot of Tungland*) that a century after Dunbar composed it, the editor of the Bannatyne manuscript used this phrase as the title, although the subject of the poem was not a friar.

The type of audience a poet expected for his piece would also have played a role in selecting both stereotypes and contemporary references, something that Lyall has shown in great detail in his edition of Lindsay’s *Satyre*. In this respect a joke at the expense of the king’s confessor might be in order, just as a joke at the expense of the king’s alchemist would have had those familiar with the background to the story greatly entertained even if John Damien did not attempt to fly off the battlements at Stirling Castle. Timing would also be essential; Buchanan’s unsubtle attack on the king’s confessor would have caused raised eyebrows while Lindsay’s much more subtle aside a decade after the king’s death would have been taken with better grace.

Generally when in search of historical fact the stereotypes developed within anti-fraternal literature – especially when applied generically – are of no help at all. It is only when it can be shown that Observants are singled out – or events pertaining to Observant friars are pinpointed – that a cautious evaluation of the information provided in a poem can be made. We are not always so fortunate as to have friars named, as in Buchanan’s *Franciscanus*, and even then it is often very difficult to verify the events described. Again, John Damien serves as an example; although he appears prominently in historical sources, there is only one source that describes his
avian adventure and some doubt has been cast as to its accuracy.115 Thus even when there is more detailed information underlying the satire, it is still very difficult to say whether the Observants were just the butt of a joke or whether these events had indeed transpired. In Lindsay’s and even Buchanan’s case, the friars in general were seen as part of a larger problem and even if Lindsay had to admit that, for example, the nuns of Sciennes led an apparently exemplary life, this did not stop him from continuing to criticise the friars, to the extent that one of his books was burnt at a Dominican chapter.116

Janet Foggie also found that the reform at work in the mendicant orders in the fifteenth century had some effect on who was targeted by anti-fraternal writings, at least on the Continent. There is evidence of a former Franciscan who, when expelled for criticising his order, reverted to the stereotypes of extant anti-fraternal literature, but he used it not to criticise the order as a whole but those parts who resisted the Observant movement.117 Unfortunately there is no evidence thus far of anti-fraternal literature being produced from within the ranks of the Scottish Observants themselves.

In the post-Reformation period in Scotland, anti-fraternal literature fades away, unlike in England where it stops only from the 1570s onwards, when objections were registered against the treatment of religious matters on stage as ‘profane amusement’.118 There are no post-Reformation Dunbars or Lindsays, and even Buchanan loses interest. It appears that he made his point and beyond that the Franciscans are of little interest to him. Friars appeared in the histories written by the likes of Calderwood and Knox, but these were narrative accounts, and no attempt was made to revive the tradition. There was still criticism of the friars, but only when they returned to the public stage, such as when Mary, Queen of Scots, appointed her four men of learning in December 1565 in accordance with Tridentine decrees. Her confessor, the Dominican John Black, was the subject of a number of attacks both verbal and physical culminating in his murder.119
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It is becoming increasingly apparent that literature is an important yet precarious tool in discerning historical fact and it is very difficult to rely on literary evidence as a gauge for mendicant misconduct. The anti-fraternal satires that were eventually used as vehicles for Protestant anti-clerical sentiment would not have been possible without the wider European tradition of anti-fraternal literature, a tradition that was already well over 200 years old when it came to be a tool in the hands of the Reformers. This tradition had evolved and adapted to fit specific issues and events linked specifically to a certain time and place – later-medieval Scotland in the context of the present study – but no matter where it was applied it would also draw on stereotypes as old as this literary tradition itself. William St Amour had begun the process and the vernacular writers had refined it to the point where the anti-fraternal stereotypes had become instantly recognisable to an audience of any social standing. This is why anti-fraternal literature is far more reliable in gauging attitudes towards the friars and how they were perceived by the audience of the works detailed above rather than giving an account of the actual conduct of the Scottish Observants. It is only when we find Observant friars, or specific events involving them, singled out that we can make an assessment as to the veracity of the stereotypes used to such great effect by the vernacular writers.
Chapter 6
The Observant Franciscans and Reformation: A Conclusion

It has been clear from the outset that the main problem of investigating the Observant Franciscan province in Scotland is one of sources: primary sources are scarce and often unreliable, while most of the secondary material is shaded by a desire to rehabilitate an order whose image has suffered first at the hands of their medieval critics, and later at the hands of the Protestant Reformers. Never is this more evident than in the analysis of the Observants in the struggles preceding the Reformation, which engulfed the friars from at least the 1530s. In Bryce’s study it is quite evident that he used those primary sources that shed a favourable light on the Observants (such as the letters by James IV to Pope Julius II and James V to Frederick I of Denmark) without critical approach, while going to great lengths to discredit the writings of William Dunbar and the ‘slanders’ of George Buchanan, while he sees Sir David Lindsay of the Mount as admonishing only the misconduct of the clergy as a whole and to a much lesser extent that of the friars. In fact, he sees Lindsay’s Satyre not as an attack on the friars, but as an endorsement: the Vices are jealous of the respect the friars are accorded due to their exemplary lifestyle and wish to gain some of that respect and privilege by taking on a friar’s disguise.¹

The sixteenth century was a century of religious upheaval, when Europe was engulfed in what has been described as ‘a whole complex of diverse revolutions, political, social, economic, as well as religious’, that brought to an end many long-standing traditions of the Church.² When the first Reformations happened – and considering the amount of time that elapsed between the occurrence of ‘Reformation’ in the different European kingdoms it is entirely appropriate to use the plural – they were a response to the need for reform within a church now perceived as decadent and immoral. Standards had slipped to the extent that even members of that church, like the Augustinian monk Martin Luther, became worried enough to go too far – from the point of view of the church. They were forced out and became part of a lay

¹ Bryce, i, p. 86f; James IV Letters, No. 76; James V Letters, pp. 231-2.
movement that was no longer content with being a passive audience in the church; they wanted to dictate the direction that the church should take and had their own very definitive views on both the morals and the theology of an ideal church. And that is perhaps one of the most significant developments of the later-medieval period: the emergence of a laity who demanded influence over the church but who did not have the leverage that important patrons of the church had exercised over the previous centuries. Without the financial leverage they were unlikely to be heard by the church, yet by driving a movement parallel to the established church they forced that church into action.

The longer the hiatus between the different Reformations, the greater the drive behind the local movements became. Scotland would be the last European kingdom to experience a Reformation and there was a sense of urgency within the Protestant movement which realised that, with the ever-increasing entanglement of religious issues with the question of political relations with England from the 1540s onwards, the case for reform could appeal to the political community as well. A Protestant Scotland could become an ally of a Protestant England and Catholic France could be stopped from meddling in Scottish affairs.

Scotland did not, however, experience a homogenous Reformation; instead, several highly localised Protestant movements followed their own distinct agendas. Perth, for example, had witnessed almost four decades of social and political unrest, sparked by a struggle for control of the burgh and burgh privileges between the merchant and craft guilds, and riots were not an uncommon feature, leaving Verschuur to conclude that in the 1550s, crisis was sparked by ‘the workings of [Perth’s] political constitution rather than religion’, and that heresy was not a ‘disruptive issue’. There are some indications that bibles in the vernacular were in circulation in Perth, mainly among the craftsmen burgesses, but the only recorded court case dealing with this matter is on the question of ownership, not on the principle of whether it was lawful to possess a Protestant bible. The Reformation crisis of 1558-9 effected a brief cease-fire, but by July 1560, craftsmen once again had to fight for their right to participate in the ‘common affairs’ of the burgh.3

The situation in Ayr was a similar one, in that the Reformation drew on very localised issues to facilitate its progress in the burgh. Protestant heresies in Ayrshire had been reported as early as 1494, when a group of Lollards from Kyle had been tried at Glasgow, yet it is difficult to see the region as a whole as a hotbed of Protestantism. For one, the Observant friary at Ayr continued to receive alms from burghal as well as private sources until at least 1558, despite a growing Protestant feeling – incidentally the same is true of the Perth Observant friary. For another, the Ayrshire reform movement appears to have been very reticent. Sanderson speaks of ‘peaceful demands for recognition and for liberty to openly practise alternative forms of worship’, while cancelling an invitation to Knox to preach in the 1550s. Presumably this was done in an effort to avoid drawing attention to a movement that was not yet strong enough to move openly – instead efforts were moved to establish the privy kirks more firmly. Sanderson attributes this approach in part to the fact that the Protestant movement in Ayrshire was represented, as were those in other localities, by an influential member, in this case Glencairn.

One of the most common expressions of a growing Protestant sentiment was iconoclasm. There is good evidence for a surge of iconoclasm and anticlericalism in the mid 1530s and again between 1543 and 1547, which is the last case of image-breaking recorded in Pitcairn. After that, there is a lull until 1558-9, when once again the friaries are attacked, as in Edinburgh in 1559. In 1533, Walter Stewart, brother of Lord Ochiltree, was summoned before Gavin Dunbar, archbishop of Glasgow, for causing ‘malicious damage’ to a statue of our Lady in the Observant friary church at Ayr, and in 1537, in Dundee and Perth two men were suspected of ‘hangeing of the Image of Sanct Francis.’ An outbreak of a rather more serious nature was recorded in 1543 in Dundee, when an ‘oppression’ was ‘committed on the Friars Preachers and Minorites of Dundee’, i.e. the Conventual Franciscan house there. A ‘great number, armed in warlike manner’ arrived at these friaries and broke down the gates and destroyed the ‘ornaments, vestments, images and candlesticks; carrying off the silvering of the altars, and stealing the bed clothes, cowls, etc., victuals, meal, malt,
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flesh, fish, coals, napery, pewter, plates, tin stoups' and other items found within these friaries.5

There was a further incident in Perth in January 1544, when Robert Lambe, William Anderson and James Ranoldson (or Raueleson) were hanged for 'hanging up the image of St Fraunces in a corde, nailyng of Rammes hornes to his head, and a Cowes rumpe to his taile'; they were also accused of eating a goose on 'Alhalow even.' Robert Lambe was furthermore accused of 'interruptyng of the fryer in the pulpit,' which he 'not only confessed, but also affirmed constantly, that it was the dutie of no man, which understood and knew the truth, to heare the same impugned without contradiction.' The friar was a friar Spence, and his sermon had been on the subject of intercession. In it he had held that without prayers to the saints, salvation would not be possible. Furthermore, James Ranoldson was accused of mocking the symbol of the cardinal's hat, by setting 'upon the round of his fourth stayre [in his house], the three crowned Diademe of Peter carved of tree.' A woman named Helene Stirk, who was also condemned for renouncing the intercessory power of the Virgin Mary, is alleged to have accused them to be 'the caus of our death this day' when passing the Observant friary on her way to the gallows.6

Verschuur ties these incidents of iconoclasm in Perth very firmly to the social conflict between merchants and craftsmen, especially in the context of the executions of January 1544. Robert Lamb was not a merchant burgess, as he appears in a number of sources, but a craftsman, a maltman by trade, one of the wealthiest crafts in Perth in the sixteenth century. Verschuur believes that the severity of the sentence against the craftsmen is to be explained as a reaction on the part of the 'authorities' against a challenge to their authority and the desire to 'make an example' of the members of the Perth craft guilds rather than as a sanction against religious dissent, especially if one considers that John Elder, a merchant of Perth, was allowed to purchase a remission, although his crimes had been just as severe as Lamb's.7

In Aberdeen in December 1544 Thomas Branche and Thomas Cussing were delivered to the bailies for hanging the image of St Francis.8 McRoberts suggested
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that the targets of these early attacks were mostly the friars, especially the ‘Greyfriars’, but considering which burghs are listed above, we can narrow this down to Observant houses, although the friars were not the only ones to suffer thus: an Act of Parliament of March 1541 decreed that ‘no one should cast down the images of saints and treat them with dishonour’, and in 1545 George Wishart and his ‘friends’ caused damage to images and windows in the parish church on a visit to Ayr, and was subsequently refused entry to the church at Mauchline by Sir Hugh Campbell of Loudon, sheriff of Ayr, because he feared similar destruction.

One point raised by McRoberts, however, does not quite tally, for he sees these attacks as being the result of a lack of protection: he believed that the friars ‘lacked the protection which the monastic orders may have derived from having kinsfolk of the nobility in their communities.’9 While this may be applicable to the Dominican order, it has been shown that the Observants drew personnel from all levels of society, and although the evidence for the higher nobility is unreliable, nevertheless, the Observants attracted patrons from among the higher nobility as well as among the burgesses. These were patrons that would not have wished to see their ‘investments’ ruined. The fact that the Elgin and Aberdeen burgh councils took charge of the Observant friary churches and thus protected at least the buildings from the destructive zeal of the Lords of the Congregation, and the burgh council of Inverness took the Dominicans’ valuables for safekeeping all suggest a similar motivation. It would seem much more likely that the friars were targeted because they were more accessible to the ‘rascal multitude’, as they lived in the burghs that were about to be reformed, while the Observants’ patrons may have been powerless in the face of the mob. In this context it should also be noted that William Hay, third Earl of Erroll, a generous benefactor of the Aberdeen Observant friary (as well as the Dominican friary of Perth), is described by Calderwood as a model Protestant, ‘having suffered much for the cause of Christ’, which might indicate that some of the friars’ patrons, in a change of religious heart, were no longer willing to protect the friars they patronised.10

The last case of iconoclasm recorded for the 1540s occurred in March 1547, when Robert Mowbray of Barnbougle was accused of casting down an image of St
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Magdalene in the chapel in Lany.\textsuperscript{11} This lull in iconoclastic activity is intriguing, and there are a number of conclusions one can draw. One of them would be whether the Protestant surge had blown itself out, but this would raise the question why? Was it tainted by linkages with England, whose Reformation – driven by Henry VIII for his own reasons – had been content to remove the authority of the pope and secularise its resources. Or was it because it lacked leaders, with Wishart executed and many other intellectuals having fled into exile.\textsuperscript{12} The provincial council of 1552, however, reported that the ‘fiery flame of heresy’ had blown out, and whether right or wrong, this is a significant view. If this was indeed the case, then the question would be whether some of the decrees of the provincial councils of the church had begun to take effect. However, if the ‘fiery flame’ had indeed gone out, it was rekindled again in the late 1550s, despite a further provincial council of 1559.

Reform had been an issue for as long as the Church had existed; in fact there had been a fine tradition of it. The Cluniac reforms in the eleventh century, the Observance movements of the later-medieval period, the devotio moderna: all these were miniature reformations within the larger structure of the church, and they were by no means a sign of trouble. On the contrary, the willingness to reform could be seen as a hallmark of a dynamic church, which was prepared to move forward, while an absence of reform would have been an indication of stagnation. Something, however, changed over the course of the later-medieval period, although all too often this change is considered only in connection with the Reformation, and that was a move within the laity to concern themselves with reforms. What had been the purview of theologians for centuries – radical ideas from laymen often led to a charge of heresy which acted as a sure deterrent – was now openly discussed outside the church, by those who until then had habitually been only spectators. Although this emancipation of the laity is often associated with the advent of Protestantism, it could be argued that it had happened much earlier and for entirely orthodox reasons.

The councils of the Scottish church of the 1540s and 1550s would be mostly concerned with the issues of discipline and education of the clergy, hoping to improve the poor intellectual state by decreeing that monasteries were to send some

\textsuperscript{11} Pitcairn Trials, i, pp. 286, 335.
\textsuperscript{12} J. Durkan, ‘Scottish “evangelicals” in the patronage of Thomas Cromwell’, RSCHS, xxi (1982), pp. 127-56.
of their monks to universities. The re-foundation of St Mary’s college at the University of St Andrews in the early 1550s has to be understood in this context.\(^{13}\) But for many these attempts were either too late or not comprehensive enough; reformers who had as yet avoided the taint of outright heresy as well as self-proclaimed Protestants would begin targeting the clergy as a whole and the friars in particular, fuelled by the kind of aggressive literature that had emerged out of the anti-fraternal tradition and was now circulated to an audience that was looking for a fight. But of the many religious orders, only the friars were targeted consistently and aggressively, because they were the most accessible and visible, and had become associated with the ‘exercise of political power in the minds of the people and exposed them to attack by radical movements of protest’ in the popular mind.\(^{14}\)

The friars were part of that reaction of the church as a whole, for obvious reasons, as their raison d’être had been to counter heresy — and that is what the Protestant movement was in the eyes of the established church. The friars of both orders had been very much involved in the provincial councils of the 1540s and 1550s, which represented a genuine attempt by the Church to respond to calls for reform. The Observants John Paterson, James Winchester, Andrew Cottis and John Scott attended the Provincial council of 1549, which was held in the Dominican friary at St Andrews. Paterson and Scott were both part of a group of Observants connected to the St Andrews friary, who came under attack from the Reformers for their inquisitorial activity. Alexander Arbuckle, too, was one of those St Andrews inquisitors. He was involved in the heresy trial of Thomas Forret, vicar of Dollar, in St Andrews in 1539, and in 1547 he engaged in an argument with John Knox. John Paterson and John Tullideff were on the tribunal that passed ‘judgement in absence’ over Sir John Borthwick in 1540, while Tullideff was also one of the judges at Patrick Hamilton’s heresy trial. Simon Maltman was involved in the trial that condemned the apostate Conventual Jerome Russell to be burnt at the stake in Glasgow in 1539, and was reported to have preached a sermon in the Abbey Church of St Andrews before the trial of Walter Myln in 1558. John Scott, however, was particularly disliked by the Reformers: according to Knox he betrayed a confession

\(^{13}\) Winning, ‘Church Councils’, pp. 343, 351; J.K. Cameron, “‘Catholic Reform’ in Germany and in the Pre-1560 Church in Scotland’, in RSCHS, xx (1980), p. 113; Chapter 1, pp. 15-6.

\(^{14}\) Lawrence, Friars, p. 177.
made to him by George Wishart, a transgression committed by him on a number of occasions, as well as posing as a convert to find and incriminate Protestant sympathisers.\textsuperscript{15}

McRoberts has put forward the suggestion that the amount of destruction, especially of churches, caused during the Reformation struggles of 1559-60 has been greatly overestimated – in fact, ‘apart from a few friaries and other religious houses actually sacked by the Reformers’ it was mainly neglect or the destruction caused by the English invasions that was to blame for the derelict state of many of the churches after 1560. The same explanation, Fleming claims, can be applied to manuscripts and books of which he believed there to have been much less in Scotland than in England, ‘even proportionately’ (there were ‘fewer manuscripts and books to destroy’), for it would appear that many were taken to the continent by exiled churchmen.\textsuperscript{16} Precautions were certainly taken, as the records of the Edinburgh and Aberdeen town councils show: in both burghs, the chalices, silverware and ornaments of the parish church – in Edinburgh this included the precious relic of the armbone of St Giles – were given to respectable members of the council for safekeeping in 1559, obviously with the expectation that once the Lords of the Congregation had passed, these would be returned. The Dominicans of Inverness acted on the same impulse, when they realised that they, too, might not be safe from what was happening in the south of the kingdom and handed ‘what precious possessions they had to the town council for safekeeping.’\textsuperscript{17}

As far as the poor state of church buildings is concerned, Moorman reports a similar situation in England for the friaries of the Franciscan order: many of them were derelict, having lacked the funds to make even the most basic repairs, which is quite in contrast to the Scottish evidence. Gifts to the Observant friaries from royal as well as noble and burghal sources continued right up to the Reformation crisis; when the Edinburgh friaries suffered damage during the Rough Wooing, the Observants received a royal payment of £33 ‘to help to repair and reparrell their place.’\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} Chapter 2, pp. 44-50.
\textsuperscript{17} Aberdeen Recs., p. 323; Edin. Rec., iii, p. 43; Foggie, Renaissance Religion, p. 229.
\textsuperscript{18} Moorman, Franciscans in England, p. 87; TA, ix, p. 226.
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Unfortunately, there has been no survey of books taken to Europe with the Observant exiles of 1559-60, and it is doubtful that a search at this stage would unearth much – if anything. Durkan and Ross’ survey of the Early Scottish Libraries has certainly shown that a significant numbers of books not only remained in Scotland, but have survived, although only a small proportion of those can now be attributed to the Observant Franciscans. This is due in part to the possibility that a portion of their books was taken to the continent and the new homes the Scottish Observants found in the friaries of the Cologne province. But despite all protestations to the contrary, as far as the friars were concerned, the Reformation was destructive. Of the Observant friary churches we can say with certainty that only two survived the Reformation: Aberdeen and Elgin, which had been handed over to the town council, while no clear records have survived to give us an indication of what happened to the Glasgow, Ayr or Jedburgh Observant friary churches. The Perth friary was destroyed when the Reformation arrived on 11 May 1559. The ‘rascal multitude’, as Knox later described them, was quite thorough: they sacked both the Dominican and Observant houses, before moving on to the Charterhouse. The same destruction occurred at St Andrews, where only the ruins of the apse of the Dominican friary church have survived (although Foggie showed that its destruction was not immediate), followed by the destruction of the friaries at Stirling and Edinburgh.¹⁹

As far as the Observant friars themselves were concerned, it would seem that most managed to get to safety before they could be physically harmed. There was no ‘rounding up’ of friars as had happened to the English Observants, who, in 1534, had been carried to the Tower for an initial refusal to take an Oath of Supremacy, which ‘acknowledged all that Henry had done and repudiated the authority of the papacy.’²⁰ Although once again the absence of sources must be treated with caution, we can assume that had any Observant friar come to harm, let alone be killed, during the upheavals of 1559-60, John Hay would have been sure to report them as martyrs. Alexander Gray is the next best thing: he was a priest of the Aberdeen friary and present when its last guardian, John Roger, resigned the friary to the magistrates and community on 29 December 1558, upon the arrival of ‘a band of militant reformers

from Angus and the Mearns.' Bryce suggests that Gray died at his brother John's house in the burgh on 10 January 1560 due to the shock of the 'severance'.

On the other hand, there was quite a distinct culture of violence and intimidation: as Ross points out 'the will to slay is plain in the preaching, and in many passages of Knox', and as no one was prepared to take up arms to block the path of the Lords of the Congregation, 'individuals and unarmed communities were helpless before the storm'. In 1562, Henry Sinclair was threatened with the sacking of his house if he received the papal nuncio De Gouda, while in the same year the queen's confessor, Rene Benoit, had to flee from repression and left Scotland with Ninian Winzet.

In a previous chapter, the metaphor has been introduced of the friar as a merchant in a marketplace that dealt in devotions and spiritual advice and guidance. This metaphor has also been used by MacCulloch to explain the rivalry between secular clergy and the friars, and why, in a way, the secular clergy were the friars' natural rivals, as they were both competing with them in their roles as 'pastors, confessors and preachers.' It was competition in a way that was never experienced between the secular clergy and what he calls the 'older religious orders', as they were not looking for their livelihood in the same market place. This competition between secular clergy and friars was 'not just for the esteem of the laity but also for their money, at a time when many clergy all over Europe were finding it difficult to make inflexible sources of income meet changing economic conditions.'

The sixteenth-century church in Scotland was in trouble: rents were falling, the church was much less wealthy than in the fifteenth century. Church lands were feued, often under worth, and ecclesiastical revenues were set in tack, that is, clergy no longer collected their own revenues, which was a profitable arrangement for the layman who took the leases. Appropriation of parish churches to religious houses or to other institutions such as the new university colleges created a similar problem in that a parish's revenues were no longer accessible to the person who needed to spend it: the parish priest. Appropriation soared to eighty-five per cent throughout Scotland,

---

21 Bryce, i, pp. 322-4, 331; ii, p. 286.
23 MacCulloch, Reformation: Europe's House Divided, p. 33.
reaching a staggering one hundred percent in Ayrshire. At the same time, the provincial councils of the 1540s and 1550s tried to re-establish the wage of a parish pries to the equivalent of a freeman’s income, which created what Durkan describes as an ‘underclass’, whose livelihood was as precarious as that of the ‘farmers of the time’, who ‘were at the mercy of plague and bad weather.’

An inflation in the number of chaplains created further economic pressures for secular clergy, especially in the burghs, where they were at the mercy of a burgh community that was largely responsible for this increase, as it was tied up with lay patronage of altars in the parish churches. The parish church of St Nicholas in Aberdeen had thirty-four altars, each of which had often numerous chaplainries endowed at them, which had been founded and were maintained by the burgh community. The founders of these chaplainries, who may have been individual patrons, craft guilds, or confraternities, employed the chaplain and thus controlled his appointment, which meant that they could also make him redundant. It was this class of lay patrons who were targeted as patrons by the friars, and once again the friars were seen as exacerbating economic instability, as they usurped confessors’ fees and burial dues.

The picture McFarlane presents of the mendicants of Aberdeen is a distinctly favourable one: they did not disturb the public peace with ‘inflammatory sermons’, and the secular clergy did not accuse them of the usual charges of friars appropriating burial charges, or encroaching on other areas which the parish clergy considered within their purview. Bryce has similar examples of good relations. When Walter Bertram endowed the altar of St Clement in the Haddington Conventual church with a secular chaplain, Bryce saw this as a sign that the relations between the secular priests and the Franciscans were good. However, the secular chaplain had been installed as a supervisor, to ensure that the Franciscans of Haddington continued to perform ‘other services’ which Bertram’s father, George, had endowed there. One would not expect this to make for ‘good relations’.

25 Durkan, ‘Chaplains in Late Medieval Scotland’, pp. 93-100; Cowan, Scottish Reformation, pp. 47, 53.
The Reformation may have represented a climax in lay emancipation. In the context of Scotland it also marked the end of the Observant Franciscan province as we have come to know it. When copies of the Beggars' Summons, issued in the name of the poor, were nailed to friary doors throughout the Scottish burghs in 1559, they marked the end of the occupancy of the friars within the burghs; they were no longer 'desirable beggars'.\textsuperscript{27} And when Scotland was reformed by Act of Parliament of August 1560, it began to sever the long-established links with northern Europe, especially France, which remained Catholic; in essence replacing the Auld Ally by seeking a closer political relationship with England.\textsuperscript{28} With it were severed the cultural links which also fed the Scottish Observants with new devotions and practices. For throughout its one hundred years in Scotland, it had kept close ties to the mother province of Cologne. It would only take two decades before the order turned its attention once again to Scotland, but those friars were sent from Ireland (the so-called Irish Mission), operating in the western Highlands and Islands, areas that traditionally had maintained close ties across the Irish Sea but had never before been penetrated by Franciscan settlements. The Irish Mission, although they were of the same order (for the Observants now had institutional supremacy), had little in common with the Observants that had come to Scotland from the Low Countries in the 1450s. The entire kingdom of Scotland underwent a re-orientation, both politically and religiously.

The Reformation in Scotland also marked a turning point for historians. It is the main reason why we now struggle with a paucity of source material about the late medieval church. At the same time, we have available detailed accounts of what happened during 1559-60 but most are from the pen of protestant reformers or from English sources which have their own bias. It is only from scraps of evidence that a tentative conclusion can be reached that a significant part of the Scottish Observants chose exile over living in a Protestant Scotland and these were incorporated into the Cologne province soon after their arrival. Hay's and Bryce's claims that the Observants were so exemplary that hardly any of them recanted or joined the Protestant religion are implausible. Durkan suggested that the 'inquisitorial zeal' displayed by the Observants from the 1530s onwards was the direct result of the

\textsuperscript{27} Verschuur, 'Perth and the Reformation', i, pp. 450-5.
\textsuperscript{28} APS, ii, pp. 526f.
defections to Protestantism in both the Franciscan and Dominican orders, but we have no way of knowing how many defections there had been.

The sources, however, yield far less evidence of Observant defections to Protestantism than they do for the Dominicans; certainly Foggie's study has been able to identify a far larger number of Dominican friars who conformed and were pensioned after the Reformation, and that is not counting those instances where friars joined the Protestants, as, for example, John Craig did when he became a close associate of John Knox after returning from Europe. Those few Observant friars that appear in the Thirds of Benefices as having received pensions are ambiguous figures at best, some of whom may even have been mistakenly identified as Observants.29

Bryce defines apostasy as begin of two distinct kinds: firstly, 'voluntary cases in which the individual conscience alone was the determining factor', and secondly, 'the common case in which the churchmen elected to abandon their church rather than their country, when a definitive choice was imposed upon them by the Act of 24th August 1560' - the acts of the Reformation Parliament, which outlawed the Mass and other Catholic activity.30

Bryce would have us believe that apostasy was only an issue for those 'unruly sons of the church', like James Melvil, insinuating that the order would be better off without them, and he believed that the Observants far outstripped the other mendicant orders in their exemplary behaviour when faced with the two choices of apostasy or outright conformity after 1560. He estimates that the 'ratio of apostasy' among the Conventuals was roughly half; with no Conventional chronicler comparable to John Hay, he felt unable to voice an opinion as to whether Conventual friars went into exile, however, he believed that as the Conventuals were much more closely tied to the communities where they lived, few would have chosen exile. The Observants, on the other hand, were idealists in his view, with the church being their 'fatherland', so that he accepted Hay's claim that as many as eighty Observants left for the Netherlands 'under the leadership of their last provincial minister, Father John Patrick'.31

---

30 Bryce, i, p. 104.
31 Bryce, i, pp. 104-5, 157-60. Bryce's wording should be noted (Bryce, i, p. 108): 'As might have been expected, the Mendicants excelled the Churchmen in fidelity to their faith; and while the
There have been attempts to quantify this 'ratio of apostasy', and it has been estimated that out of a total of approximately 700 religious in 1559-60, roughly 140 conformed and took up positions in the reformed church. Within that figure, Haws counted thirty-six friars, out of a possible total of 171, equalling twenty percent. This is contrasted a rate of conformity of twelve percent of monks and twenty per cent of canons regular. Haws' numbers for the Observants, however, are problematic: He identifies thirty friars although he states that 'there may have been many more’. This roughly tallies with the number of friars that can definitely be counted at the Reformation, either as having received pensions or gone into exile (or, in one case, died in 1560). Haws agreed with Bryce that the majority of Observants would have gone into exile. On the other hand, only one of the two friars he identified as Observants who served in the reformed church can be verified as such: Alexander Harvey of the Aberdeen friary, who appears in the Thirds of Benefices for 1561-3 and 1576. The other, a Thomas Aitken of Perth, does not appear anywhere else as an Observant, although Foggie identified a Dominican friar Robert Aitken of the Glasgow friary, who was pensioned after the Reformation among the Dominicans of Perth.

A number of friars appear in the Thirds of Benefices as being in receipt of the pension granted to those religious who recanted. William Symson, a mendicant friar of 'Elgin or Inverness’, appeared twice in the records for 1562 and 1566 and was listed among the ‘Blak and Gray Freiris of Elgin and Inverness’. There are corresponding entries for three friars, again summed up as ‘Blak and Gray Freiris of Edinburgh’, James Johnnestoun, James Richardson and John (or James) Stevenson. Bryce had no opinion as to whether these were Dominicans or Franciscans, but two of them appear in Foggie’s study on the Scottish Dominicans and in Ross’ article on

Conventual Franciscan may perhaps claim no greater meed of praise in this crisis than the Dominican or Carmelite Friars, the Observantines stand out as an Order which homologated its previous resistance to the establishment of the new faith by accepting exile as their portion."


Bryce, ii, pp. 345, 365. The second entry simply reads ‘freiris of Elgin and Inverness’. Rather curiously, the copy of Bryce’s Grey Friars in the Edinburgh University Library (Shelfmark 2713(41)Bry) is annotated with a number of footnotes in handwriting identifying a the greater number of the names listed in the 1562 entry as Dominicans of Elgin or Inverness. Williame Symson is in this case footnoted as having been a ‘Black Friar (Elgin)’. "
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religious orders. One of these was James Johnnestoun: Foggie and Ross list a James Johnstone as Dominican prior of St Andrews, although both are silent as to his activities after 1560.\(^{35}\) The same is true of James Richardson, who was listed as James Richertsoun or Richardsoun in the *Thirds of Benefices* for 1561 and again for 1562, although the 1562 entry lists him separately from the other two and without the title of friar (although Bryce equates him with the James Richertsoun of the 1561 entry). Again, Foggie has found evidence for a Dominican James Richardson, but without any further evidence as to his career after 1560. She does suggest, however, that he may have been ill, which would make it likely that he remained in Scotland.\(^{36}\) John Stevinsoun is the only friar in this group for whom there is no corresponding Dominican friar in Foggie’s study. In the 1562 entry he is listed with Richardson, not with the group of ‘Blak and Grey Freiris of Edinburgh’, as James Stevinsoun, although Bryce believed them to be the same person.\(^{37}\)

Three more friars are listed in the *Thirds of Benefices* as having definitely been Observants. These were John Geddy and William Lamb, who received £10 each in 1561 and 1562 ‘for the keping of the Gray Freiris place of Abirdene and the yardis thairof’, an appointment that was made in 1560. There is a further entry cited by Bryce from the *Thirds* for the year 1563, for Johnne Gawdie, Greyfriar of Aberdeen. His death is recorded in the Aberdeen death register for 1575.\(^{38}\) The third friar was Alexander Harvey, also a former member of the Aberdeen friary. As opposed to friars Lamb and Geddy, however, he had apparently been receiving the full pension from the start, while they received the full pension only in 1563.\(^{39}\)

We have no way of knowing if any of these friars simply conformed or if they actually converted, nor do we know what happened to the remaining friars that did not leave for the Low Countries or Germany. Those who had been members of

---


\(^{37}\) Bryce, ii, pp. 342, 346 and index.

\(^{38}\) Bryce, i, pp. 154 and note 3, 157 note 1, 324 note 5; ii, p. 342, 346, 357. His name is given here as Johnne Gadye / Gady.

\(^{39}\) Bryce, i, pp. 154 and note 3, 157 and note 1, 324. Bryce adds him to his list of the *Obituary* in square brackets: see Bryce, i, p. 332. For a list of the pensions received, and the years in which they were received, see Bryce, ii, pp. 341, 346, 357, 358. There is a discrepancy here, since Bryce has him as receiving pensions only for the years 1561-3 in Bryce, i, p. 332, but in Bryce, ii, p. 358, Harvey is listed also under the year 1567. Bryce adds him to his translation of the *Aberdeen Obituary*: see Bryce, i, p. 332.

---
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the more prominent burgess families would have enjoyed a certain amount of protection and it should not have been difficult for them to return to the protection of their families. Then, of course, there was John Roger, who continued his 'papist' activities in esteemed company at the court of Mary, Queen of Scots, as preacher and one of the 'four men of learning' from 1565. It is not entirely clear where he had spent the interim; Bryce attested that he had led his 'brethren into their long exile', but he must have returned a considerable time before 1565 to come to Mary's attention; dare we imagine he may have returned with her entourage?40

However, as has been repeatedly emphasised, the sources we have are incomplete and often unreliable, and one should not fall into the trap of thinking that the Observants were somehow less susceptible to Protestant propaganda than the Dominican friars were — a trap which Bryce did not manage to avoid. Yet the problem remains that only very few Observants appear in the records after the Reformation, and some of them did not conform. Robert Veitch, former guardian of the Stirling friary, caused the Stirling Presbytery substantial trouble for his refusal to conform. On 8 October 1583 he was charged by the Presbytery for failing to 'compair before the synod' at Edinburgh on 1 October 1583 to give a confession of his 'fayth and relixioun' and to be disciplined for his 'formar abuis', and was commanded to find surety from his cautioner, Michaell Rynd, a goldsmith of Stirling, 'that he would appear before the general assembly'. But after the fourth admonition and Veitch's continued failure to 'randir obedience to the reformit kirk', he was excommunicated on 1 December 1583 by James Anderson, minister at Stirling.41 A Franciscan friar, Thomas Aitken, was cautioned in 1572 for 'contravening the Actis and Ministratioune of the Sacramentis in the Papisticall manner' and friar Leitch was recorded in 1585 as 'haunting the Master of Gray's household'.42

It was not only personnel that were expected to convert after the Reformation: quite curiously, William of Touris' devotional poem *A Contemplacioun of Synnaris*, was reworked into a Protestant lyric that found its way

40 M. Lynch, *Queen in Three Kingdoms*, p. 17; *Papal Negs.*, pp. 492, 495.
42 Ross, 'Some Notes', p. 200; Pitcairn, i, pt 2 p. 35; Durkan, 'Observant Province', p. 54. See also Calderwood, *History*, iv, p. 399.
into the Bannatyne manuscript of 1568. It would appear that there had been substantial Protestant interest in this work of pre-Reformation devotion, especially in the section dealing with the Passion. It had been altered to such an extent that it bore little resemblance to the original and even contemporaries would not have recognised it for the pre-Reformation penitential poem that it had once been. Part of the changes are quite obviously due to the fact that the original was a piece of Catholic devotion, and that certain stanzas had to be left out, such as the stanzas dealing with Mary, thus removing any traces of the Catholic devotional image of the pietà. A further problem this work posed was the Passion’s inherent association with the sacrament of penance; these stanzas, too, had to be omitted. In addition to this, certain words were left out or changed, such as ‘blessed’ which was substituted by ‘glorious’. But most importantly, William of Touris’ characteristic approach was lost in this post-Reformation version. Although the Passion could be turned to Protestant use, Touris’ insistence that redemption could be reached by concentrating on Christ’s Passion was too Catholic to be adapted.

A Conclusion
Perhaps the most surprising conclusion to a study into the Observant Franciscans in Scotland is that there is an unexpected amount of evidence available, but it is hidden away in odd places. Not much of it comes in the form of documentary sources, and when it does, it is often either too vague or incomplete to be of much use on its own. Most of the evidence concerning the Scottish Observants needs to be qualified and checked against other evidence where available, otherwise we are left with speculations that have no grounding whatsoever. It is a jigsaw composed of a multitude of little pieces, but, eventually, it can be assembled into a picture that, although by no means complete, is at least a little clearer.

When Leo X had composed his bull Omnipotens Deus he had been foresighted enough to include specific instructions that a Conventual house may only

---

43 NLS Adv. MS I.1.6; see also MacDonald, ‘Catholic Devotion’, p. 58.
44 MacDonald, ‘Catholic Devotion’, p. 63; MacDonald, ‘Passion Devotion’, p. 117.
45 MacDonald, ‘Catholic Devotion’, p. 63-5; Bennett, Devotional Pieces, pp. 127, lines 905-912, 133, lines 1017-1024, 135, lines 1057-1064.
be reformed according to the Observance if the friary asked for it and if two-thirds of the friars within it agreed to being reformed. What he had not been able to safeguard against was the economic pressure that could be brought against Conventual friaries by their patrons. Francis' ideal of poverty had ensured that, unlike monasteries of the older orders, Franciscan friaries could not accept grants of land in order to secure a steady income. On the one hand this saved the Scottish friars from the fate that other religious institutions suffered under the Stewart kings, and especially James V, of the feuing out of church lands in order to raise money for royal taxes. On the other hand, it made them vulnerable to the whims of their patrons. In her will Isabella of Portugal, wife of Philip, Duke of Burgundy tied a number of grants to mendicant convents to the condition that they be reformed after the exact example of the Observant convents of the friars and grey sisters of Saint-Omer, which were centres of the Observance movement in Flanders. Despite all protestations that they should not handle money, if the friars thought practically, they would not have wished to lose such a gift – their compliance to what could be called an outrageous interference in the convents' internal affairs bears witness to this and gave the wealthy laity unprecedented control over what should have been a religious matter.  

There is little doubt that the Observants' reputation for 'holiness' had put them in a position in which they had caught the attention of Mary of Gueldres, who, following continental trends, decided to patronise them. She did not, however, bring them here to supplant the Franciscans that were already in Scotland. Overall, the Observants were under much less pressure from their patrons to perform than their European counterparts.  

The Observants had only been in Scotland for little more than a century, before the Reformation forced them to abandon their friaries and either return to the society which they had left when joining the order, or leave altogether to find a home in the mother province from whence had come the founding community led by Cornelius of Zierekzee. They were the last new religious order to come to Scotland before the Reformation although foundations of new houses continued in the established orders well into the Reformation century. The only other 'innovation', so to speak, had been the foundation of the Charterhouse in Perth about thirty years previously. As a result they were relatively short-lived as far as religious

establishment in Scotland is concerned and unbeknownst to those first Observants who arrived from the Low Countries in the 1450s to establish an Observant presence in Scotland, they would only have a century to make a mark on Scotland’s religious landscape. It is even more impressive that they had managed to permeate all levels of society and had established themselves as a firm and influential presence in this short period of time. Unlike the Carthusians, who only had the one house in Scotland because their fortunes were so closely tied to their patron and founder, James I, the Observants would manage to appeal to a diverse enough group of patrons that by the beginning of the sixteenth century they would have nine houses in Scotland which would all last until the Reformation.

Was the settlement of Observant Franciscan friars in Scotland a successful one? If the question is answered from the vantage point of even the mid-1550s, unencumbered by hindsight, the answer must be yes. In a relatively short period of time, the Observants had managed to establish nine houses in Scotland, with personnel drawn from a wide spectrum of Scottish society; they attracted patrons from an equally wide range of society; and they fitted well into the framework of late-medieval Scottish piety, to which they added a distinct flavour. Of the four houses founded during the reign of James III, three were founded during his minority – two of which were not even royal foundations – while the one friary founded during the reign proper was an episcopal foundation. His son, James IV, then emerged as the great patron of the Observants: of the five friaries founded during his reign, four were quite possibly royal foundations. Yet there were no further foundations during the reigns of James IV’s son and granddaughter. Beyond the fact that James V also drew his confessor from the Observant house at Stirling, the evidence for the period after 1513 is ambiguous. Eventually it became clear that the Observants were relaxing at least some of their rules – like the early Franciscans they would have realised that absolute poverty is a fine ideal but virtually impossible to administer. They allowed benefactors to be buried within their cloister walk, had bell towers with their churches and stained glass windows in at least one of them. As with the Conventuals, the Observants had to consider the practicality of a life of absolute poverty, and they did not seem inclined to turn prospective patrons away. As Dunbar and Buchanan tell us in their poems, there were certainly no saints among the
Scottish Observants (although Bryce would have argued this point), but they were by no means as corrupt as their critics would paint them, especially if we consider that these critics were poets who had a long established and rich repertory from which to draw their insults. A measure of this is the Observants’ continued ability to secure patronage, which they did well into the late 1550s, even in those areas of Scotland where the Reformation movement was perceived to be strongest. The Observants’ patrons did not seem to share the critics’ view that they were no longer morally worthy of receiving their patronage – an important point, as this patronage was bestowed with the understanding that it would improve the benefactor’s chances of salvation.

Ultimately, however, the Scottish Observant Franciscans were as unable to avert a Reformation as the rest of the Scottish church, and this is where we must judge them as a failure. The Scottish Reformation was among the most thorough in Europe: the Reformation Parliament of 1560 declared the entire kingdom free from the authority of the pope and outlawed Catholicism in all its facets and with all its trappings. There was no settlement as there had been in the Holy Roman Empire, no provision for the nobility to choose the religion of their localities. With the Reformation also came the end of the Observant province as it has been presented in this study: Scottish links to the Low Countries and France were weakened in favour of a stronger orientation towards England and the cultural impetus from these areas was diminished. It is still difficult to determine exactly what happened to the friars of the Scottish Observant province, but a significant number left for the mother province of Cologne. Of those that remained not much is known, but there must have been more than those few who appear in the Thirds of Benefices as having recanted, or those who fell foul of the new kirk sessions because they were a source of trouble for the Reformed church. Many, in effect, simply disappeared from view. What we can say for certain is that after 1560 the Scottish Observant settlement that had been founded in the mid-fifteenth century effectively ended. No significant residue remained.

The present study is by no means the last word on the subject of the Observant Franciscans in Scotland. However it is hoped that it represents a significant advance in our understanding of the movement after a century in which
Bryce's *Scottish Grey Friars* has dominated historiography. The thesis has attempted to test many of the credulous assumptions underlying established interpretations of the Observants and to highlight their significance in the development of pious devotions in late-medieval Europe, as well as providing a springboard for further research in a variety of ways.
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Appendix 1: Maps.

1: Observant Franciscan Friaries in Scotland, c.1457-1560

‘Bird’s Eye View of St Andrews’


http://www.nls.uk/digitallibrary/map/early/record.cfm?id=215
Detailed view of Geddy, John, fl. 1571-1594, ‘S. Andre sive Andreapolis Scotiae Universitas Metropolitana.’ [ca. 1580] NLS MS.20996, showing the Observant Franciscan friary of St Andrews in the centre, located on the eastern edge of the burgh, bounded by Market Street to the south and Greyfriars Garden to the west.

http://www.nls.uk/digitallibrary/map/early/record.cfm?id=215

Appendix 1: Maps
Detailed view of Geddy, John, fl. 1571-1594, ‘S. Andre sive Andreapolis Scotiae Universitas Metropolitana.’ [ca. 1580] NLS MS.20996. The prominent features of the friary are the low cloister building in the foreground and the friary church and bell-tower in the background.

http://www.nls.uk/digitallibrary/map/early/record.cfm?id=215
3: Images of the Observant Franciscan Friary Churches of Elgin and Aberdeen:

Taken from MacGibbon, David and Ross, Thomas, The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland From the Earliest Christian Times to the Seventeenth Century, 3 vols (Edinburgh 1896-7), pp. 356-362

‘Greyfriars’ Church, Elgin’

Fig. 1291.—Greyfriars’ Church, Elgin. View from North-West.

Fig. 1290.—Greyfriars’ Church, Elgin. Plan.
'Greyfriars' Church, Aberdeen'

Fig. 1198. — Greyfriars' Church, Aberdeen. View from South-West.

Appendix 1: Maps
Fig. 1297.—Greyfriars' Church, Aberdeen. East Wall and Window.
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Appendix 2
Personnel of the Observant Franciscan Province in Scotland, c.1457-1560

The following list of Observant Franciscan friars represents an attempt to give as full a record as possible. At times there are significant differences between the sources, both primary and secondary; sometimes the same secondary source provides different forms for what could, conceivably, be the same person. Most of the personnel listed has been traced through the five most essential sources for the Observant Franciscans in Scotland, c.1457-1560. Where these differ in the spelling of names, superscript letters have been used to identify where a particular spelling originated (no superscript letters will be used if the form of the name is common for all the sources):

DR Durkan and Ross, Early Scottish Libraries (Glasgow, 1961, and annotated copy in NLS, Shelfmark SU.37 (D.11.1 Dur)).
BH Translation of Hay in Bryce, should the form differ from the Latin text or the form used throughout Bryce.

Adam Abell (AbelB)
Originally an Augustinian canon at Inchaffray Abbey, Abell entered the Observant friary of Jedburgh sometime after 1510. He was born c.1475 and entered Inchaffray in 1495, a choice that may have been influenced by the fact that he was related to Robert Bellenden, the Augustinian abbot of Holyrood. There is some evidence that
he tried to get papal permission to leave Inchaffray, either for another house of Augustinian canons or a house of the regular Observance as early as 16 June 1508, although he was still listed among the canons in a petition dated 20 June 1510 to John Lord Oliphant. When the abbot of Inchaffray, Laurence Oliphant, was killed at Flodden in 1513, Abell may already have transferred to the Observant friary of Jedburgh. In 1533 Abell wrote his chronicle, The Roit or Quheill of Tyme, apparently a translation of a work he had previously compiled in Latin and is a ‘short history of Scotland from its legendary beginnings down to the year 1537’ though initially the chronicle ended in 1533 and the remaining four years (and six folios) were added in 1537. He bears a further distinction that he is one of only two friars of the Jedburgh house for whom we have any historical evidence.

Thomas Aitken, Franciscan
Cautioned in 1572 for recusant activities. See also Robert Veitch.

Duncan Alexander\textsuperscript{B} (Duncanus Alexandrus\textsuperscript{OB})
Observant friar at Aberdeen, his death is recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary Calendar for the year 1483 as ‘Obitus fratris Duncani Alexandri, multum devoti, humilis et exemplaris’.

Friar Anderson\textsuperscript{B}
The only entry for this friar is an addition in Bryce, where he completes the list of the Obituary Calendar, sharing his entry with William of Touris.

Alexander Arbuckle (Alexander Arbuchell\textsuperscript{H})
Alexander Arbuckle was very much an Observant of the pre-Reformation struggles, involved in the debates with the Protestant preachers in the decades preceding it. He had studied at St Andrews and eventually gained a reputation as an excellent scholar of Greek and Hebrew. He appears to have been guardian at Edinburgh in 1542 and is listed in Hay’s list of provincial ministers as having been elected three times to that office. He was also connected to the St Andrews friary in 1526 and, according to Hay, he died abroad in 1562 in the household of an unnamed Catholic bishop.
During his stay at St Andrews, which coincided with Cardinal Beaton's tenure as cardinal, he was connected with the ‘inquisition upon heresy’: in 1539 he was involved in the interrogation of Thomas Forret, Vicar of Dollar, who was eventually burnt with five others in Edinburgh in the presence of James V on 1 March 1539. At that time he was also spokesman for a convention of Franciscans and Dominicans, who had entered into a dispute with John Knox concerning his ‘heretical and schismatical doctrine’ in St Leonard’s Yard, St Andrews in 1547.

Robert Bailie^B (Robertus Bailze^OB)
A guardian of Aberdeen (according to Bryce the direct successor of warden Childe), whose death is recorded in the *Obituary Calendar* as 1510: ‘viri profunde humilitatis, patientie et ardentis charitatis, huius conventus quondam gardiani, a fratribus, quibus in vita prefuit, propter eius mansuetam conversationem singulariter predilecti’.

Anthony Baldowy^DR (Anthonius Baldowy^DR)
A student in St Leonard's College, St Andrews, in 1522, who was in the possession of a book by the Franciscan Nicholas Herborn: *Enarrationes Evangeliorum*. It had initially belonged to Peter Chaplain, provost of St Salvator’s college, which had then passed, in order, to the Observant friars John Tullidaff, Anthony Baldowy and Andrew Cairns, along with the signature of Lewis Williamson. Since Tullidaff had been guardian at St Andrews in 1541, this might suggest that Baldowy, too, remained at St Andrews for some time after his graduation.

Thomas Bawfour^B
Lay brother of the Glasgow friary who, with fellow lay brother Alexander Cottis, John Johnson (guardian of Glasgow) and friar Tenand, witnessed a document on 9 April 1513, in which Alexander Inglis, Treasurer of the Church of Glasgow renounced his offices.

James Baxter^B
A member of the Glasgow Observant friary, he gave up his ownership of land which he had rentalled from the Archbishop of Glasgow ‘in early life’ upon entering the
order. He still remained rentaller ‘ex facie of the register’, though it appears that he did not draw the rents, but that another member of his family did. On 19 June 1560 he resigned an inheritance received from his just deceased brother Robert Baxter as well as the lands mentioned above in favour of his kinsman Robert Herbertson and he does not appear to have received the pension of £16 granted to recanting friars at the reformation.

Alexander Blair\(^B (Alexandrus Blair^{OB})\)
A friar of Aberdeen, his death is noted in the *Aberdeen Obituary* as 1549, ‘obitus devoti patris confessoris, Fratris Alexandri Blair’.

John Bothwell\(^DR\)
Listed as the owner of a copy of Angelus de Clavasio’s *Summa angelica* (Paris, 1506). There is no indication whether he was Observant or Conventual, but the inscription in the book suggests that it had also been used by Thomas Ray ‘usque ad reuocacionem Jo. bothwell manu propria’, which would suggest that Bothwell, too, was a member of the Observants, possibly in the first half of the sixteenth century. The fact that the book is now part of the collection of the Aberdeen University Library could suggest that he, too, had been at Aberdeen when he had owned it.

John Burrell\(^D\)
Witness to the will of James Winchester, college chaplain of St Andrews on 21 August 1558, with Herbert Carneill, John Geddy and John Knycht.

Andrew Cairns (Andreas Curnius,\(^H\), Andrew Curney,\(^BH\) Andrewe Carnys,\(^OB\) Andreas Cayrnis\(^DR\))
Andrew Cairns was from Glasgow and graduated at St Andrews in 1514. In 1521 while guardian of Edinburgh, Cairns, along with Robert Stewart, was part of a controversy involving John Convalson (Conventual provincial master) and John Ferguson (guardian of Conventual convent of Dundee), which resulted from the papal bull of 1517 regulating the split between the two parts of the Franciscan order. The Observant friars involved in this disputed demanded that the Conventual friars in
Scotland wore a distinctive mark. On 1 November 1530 Cairns, as guardian of the St Andrews friary, and Friar Ramsay witnessed the will of the St Andrews regent, Thomas Ramsay, and in 1531, while provincial minister (an office he held at least three times), Cairns mediated in the dispute between James V and the earl of Angus. He died in Edinburgh in 1543 and was buried before the high altar. At some point during his life he was also guardian of the Aberdeen friary, since he was inscribed as ‘ffrater andreas cayrnis gardianus aberdonensis’ in the copy of Franciscan Nicholas Herborn’s *Enarrationes Evangeliorum*, which had also been in the possession of Anthony Baldowy (see above).

John Cauldwell (Johanni Cauldwell)
He appears in the records as a friar of Stirling who was in charge of the friary garden.

Herbert Carneill
See above, John Burrell.

James Childe (Jacobum Childe)
Styed guardian of Aberdeen in a Minute of Agreement dated 2 April 1505 between him and Gilbert Menzies, burgess, in order to settle a dispute over the southern boundary of the Aberdeen friary. It is possible that he was the immediate predecessor of guardian Robert Baillie. His death is not recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary*.

Cornelius of Zierikzee (Cornelius a Zericzea, Cornelius of Zierikzee)
Cornelius von Zierzksee, a member of the Cologne province under Michael of Lier, was the leader of the first group of Observant Franciscans to arrive in Scotland, though date and circumstances are somewhat obscure; there are claims that he arrived as early as 1447. He may have been the Cornelius of Zierksee, who was recorded as son of Peter, scribe of a former manuscript owned by the Louvain Franciscans, the *Speculum Perfectionis*, written by him on 9 February 1454 while still a novice. If this assumption is correct, he would have not yet have had the authority to lead a group of Dutch or Flemish friars to Scotland in 1447; he probably
arrived in Edinburgh c.1457 (see below, David Crannoch). According to Hay’s chronicle, Cornelius died in Antwerp.

Alexander Cottis B
See above, Thomas Bawfour.

Andrew Cottis.
He was guardian of the friary at St Andrews in 1549, when he was involved in a dispute about prayer to the saints with an English Dominican, which took place during his presence at the provincial council held in the Dominican friary of St Andrews that year.

Master David Crannoch D (Crannach, David Crannok, B David of Carnok, B David de Carnok, B David Crannoch, B David Crannoth) B
Successor of Cornelius of Zierekzee, he was a layman and royal physician of James II and Mary of Gueldres in 1457 and joined the Observants c.1459. He had been determined at Paris in 1447 and licensed in 1448 or 1449 and went on to be procurator of the German nation at the University of Paris in December 1453 and continued as such in January 1454; he is listed as a doctor of medicine of Paris of 1454. He was one of the first native Scots to be recruited by the newly arrived Observants, and he was guardian of the Edinburgh friary in 1464. It was during his guardianship that the Chapel of St John the Baptist, outside the West Bow in Edinburgh, was transferred to the Observants for their use, presumably before they had occupied the area at the top of Candlemaker Row. In 1471 he accompanied Alexander Vaus, official of Aberdeen, on his return journey to Aberdeen, to assist at the opening of the friary; during these proceedings Crannoch was described as ‘provincial’. The date of his year of his death is given as 1472 in the Aberdeen Obituary, stating that he died in England.

Alexander Dick B (Alexander Dik) B
Observant friar of Aberdeen, who confessed to Protestant views in 1532 and fled Aberdeen for Dundee where he hoped for protection from his friends and where he
exchanged his habit for secular garments'. He was supported by high-ranking members of the burgh of Dundee, among them Provost James Scrimgeour, hereditary Constable of Dundee and his bailies. Demands that he be handed over either to Friar Lang who had arrived from St Andrews, or to the Bishop of Brechin were thwarted by the townspeople. There was a failed attempt by Provost Scrimgeour and Bailie James Rollock to secretly bring Dick to St Andrews into the care of archbishop and Dick returned to Dundee. A further demand was made to deliver him to either the Aberdeen or St Andrews friaries, though nothing is known how this dispute was resolved.

James ElphinstoneB (Jacobus ElphistoneOB)
A member of the Aberdeen friary, listed in the Aberdeen Obituary as 'predicatoris et confessoris' with his year of death recorded in 1553.

William Fleming (Villelmus FlemingOB)
A member of the Aberdeen friary, his death is recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary for the 1530s (the date is incomplete). According to the Obituary he had spent ten years in Edinburgh and St Andrews, before coming to Aberdeen where he lived for thirty-four years.

John Geddy (John Gaddy, B'JOHNE GADYE, JOHNNIE GADY, JOHNNE GawdieB)
John Geddy (or Gaddy) was, according to Bryce, one of only three Observants of whom we know that they received the pension provided for recanting friars at the Reformation from the Aberdeen magistrates. The other two are Alexander Harvey and William Lamb (see below). Geddy is also listed in the Accounts of the Collectors-General for 1561 and 1562 along with William Lamb as having received £10 each ‘for the keping of the Gray Freiris place of Abirdene and the yardis thatrof’, i.e. for having been appointed custodiers ‘on behalf of the town council’, an appointment that was, presumably, made in 1560. There is a further entry cited by Bryce from the Accounts of the Sub-Collectors for the year 1563, for Johnne Gawdie, Greyfriar of Aberdeen. His death is recorded in the Aberdeen Death Register for 1575. He was presumably the same John Geddy who witnessed the will of James
Winchester, college chaplain of St Andrews on 21 August 1558, with John Burrell, Herbert Carneill and John Knycht, which would also place him at St Andrews (See above, John Burrell).

Gerard of TexelDB (Gerardus de TaxaliaOB)
Gerard of Texel arrived in Scotland in c.1457 as one of the companions of Cornelius of Zierekzee. He graduated in arts at Cologne in 1455, a further indication that the foundation of the Edinburgh Observant friary must have been after that date. He is reported to have arrived at Aberdeen in 1461 with John Richardson to oversee the foundation of an Observant friary there, although this date is doubtful, as the Aberdeen friary was founded in 1469. He was recorded as the first guardian of the Aberdeen friary in 1471 and died in 1473 as vicar of that friary, although the Aberdeen Obituary lists him only as vicarius conventus, not guardiani.

Donald GilbertDB (Gibson/ Gilberti)
First recorded guardian of the royal foundation at Greenwich, England (founded in 1482), he was 'the Scottyshe doctor and ffrere of Grenewych', whom Sir Thomas More heard in his youth, attacking the abuses attached to pilgrimages to Marian shrines.

William GilruifB (Willelmus GilrwifOB)
Friar of Aberdeen, listed in Aberdeen Obituary as 'priest who died in the flower of his youth' in 1555.

Alexander GrayB (Alexandri GrayOB)
Priest and confessor, he was a member of the Aberdeen friary before 29 December 1558, when its guardian, John Roger, resigned the friary to the magistrates and community upon the arrival of militant reformers from Angus and the Mearns. He died on 10 January 1560 at the house of his brother, John Gray and was 'buried in his habit in the Cathedral Church before the altar of St Catherine'.
Thomas Gray\textsuperscript{B}
A friar that has been described as a philosopher and who may have been guardian of Aberdeen, he went into exile in 1560 and is listed among a group of friars who left the Netherlands for Rouen in 1579. It is doubtful that he was the author of an *Admonition to Novices*, which was a treatise on the *Universal Philosophy of Aristotle* as well as a *Commentary on Four Books of the Sentences*, as, so Bryce, he would then have had to attain the age of 137 years.

Alexander Harvey\textsuperscript{B} (Alexander Harwy/ Herwy/ Harvie\textsuperscript{B})
A member of the Aberdeen friary sometime before 1560, he was one of the three Observants of whom we know that they received a pension as recanting friars from the Aberdeen magistrates after 1560, along with William Lamb and John Geddy of Aberdeen (see above). As opposed to friars Lamb and Geddy, however, he had apparently been receiving the full pension from the start, while they received the full pension only in 1563.

John Hay
As author of the *Chronicle of the Observantine Province of Scotland*, John Hay has the distinction of being one of three Scottish Observant friars, whose literary output has survived. He was professed at Stirling in 1551, an event that was allegedly attended by Mary of Guise and the chief nobles of the kingdom. In 1559 he was still a junior friar, when the Reformation forced him to leave Scotland for the Cologne or Lower German Province. At some point before 1586 he became provincial minister of the Cologne province and in 1586 he wrote the *Chronicle of the Observantine Province of Scotland*, which was meant to be used in the history of the ‘Seraphic Order’ by minister general Francis Gonzaga.

Robert Hay\textsuperscript{D}
Witnessed the foundation of Mr Robert Davidson in St Salvator’s college on 29 June 1527 with William Martin, possibly a friar at St Andrews.
Friar Homes
He was guardian of Jedburgh and is the only other member of the Jedburgh friary beside Adam Abell of whom we have a record. He is reported to have preached at Norham in 1524.

Thomas Hutchinson (Thomas Huchisone)
He was a member of the Aberdeen friary c.1528, and recorded as the owner of a copy of Lorenzo Valla’s *Elegantiae*, gifted to him by Alexander Hepburn, a benefactor of the Aberdeen Franciscans.

Francis Jamisone (Franciscus Jamissone)
A member of Aberdeen friary, ‘priest, preacher and confessor’ he died (according to the *Aberdeen Obituary*) of old age on St Laurence Day 1557.

James Johnnestoun, Observant or Dominican
Entry in Thirds of Benefices for 1561 and again for 1562, along with James Richertsoun and John Stevinsoun, all listed as ‘Blak and Gray Freiris of Edinburgh’.

John of Deinze (Donza)
John of Deinze (near Ghent) is recorded in a Namur manuscript as former ruler of the Scottish province who was twice in office. He died in 1508.

John of Leiden (de Leydis, John Leydes, Johannis Leydes)
Lay brother and member of the Aberdeen friary, along with his brother Walter of Leiden. They were carpenters by trade, and among the first whom John Richardson and Gerard of Texel converted after he came to Aberdeen. He was involved in the construction of the Elgin friary and in the repair of other friaries. His death is recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary* for 1459 (‘layman and carpenter’) although Bryce added the year 1479 in brackets with the suggestion that the *Aberdeen Obituary* was a transcript of an older register and that some entries had been post-dated.
John Johnson (Johannes Johnson)
While guardian of the Glasgow friary, he was involved in the extension of the friary grounds in 1512 through lands granted by Rolland Blacader, canon and prependary of Glasgow. On 9 April 1513 he, along with three other friars, witnessed a document in which Alexander Inglis, Treasurer of the Church of Glasgow renounced his offices (See above, Thomas Bawfour). There are some suggestions that he joined the Protestant Reformers at a relatively early date.

Thomas Johnson
Member of the Edinburgh friary, he died of the plague in 1545.

John Keith (Joanne Creyth)
Listed in Hay’s chronicle among the provincial minister and the brother of Robert Keith (see below), which would also make him a son of the Earl Marischal. According to Hay’s list he was also provincial minister, like his brother.

Robert Keith (Robertus Creyth, Roberti Crethy, Robert de Keth, Creth)
A son of the Earl Marischal, he was among the early Scottish additions to the first group of Observants under Cornelius of Zierenzee and a novice at the Edinburgh friary. He had been matriculated at Cologne as a theological student in 1439 under the name Robert de Keth and was referred to by Hay as ‘a doctor in sacred theology’. He had been among the first friars of the St Andrews friary and its first guardian, probably from c.1463. He was twice provincial minister of the Scottish Observants. According to Hay, he had a brother: John Keith (see above). There is also a record of a Robert Keith, rector of Dysart, having been in possession of a copy of Jean Gerson’s Alphabetum divini amoris (Cologne, c.1466), but the signature is simply ‘Robertus Keth’.

John Knvcht, Observant
See above, John Burrell.
Walter Laing (Walter Lang, B Gulielmus Langius, William Lang)
Confessor of James V and a member of the Stirling friary, he was the subject of Alexander of Glencairn's 'Epistle directed frome the holie Heremite of Larite, to his Brethren the Gray Freris' written in 1539. He was also prominent in Buchanan's poem *The Franciscan* in connection with the so-called Dysart affair, which occurred sometime before Buchanan wrote *The Franciscan* in 1538 and reported of a false miracle performed by Laing. Furthermore he was connected with the 'martyrdom' of Henry Forrest (1532-3) when he was accused of disclosing details of Forrest's confession to Cardinal James Beaton.

William Lamb (William B), Observant
Along with John Geddy and Alexander Harvey he was one of the three Observants who received a pension provided for recanting friars at the Reformation from the Aberdeen magistrates and was appointed, along with John Geddy, by the Aberdeen Town Council as custodier of the Aberdeen friary in 1560. For this he received wages for the years 1561-2 and is listed again in 1563 for having received a pension.

Friar Lawson, Grey Friar
The *Treasurer's Accounts* for 28 December 1552 recorded £5 given in alms to a Grey Friar called Lawson.

Walter Leche (Valterus Leche B)
Member of the Aberdeen house, he is listed in the *Aberdeen Obituary* as 'priest, preacher and confessor of the seculars', but no date of death is given.

Friar Leitch D
A post-Reformation recusant, he was recorded as having been in the household of the Master of Gray in 1585.

William Lesle (Villelmus Lesle B)
A friar of Aberdeen, he is recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary* as ‘priest and chantor, faithful in divine service, young in years, of sedate manners, and comely in body’, having died in 1523.

**Jerome Lindsay** (Hieronymus Lyndsay, Jerome Lyndsay)

According to Hay he was a son of the earl of Crawford (though Bryce believed him to be a kinsman, rather than son) and friar at Perth in 1460, although the Perth friary was not in existence this early. Lindsay graduated at St Andrews in 1489 as one among four ‘nobles’. This being so, he cannot have been a convert of Father Cornelius of Zierekzee as Hay claimed, and his assertion that Lindsay was a Doctor of Civil and Canon Law of Paris ‘before the coming of religion’ are subsequently uncertain. Lindsay appears in Hay’s list of provincial ministers as having been elected to that office three times, and he was possibly the first guardian of the Perth friary.

**John Litstar, junior** (Joannes Lystar, John Lystar)

He was a graduate of St Andrews in 1487 and a member of the St Andrews friary. In October 1487 he was excused delivering lectures in arts since he had entered the Observant order. According to Hay he was provincial minister twice, like his brother John Litstar (senior).

**John Litstar, senior** (Lystar, Joannes Lystar, John Lystar, Johannis Lytstar)

He was guardian of the Aberdeen friary and provincial minister in April 1482, when he was collecting for the crusade against the Turks, and he died c. 1505, while in the office of provincial minister for a second time. There are some indications that he may have been at Cologne University in 1475.

**John Louthon** (Johannis Lothon)

According to the *Aberdeen Obituary*, he was a member of both the St Andrews and Aberdeen friaries, as an itinerant scribe. He died in 1473.
According to Knox, John Lyn left the Observant order in 1539.

George Lythtone\(^B\) (Georgius Lythtone,\(^OB\) Lychtone\(^B\))
He was guardian in several friaries, including the Edinburgh and Aberdeen houses, as well as provincial minister, an office he gave up in old age. the *Aberdeen Obituary* records his death at Edinburgh in 1499.

Simon Maltman\(^DR\) (Ledgerwood,\(^DR/B\) Simon/Symon Maltman,\(^B\) Legerwood,\(^B\) Symon Lydzartwood\(^B\))
He was connected to the friaries of Glasgow, Aberdeen and St Andrews. He was guardian at St Andrews c.1539, when he was involved in the trial of Friar Jerome Russell at Glasgow, and he preached at the Abbey Church of St Andrews before the trial of Walter Myln. Like Alexander Arbuckle, he was one of a number of Observant inquisitors active in the decades preceding the Reformation. He witnessed a deed of presentation on 10 October 1539 by the Earl of Bothwell to prebend Hauch in the Collegiate Church of Dunbar, and on 18 May 1559 he resigned the St Andrews friary to the magistrates. He had been in the possession of a copy of Silvestro Mazzolini di Prierio's *Aurea rosa* (Lyons, 1528). Among the inscriptions in the book there is one at the end of the preface to 'usus huius libri conceditur fratri Symony lidzartwod/franciscus'.

Alexander Marchel\(^B\) (Alexandrus Marchel\(^OB\))
A member of Aberdeen friary, his death is recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary* for the year 1526.

William Marschell\(^B\) (Marschel,\(^B\) William Marshall,\(^B\) Willelmus Marschel\(^OB\))
An early member of the Aberdeen friary, his death is recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary* for 1469.

William Martin\(^D\)
See above, Robert Hay.
John McHaigh
A member of the Ayr friary, he was summoned as a witness to Stirling on 7 March 1502 in an action against James Kennedy of Row.

Archibald Meltrin
According to Hay’s Chronicle, he was thrice provincial minister and brother of David Meltrin (see below).

David Meltrin
Brother of Archibald Meltrin, listed by Hay as Reader.

James Melvil/ Melvin
Melvil’s was the earliest recorded case of an apostate from among the Observants. He was a member of the St Andrews friary and converted to Lutheranism c.1526. In August 1526, however, he took his case first to the court of the archbishop of St Andrews and then to the Curia, where, based on incomplete information, he received permission to join the Conventuals apparently upon the basis of incomplete information, a decision that was later rescinded and James V was charged to either imprison or exile Melvil from the country. Melvil went into exile in Germany, until he returned to Scotland in 1535, still disseminating Lutheran teachings, which prompted James V to petition the pope not to re-instate Melvil to his position as Franciscan friar. Bryce suggested that there was a slight possibility that Melvil may be the same James Melvil who was rector of St Catherine’s at Rome and appointed Apostolic Preacher in 1534, as he was described in a correspondence of 1543 as a Scotsman who held a benefice in Rome although ‘abhoring the Bishop’s part.’

Alexander Merser (Alexandrus Merser)
He was the son of Robert Merser, laird of Innerpeffy in Strathearn and was an early member of the Aberdeen friary, renouncing his title as laird of Innerpeffry when joining the Observants. The Aberdeen Obituary records his death in 1469.
Thomas Motto\textsuperscript{DB/H}

Motto has sometimes been described as a junior friar in 1559, when he left Scotland in the company of fellow exile of John Hay. Hay described him as an instructor of the youth in the Lower German Province and guardian, though he was not specific as to which friary Motto was guardian of. In 1579 he left the Lower German Province for the Province of Paris, and in 1586 was resident in the convent of Rouen.

David Nory\textsuperscript{DR} (Dauidis Nory\textsuperscript{DR}) Franciscan

David Nory was a brother of the laird of Finnersy in Aberdeenshire who resigned his inheritance in 1514 when he joined the Franciscans. He had been the owner of a book by Guillaume Pepin, \textit{Sermonum dominicalium pars hyemalis}, written at Paris in 1534. The inscription provides no clue as to whether he was an Observant or Conventual friar, it reads: ‘in custodia f. dauidis nory minorite’, though perhaps his home may suggest that he could have joined the Aberdeen Observants, as there were no Conventual friaries in Aberdeenshire.

Arthur Park\textsuperscript{B}

He was guardian of the Ayr friary c.1529, when he is mentioned in a decree of court of 26 June 1529. According to this decree he had taken charge of the ‘sum of twenty merks in a closed purse’ from Margaret Crawford, widow of William Hebburn of Lowis, and Janet Crawford, widow of William Cathcart of Drumsmuddan, ‘for the use of David and Margaret Cathcart, children of the said William Cathcart’.

Alexander Paterson\textsuperscript{B}

He was guardian of Stirling in the 1540s, when he was appointed overseer of the executors of Robert Wemes, Vicar of Stirling, who was buried in the Stirling friary as requested in his testament of 18 April 1544.

John Paterson\textsuperscript{DB} (John Patrick,\textsuperscript{B} Joannes Patricii\textsuperscript{H})

He was guardian of the Glasgow friary in 1531 and provincial minister in 1540, when he sat on a tribunal with Warden Tullideff (Dillidaff) of St Andrews, passing judgement over Sir John Borthwick. He was twice provincial minister and celebrated
his jubilee as a priest sometime before he went into exile in 1559, allegedly with eighty other priests. Paterson and his fellow exiles were incorporated into the Lower German province in 1563 by Francis Zamorra, minister general. An epitaph of 1573 states that he had lived at Louvain for fifteen years and had been in the order for fifty-three years. Apart from his activities on the tribunal in 1540, he also attended the provincial council of 1549 (held in the Dominican friary at St Andrews) along with three other Observantine friars and witnessed a deed of indenture of the ‘Prenteischip of Patrick Dunlop of the saydlar craft’ on 24 October 1531.

John Patrick of Banff, B Observant
Exiled in 1560, he has been credited with some form of literary activity (possibly in connection with Francis Gonzaga) on the Scottish Observants in exile.

James Peebles, DR (James Peblis, DR Jacobus Peblys, DR Jacobus Peblis, DR)
He was vicar in the St Andrews friary in 1551, when he witnessed the will of Provost Peter Chaplain on 6 February 1551 with guardian James Winchester (see below). He and others, among them Ninian Winzet, were denounced by the Council as ‘rebels abroad’ in 1574. Peebles owned a copy of Angelo Poliziano’s Virorum Illustrium Epistolae (Paris, 1526), which is inscribed ‘frater jacobus peblis me utitur anno domini 1549’.

James Pettigrew, D (Jacobus Petigreu, OB James Pettigreu, B Jacobus Pedegrew, B)
He was a Glasgow University regent who joined the Observant order, later becoming provincial minister. He was present in his role as provincial minister in Glasgow on 22 March 1512, when additional lands were transferred to the Glasgow Observants friary. His death is recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary in 1518.

William Pettigrew (Willelmus Pedegrew, B)
A lay brother in the Glasgow friary, he is listed as a witness in the document ‘relating to the acquisition of two strips of land’ for the Glasgow friary on 22 March 1512, the same document in which James Pettigrew (see above) appears as provincial minister, which could suggest that the two friars might have been related.
Finlay Ramsay

He was regent at St Andrews in 1514 (as was Thomas Ray from Louvain, see below), and became a member of the St Andrews friary, where he witnesses the will of Thomas Ramsay, regent of St Andrews with Andrew Cairns as his guardian on 1 November 1530.

Patrick Ranwick (Patrick Ranny, Patricius Ranny, Patricius Ranus)

He was guardian of the Stirling friary (perhaps even its first guardian) and confessor to James IV and (according to Bryce) also James V. He is listed alongside Friar William Touris (see below) as witness in a Glasgow University document of 21 February 1495 and was provincial minister three times. There is a tradition that states that it was him who advised James IV to wear an iron girdle as penance for the part he played in his father’s death in 1488.

Thomas Ray (Thome Ray, Friar Rae, Ra)

He was guardian of the Ayr friary in the 1530s, when he appears in a matter concerning the heirs of Sibilla Cathcart and her sister Margaret, who had given Letters of Reversion to the friars for safe-keeping. On 21 June 1532 the guardian was ordered to produce the documents and had to subsequently appear before the court in order to ascertain the authenticity of the grant of sasine to Sibilia Cathcart. There is also an entry in the Treasurer’s Accounts for 15 June 1532 pertaining to this matter, when David Purves, Masur, was given 20s to carry letters ‘fra the Lordis to the Wardane of the Gray Freris of Air, anent ane instrument pertenyng to the sisteris and airis of Carleton.’ Presumably he was the same Thomas Ray who had been a student at St Andrews in 1511 and the Thomas Ray from Louvain who was a regent at St Andrews in 1514, along with Finlay Ramsay (see above). He was in possession of a copy of Angelus de Clavasio’s Summa angelica (Paris 1506), which had apparently belonged to John Bothwell (see above). The inscription reads ‘ad usum fratris thome ray usque ad reuocacionem Jo. bothwell manu propria’.
Alexander Redy, OB/B
A friar of Aberdeen, priest and confessor, whose death is recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary 1529.

Robert Richardp/B (Robertus Ricardi11)
He went into exile in 1559 and took up residence in the Louvain friary on 1 September 1560 and Hay’s phrasing suggests he was guardian there at some point. According to Hay he died on the ‘day of the Nativity of the blessed Virgin Mary’, although he neglects to provide us with the year of Richard’s death.

John Richardsonp/B (Jo. Rychardi de Scotia, D Johannis RichardiOB)
He was one of the Scottish companions of Cornelius von Zierekzee, first stationed in Edinburgh then moved to St Andrews and later to Aberdeen to oversee the Observant settlements in these burghs. There is some evidence to suggest that he was a priest who had matriculated in arts at the University of Cologne on 15 August 1450 and graduated in arts at Cologne in 1453, and may have taught there until 1460, although that would exclude him from having been a companion of Cornelius (the Aberdeen Obituary entry would suggest that he had come to Scotland in Cornelius’ group). He was recorded in the university’s records as ‘Jo. Rychardi de Scotia’ (not to be confused with another Scottish friar at Cologne, Jo. de Scotia). Richardson’s death is recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary for 1469. He was buried near the high altar of the parish church of St Nicholas, since the friary church was not yet completed.

James Richertsounp/B RichartsounB, Dominican or Observant
Entry in Thirds of Benefices for 1561 and again for 1562, along with James Johnnestoun and John Stevinsoun, all listed as ‘Blak and Gray Freiris of Edinburgh’.

John RobertsonBH (Joannes Roberti)
Apparently the only entry for this friar is in Hay’s Chronicle, among his list of provincial ministers. The entry states that he was thrice provincial minister, but when chosen a fourth time (at seventy-eight years old) he ‘proceeded to the Chapter
General, where, with many tears and prayers, he asked for and obtained his deposition'.

**John Roger**\textsuperscript{DR/B} (\textit{Johannes Roger}\textsuperscript{DR/B})

He was the last guardian of the Aberdeen friary before the Reformation, when on 29 December 1559 he resigned the friary into the hands of the magistrates and then proceeded into exile. An entry in the \textit{Exchequer Rolls} for 1550, listed ‘John Roger, junior’ being paid by the Comptroller ‘in name of the Friars of Observance of Perth, receiving annually £5 in the Feast of the Circumcision of our Lord, during the will of the Governor, £10’. He owned two books (both by Franciscan authors): Angus de Clavasio’s \textit{Summa de casibus} (Strasbourg, 1491) and Nicholas de Lyra’s \textit{Quinta (sexta) pars Biblie. Glossa ordinaria} (Lyons, 1529). The inscription in the former states that the book had been given to a Franciscan convent (presumably Perth, which means he would have been at Perth in 1553) by John Paterson, dean of Dunkeld, in 1553, in return for prayers to be said for his well-being. Another inscription made by John Roger himself states that said book had been given to him by Paterson and that it is now to remain in the convent of Stirling for the benefit of the community. The inscription in the second book appears to be signed by Roger as ‘guardiano fratrum minorum de perth’ and there appears to be ‘an Aberdeen convent inscription’ (presumably the Aberdeen Franciscan convent). This book was given to him by John Hepburn, dean of Dunkeld, ‘usque ad reuocacionem’, and signed by Hepburn and Roger. An entry in the \textit{Treasurer’s Accounts} for 1562 listed a John Roger, son of Alexander Roger of Drumfarg, but there is no indication if this was the same as friar John Roger. After the Reformation John Roger was appointed in 1565 alongside John Black, Andrew Abercromby and George Clapperton as Catholic men of learning by Mary, Queen of Scots in accordance with Tridentine decrees.

**John Ryntoull**\textsuperscript{BH} (\textit{Joannes Roytnoall})

He is listed in Hay’s chronicle among the Observant provincial ministers (he held the office four times).
John Scott (Johannis Soct; Ioannis Scot; ioannes skoktous, Joannis Scot; Ioannis Skokti)

He was a member of the Edinburgh, Aberdeen and St Andrews houses and first appears in our records in 1546, although it is possible that he was a student at St Andrews in 1531. He, too, was active as an inquisitor prior to the Reformation, an interest which might be evidenced by some of the books he owned. Among the seven books we know he owned (the biggest collection of any Observant we are aware of) was Franciscus Lichetus' *In libros Sententiarum Scot* (Partis, 1520) which is inscribed: ‘ex dono domini Abbatis de Cambuskynnetht alexandri myln ex usu ordinis minorum’ and ‘ex libris fratris johannis soct (franciscani)’, while Frans Titlemans’ ‘Elucidatio in omnes epistolas apostolicas’ (Lyon, 1546) appears to have passed to Henry Sinclair, bishop of Ross, since Scott’s signature (in Greek characters) is crossed out. The two volumes of Hugh of St Victor’s ‘Operum’ are inscribed ‘pro conuentu fratum minorum Conuentus edinburgensis’. Two further books state that Scott was a member of the Aberdeen convent as well as the Edinburgh friary. As far as the Protestant reformers were concerned, Scott was most notorious for his involvement with George Wishart, when Knox reported that Scott was one of two Greyfriars who invited him ‘to confess to them before he was burned on the Castlehill’ in St Andrews in March 1546 (his trial had been in February 1546).

I. Smaloysel

He is mentioned in a letter of confraternity dated Pentecost 1487, to Robert Arbuthnot and his wife Marion Scrimgor, as ‘I. Smaloysel, de mandato R.P. [reverndissimi patris], Vic. Gen.’.

Patrick Stalker (Patricius Stalkar)

He was a member of the Aberdeen friary and his death is recorded in the *Aberdeen Obituary* in 1512, after having been in that friary for twenty-six years, placing his arrival at Aberdeen c.1486. This would put him among the second generation of friars to have lived in this friary.
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John Stevinsoun, James Stevinsoun, Dominican or Observant
Entry in Thirds of Benefices for 1561, along with James Johnnestoun and James Richertsoun, all listed as ‘Blak and Gray Freiris of Edinburgh’.

Robert Stewart, (Roberti Steward, Robert Stuart, Robertus Stuoardt)
He is perhaps the most interesting friar, since Hay reports him to be ‘a kinsman of James V’, which would make him the only member of the House of Stewart known to us to have entered the Observant order. According to Hay he was born in 1475 and died at St Andrews aged eighty, which would make the year of his death c.1555, though we do know he was at Elgin in 1554, when after he received a book from Thomas Hay, dean of Dunbar. In 1507 he was the subject of a letter by Henry VII of England to Sir Gilbert Talbot, deputy of Calais, warning Sir Gilbert not to allow passage into England of ‘a frere Observant called frere Robert Steward, being a Scottishman’. He was also involved in the controversy of 1521 between Conventual and Observant friars (see above, Andrew Cairns). In this controversy he was titled as guardian of Moray (i.e. Elgin). He owned of a copy of Denys Carthusian’s’ *In IV evangelistas* (Paris, 1536), a book that had been gifted to the convent of Elgin by Thomas Hay, dean of Dunbar, ‘ad usum fratrum minorum conventus elginensis ex industria venerandi patris fratris roberti steward anno domini 1554’. Hay reports that Robert Stewart, having once put on a woollen under tunic he never changed it until he died, as it would not be fitting to change ‘during a solemn penance’ and that Stewart foretold ‘a national disaster’ on his deathbed, presumably the Reformation. He was twice provincial minister.

John Strang, (Johannes Strang)
He was a priest at the Aberdeen friary, a skilled glassworker, who, according to the entry in the *Aberdeen Obituary* worked on the buildings of the friaries at Aberdeen, Perth, Ayr and Elgin. He died in 1517.

William Symson, (Willelmus Symson, William Symson), Franciscan
William Symson was listed twice in the Thirds of Benefices among ‘Blak and Gray Freiris of Elgin and Inverness’ for 1562 and 1566 (the second entry simply reads
'freiris of Elgin and Inverness'. He was also the owner a copy of Antonius Brockweg's book, *Concordantiae Maiores* (Lyons, 1529), which was at some point also in the possession of Alexander Arbuckle, and would suggest a link to the Edinburgh house at some point in Symson's career as an Observant friar.

**Friar Tenand**

See above, Thomas Bawfour.

**John Thomson** (Johannis Thomson)

He was a lay brother at the Aberdeen friary and a carpenter. The entry in the *Aberdeen Obituary* suggests that he received payment in kind for services rendered, presumably for work done outwith the friary. The *Obituary* records no date of death.

**William of Touris** (Towris), Observant

Probably best known for his penitential poem, the *Contemplacioun of Synnaris*, probably composed for James IV during one of his Lenten retreats, he was twice vicar of the Scottish Observant province and may have been a member of the family of Touris of Inverleith, who were neighbours and benefactors of the Edinburgh friary. He studied at Paris in 1469-1472 and appears at the Glasgow Observant friary in 1494, where he may have written his poem, and where he appears as a witness alongside Patrick Ranwick (see above) in a university document of 21 February 1495. In 1504 he was at St. Andrews in 1504 and he may also have been at Aberdeen, due to an entry in the *Exchequer Rolls* for 1502, when he accepted a gift of salmon for the Franciscan nuns at Veere. He died c.1505-8.

**John Tullideff** (Iohannis Tulidef, Johanni Tullidaff, Dillidaifi)

He was a theologian at St Andrews in 1541, as well as guardian of the St Andrews friary, and may have been at Elgin and Aberdeen, too. He was in the possession of Thomas Aquinas' *In beati Pauli epistolas* (Paris, 1529) which bears inscriptions detailing it to be both for his use as well as that of the Aberdeen convent, in addition to an inscription 'pro communitate fratum minorum conuentus elgenensis'. He also owned Nicholas Herborn's *Enarrationes evangeliorum* (Antwerp, 1533), which had
been donated to Tullideff by Peter Chaplain, canon of St Salvator's, regent in the Pedagogy, Professor of theology and finally provost of St Salvator's College between 1550-1, when he died. The book then passed to Anthony Baldowy (see above) and was at some point also in the possession of Andrew Cairns (see above) and Lewis Williamson (see below). He was, presumably, the same person whom Bryce identified as Warden John Dillidaff who sat among the judges who condemned Patrick Hamilton, Abbot of Fern, on the accusation of the Dominican Prior, Alexander Campbell, in 1528 and who, in 1540, formed one of the tribunal that passed judgment on Sir John Borthwick, along with his provincial minister John Paterson (see above).

Alexander Van\textsuperscript{D} (Alexandrus Van\textsuperscript{OB})
A member of the Aberdeen friary, his death is recorded in the \textit{Aberdeen Obituary} for 1523.

Robert Veitch\textsuperscript{D}
Guardian of the Stirling friary, he is known to be still active as a priest in 1583 when, on 8 October 1583, he was charged by the Stirling Presbytery for failing to appear before the synod at Edinburgh on 1 October 1583 to give a confession of his faith and religion, and be disciplined for his former abuses. He was commanded to find surety from his cautioner, Michaell Rynd, a goldsmith of Stirling, that he would appear before the general assembly, but after the fourth admonition and Veitch's continued failure to recant, he was excommunicated on 1 December 1583 by James Anderson, minister at Stirling.

John Wadlock\textsuperscript{B}
There is a doubtful reference to John Wadlock in 1541, supposedly a mathematician residing at the St Andrews friary.

Walter of Leiden\textsuperscript{D} (de Leydis,\textsuperscript{D} Walter Leydes,\textsuperscript{B} Valterus Leydes\textsuperscript{OB})
Lay brother of Aberdeen friary, who, like his brother John of Leiden (see above), was a carpenter and took part in the construction of the Aberdeen friary; the
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Aberdeen Obituary reported that he constructed a belfry and cells for the friars. His death is recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary for 1469.

John Whiteford\textsuperscript{D} (Johannis Quhitfurd\textsuperscript{OB} John Quhitfurd\textsuperscript{B} John Whitefurd\textsuperscript{B}), He was a Glasgow University regent, who joined the Observant Franciscans (see also James Pettigrew, above). His death is recorded in the Aberdeen Obituary as 'Friar John Quhitfurd, priest preacher and confessor', but without a date.

Louis Williamson\textsuperscript{DR} (Lewis Williamson\textsuperscript{D} Ludovicus Williamson\textsuperscript{B} Ludovicus Gulielmi\textsuperscript{H} Ludovicus Williamson\textsuperscript{DR} Ludovici Wyllemsone\textsuperscript{OB} Ludovicus Willelmi\textsuperscript{B}) Born in 1475, he was ordained priest at the Greenwich Observant friary in 1501, later was twice provincial minister of the Scottish Observants and died and was buried at Edinburgh in 1555 (having 'attained his jubilee in the order'), as stated by an entry in the Aberdeen Obituary. Along with John Tullideff, Anthony Baldowy and Andrew Cairns, he can be listed among the owners of the copy of Nicholas Herborn's *Enarratioines Evangeliorum* (Antwerp, 1533) which had initially belonged to Peter Chaplain, provost of St Salvator's College. This might suggest a connection with St Andrews, since the three other friars who had this book in their possession were probably at St Andrews at some point in their careers, while Hay's chronicle suggests a Stirling connection as well. As provincial minister, Williamson was also the author of a letter of confraternity to Sir Patrick Hepburn of Wauchton, dated at Edinburgh 1542.

James Winchester\textsuperscript{DB} (Jacobus Wincister\textsuperscript{OB}), Observant He was guardian of the Perth, Aberdeen and possibly St Andrews friaries. On 6 February 1551 he witnessed the will of Provost Peter Chaplain at St Andrews, alongside James Peebles, his vicar in the friary. Bryce designated him guardian of Perth when he attended the Provincial Council of 1549, held at the Edinburgh Dominican house, and that shortly after he moved to Aberdeen where he was guardian when he died on a mission to France in 1553. The Aberdeen Obituary records his death for 20 August 1553, where he is described as 'warden and custos'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Friary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abell, Adam</td>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Born c. 1475; entered Inchaffray, 1495; transferred to Jedburgh after 1510; <em>Roit and Quheill of Tyme</em>, 1533-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, Duncan</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1483.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Friar</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbuckle, Alexander</td>
<td>St Andrews, Edinburgh</td>
<td>Guardian (Edinburgh), provincial minister</td>
<td>At St Andrews, 1526; interrogating Thomas Forret, 1539; guardian at Edinburgh, 1542; disputation with Knox, 1547; died, 1562.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailie, Robert</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Guardian (Aberdeen)</td>
<td>Died 1510.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldowy, Anthony</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Student at St Andrews</td>
<td>Died 1522.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawfour, Thomas</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Witness, 9 April 1513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair, Alexander</td>
<td>Aberdeen (? )</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1549.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothwell, John</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 1506-1560.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrell, John</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Witness, 21 August 1558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns, Andrew</td>
<td>Glasgow, Edinburgh, St Andrews, Aberdeen</td>
<td>Guardian (St Andrews and Aberdeen); provincial minister</td>
<td>Graduated at St Andrews, 1495; Observant/ Conventual controversy, 1521; witness, 1 November 1530; mediator, 1531; died 1543.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carneill, Herbert</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witness, 21 August 1558.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauldwell, John</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td></td>
<td>1499-1501.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childe, James</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Guardian (Aberdeen)</td>
<td>Minute of Agreement, 2 April 1505.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius of Zierekzze</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Novice, 1454; arrived in Scotland c.1457.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottis, Alexander</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Witness, 9 April 1513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottis, Andrew</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Guardian (St Andrews)</td>
<td><em>Pater Noster</em> controversy, 1542; Dispute with English Dominican and attendance at provincial council, 1549.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Friary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crannoch, David</td>
<td>Edinburgh, Aberdeen</td>
<td>Guardian (Edinburgh), provincial minister</td>
<td>Determined at Paris, 1447; licensed 1448/9; doctor of medicine, 1454; royal physician, 1457; joined Observants by 1459; guardian of Edinburgh, 1464; provincial vicar by 1471; died in England, 1472.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick, Alexander</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fled Aberdeen for Dundee, 1532.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elphinstone, James</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1553.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Jamesone</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died St Laurence Day, 1557.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geddy, John</td>
<td>St Andrews, Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witness, 21 August 1558; custodier of Aberdeen friary, 1560, 1561-2; receives pension, 1563; died 1575.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard of Texel</td>
<td>Edinburgh, Aberdeen</td>
<td>Guardian/ vicar (Aberdeen)</td>
<td>Arts graduate, Cologne, 1455; arrived in Scotland c.1457; guardian (Aberdeen), 1471; died 1473.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert, Donald</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>Guardian (Greenwich)</td>
<td>At Greenwich, c.1482.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilruif, William</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1555.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Alexander</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 10 January 1560.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Thomas</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exiled, 1560.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey, Alexander</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Received pension, 1561-3 and 1567.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay, John</td>
<td>Stirling and Cologne</td>
<td>Provincial minister (Cologne)</td>
<td>Professed at Stirling, 1551; went into exile, 1559; provincial minister, c.1586.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay, Robert</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witness, 29 June 1527.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes, Friar</td>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
<td>Guardian (Jedburgh)</td>
<td>Preaches at Norham, 1524.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson, Thomas</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>At Aberdeen c.1528.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pettigrew</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Provincial minister</td>
<td>Witness, 22 March 1512; died 1518.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Deinze</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial minister</td>
<td>Died 1508.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Leiden</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1459/ 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnestoun, James</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thirds of Benefices, 1561 and 1562.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Friary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, John</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Guardian (Glasgow)</td>
<td>Involved in extension of friary grounds, 1512; witness, 9 April 1513.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Thomas</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1545.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, John</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Guardian (Glasgow)</td>
<td>C. mid-fifteenth century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Robert</td>
<td>Edinburgh, St Andrews</td>
<td>Guardian (St Andrews); provincial minister</td>
<td>Matriculated at Cologne, 1439; at St Andrews from c. 1463.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knycht, John</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witness, 21 August 1558.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laing, Walter</td>
<td>St Andrews, Stirling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dysart incident, pre-1538; at Dundee to arrest Alexander Dick, 1532.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb, William</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Custodian of Aberdeen friary, 1560, 1561-2; receives pension, 1563.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson, Friar ('Grey Friar')</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Received alms, 28 December 1552.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leche, Walter</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>In Master of Gray’s household, 1585.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie, William</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Died 1523.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay, Jerome</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Guardian (Perth); provincial minister</td>
<td>Graduated at St Andrews, 1489.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litstar, John (junior)</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Graduate of St Andrews, 1487; member of Observants, October 1487.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litstar, John (senior)</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Guardian (Aberdeen); provincial minister</td>
<td>Possibly at Cologne University, 1475; guardian and provincial minister, 1482; died c.1505.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louthon, John</td>
<td>Aberdeen, St Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1473.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyn, John</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Left order, 1539.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Friary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lythtone, George</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Guardian (Edinburgh, Aberdeen); provincial minister</td>
<td>Died 1499.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltman, Simon</td>
<td>St Andrews,</td>
<td>Guardian (St Andrews)</td>
<td>Guardian/ trial of Jerome Russell, 1539; witness to deed of presentation, 10 October 1539 transfers ownership of St Andrews friary to burgh, 18 May 1559; Notarial Instrument, 21 September 1559.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchel, Alexander</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1526.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marschel, William</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1469.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, William</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Witness, 29 June 1527.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHaigh, John</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Witness, 7 March 1502.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meltrin, Archibald</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Provincial minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meltrin, David</td>
<td>Aberdeen (?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvil, James</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Convert to Lutheranism and exile, c.1526; Apostolic Preacher, Rome, 1534(?); returned to Scotland, 1535.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merser, Alexander</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1469.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motto, Thomas</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Exiled, 1559; left Lower German Province, 1579; at Rouen, 1586.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nory, David</td>
<td>Aberdeen (?)</td>
<td>Entered Minorites, 1514.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Franciscan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Arthur</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Guardian (Ayr)</td>
<td>Decree of court, 26 June 1529.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson, Alexander</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Guardian (Stirling)</td>
<td>Appointed overseer, 18 April 1544.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson, John</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Guardian (Glasgow); provincial minister</td>
<td>Witnesses deed of indenture, 1531; provincial minister and at tribunal of Sir John Borthwick, 1540; attended provincial council, 1549; exiled, 1560; incorporated into province of Lower Germany, 1563; Louvain epitaph, 1573.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick, John, of Banff</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exiled, 1560.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Friary</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peebles, James</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Vicar (St Andrews)</td>
<td>Inscription, 1549; witness, 6 February 1551; denounced as ‘rebel abroad’, 1574.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettigrew, William</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witness, 22 March 1512.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsay, Finlay</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regent at St Andrews, 1514; witness, 1 November 1530.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranwick, Patrick</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Guardian (Stirling); provincial minister</td>
<td>Witness, 21 February 1495; first warden of Stirling, c.1497.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray, Thomas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Guardian (Ayr)</td>
<td>Student at St Andrews, 1511; regent, 1514; involved in legal proceedings, June 1530-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redy, Alexander</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1529.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard, Robert</td>
<td>Louvain</td>
<td>Guardian (Louvain)</td>
<td>Left Scotland, 1559; admitted to Louvain, 1 September 1560.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, John</td>
<td>Edinburgh, St Andrews and Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculated at Cologne, 15 August 1450; determined 30 June 1451; graduated, 1453; died at Aberdeen, 1469.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richertsoun, James</td>
<td>Edinburgh (Observant or Dominican)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thirds of Benefices, 1561 and 1562.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger, John</td>
<td>Aberdeen, Stirling and Perth</td>
<td>Guardian (Perth, Aberdeen)</td>
<td>At Perth, 1550; given book, 1553; resigns Aberdeen friary, 29 December 1559; possible entry in TA, 1562; appointed as preacher, December 1565.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rynotull, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, John</td>
<td>Edinburgh, Aberdeen, St Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly a student at St Andrews, 1531; Scott and George Wishart, March 1546.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Ledgerwood:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Friary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stalker, Patrick</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry into Aberdeen convent, c.1486; died 1512.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevisoun, John</td>
<td>Edinburgh (Observant or Dominican)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thirds of Benefices, 1561.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, Robert</td>
<td>St Andrews, Elgin</td>
<td>Guardian (Elgin); provincial minister</td>
<td>Born c.1475; refused passage through England, 1507; controversy of 1521; gift of book, Elgin, 1554; died c.1555.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strang, John</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1517.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symson, William</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thirds of Benefices, 1562 and 1566.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenand, Friar</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witness, 9 April 1513.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson, John</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touris, William of</td>
<td>Glasgow, St Andrews, Aberdeen</td>
<td>Provincial minister</td>
<td>At Paris, 1469-72; at Glasgow, 1494; witness, 21 February 1495; Contemplacioun printed, 1499; at St Andrews, 1504; accepted gift for nuns at Veere, 1502; died c.1505-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullideff, John</td>
<td>St Andrews, Elgin, Aberdeen</td>
<td>Guardian (St Andrews)</td>
<td>Judge in trial of Patrick Hamilton, 1528; tribunal of Sir John Borthwick, 1540; theologian at St Andrews, 1541.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van, Alexander</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1523.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veitch, Robert</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Guardian (Stirling)</td>
<td>Summoned before the synod, October 1583; excommunicated, 1 December 1583.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadlock, John</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reign of James V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter of Leiden</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1469.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteford, John</td>
<td>Glasgow, Aberdeen(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fleming</td>
<td>Edinburgh, St Andrews, Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1530s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson, Lewis</td>
<td>Greenwich, Stirling</td>
<td>Provincial minister</td>
<td>Born, 1475; ordained priest, 1501; letter of confraternity, 1542; died 1555.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Friary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winchester, James</td>
<td>Perth, Aberdeen (and St Andrews?)</td>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>Witness, 6 February, 1551; attended Provincial Council, 1549; died in France, 1553.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Patronage

1: *Compota Thesaurariorum Regum Scotorum* – Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Oct 1497</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, i (1473-1498), p. 362</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris thare [Aberdeen], 11s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Dec 1497</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, i (1473-1498), p. 373</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, that [day] to Schir John Ramsay, that he laid doune to the men that flittit the bastailzy fra the Freris to the Tolbuth of Abirdene, and flittit the burdis fra the Freris to the Tolbuth, 27s. [blockhouse removed from the Friars to the Tolbooth]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Oct 1501</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 75</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, for half ane stane of wax to the Gray Freris of Abirden, 9s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nov 1504</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 266</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, tot he Gray Freris of Abirdene, be the Kingis command, 42s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ix (1546-1551), p. 252</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Aberdene, £4. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 July 1552</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, x (1551-1559), p. 94</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, quinto Julii, to the grayfreris in Abirdene, £20. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 1488</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, i (1473-1498), p. 90</td>
<td>Aberdour [St Martha of Aberdour]</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Sisteris of Abirdowre, at the Kingis commande, £2. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1489</td>
<td>TA, i (1473-1498), p. 110Aberdour [St Martha of Aberdour]</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Sisteris, at the Kingis commande,</td>
<td>£2 10/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 100Aberdour [St Martha of Aberdour]</td>
<td>Item, be the Kingis command, to the Gray Sisteris thre Franch crounis; summa 42s. [Alms]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 March 1497-8</td>
<td>TA, i (1473-1498), p. 381Ayr Observant</td>
<td>Item, the sevint day of March, [in Air] giffin to Schir Andro to gif the Gray Freris, be the Kingis command,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 72Ayr Friars</td>
<td>Item, the samyn day [24 April 1501], to the Freris of Air, be the Kingis command, 14s. [Alms]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Aug 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 81Ayr Observant</td>
<td>Item, the samyn day [26 Aug 1501], to the Gray Freris of Air be the Kingis command, 40s. [Donation]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 April 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 250Ayr Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xviij day of Aprile, payit to Schir Andro Makbrek that he laid doun to the Gray Freris of Air, the ix day of Aprile bipast, 20s. [Donation]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 251Ayr Observant</td>
<td>Item, that samyn day [17 May 1503], to the Gray Freris thare [Ayr], 18s. [Donation]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 April 1504</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 260Ayr Observant</td>
<td>Item, the samyn day [14 April 1504], be the Kingis command, giffin to the Gray Freris of Air for vj bollis of Bere, left in legasy be Schir Robert Bell in Mauchlin, to the said Freris, qhilk Schir Robert deit bastard, and the King gat his eschet, £3 12/-: [payment of legacy to Gray Friars]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June 1504</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 261Ayr Observant</td>
<td>Item, that day ['the secund day of Junij], payit to Schir John Ramsay, he laid doun be the Kingis command to the Gray Freris of Air, 18s. [Donation]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Patronage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 June 1504</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 262</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris thare [Ayr], 40s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June 1505</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, iii (1506-1507), p. 60</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xvj day of Junij, in Air, to Schir Andro Makbrek, to preistis, freris and preistis of Our Lady Kirk of Kyle, £5. [pyaments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 July 1505</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, iii (1506-1507), p. 62</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to him, to the Gray Freris of Air, 28s. [Alms, payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 July 1506</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, iii (1506-1507), p. 73</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>[the xviij day of Julij (l. Aprile)] Item, to the Gray Freris of Air, 42s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 July 1506</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, iii (1506-1507), p. 80</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the ferd day of Julij, for ane cheseb of rede chamlot to the Gray Freris of Air, with cors of slicht gold, £4 10/-. Item, for vj ½ elne Bertane claiith to be ane alb to the samyn; ilk elne 22d; summa 11s 11d. Item, for making of the samyn, 2s 6d. Item, for xviij unce silvir to be ane chalice to thaim; ilk unce xjs.; summa £9 18½. Item, for making of the samyn; ilk unce 2s; summa 36s. Item, for gilting of it, ... [vestments and chalice for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Aug 1506</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, iii (1506-1507), p. 280</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Air, 14s. [Payments to Friars of Ayr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Aug 1506</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, iii (1506-1507), p. 280</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the vij day of August, to the Gray Freris of Ayr, 42s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jan 1506-7</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, iii (1506-1507), p. 286</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, for gilting of ane chalice to the Gray Freris of Air, £3 4½/- [chalice for Gray Freris]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July 1507</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, iii (1506-1507), p. 291</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Air, 14s. [payments to Friars of Ayr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 July 1507</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, iii (1506-1507), p. 292</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Air, 14s. [payments to Friars of Ayr]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Patronage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 May 1512</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 187</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray freris of Air, 40s. [payments, donations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May 1512</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 187</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the second day of Maij, to the freris of Irwyne and Air, ij Franch crounis, 28s. [donation to the friars in Ayr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Aug 1530</td>
<td>TA, v (1515-1531), p. 390</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>... Item, tot he Gray freris of Are, £10. ... [donation, 'Elemosina']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June 1532</td>
<td>TA, vi (1531-1538), p. 59</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xv day of Junii, to David Purves, masar, to pas with lettres fra the lordis to the wardane of the grayfreris of Air, anent ane instrument pertenyng to the sisteris and airis of Carletoun, 20s. [letters to the warden of the Greyfriars of Ayr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March 1551-2</td>
<td>TA, x (1551-1559), p. 66</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, be command of my lordis compositouris to the gray freris in Aire in almois, £20. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan 1559-60</td>
<td>TA, xi (1559-1566), p. 5</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Air, £12. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 May 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 251</td>
<td>Ayr / Glasgow</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, payit to the comptrollar that he laid doun be the Kingis command to the Freris of Air and Glasgo quhen the King com fra Quithirm in Aprile bipast, 6 Franch crounis; summa £4 4/-.. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Jan 1473-4</td>
<td>TA, i (1473-1498), 46</td>
<td>Coupar in Angus</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, gevin to Gilbegane, passande to Coupar in Angus for freir Andro, 2s 8d. [Andro, Friar, sent for by James III]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Jan 1496-7</td>
<td>TA, i (1473-1498), p. 309</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xij day of January, giffin to the Gray Freris in Edinburgh, at the Kingis command, 40s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 251</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xxvij day of March, Pasch day, to the Freris of Edinburgh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 78</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the samyn day ['last day of Aprile' 1503], to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 June 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 251</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, that samyn day ['on Witosnday, the ferd day of Junij'], to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nov 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 256</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xj day of November, to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Dec 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 257</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to Schir Andro Makbrek, to the Gray Freris in Edinburgh, 42s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May 1504</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 261</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, [the xxvij day of Maij], to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June 1504</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 261</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, for tua barrellis beir to the Gray Freris of Edinburgh, 25s. [payment for beer, donation?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Dec 1504</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 267</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Edinburgh that day, 14s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb 1504-5</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 268</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, that samyn day ['the second day of Februar', Candlemas], to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 58</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Edinburgh, Quenis Ferry and Inverkethin, 3 Franch crounis; summa 42s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 59</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Edinburgh, Inverkethin, the Quenis Fery, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 61</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Dec 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 69</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Item, the xxvj day of December, Sanct Stevinnis day, to th Kingis offerand, 14s. [To the Black Friars of Edinburgh, the Friars of Perth, Queensferry, Inverkeithing, and Lufness, each 14s.] [Payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 72</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 74</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 74</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the thrid day of Junij, to Schir Andro Makbrek to the Gray Freris of Edinburgh, 40s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 284</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item [the first day of November], to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Dec 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 284</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item [the xxvj day of December], to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 April 1507</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 284</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 May 1507</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 289</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xxiiij day of Maij, to the Freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept 1507</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 34</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the freris of Edinburgh, 14s. [And four similar entries.] [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept 1511</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 175</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Edinburgh and Inverkething in elimose, ane uncorne and ane half, 30s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td>TA, vi (1531-1538), p. 225</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Grey freris of Edinburgh for almos and intertining of ane gentillman strangeir, £5. [in alms, and for entertaining a gentleoman stranger]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Aug 1547</td>
<td>TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 105</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to ane smyth duellande at the grayfreris for xxij schule irnes, 22s. [shovel irons bought from a smith dwelling at Edinburgh]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 226</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris to help to prepair and reparrell thair place, £33. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 252</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Edinburght in almos, £11 5/- . [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 434</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the grayfreris of Edinburgh in almous, £10. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 April 1550</td>
<td>TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 393</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, till uther tua men beand at the Gray freris yet quhilkes war hurt at the recovering of Brochty, 46s. [donation to men at the gate of the Greyfriars who were hurt at the siege of Broughty]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Dec 1550</td>
<td>TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 464</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris in almous, £5. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>TA, x (1551-1559), p. 134</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Edinburgh in almous, and to thair support and sustentatioun, £40. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>TA, x (1551-1559), p. 206</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Edinburgh, in almous, £5. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>TA, x (1551-1559), p. 216</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Edinburgh, and to thair support, in almous, £40. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>TA, x (1551-1559), p. 303</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris of Edinburgh, in almous, £20. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>TA, x (1551-1559), p. 444</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris in almous, £20. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb 1502-3</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 248</td>
<td>Edinburgh, Gray Sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, [the third day of Februar, Sanct Blais day], in Edinburgh, to the Gray Sisteres, be the Kingis command, 42s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 75</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the first day of November, to the Freris of Elgin, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Oct 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 255</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris there [Elgin], 40s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Oct 1504</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 265</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Abbot of Cambuskinneth, he gaif the Freris of Elgin, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Oct 1504</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 266</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris thare [Elgin], 28s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sept 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 282</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item [the xxij day of September], to the Freris of Elgin, 14s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept 1552</td>
<td>TA, x (1551-1559), p. 106-7</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Elgin, £20. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, to the Wardane of the saidis gray freris, 40s. [payment to the Warden of]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Aug 1556</td>
<td>TA, x (1551-1559), p. 313</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris of Elgin, [ ] [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Dec 1488</td>
<td>TA, i (1473-1498), p. 99</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Glesco for the Kingis awmus, £5. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1489</td>
<td>TA, i (1473-1498), p. 110</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Glescow, at the Kingis commande, £10. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Feb 1500-1</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 69</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the fift day of Februar, giffin be the Kingis command to the Gray Freris of Glasgo, deliverit to their provisour, 28s. [Payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 60</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Glasgo, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 60</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris of Glasgo, 40s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 April 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 73</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item to the Freris of Glasgo, 14s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 74</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, payit to Lord Avendale, he gaif to the Freris of Glasgo, 14s. [Donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Sept 1531</td>
<td>TA, vi (1531-1538), p. 32</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris of Glasgul the same tyme ['at the time of the air of Dunbartane be the lordis componitouris consideratioune']?, £10. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct 1547</td>
<td>TA, ix (1546-1547), p. 32</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Glasgw, £5 10/- [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Glasgow/Queen’s</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the thrid day of Junij, giffin to the frere of Glasgo that cumis to the lady in Strivelin to heir hir confessioun, 28s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 May 1498</td>
<td>TA, i</td>
<td>Gray Freris Observant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, payit be me to the Portingale merchand, for 1 twn of wyne the King gaif the Erle of Lenax, 1 pipe he gaif the Gray Freris, 1 pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>he gaif to Alexander Stewart; for ilk twn £22; summa £24. [gift by the king of a pipe of wine to the Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 March 1506-7</td>
<td>TA, iii</td>
<td>Gray Friar Observant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, the xij day of March, for ane coule to ane Gray frere, 24s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Aug 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii</td>
<td>Gray Friars Observant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris, 20s. [payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Feb 1506-7</td>
<td>TA, iii</td>
<td>Gray Friars Observant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, the ix day of Februar, to the Abbot of Cambuskintheth he gaif the Gray Freris, 9s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Nov 1511</td>
<td>TA, iv</td>
<td>Gray Friars Observant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for ail and fische to the Gray Freris, 4s. [ale and fish for the Grey Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 April 1512</td>
<td>TA, iv</td>
<td>Gray Friars Observant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, the vj day of Aprile, to the Gray freris in elimose, 20s. [payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 April 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Gray Sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, the xxvij day of Aprile, to the Gray Sisteris in almous be the Kingis command, 40s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Nov 1504</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Gray Sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, the xxvij day of November, to the Gray Sisteres, be the Kingis command, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 1513</td>
<td>TA, iv</td>
<td>Gray Sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Sisteris in almous, £5. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sept 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Gray Sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Sisteres that day [8 Sept 1503], be the Kingis command, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>TA, v</td>
<td>Greyfriars</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, deliverit to the grayfreris for lxij unce siluer stollin fra the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March 1505</td>
<td>T4, iii (1506-1507), p. 58</td>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>King, and revelit to thaim in confessioun, be the Kingis precept, to the men that had the said silverwerk in wed, £20. [silver stolen from the King and revealed in confession to the Greyfriars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Oct 1526</td>
<td>T4, v (1515-1531), p. 306</td>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, for tua barrellis beir to the Gray Freris of Gedburgh, 24s. [beer to the friars of Jedburgh]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 July 1527</td>
<td>T4, v (1515-1531), p. 306</td>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the viij day of Julii, gevin to the grayfreris of Jedburgh to the edificatioun and reparatioun of thair place, £14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>T4, vii (1538-1541), p. 450</td>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris in Jedburgh to the help of the reparatioun of thair place, £20. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov 1496</td>
<td>T4, i (1473-1498), p. 304</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, that samyn day [1 Nov 1496], to the Gray Freris of Perth, 40s. [payment for masses to the Grey Friars of Perth]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Dec 1497</td>
<td>T4, i (1473-1498), p. 372</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, that samyn day [19 Dec 1497], be the Kingis command, giffin to the Gray Freris of Perth, ane ducait and ane leo; summa 33s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jan 1502-3</td>
<td>T4, ii (1500-1504), p. 247</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, [the x day of Januar], in Perth, to the Gray Freris thare, 20s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 June 1503</td>
<td>T4, ii (1500-1504), p. 253</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris thare [Sanct Johnstoun], 42s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Oct 1503</td>
<td>T4, ii (1500-1504), p. 255</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris thare [Sanct Johnstoun], 28s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Oct 1504</td>
<td>T4, ii (1500-1504), p. 265</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xj day of October, to the Gray Freris of Sanct Johnestoun, 40s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb 1507-8</td>
<td>T4, iv (1507-1508), p. 265</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Provest of Methuen to gif to the freris of Sanct Johnstoun,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 Dec 1511</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 181</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the freris of Sanct Johnstoun, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 1527</td>
<td>TA, v (1515-1531), p. 306</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the freris minoris of Perth in almous, be the Kingis precept, £10. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Dec 1530</td>
<td>TA, v (1515-1531), p. 429</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, be the Kingis precept to the gray freris of Perth, £10. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 July 1553</td>
<td>TA, x (1551-1559), p. 189</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Perth, £70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Dec 1497</td>
<td>TA, i (1473-1498), p. 371</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris of Sanct Androis, be the Kingis command, ane vicorome and ane ducait; summa 33s 6d. [payment to the Gray Friars of St Andrews]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Jan 1503-4</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 417</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to Schir Andro [Makbrek], to the Gray Freris thare [Sanctandrois], 40s. [Payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Jan 1503-4</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 417</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris of Sanctandrois, be the Kingis command, for the archdene of Sanctandrois, £3. [Payment to the Gray Friars on behalf of Archdean of St Andrews, Alexander Stewart, the King’s son by Margaret Boyd]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jan 1505-6</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 70</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris in Sanctandrois, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March 1505-6</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 71</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Sanctandrois, 14s. [Payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March 1505-6</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 71</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xvij day of March, to the Gray Freris of Sanctandrois, 42s. [Payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 April 1507-8</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 40</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Friar</td>
<td>Item, to ane frere of Sanctandrois, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 40</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the freris of Sanctandrois, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9 Dec 1546   | TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 42 | St Andrews | Observant | Item, to tua gray freris in Sanctandrois tha twar to depart towart France to pay their fraucht, £13 4/-.
| 9 Dec 1546   | TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 43 | St Andrews | Observant | Item, to the gray freris of Sanctandrois, £6 12/-.
| 9 Dec 1546   | TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 43 | St Andrews | Observant | Item, agane to the gray freris, £6 12/-.
| 3 Jan 1546-7 | TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 49 | St Andrews | Friars   | Item, to the freris of Sanctandrois, £7 14/- [payment]                 |
| 1548         | TA, ix (1546-1551), p. 217 | St Andrews | Observant | Item, to the gray freris to help to byg up thair place, conforme to my lord governoures precept, £20. |
| 9 Nov 1496   | TA, i (1473-1498), p. 305 | Stirling    | Friars   | Item, the ix day of Nouember, to the Freris of Striuelin that brocht apillis to the King, 9s. [payments to friars] |
| 12 May 1498  | TA, i (1473-1498), p. 391 | Stirling    | Observant | Item, for ij waw x pund of irne, to the Grayfreris of Striuelin to thair bigging sic like, £2. 16/4d. [contributions by James IV to the Gray Friars of Stirling] |
| 9 May 1498   | TA, i (1473-1498), p. 390 | Stirling    | Observant | Item, the ix day of Maij, giffin to the Gray Freris prouisour in Striuelin, to the bigging, £66 13/4d. [contributions by James IV to the Gray Friars of Stirling] |
| 8 April 1501 | TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 71 | Stirling    | Observant | Item, the viij day of Aprile, giffin be the Kingis command to Maister Leonard Logy, to by met and drink to the Grey Freris in Strivelin, 20s. [meat and drink for Gray Friars] |
| 30 April 1501| TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 71 | Stirling    | Observant | Item, the last day of Aprile, giffin for xv ½ elne gray claiith to the |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 May 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xv day of Maii, for ij patenebreddsis of ivory bane to he Gray Freris of Strivelin, 4s. [Patenbreddis for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the lok Smyth of Edinburgh, for carying of part of lokiis to Strivelin to the Gray Freris, 8d. [Locks for the Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the samyn day [xj day of Junij], payit to the broodstair for making of ane cheseb tot he Greyfreris, 10s. [Chasuble for Gray Friars Church at Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for making of ane tunycall to the samyn freris in Strivelin, 10s. [A Tunical for the Gray Friars Church at Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, the xj day of Junij, payit to the broodstair for making of thre vestimentis of gray damas in Strivelin, 30s. [Damask]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sept 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the x day of September, for xxv elne quhit to be blancatis to the Gray Freris in Strivelin, ilk elne 2s; summa 1s. [Cloth for Gray Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Sept 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris of Strivelin, 18s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Dec 1501</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xxj day of December, giffin be the Kingis command, to Maister Leonard Logy to by flesch to the Gray Freris in Strivelin, 14/8d. [Meat and drink for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Feb 1501-2</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to Sir Johne Ason, in Strivelin, to gif the Gray Freris, 40s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 March 1501-2</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, in Strivelin, for ane galloun Mavasy to the Gray Freris, 16s. [Malvoisie wine for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 March 1501-3</td>
<td>TA, ii</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, for thre stane of tyn, bocht at Johne loksmyth to the Gray Freris of Strivelin, 40s. [Tin for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 67</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xj day of Aprile, to Patrick Redheuch for certane ymagis brocht hame be him to the Freris in Strivelin, £35. [images to Friars of Strirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 April (?) 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 67</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the 14 day, for ane weddircok to the Frere Kyrrk of Strivelin, £5. [weathercock for Friars' Kirk of Strirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 April 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 67</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, for 42xlij elne Bertane lynyn to the Gray Freris in Strivelin for thair kyrrk, £4 4/-; [linen for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 June 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 79</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the ix day of Junij, in Strivelin, to Sir Johne Ason, to gif the Freris, 42s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 153</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the vj day of Julij, in Strivelin, for wesching of the Gray Freris clathis and kyrrk graith, 17s. [washing clothes, etc, of Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sept 1503</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 244</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xvij day of September, for thre dosan of colis to the freris of Strivelin, 21s. [coals for friars of Striling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sept 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 69</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the first day of September, giffin to the monk of Culros in part of payment of the Gray Freris bukis writing, £5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Oct 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 245</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, [the v day of October], to Schir Johne Ayson to the Gray Freris of Stirling, 42s. [Alms] [And twelve similar entries, amounting in the aggregate to £18 18/8d.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Oct 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 245</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, that samyn day [9 Oct 1502], to ane man to pas for certane irne werk maid to the Freris of Stirling in Edinburgh, 33s. [Ironwork for Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Oct 1502</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 245</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xvij day of October, to Schir Johne Ayson to the Gray Freris of Strivelin, 18s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Jan 1502-3</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 247</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, that samyn day [29 Jan 1502-3], payit to James Redeheuch for tua dosan colis and other stuf he gaif to the Freris of Strivelin, be the Kingis command, 32s. [coals for friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Feb 1502-3</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 248</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, [the xix day of Februar], fo riiij cappes to torchis for the Freris of Strivelin, 6s. [caps to torches for Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 April 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 250</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, for iij dosan of small cammes to the Gray Freris in Strivelin, 30s. [canvas for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 April 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 250</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the 20 day of Aprile, to the monkis of Culros in pairt of payment of the Freris of Strivelin bukis, £21 13/4d. [books of Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, to Patrick Redheuch, for chandilleris to the Gray Freris of Strivelin, weyand thre stane vij ½ punk, ilk pund xvijd.; summa £4 3/3 d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for xlvij parchment skinnis of Flandrez to thaim, ilk pece xvj d.; summa £3 -/4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for xv elne braid dornyk to thaim, ilk elne 2s 6d; summa 37s 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for 4 mes bukis to thaim, £4 -/12d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for ane gret portuous to thaim, 36s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for ane buke callit Sermones to thaim, 30s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for ane graill to thaim, 9s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for ane buk callit the Mamitretis to thaim, 9s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for x elne chamlot, bleu and grene, to the said Freris, to be frontales to thair altaris, ilk elne 10s; summa £5. [gifts to Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 250</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the loksmyth of Edinburgh, for certane lokkis and bandis to the Freris of Strivelin, 28s. [locks and bands for Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 April 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 289</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xxvj day of Aprile, for tua steik burd Alexander to the Gray Freris, to the kirk graith in Strivelin, 48s. [burd-alexander for the kirk of the Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 366</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, [the xiij day of Aprile], tot he wricht that makis the altair in the Gray Freris in Strivelin, in drinksilver, 3 Franch crounis; summa 42s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 252</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xvij day of Junij, be the Kingis command, to the Monkis of Culros, in pairt of payment of the Freris of Strivelin bukis, x Franch crownis; summa £7. [books of Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 253</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, that samyn day [25 July 1503], payit to George Corntoun he laid doun for ane barrell of oyle to the Freris of Strivelin, 40s. [barrel of oil for Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Aug 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 254</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xvj day of August, for lxj elne Bertane lynyn to the Gray Freris in Strivelin, ilk elne 22d; summa £5. 11/10d. [linen for Gray Friars] Item, for vj crwatis for thaim, vjs. [crates for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sept 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 254</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, [the vj day of September], payit to Andro Aytoun he laid doun for xiiij gallonis of aill to the said Freris [Gray Friars of Stirling], ilk gallon 16d.; summa 16s 4d. [ale for Gray Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sept 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 254</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, that samyn day [8 Sept 1503], to the Monkis of Culros, in pairt of payment of the Gray Freris bukis for Strivelin, 42s. [books of Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Sept 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 255</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Monkis of Culros, in pairt of payment of the Freris of Strivelin bukis, vij Franch crownis; summa £4 18/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Oct 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 256</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the last day of October, payit to James Redheuch for vj dosan of colis laid in, be the Kingis command, to the Gray Freris in Strivelin, 36s. [coals for Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nov 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 256</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, for xxxij elne Bertane lynyn, to be surplisses to the Gray Freris in Strivelin, ilk elne 2s; summa 48s. [surplices to Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nov 1503</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, ii (1500-1504), p. 256</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the samyn day [25 Nov 1503], to James Redheuch, that he laid doun for ane barrell of Hamburgh beir to the Freris of Strivelin, 28s. [beer for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jan 1503-4</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 257</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the penult day of Januar, for ane dosan parchment skinnis to the Freris of Strivelin, 8s 6d. [parchment skins for Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb 1503-4</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 258</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, [the third day of February], to Schir Alexander Crag, to the Gray Freris of Strivelin, 28s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 March 1503-4</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 258</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, [the third day of March], payit to James Redheuch, he laid [doun] for colis to the Gray Freris in Strilin, and for thair clothes wesching, vj Franch crounis; summa £4 4/- [washing clothes, etc., of Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 March 1504</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 259</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xxvj day of March, to the Freris of Strivelin, be command, 14s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Feb 1504-5</td>
<td>TA, ii (1500-1504), p. 268-9</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, [the vj day of Februar], payit to Alexander Balfour of the sellar, that he laid doun for ane barrell of Hamburgh beir to the Freris of Strivelin, be the Kingis command, 28s. [beer for Gray Friars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb 1504-5</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 56</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, payit to Schir William Malvile that he laid doun at divers tymes to the Gray Freris of Strivelin sen the first day of August bipast, at sindry tymes, 59s. [payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Feb 1504-5</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 57</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xix day of Februar, in Cambuskinneth, to the Freris of Strivelin, 9s. [payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 April 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 59</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friar</td>
<td>Item, the xxvij day of Aprile, in Strivelin, to the Kingis offerand to one freris first mes, 14s. [King’s offerings in Striling, at a friar’s first mass]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 59</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris of Strivelin, 36s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Aug 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 63</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the x day of August, for xij ½ elne lynyn claith to the Freris of Strivelin for towales; ilk elne 16d.; summa 12s 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Aug 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 63</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, for xxiiij elne braid quhit to thair blanctis; ilk elne 2s 3d; summa 54s. [towels and blankets for donation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sept 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 65</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xxij day of September, to the Gray Freris of Strivelin, be the Kingis command, £3. [Alms, payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sept</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 65</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Strivelin, 14s. [Alms, payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dec 1505</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 69</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris of Strivelin, 40s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Jan 1505-6</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 69</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xj day of Januar, to the Freris of Strivelin, 14s. [payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 April 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 73</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xxj day of Aprile, to the Freris of Strivelin, 14s. [Alms to Friars of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 July 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 75</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Strivelin, 14s. [payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Aug 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 280</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the ferd day of August, giffin to Schir Johne Ramsay, that he laid doun be the Kingis command for xxij salmond, xl fresch kelyng,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tua barrellis beir, iiij mes brede, and fraucht of the samyn to Strivelin to the Gray Freris thare, £6. 3/-.. [victuals and drink for donations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sept 1506</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 283</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Strivelin, 14s. [payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Feb 1506-7</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 286</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the vij day of Februar, to the Freris of Strivelin, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 April 1507</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 289</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Grey Freris of Strivelin, 20s. [Alms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Aug 1507</td>
<td>TA, iii (1506-1507), p. 289</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the Freris of Strivelin, 14s. [payments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Sept 1507</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 35</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the freris of Strivelin, 14s. [And eight similar entries.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Sept 1507</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 35</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, the xxvij day of September, to the freris of Strivelin that brocht peris and plowmentis, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Oct 1507</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 35</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xxxiij day of October, to the Gray Freris of Striveling, 28s. [donations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 July 1508</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 43</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the xxixiij day of Julij, payit to Schir Duncane Forestar that he laid doun, be the Kingis command, to the gray freris of Strivelin, £4. [donations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June 1512</td>
<td>TA, iv (1507-1513), p. 189</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the freris of Strivling, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 April 1526</td>
<td>TA, v (1515-1531), p. 256</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item to the Grey freris of Striveling, £5. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 May 1529</td>
<td>TA, v (1515-1531), p. 379</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray freris of Striveling half ane hundredth eistland burdis, £10. [Eastland boards for the Greyfriars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 April 1531</td>
<td>TA, v (1515-1531), p. 430</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, to the gray freris of Striveling be the Kingis precept, £1. [payment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Nov 1531</td>
<td>TA, vi (1531-1538), p. 32</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, the penult daye of November, be the Kingis command, to the Gray Freres of Striveling to the completing of their Frater, £10. [payments to Greyfriars of Stirling, to complete their frater]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td>TA, vi (1531-1538), p. 90</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, be the Kingis command, to the gray freris of Striveling to the completing of thair frateur, £10. [payments to Greyfriars of Stirling, to complete their frater]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 June 1546</td>
<td>TA, viii (1541-1546), p. 461</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, xij Junii, to the grayfreris in Striviling for thair kaill distroyit and dountrod be mennis feit, 44s. [compensation to the Greyfriars of Stirling, for the destruction of their kaill]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 April 1552</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, x (1551-1559), p. 77</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Item, to the freris of Strveling in almois, £5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May 1552</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, x (1551-1559), p. 82</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Item, gevin to the gray freris in Strveling in almous, 40s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Sept 1531</td>
<td><em>TA</em>, vii (1531-1538), p. 32</td>
<td>Stirling / St Andrews,</td>
<td>Observant (king’s confessor)</td>
<td>Item, the xxiiij day of September, for ane hors hyre to ane grey freir of Strveling, the Kingis confessour, to ryde to Sanct Andros to heir the Kingis confessioun at the pardone, 14s. [Greyfriar of Stirling confesses the King in St Andrews / horse hire for the King’s confessor – a Greyfriar of Stirling]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: Patronage

#### 2: *Rotuli Scaccarii Regum Scotorum* – The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, vii (1460-1469), p. 143</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Et eisdem, per liberacionem factam Johanni Lardenare, servitori domini regis, misso per dominum regem et dominos de consilio versus Aberden pro provisione domini regis tempore quo disposuit se versus castrum de Kildrummy, licet mutaverat postea propositum suum, de mandato suo literatorio sub signeto osteno super compotum, ad suas expensas et certas uncostez, cum viginti laginis cervisie distributis Fratibus et pauperibus, ex consideracione auditorum ad presens, £3 10/6d. [Ale distributed to friars at Aberdeen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 327?</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>[Friars, Franciscan or Minorite of Aberdeen, a barrel of salmon to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xii (1502-1507), p. 161</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Aberdeen/Poor Clares</td>
<td>Et eudem per solutionem factam Sororibus Sancte Clare in quadraginta solidis commorantibus in Fere pro uno barili salmonum ex donacione domini regis Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Abirden, per suas literas unacum precepto domini regis sub suo signeto ostensas super...[grant to Friars Observant of Aberdeen from customs of Aberdeen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 389</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Aberdeen/Poor Clares</td>
<td>Et pro uno barili salmonum liberato Sororibus Sancte Clare in Le Veir, ex elimosina domini regis, ut patet per quittantiam Fratrum Minorum de Abirdene de recepto et deliberatione ostensam super compotum, 1 s. [Friars, Franciscan or Minorite of Aberdeen, their receipt in behalf of Sisters of St Clare in Campvere]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvi</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Aberdour</td>
<td>Et eudem in quatuor bollis frumenti deliberatis Sororibus de Abirdour de croppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 209</td>
<td>Aberdour</td>
<td>Et eodem in quatuor bollis frumenti deliberatis Sororibus de Abirdour ex elimosina domini regis ex ipsius speciali mandato literatorio ostendo super compotum de terminis compoti, 4 bolle frumenti.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 328</td>
<td>Aberdour</td>
<td>Et eodem in quatuor bollis ordei deliberatis Sororibus de Abirdour, ut supra in compoto frumenti, 4 bolle ordei.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 407</td>
<td>Aberdour</td>
<td>Et eodem in quatuor bollis ordei deliberatis Sororibus de Abirdour [ut supra, 4 bolle ordei].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 512</td>
<td>Aberdour</td>
<td>Et eodem in quatuor bollis frumenti deliberatis Sororibus de Abirdoure ex eleemosina ut supra, de terminis compoti, 4 bolle frumenti.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 513</td>
<td>Aberdour</td>
<td>Et eodem in quatuor bollis ordei deliberatis Sororibus de Abirdoure ut supra, 4 bolle ordei.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 18</td>
<td>Aberdour</td>
<td>Et eodem in quatuor bollis frumenti deliberatis Sororibus de Abirdour ex eleemosina ut supra de terminis computi, 4 bolle frumenti.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 20</td>
<td>Aberdour</td>
<td>Et eodem in quatuor bollis ordei deliberatis Sororibus de Abirdour ut supra, 4 bolle ordei.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 594</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Et eodem in duabus bollis ordei per liberationem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Aire ex eleemosina domini regis, de terminis computi, 2 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Ayr, payment to of barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Patronage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xviii (1543-1556), p. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td><em>Et eadem in quatuor bollis ordei per deliberationem factam Fratribus Observantie de Are,</em> ... [Friars Minorites Observantine of Ayr, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, vii (1460-1469), p. 211</td>
<td>27 July 1462 - 27 July 1463</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>[To Treasurer for household epenses], videlicet in feodis servitorum, speciebus, chandria, libertatis Henrico regi Anglie, custodia casti Berwici, Fratribus Minoribus, et aliiis libertatis, ut patet per plures literas dicti thesaurarii ostensas, et ipso fatente receptum super computum, ut patet in computo suo, £1396 4/11d. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, part payment of King’s debt to Nicholas Spethy for repairs of their convent]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, vii (1460-1469), p. 284</td>
<td>6 June 1462 - 7 June 1464</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et eadem per solucionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Edinburgh de ducentis libris debitis per dominum regem Nicolao Spethy, de quibus assignabantur domine regine quinuaginta libre, et residuum ad reparacionem loci dictorum Fratrum, pro prout patet per literas dicti domini nostri regis de precepto et dictorum Fratrum de recepto ostensas super computum, £1, et sic restant solvende dictis Fratribus quinuaginta libre, quia alie quinuaginta libre allocabantur thesaurario in computo anni elapsi. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, part payment of King’s debt to Nicholas Spethy for repairs of their convent]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xii (1502-1507), p. 314</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et de una bolla frumenti liberata Fratribus de Observantia in Eddinburgh tempore infectionis pestilentie in elimosina, 1 bolla frumenti. [Friars Observant in Edinburgh, wheat to in time of plague]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiv (1513-1522), p. 178</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et per liberationem factam Fratribus Predicatoribus de Edinburgh in triginta bollis ordei et Fratribus Minoribus de Edinburgh in alii triginta bollis ordei per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto manu ejus subscripto et dominorum consili ostenso super computum, 3 celdre 12 bolle ordei. [Friars Minor of Edinburgh, barley to, by order of the lord governor]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiv (1513-1522),</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et pro marta et porco donatis Fratribus Minoribus in elimosina domini regis in Edinburgh, 18s. [Friars Minor of Edinburgh, mart and pig to, in alms from the</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>ER, xiv (1513-1522), p. 470</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Edinburgh in duabus celdris et quindecim bollis capientibus in anno duodecim bollas una bolla dempta, a primo die mensis Septembris anni Domini etc. v°decimi octavi inclusive usque ad primum diem ejusdem mensis anni Domini etc. v°vicecimi secundi exclusive, qui sunt quartu anni completi, 2 celdre 15 bllle frumenti. [Friars Minor of Edinburgh, wheat and barley to ‘fratres minores de observantia’ of Edinburgh]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 100</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Edinburgh in una celdra decem bollis et duabus ferlotis ordei in elimosina domini regis prout constabat auditoribus super compotum, 1 celdra 10 bolle 2 ferlote ordei. [Friars Minor of Edinburgh, King’s alms of wheat to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 208</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Edinburgh in elimosina domini regis per tempus compoti, 8 bolle. [Friars Minor of Edinburgh, payment of corn to, of the King’s charity]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 293</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Edinburgh in elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 8 bolle. [Friars Minor of Edinburgh, corn to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 294</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et per emptionem sex barilium adipis pro in decem libris et octo solidis liberatis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 466</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Edinburgh in elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, King's alms of wheat to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 551</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Edinburgh ex elimosina domini regis per tempus compoti, 1 celdra ordei. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, corn to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 140</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Edinburgh ex elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 178</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh in quadraginta octo solidis pro quatuor martis Orchadie in elimosina domini regis eisdem deliberatis, 48s. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 179</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh in octo bollis per deliberationem dicti Walteri Scott, de anno compoti, et de alis octo bollis de anno precedente hoc compotum et compotanti hucusque minime allocatis, 1 celdra frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 180</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantie de Edinburgh ex elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 1 celdra ordei. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 299</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh in una celdra ordei et octo bollis frumenti in elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 1 celdra ordei 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 300</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et in una celdra ordei deliberata Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh per tempus compoti, 1 celdra ordei. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 353</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh in una celdra ordei et octo bollis frumenti in elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 1 celdra ordei 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 398</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh in octo bollis frumenti una celdra ordei ex elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 8 bolle frumenti 1 celdra ordei. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 399</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh ultra celdram ordei eisdem prius allocatam per preceptum domini regis speciale per tempus compoti, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 480</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh ex elimosina domini regis per tempus compoti, 1 celdra 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536),</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et eidem deliberatum Fratibus Minoribus de Edinburgh in sex martis et quatuor porcis de Orknay extendens ad quatuor libras sexdecim solidos, et in alii sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Patronage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvi (1529-1536), p. 480L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et</em> eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus de Edinburgh super compotum, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minor of Edinburgh, payments of victual and stock to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvii (1537-1542), p. 171</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et</em> in novem libris per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia Edinburgi ex elimosina domini regis pro certis marts et porcis terrarum de Schetland eis deliberatis, de anno compoti, £9. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Edinburgh, payment to for marts and swine of Shetland]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvii (1537-1542), p. 174</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et</em> Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Edinburgh, payment to of wheat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvii (1537-1542), p. 294</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et</em> eidem per liberationem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh ex elimosina domini regis per temporis compoti, 1 celdra 9 bolle 2 ferlote ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Edinburgh, payment to of barley]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvii (1537-1542), p. 327</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et</em> eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh ex elimosina domini regis de terminis compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Edinburgh, payment to of wheat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvii (1537-1542), p. 512</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et</em> eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Edinburgh, payment to of wheat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xviii (1543-1556), p. 142</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td><em>Et</em> eidem in octauaginta liris per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh, percipientibus annuatim viginti libras ex elimosina domini gubernatoris, de annis computi, £80. [Friars Minorites of Edinburgh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et eodem in decem libris per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Edinburgh, percipientibus annuatem viginti libras in elmosina, per tempus computi, £10. [Friars Minorites Observantie of Edinburgh, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et eodem in una celdra frumenti et una celdra ordei deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Edinburgh per preceptum Marie, regine dotarie Scotie et regentis, manu sua subscriptum, ostensum super computum, de termino Sancti Martini infra hoc computum, 1 celdra frumenti, 1 celdra ordei. [Friars Minorites Observantie of Edinburgh, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites of Edinburgh, 1 chalder wheat, 1 chalder wheat, 1 chalder barley. [Friars Minorites Observantie of Edinburgh, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557-1567</td>
<td>ER, xix</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et eodem in una celdra frumenti et una celdra ordei deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus de Edinburgh de mandato Marie, regine dotarie Scotie et regentis regni, 1 celdra frumenti, 1 celdra ordei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>ER, xix</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites of Edinburgh, 1 chalder wheat, 1 chalder bear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td>ER, xix</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites of Edinburgh, 1 chalder wheat, 1 chalder bear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>ER, xix</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Et eodem in una celdra frumenti dicti dominii, deliberata Fratribus Minoribus de Edinburgh de mandato domine regine regentis et per preceptum ejusdem, 1 celdra frumenti de Dunbar. [Friars Minorites Observantie of Edinburgh, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560-1</td>
<td>ER, xix</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Que resta frumenti et ordei soluta fuit Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Edinburgh pro tempore de mandato domine regine regentis, 1 celdra frumenti, 1 celdra ordei. [Friars Minorites Observantie of Edinburgh, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>ER, x (1488-1496), p. 523</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et per solucionem factam Fratribus de Observancia de Elgin in elimosina per simile preceptum compotorum rotulatoris, 20s. [Friars Minorite Observant of Elgin, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td>ER, xi (1497-1501), p. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et eidem per solucionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observancia de Elgin ex elimosina domini regis et de mandato ejusdem, rotulatore testante mandatum super compotum, 2 bolle frumenti. [payments in wheat to Friars Minorite Observant of Elgin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>ER, xi (1497-1501), p. 177</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et eidem per solucionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observancia de Elgin ex elimosina domini regis de decem bollis frumenti, ut patet per literas domini regis sub signeto et subscripione compotanti directas de data decimi quinti Octobris anno regni regis decimo, et de decem bollis brasii inferius allocandis, ut patet in dictis letteris ostensis super compotum, x bolle frumenti. Et per solucionem factam dictis Fratribus de Observancia de mandato domini regis de quatuor bollis frumenti in mense Februrii anni nonagesimiseptimi. Duncano Forestar, tunc compotorum rotulatore, testante mandatum regis, et de quatuor bollis ordei inferius allocandis, 3 bolle frumenti. [payments in wheat to Friars Minorite Observant of Elgin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>ER, xi (1497-1501), p. 179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per liberacionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observancia ex causa superius expressa in compoto frumenti, 14 bolle ordei. [barley to Friars Minorite Observant of Elgin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>ER, xi (1497-1501), p. 350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Observancia in Elgin in decem bollis frumenti per literas domini regis sub signeto, de anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti, citra decem bollas ordei inferius allocandas. [payments in wheat to Friars Minorite Observant of Elgin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>ER, xi (1497-1501), p. 351</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et per solucionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observancia in Elgin in decem bollis ordei, ut patet superius in compoto frumenti, 10 bolle ordei. [barley to Friars Minorite Observant of Elgin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>ER, xi (1497-1501), p. 351</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et per solucionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observancia in Elgin in decem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>ER. xi (1497-1501), p. 355</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>bollis frumenti per litteras domini regis de arreragiis prescriptis, 10 bolle frumenti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1502</td>
<td>ER. xii (1502-1507), p. 355</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratres Minoritius de Eeling ex elmosina domini regis de dictis arreragiis, 1 bolla frumenti per litteras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>ER. xii (1502-1507), p. 224</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocati componuntur per liberacionem factam Fratres Minoritius de Eeling in decem bollis frumenti, 10 bolle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>ER. xii (1502-1507), p. 396</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratres Minoritius de Observantia in Elging percipientibus in anno decern bollas frumenti, de anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506</td>
<td>ER. xii (1502-1507), p. 396</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocati componuntur per liberacionem factam Fratres Minoritius de Observantia in Elging, percipientibus in anno decern bollas frumenti, de anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td>ER. xii (1502-1507), p. 491-2</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratres Minoritius de Observantia in Elging, percipientibus in anno decern bollas frumenti, de anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 3: Patronage*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xii (1502-1507), p. 493</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocate compotanti per liberationem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Elgin percipientibus decem bollas ordei ex gratia domini regis de anno compoti, 10 bolle ordei. [annuity to Friars Observant of Aberdeen in wheat and barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 13</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Elgin, percipientibus in anno decem bollas frumenti ex elimosina et tollerantia regis moderni, de eodem anno, 10 bolle frumenti. [Friars Franciscan or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in wheat]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 14</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratribus de Observantia in elimosina regis apud Elgin, 10 bolle ordei. [Franciscans or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 203</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia [de Elgin] in decem bollis frumenti ex tollerantia domini regis de dicto anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti. [Friars Franciscan or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in wheat]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 203</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia [de Elgin] percipientibus in anno decem bollas frumenti ex tollerantia domini regis, de anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti. [Friars Franciscan or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 294</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocate compotanti Fratribus de Observantia in Elgin ex tollerantia domini regis et elimosina ejusdem, 10 bolle ordei. [Franciscans or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 294</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per solutionem factam Fratribus de Observantia in Elgin ex tollerantia domini regis in elimosina ejusdem, 10 bolle ordei. [Franciscans or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 459</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia [de Elgin] percipientibus in anno decem bollas frumenti ex tollerantia domini regis de anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti. [Friars Franciscan or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in wheat]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513), p. 460</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia in Elgin in elimosina ex tollerantia domini regis de anno compoti, 10 bolle ordei. [Franciscans or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>ER, xiii</td>
<td>(1508-1513), p. 522</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Elgin percipientibus annuatim decem bollas ex tollerantia domini regis de anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti. [Friars Franciscan or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in wheat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>ER, xiii</td>
<td>(1508-1513), p. 523</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per liberationem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Elgin de Observantia in elimosina domini regis ex tollerantia ejusdem, 10 bolle ordei. [Franciscans or Observantine of Elgin, annuity to in barley]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td>ER, xiv</td>
<td>(1513-1522), p. 29</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minor of Elgin, percipientibus in anno decem bollas ex tollerantia domini regis, sub eodem periculo de anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minor of Elgin, annuity to, in wheat 'ex tollerantia de regis']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td>ER, xiv</td>
<td>(1513-1522), p. 30</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Elgin in elimosina domini regis ex tollerantia ejusdem, 10 bolle ordei. [Friars Minor of Elgin, annuity to, in barley 'in elimosina regis ex tollerantia']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>ER, xiv</td>
<td>(1513-1522), p. 70</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minor of Elgin, percipientibus in anno decem bollas ex tollerantia domini regis, sub eodem periculo de anno compoti, 10 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minor of Elgin, annuity to, in wheat 'ex tollerantia de regis']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>ER, xiv</td>
<td>(1513-1522), p. 71</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Elgin in elimosina domini regis ex tollerantia ejusdem, 10 bolle ordei. [Friars Minor of Elgin, annuity to, in barley 'in elimosina regis ex tollerantia']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>ER, xix</td>
<td>(1557-1567), p. 73</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Elgin, percipientibus annuatim decem bollas frumenti ex tollerantia domini regis, de annis computi, 1 celdra 4 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Elgin, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>ER, xix</td>
<td>(1557-1567), p. 73</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Elgin, percipientibus annuatim decem bollas ordei, de annis computi, 1 celdra 4 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Elgin, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>ER, xv</td>
<td>(1523-1529), p. 552</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Glasgow 2 barilia maris occidentalis. [Friars Minorite of Glasgow, herring to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>ER, xvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Galsgw ex elimosina domini regis per</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1537-1542), p. 176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tempus compoti, 1 barile allecum. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Glasgow, payment to of herring]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560-1</td>
<td>ER, xix (1557-1567), p. 142</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow/Stirling</td>
<td>De quibus allecibus superius restantibus, videlicet, undecim lastis octo barilibus allecum, allocatur computanti in duobus barilibus maris occidentalis, deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus de Observantiae de Striviling et Glasgw, ex elemosina dominorum regis et regime per tempus computi, 2 barilia allecum maris occidentalis. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Glasgow, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 480K</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minorite</td>
<td>Et eadem in quinquaginta solidis pro una dacra corriorum deliberata ad lardinarian domini regis et in decem solidis pro aliis diobus correis deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus ex elemosina domini regis £3. [Friars Minorites, payment of hides to, by Comptroller]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minorite and Preachers</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur computanti per emptionem septem bollarum et duarum ferlotarum frumenti pro octo libris et octo solidis vari et pretii, de quibus donate Mariote Douglas, nutrici domini regis tres bolle, et Minoribus ac predictoribus Fratibus quatuor bolle et due ferlote, £8. viij. [Friars Minorite and Preachers, gift of corn to, by Comptroller]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td>ER, 10 (1488-1496), p. 143</td>
<td>4 Feb 1489</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Et per liberacionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observancia ex elemosina domini regis, sicut consueverunt percipere de mandato speciali domini regis, ut patet per lietaras suas sub signeto et subscripione de data Quarta Februarii usque in decimum terciu Decembri futuri, que sunt quadraginta quinque ebdomide, reddendo eadem ebdomidatim pro panibus, videlicet quatuordecim panibus, cervisia, et quinqualibus, decem solidos ex composicione per auditores pro preteritis duntaxat, £22 10/- . [Friars Minorite Observant, eatables and drinkables to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td>ER, 10 (1488-1496), p. 229</td>
<td>3 July 1490</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Et per liberacionem factam Fratribus Minoribus der Observancia, perpientibus ex elemosina domini regis in esculentis et poculentis ebdomidatim decem solidos usque in terciu Julii inclusive, que sunt viginti octo ebdomide, de percepto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>ER, xiv (1513-1522), p. 178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus ville de Perth in octo bollis ordei per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto manu ipsius subscripto ostendo super compotum, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minor of Perth, payment of wheat and barley to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>ER, xiv (1513-1522), pp. 176-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Et per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus ville de Perth in octo bollis frumenti per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto manu ipsius subscripto ostendo super compotum, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minor of Perth, payment of wheat and barley to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>ER, xiv (1513-1522), p. 250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia in Perth in octo bollis ordei per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto manu ejusdem subscripto ostendo super compotum, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minor of Perth, payment of wheat and barley to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>ER, xiv (1513-1522), pp. 249-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Et per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Perth in octo bollis frumenti per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto manu ejusdem subscripto ostendo super compotum, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minor of Perth, payment of wheat and barley to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>ER, xiv (1513-1522), p. 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Et per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Perth in octo bollis frumenti per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto manu dicti gubernatoris subscripto alias ostendo super compotum, de anno compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minor of Perth, payment of wheat and barley to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>ER, xiv (1513-1522), p. 321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus Observantie in Perth in octo bollas ordei per preceptum domini gubernatoris alias ostensus super compotum, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minor of Perth, payment of wheat and barley to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521-2</td>
<td>ER, xiv (1513-1522), p. 407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis annuatim per preceptum domini gubernatoris alias ostensus super compotum, de annis compoti, 1 celdra 8 bolle. [Friars Minor of Perth, payment of wheat and barley to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521-2</td>
<td>ER, xiv (1513-1522), pp. 405-6</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Perth in octo bollis frumenti annuatim per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto manu dicti domini gubernatoris subscriptio alias ostensu super compotum, de annis compoti et sub periculo compotantis, 1 celda 8 bolle. [Friars Minor of Perth, payment of wheat and barley to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 45</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Perth in octo bollis frumenti annuatim per preceptum domini gubernatoris alias ostensam super compotum de annis compoti et sub periculo compotantis, 1 celda frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Perth]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 47</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis ordei annuatim per preceptum domini gubernatoris alias ostensam super compotum de annis compoti, 1 celda ordei. [Friars Minorite of Perth]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 119</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Perth percipientibus in octo bollis frumenti annuatim per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto ostensu super compotum de dicto croppo, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of corn to, from Fife]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 121</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Perth in octo bollis ordei annuatim per preceptum domini gubernatoris ostensu super compotum de dicto croppo, 8 bolle ordei.[Friars Minorite of Perth, wheat to from Fife]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 130</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Perth in octo bollis frumenti annuatim per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto alias ostensu super compotum de croppo compoti et sub periculo compotantis, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, corn from Fife delivered to, by warrant of the Governor]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 132</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis anuatem per preceptum domini gubernatoris ostensu super compotum de croppo compoti, et quod non allocetur in futurum usque ad novum mandatum quia olim gubernator mandaverat deliberare dictis Fratribus octo bollas frumenti et octo bollas ordei, et sic requiritur novum mandatum pro deliberatione dictorum victualium, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, wheat to from Fife]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 231</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis frumenti ex consideratione auditorum de hoc anno tantum, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of corn to, from Fife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 232</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis ordei de croppo compoti tantum, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, wheat to from Fife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 352</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis frumenti de hoc anno propter caristiam ex consideratione auditorum, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of corn to, from Fife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 353</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis ordei de croppo compoti, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, wheat to from Fife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 398</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis ex elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 8 bolle, et mandatur compotanti quod de cetero non respondeant dictis Fratibus sine speciali mandato domini regis. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of corn to, from Fife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 399</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis de dicto croppo, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, wheat to from Fife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 474</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth, in octo bollis ex elimosina domini regis per speciale preceptum ejusdem, de anno compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of corn to, from Fife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 475</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis de precepto domini regis de dicto croppo, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, wheat to from Fife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis ex elimosina domini regis et per preceptum ejusdem de anno compoti, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of wheat to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis de precepto domini regis de croppo compoti, 8 bolle. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of barley by chamberlain of Fife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvi (1529-1536), p. 92</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis per preceptum domini regis de anno compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of wheat to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvi (1529-1536), p. 94</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in octo bollis per preceptum domini regis de croppo compoti, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of barley by chamberlain of Fife]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvi (1529-1536), p. 267</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in elimosina domini regis ex ejus speciali mandato literatorio ostensio super compotum, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of wheat to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvi (1529-1536), p. 313</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in elimosina domini regis ex ejus speciali mandato literatorio ostensio super compotum, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of wheat to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvi (1529-1536), p. 314</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis ordei deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex elimosina domini regis ex ejus speciali mandato literatorio ostensio super compotum, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of barley by chamberlain of Fife]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvi (1529-1536), p. 430</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in elimosina domini regis ex ejus mandato, dicto rotulatore testante mandatum super compotum, de terminis compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of wheat to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvi (1529-1536), p. 430</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis ordei deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth in elimosina domini regis ex ejus mandato, dicto rotulatore testante mandatum super compotum, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of barley by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 466</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>chamberlain of Fife</td>
<td><em>Et eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex elimosina domini regis ex ejus speciali mandato, dicto rotulatore testante mandatum super compotum, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of wheat to]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>ER, xvi (1529-1536), p. 467</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>chamberlain of Fife</td>
<td><em>Et eidem in octo bollis ordei deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex elimosina domini regis ex ejus speciali mandato ut supra in compoto frumenti, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite of Perth, payment of barley by chamberlain of Fife]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 8</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>chamberlain of Fife</td>
<td><em>Et eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of wheat]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 9</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>chamberlain of Fife</td>
<td><em>Et eidem in octo bollis ordei deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex elimosina domini regis ex ejus speciali mandato, ut supra in compoto frumenti, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of barley]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 104</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>chamberlain of Fife</td>
<td><em>Et eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of wheat]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 105</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>chamberlain of Fife</td>
<td><em>Et eidem in octo bollis ordei deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex elimosina domini regis ex ejus speciali mandato, ut supra in compoto frumenti, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of barley]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 96</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>chamberlain of Fife</td>
<td><em>Et eidem per deliberationem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Perth in duabus bolis frumenti et duabus bolis ordei de speciali mandato domini regis, 2 bolle frumenti 2 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of wheat and barley]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 209</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>chamberlain of Fife</td>
<td><em>Et eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex elimosina domini regis de terminis compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of wheat]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 210</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis ordei deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth, ex elimosina domini regis ut supra in compoto frumenti, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 216</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>De quo frumento allocatur compotanti in duabus bollis deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex elimosina domini regis de terminis compoti, 2 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of wheat]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), pp. 216-7</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>De quo ordeo allocatur compotanti in duabus bollis ordei deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth, ex elimosina domini regis de terminis compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 327</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>De quo frumento allocatur compotanti in duabus bollis frumenti per liberationem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Perth ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 2 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of wheat]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 328</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis ordei deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Perth, ex elimosina domini regis, ut supra in compoto frumenti, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 361</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>De quo frumento allocatur compotanti in duabus bollis frumenti per liberationem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Perth ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 2 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 362</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>De quo ordeo allocatur compotanti in duabus bollis ordei per liberationem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Perth ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 2 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>ER, xvii</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>De quo frumento allocatur compotanti in duabus bollis frumenti per liberationem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>ER, xvii</td>
<td>(1537-1542), p. 435</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>De quo ordeo allocatur compotanti in duabus bollis ordei deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex eleemosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 2 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of barley]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>ER, xvii</td>
<td>(1537-1542), p. 512</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie prope burgum de Perth ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of wheat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>ER, xvii</td>
<td>(1537-1542), p. 513</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis ordei deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex eleemosina domini regis ut supra in compoto frumenti, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Perth, payment to of barley]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>(1543-1556), p. 18</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis frumenti deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex eleemosina quondam domini regis de terminis computi, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Perth, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>(1543-1556), p. 20</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in octo bollis ordei deliberatis Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Perth ex eleemosina domini regis pro tempore ut supra in computo frumenti, 8 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Perth, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>(1543-1556), p. 142</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Et eidem in decem libris per solutionem factam fratri Johanni Roger, mini, nomine Fratrum de Observantia de Perth, percipientium annuatim quinque libras annuatim in festo circumcensionis Domini, durante voluntate dicti domini gubernatoris, £10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>ER, xvii</td>
<td>(1537-1542), p. 144</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Et in quatuor libris sex solidis et octo denariis pro lucratione feni prati de Glamys et custodia boum et portatione quatuor bollarum victualium Fratibus Minoribus Observantie de Sancto Andrea, de terminis compoti, £4 6/8d. [Friars Minorite Observantine of St Andrews, payment for carriage of victual to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>ER, xvii</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 147</td>
<td>1538 ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 147</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Observantia in Sanctoandrea in duabus bollis frumenti ex elimosina domini regis de firmis terrarum de Langfargound, de terminis compoti, 2 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of St Andrews, payment to of wheat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 250</td>
<td>1539 ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 250</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia Sanctiandree ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 2 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of St Andrews, payment to of barley]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 383</td>
<td>1540 ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 383</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia in Sanctoandrea in duabus bollis frumenti ex elimosina domini regis de firmis terrarum de Langfargound, de terminis compoti, 2 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of St Andrews, payment to of barley]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 418</td>
<td>1541 ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 418</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti in duabus bollis ordei deliberatis Fratribus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvii (1537-1542), p. 478</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia in Sanctoandrea in duabus bollis frumenti ex elimosina domini regis de firmis terrarum de Langfargound, de terminis compoti, 2 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of St Andrews, payment to of barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xvii (1537-1542), p. 479</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur compotanti in duabus bollis ordei deliberatis Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia in Sanctoandrea ex elimosina domini regis, de terminis compoti, 2 bolle ordei. [Friars Minorite Observantine of St Andrews, payment to of barley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xviii (1543-1556), p. 142</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Et eidem in quinque libris per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus Sanctiandree ex elimosina domini gubernatoris in anno 1549, £5. [Friars Minorites of St Andrews, payment to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xi (1497-1501), p. 18</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et fratri Johanni Cauldwell pro laboribus suis factis in gardino castri de Strivelin de mandato domini regis, ut patet per literas suas manu sua subscriptas ostensas super compotum, de anno compoti, xx s. [his labours in the garden of Stirling Castle]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xi (1497-1501), p. 378</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>... Alexandre per solucionem factam pro tribus le credillis (crates) vitri liberatis ad reparacionem ecclesie Fratrum Minorum in Strivelin extendentibus ad novem libras, per literas domini regis ac precepto quondam Roberti Lundy, tunc compotorum rotulatoris, ix £., pro quibus dictus quondam rotulator respondebit. [Friars Minorite of Stirling, glass for their church] £9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xii (1502-1507), p. 543</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Striveling in elimosina de mandato domini regis, rotulatore testante mandatum super compotum, 4 bolle brasii. [Friars Minorite Observant of Stirling, malt to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii (1508-1513),</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et per solucionem factam per dictum Andream factoribus Fratrum Minorum de Observantia de Striveling in elimosina domini regis de mandato ejusdem per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>ER, xiii (1508-1513), p. 26</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>spatium sex mensium, ut patet per preceptum thesaurarii dicto Andree directum, £6. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, payments to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>ER, xiii (1508-1513), p. 26</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et per librationem factam ad expensas domicilii domini regis et intratas in libris ejusdem penultimo Septembris, septimo Octobris, xxvij ⁹ ejusdem, et xvij ¹ Novembris, ut patet in dictis libris, 4 celdre xj bolle 1 firlota frumenti, de quibus sunt de arreragiis viginti sex bolle frumenti, et ad expensas Fratrum Minorum in Strivelin, e mandato domini regis, 1 celdra frumenti. Summa expensarum, vj celdre xj bolle 1 firlota. Et sic restant ix celdre 5 bolle 2 firlote 1 pecca. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, wheat to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>ER, xiii (1508-1513), p. 165</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et ad expensas Fratrum Minorum de Observantia in Striveling in una celdra brasii ad eorum expensas per Andream Aytoun de precepto domini regis, 1 celdra brasii. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, malt for ale to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>ER, xiii (1508-1513), p. 27</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Observantiae in Striveling in octo bollis brasii pro cervisia ad eorum expensas liberatis per Dun菅um Darach de mandato domini regis, 8 bolle brasii. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, malt for ale to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td>ER, xiii (1508-1513), p. 272</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Strivleing in quatuor bollis frumenti in elimosina de mandato domini regis de anno compoti, 4 bolle frumenti. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, wheat to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td>ER, xiii (1508-1513), p. 273</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia in elimosina de anno compoti, 4 bolle brasii. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, malt for ale to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td>ER, xiii (1508-1513), p. 387</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et eidem per solutionem factam Alisone Mailvile, sponse Georgii Crichtoun in Striveling, in decem libris et quinque [ ] ad provisionem Fratrum Minorum de Observantia in Striveling, percipienti ebdomidatim quinque solidos [ ] Fratribus satisfactis usque ad diem presentis compoti inclusive de mandato domini regis, dicto mandato [ ] subscriptione unacum testificatione dicatorum Fratrum [ ] super compotum, £10 5/-s. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, payments to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii</td>
<td>(1508-1513), p. 404</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia in Strivelin in elimosina de mandato domini regis, 38s. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, payments to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii</td>
<td>(1508-1513), p. 405</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratibus de Observantia de Strivelin in elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 8 bolle frumenti. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, wheat to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii</td>
<td>(1508-1513), p. 406</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Strivelin ex elimosina domini regis, 8 bolle brasii. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, malt for ale to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii</td>
<td>(1508-1513), p. 566</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et per solutionem factam ad expensas et sustentationem Fratrum Minorum de Observantia de mandato domini regis in elimosina, videlicet in abdomida quinque solidi per unum annum integrum, £13. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, payments to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii</td>
<td>(1508-1513), p. 566-7</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Strivelin in elimosina domini regis de anno compoti, 8 bolle frumenti [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, wheat to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiii</td>
<td>(1508-1513), p. 567</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia in Strivelin ex elimosina domini regis, 8 bolle brasii. [Franciscan or Observantine of Stirling, malt for ale to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiv</td>
<td>(1513-1522), p. 39</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et per solutionem factam ad expensas et sustentationem Fratrum Minorum de Strivelin de mandato domini regine literario in elimosina, percipientium ebdomidatim quinque solidos per unum annum integrum, £13. [Friars Minor of Stirling, weekly payment to, for one year 'de mandato regine in elimosina']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiv</td>
<td>(1513-1522), p. 40</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia de Strivelin in elimosina domini regis et regime de eodem anno, 8 bolle frumenti. [Friars Minor of Stirling, wheat and malt to friars minor 'de observantia' 'ex elimosina' of king and queen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td><em>ER</em>, xiv</td>
<td>(1513-1522), p. 40</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus de Observantia in Strivelin ex elimosina domini regis et</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Patronage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1513-1522), p. 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regine de dicto anno, 8 bolle brasii. [Friars Minor of Stirling, wheat and malt to friars minor 'de obserservantia' 'ex elimosina' of king and queen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>ER, xv (1523-1529), p. 465</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et Fratibus Minoribus Observantiae de Strivelinge in elimosina domini regis ex consideratione auditorum de hoc anno, £6 13/4d. [Friars Minorite of Stirling, payment to, by King’s alms]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p. 598</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et eadem in tresdecem libris per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Observantiae de Strivelinge ex eleemosina domini regis, de terminis computi, £13. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Stirling, payment to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>ER, xvii (1537-1542), p.599</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et eadem in una celdra frumenti per deliberationem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Observantiae de Strivelinge ex eleemosina domini regis, 1 celdra frumenti. [Friars Minorite Observantine of Stirling, payment to of wheat]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 142</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et eadem in quadraginta libris per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Observantiae de Strivelinge, percipientibus annuatim decem libras ex elimosina domini gubernatoris, de annis computi, £40. [Friars Minorites of Stirling, payment to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 163</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et eadem in tresdecem libris per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus de Observantiae de Strivelinge ex eleemosina domini regis, de terminis computi, £13. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, payment to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 166</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et eadem in una celdra ordei soluta Fratibus Minoribus Observantiae de Strivelinge, ut in computo frumenti, 1 celdra ordei. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, payment to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), pp. 165-6</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur computanti per solutionem factam Fratibus Minoribus Observantiae de Strivelinge in una celdra frumenti ex eleimosina domine nostre regine, de terminis computi, 1 celdra frumenti. [Friars Minorites Observantine of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>p. 185</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To the Friars Minorites Observantine of Striveling, £13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>p. 186</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Discharge. To Friars Minorites Observantine of Striveling, 1 chalder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>p. 186</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Striveling, 1 chalder barley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>p. 209</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, £13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>p. 209</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Discharge. To Friars Minorites Observantine of Striveling, 1 chalder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>p. 210</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, 1 chalder barley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>p. 242</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, £6 10s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td>p. 242</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Discharge. To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, 1 chalder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>ER, xviii</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, 1 chalder barley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 273</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, £6 10s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 307</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et eidem in decem libris per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Striveling ex elimosina dicte domine regine per suum preceptum manu sua subscriptum, ostensum super computum, £10. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, payment to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 313</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, £13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 314</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Discharge. To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, 1 chalder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 314</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, 1 chalder barley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 314</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, £13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 354</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Discharge. To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, 1 chalder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>ER, xviii (1543-1556), p. 354</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Discharge. To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, 1 chalder malt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>ER, xix</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Et eidem in tresdecim libris solutis Fratribus Minoribus Observantie de Striviling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1557-1567), p. 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ex ecleomina domini regis, de terminis computi, £13. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, payment to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>ER, xix (1557-1567), p. 29</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur computante per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus Observantiae de Striviling in una celdra frumenti ex ecleomina domini regis, de termino computi, 1 celdra frumenti. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, payment to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>ER, xix (1557-1567), p. 29</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>De quibus allocatur computante per solutionem factam Fratribus Minoribus de Observantia de Striviling in una celdra brasi, ut patet in computo frumenti, 1 celdra brasi. [Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, payment to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>ER, xix (1557-1567), p. 68</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling, £13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>ER, xix (1557-1567), p. 68</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Discharge. To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling. 1 chalder wheat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>ER, xix (1557-1567), p. 69</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Discharge. To Friars Minorites Observantine of Stirling. 1 chalder malt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3: William Moir-Bryce: Patronage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Benefactor</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Alexander Richard or Richardson</td>
<td>Contributed upwards of £10 to the friary at Aberdeen, and £600 in all to the Scottish Franciscans during his lifetime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Elizabeth Lewynton, sometime Lady of Ruthven</td>
<td>gave 40 merks, and liberal alms to other friaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Robert Colane, burgess</td>
<td>Robert Colane, a notable benefactor of the order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Robert Valterstone, Provost of Bothans Church</td>
<td>Gave £27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>John Forbes of Pitslipo</td>
<td>In life and in death a great friend to the friars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Richard Vaus ('de Vallibus'), Laird of Many, Aberdeenshire and burgess of Aberdeen</td>
<td>Secured the permanent settlement of the friars in Aberdeen upon a plot of ground valued at £100 Scots in 1470.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>William Ogilvy, Chancellor of Brechin and host of the friars</td>
<td>Left many books to the Order at his death in 1480.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>David Colison, burgess of Aberdeen and his eldest son</td>
<td>Made a gift of land necessary for the extension of the cloister in 1481; his eldest son built a trance to the choir and gave liberal alms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>John Leis, Chaplain and member of the Third Order</td>
<td>Gave 12 merks, and acted as host of the friars in Brechin, was alive in 1482.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Alms / Gifts</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>James Lindsay, Archdeacon of</td>
<td>Gave victuals and daily alms, seventy well-bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>volumes and a large chest; died in 1495 and buried in the friary at Edinburgh, the anniversary of his death being celebrated in the Cathedral Church of Aberdeen on 17 January.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td><em>Gift / Alms</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Duncan Scherar, Rector of Clat</td>
<td>Rector of Clat, in the Garioch district of Aberdeenshire, gave upwards of £40 for the buildings and other needs of the friars, in addition to occasional alms and wine for the celebration of mass. Died 4 October 1503.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td><em>Gift</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>William, third Earl of Erroll</td>
<td>Gave large annual doles in victual and meat, and provided for the building of a large part of the south wall of the friary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td><em>Alms</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Adam Gordon, Rector of Kinkell</td>
<td>Did much good for this convent and for that of Elgin; after he lost his reason the friars of Aberdeen received ten merks annually out of his alms by direction of the Bishop, in consideration of his previous generosity towards them; died 1508.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513/1534</td>
<td><em>Alms / Legacy</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Lady Janet Paterson, relict of Sir Alexander Lauder</td>
<td>Gave liberal alms, and 100 merks as a legacy. Daughter of burgess of Edinburgh, married to burgess of Edinburgh and then Sir Alexander Lauder of Blyth, who was Provost of Edinburgh most of the years from 1500 until his death at Battle of Flodden on 9 September 1513. Died 1534.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td><em>Alms</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>William Crichton, Rector of</td>
<td>Gave liberal alms, and bequeathed £40 out of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Oyne</td>
<td>which a large part of the north wall of the lower garden was built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Thomas Myrton, as executor of Bishop Elphinstone</td>
<td>Purchased a plot of land for 70 merks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Thomas Halkerston, Provost of the Collegiate Church of Crichton</td>
<td>Provost of Collegiate Church of Crichton, Midlothian. Halkerston gave 34 merks. Died 1516.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>William Chalmer, of Balnacrag</td>
<td>Gave £20 for the needs of the convent and its building, and £8 for a chalice. Buried with the friars upon his death in 1516.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Duncan Chalmer, son of William Chalmer, of Balnacrag</td>
<td>Gave £20 in addition to other frequent alms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Donation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Elizabeth Barla or Barlow, Lady of Elphinstone and Forbes</td>
<td>A silver chalice worth £20 for the altar of St Francis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Gavin Dunbar, Bishop of Aberdeen</td>
<td>Built new church at a cost of 1400 merks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Gift/Legacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Andrew Rainy of Davolz</td>
<td>Contributed victuals and pecuniary alms almost from the foundation of the friary until his death in 1519, when he left to the friars a legacy of 24 merks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520/2</td>
<td>Alms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>John Flescher, Chancellor of Aberdeen</td>
<td>Gave liberal yearly alms, and £20 Scots for the construction of the north house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>John Maitland, Subdeacon of Ross</td>
<td>Contributed 100 merks for the building of the lower part of the convent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 October</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement ratified in the 'place' of the Friars Minor of Aberdeen, 5th October 1524. (Sir John</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Benefactor</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Alms</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>John Murray, burgess</td>
<td>Gave £20 in addition to other small alms; died c. 1527.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 February</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arbiters appointed to meet in the ‘place’ of the Friars Minor of Aberdeen, 3rd February 1527. (Sir John Cristisone, No. 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Alms</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>William Elphinstone, Rector of Clat</td>
<td>Gave liberal yearly alms in money and kind, a chalice worth £22, ten merks for the construction of the wall of the old choir, and £100 towards the construction of the new church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>William Elphinstone, Rector of Clat</td>
<td>As a legacy he left £20 and four bolls of malt (died 1528).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Bequest (Deed of Settlement)</td>
<td>31 August</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Egidia Gillian Blair, Lady of Row, daughter of John Blair of that ilk, and wife of James Kennedy of Baltersan, laird of Row, and son of Gilbert, first Lord Kennedy</td>
<td>Twenty merks to the chaplains and friars on the day of her burial, and forty pounds, two pairs of blankets, three bed-rugs and one bed-cover of needlework to the Grey Friars (the 'Fratres Minimi') of Ayr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Egidia Gillian Blair, Lady of Row</td>
<td>120 merks given towards the construction of the second church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Margaret Chalmer, Lady of Finlater and Drum</td>
<td>A silver spoon and three sums of £20, £17 and £10 for the needs of the friars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532-45</td>
<td>Alms</td>
<td>1532-45</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>William Stewart, Bishop of Aberdeen</td>
<td>Contributed daily alms, £40 for the purchase of the site of the north part of the new church, and built a new infirmary for the sick and infirm friars. Died 17 April 1545.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Gavin Dunbar, Bishop of Aberdeen</td>
<td>Left as a legacy to the friary a silver chalice, a scarlet chasuble and ten merks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Robert Schand, Rector of Alness</td>
<td>Gave alms at different times, and purchased the north part of the lower garden. Died 1 August 1549.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19 April</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Instrument of Resignation done in the 'public street' of Aberdeen at the place of the Friars Minor, 19th April 1551. (Robert Lumisdane, No. 6).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Duncan Burnet, Rector of Methlick</td>
<td>Annual gift of 10 merks, with diverse other alms and a scarlet cloth for the high altar; 108 merks to St Andrews, 109 merks to Perth, £100 to Aberdeen and 10 merks to each of the other friaries towards the close of his life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Duncan Burnet, Rector of Methlick</td>
<td>Gift of £100 (towards the close of his life).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Gift / Legacy</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Alexander Galloway, Rector of Kinkell and architect of the second church</td>
<td>Obtained 50 merks for the friars every four years, and left them thirty merks at his death, was closely associated with Bishop Gavin Dunbar; second church of Grey Friars in Aberdeen was erected by him in 1518 or shortly thereafter, at the request, and largely at the expense of Gavin Dunbar; was Rector of Aberdeen University from 1516-1549, died in 1552.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20 February</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Procuratory of Resignation made in the 'chapter' of the Friars Minor of the town of Aberdeen, 20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Benefactor</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24 June</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement made in the 'cloister' of the Friars Minor of the town of Aberdeen, 24th June 1552. (Robert Lumisdane, No. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 October</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement made in the 'church' of the Friars Minor of the town of Aberdeen, 7th October 1553. (Robert Lumisdane, No. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1493</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Elizabeth Vindegatis</td>
<td>3000 merks (£2000 Scots) for the purchase of chalices, ornaments, images, bells, etc., for the seven friaries erected prior to her death in 1493.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Deed of Settlement</td>
<td>31 August</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Egidia Gillian Blair, Lady of Row</td>
<td>Item, on the day of my burial, to the Minimi Friars of Ayr, two pairs of blankets, three bed rugs and one bed-cover of needlework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Deed of Settlement</td>
<td>31 August</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Egidia Gillian Blair, Lady of Row</td>
<td>Item, to the Minimi Friars of Ayr, forty pounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Frenchmen for ane ... of vyne to the Gray Freris, £3, 10s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>For ane hogheid of vyne to the Gray Freris, £3, 17s. 6d. Item, to the Frenchman that brought in the wyn, 31s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>To James Johnestoun for vyne to the Gray Freris at command of the provest, bailleis and communitic, 48s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>27 June</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>For ane hogheid of vyne to the Gray Freris, £3, 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>27 June</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>For ane hogheid of vyne to the Gray Freris, £5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For a hogheid of vyne to the Gray Freris the fifth day of August, 50s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Martinmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>For a hogheid of vyne to the Gray Freris, 55s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(In the Dean of Guild's Account), Item, for vyne gevin to the tounis freindis that come agains the Maister of Montgomery quhen he gatherit for the Gray Freir that wes put in the tolbuith, 24s. 'To the pursuivant that brought the letters to use the Scripture in English, 2s.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>23 September</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Hugh, first Earl of Eglinton</td>
<td>Testament, confirmed by Archbishop of Glasgow, 12th March 1545-46: 'To the Friars Minor of Ayr for the space of three years, £10 Scots for prayers for the weal of the souls of himself and his wife.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>4 November</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>William Cunningham of Glengarnok</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor of Ayr and Glasgow, 20 merks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Gray Freris at the tounis command, 53s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>14 January</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Archibald Weyr</td>
<td>Testament of Archibald Weyr, who died 7th October 1547, 6s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow</td>
<td>£10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>13 January</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Gilbert Kennedy of</td>
<td>In his Testament, Gilbert Kennedy of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Balmaclanochan</td>
<td>Balmaclanochan, who was killed at the battle of Fauside on 12th January 1547-48, left a debt of 40s. due to him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Dunlop</td>
<td>For a hogheid of vyne to the Gray Freris, £4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Testament of Patrick Dunlop, a boll of meal in return for a tregintal of masses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>5 August</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Andrew Wilson</td>
<td>Testament of Andrew Wilson, 15s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>Margaret Fullerton of Irvine, wife of John White</td>
<td>Testament of Margaret Fullerton, wife of John White, half a merk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>A hogheid of wine to the Gray Freris, £4, 15s.; also 'for wine to the Gray Freris, £4.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>For wine to the Gray Freris, 44s.; also for one hogheid of wine to the Gray Freris, £4; also, to tak afeild the freiris discharge to the chakker, 11s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>For three hogheids of wine, two to the provost for his labors in getting in the byrun maills of Lee and Cartland, and one other to the Gray Freris, £13, 6s. For a hogheid of wine to the Gray Freris, £4, 6s. A boll of salt to the Gray Freris, 18s. Another boll of salt to the freirs, 18s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Municipal Charities</td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the freirs for a boll of salt, 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td><em>Municipal</em></td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>For ane hogheid of vyne to the Gray Freris, £4, 5s. Ane hogheid of vyne to the Gray Freris, £4, 3s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td><em>Municipal</em></td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>For salt to the Gray Freris, 39s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td><em>Municipal</em></td>
<td>Michaelmas</td>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>For a boll of salt to the Gray Freris, 23s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td><em>Alms</em></td>
<td>17 August</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Lady Janet Paterson, relict of Sir Alexander Lauder</td>
<td>The relative Crown Confirmation, 17 August 1513, provided that Friars Minor of Edinburgh were to receive a portion of the alms gift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td><em>Edinburgh</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At ye maisteris qumand to ye Gray Frars, 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td><em>Hammermen</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ye Gray Frars at ye maisteris qumand as other craftis dois, 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td><em>Hammermen</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At ye maisteris qumand to ye Gray Freris, 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td><em>Hammermen</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ye Gray Freris as use is, 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td><em>Legacy</em></td>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of</td>
<td>Testament of Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Benefactor</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>John Lindsay of Covington</td>
<td>Glasgow, 'Item, to the Friars Minor of Edinburgh, £6, 13s. 4d.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Burgh Records</td>
<td>9 December</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, to the Blackfreris and the Grey freris forthair penschioun yeirlie, twelve barrels beir, summa, £12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Burgh Records</td>
<td>18 March</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Sir William Cockburn of Scarling, Knight</td>
<td>Testament of Sir William Cockburn of Scarling, Knight, who desired to be buried in the aisle of St Gabriel in the Church of St Giles of Edinburgh, leaves to the Friars Minor of Edinburgh a load of wheat and 5 merks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Burgh Records</td>
<td>1 December</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, payit and delyverit to the Grayfreris be ane precept daitit the first day of December 1553, £6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>Burgh Records</td>
<td>20 July</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, to the Blackfreris and to the Grayfreris for thair preching yeirlie twelve barrels beir, price thairof, £14, 8s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>Burgh Records</td>
<td>16 August</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, to the Blackfreiris and the Grayfreiris for thair preching yeirlie, ikl ane of thameself ane last of sowndis beir, price of ilk boll, 28s., summa, £16, 16s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Benefactor</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Burgh Records</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>dosane eistland burdis to the Grayfreirs, be ane precept the 16th day of August 1555, £4, 16s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Burgh Records</td>
<td>31 July</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Item, to the Blackfrers and the Gray, for thair preching yeirlie, twelve baralis beir, price thairof £18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Burgh Records</td>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Item, the 18th day of Junii, be ane precept, for half ane last of beir to the Grayfreris gevin thame for thair preicheing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>Burgh Records</td>
<td>5 June</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Item, to the Gray Freris, be ane precept of the dait the 5th day of Junij, anno 1558, for the halfe last beir granitit to thame yeirlie for thair preicheing, the sowme of £6, 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Gordon, Rector of Kinkell</td>
<td>Did much good for convents of Aberdeen and Elgin ... died 1508.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>City Treasurer's Accounts</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, gevin for the Graye Freris salt, 18s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>City Treasurer's Accounts</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, gevin to ye Graye Freris for thair almis salt, 12s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552-53</td>
<td>City Treasurer's Accounts</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, allowit 12s. 6d. gevin to the Graye Freris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, gevin to the Greye Freris for ane bowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td><em>Treasurer's Accounts</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>graith salt, 18s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td><em>City Treasurer's Accounts</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, gevin to ye Graye Freiris for ane bowe salt, 16s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td><em>City Treasurer's Accounts</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, gevin to ye Graye Freiris for yair almes salt, 16s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td><em>City Treasurer's Accounts</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, gevin to ye Gray Freris for ane boll of salt, 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td><em>City Treasurer's Accounts</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, to ye Gray Freris for ane boll of salt, 28s. The Comptar dischairgis him of £6, 14s. giffin to the laird of Innes for ... of his cummeris of ye knok vas coft fra ye Gray Freris. Item, to ye Gray Freris in complet payment of £11, 12s. promeist to yaim for thair knok and bell extending to £10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td><em>City Treasurer's Accounts</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, for mending of ye trestis, 12d. Item, for careing of them to ye freris, 20d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, 5s. money giffen for certain garrowing vaillis to big the seittis of the Gray Freiris conforme to the townis precept. Item, 14s. giffin to Teophilus Jhonstoun for certand timmir giffin to big the seittis into the Gray Freiris. Item, 20s. giffin to Jhone Baxter anent...and George Gaderar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>Common Good Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>for bigging ye seittis to ye Lordis in ye Gray Freiris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Common Good Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item, mair giffin to Jhone Williamson for the bigging of ye Gray Freir Wynd and the Schoill Wynd, 6s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>23 September</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Earl of Eglinton</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor for one year, £10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>24 March</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Peter Adam</td>
<td>Testament of Peter Adam, to the Friars Minor of Glasgow, 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>4 November</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>William Cunningham of Glengarnok</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor of Ayr and Glasgow, 20 merks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>19 June</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Cuthbert Adam</td>
<td>Item, lego fratibus minoribus Glasguen. pro trigentalio aureo celebrando pro anima mea, 30s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow</td>
<td>Item, to the Friars Minor of Glasgow, £10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>27 April</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Janet Maxwell, wife of John Knox, citizen of Glasgow</td>
<td>Testament of ... to the Friars Minor, 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>26 June</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Janet Mulzeane</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor of Glasgow, 10s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>10 December</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mr James Houston, Subdean and Vicar General of Glasgow</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor of Glasgow, 40s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>18 October</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mr James Houston, Subdean and Vicar General of Glasgow</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor of the city of Glasgow, £10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>13 February</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Richard Hucheson</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor of Glasgow, 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>10 October</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Janet Bailie, Lady of Cruddildyks</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor of Glasgow, two bolls of meal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>John Lindsay of Covington</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor in Glasgow, 40s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>6 February</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Cuthbert Simson, Vicar of Dalliel</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor of Glasgow, 10 merks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>16 April</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>John Haisty</td>
<td>To the Friars Minor of Glasgow, 6s. 8d. (see note 1, Bryce, i. p. 351).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Franciscan</td>
<td>Contributed £600 in all to the Scottish Franciscans during his lifetime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Gave liberal alms to other friaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>Legacy (MS. Reg. Conf. Test.)</td>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Robert Menzies of that Ilk</td>
<td>Directed his body to be buried in the choir of the parish church of Weyme, founded by himself; left 20 merks for payment of his other funeral expenses, 40 merks for repairing the lamp of the choir newly founded by him where his body lies, to the Friars Minor 2 bolls of oatmeal, to the Friars Preachers 30s; appointed Robert Menzies, his son and heir, to be his executor: confirmed 7th April 1524.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Benefactor</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow</td>
<td>Testament of Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow: 'Item, to the Friars Minor of Perth, £6, 13s. 4d.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Duncan Burnet, Rector of Methlick</td>
<td>Gift of 109 merks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>1 June</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Marjory Lawson, Lady of Glenegies</td>
<td>(Beginning of Testament awanting) ... 'Minoribus de Perht orandi ... ij boll ordei, ij boll farine avenatice.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>19 June</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Marjory Lawson, Lady of Glenegies</td>
<td>Testament of Marjory Lawson, Lady of Glenegies, to the Friars Minor, 30s. (Perth?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>12 November</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Mr James France, chaplain</td>
<td>Testament of Mr James France, chaplain, made at Dunblane, to the Friars Minor of Perth, 2 stones of cheese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Duncan Burnet, Rector of Methlick</td>
<td>Gift of 108 merks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18 April</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Stevenson of Callander, elected to be buried within the friary in preference to his own church.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>