The Schottenkloster were founded for Irish monks, who retained the name of Scotti after it developed its modern meaning. The remnant was taken over by Scottish Benedictines on the grounds that they, as Scotti, were the rightful owners.

In 1595 they recovered the Schottenkloster of St James in Würzburg from Julius Echter, the great reforming prince-bishop. The new foundation did not prosper, until in 1615 William Ogilvie was elected abbot. Under him it increased in numbers and prestige, then almost everything was lost in the Swedish occupation (1631-34).

Archival material is particularly scarce for the period 1640-60, but the monastery seems to have recovered slowly and it went to the rescue of the Scottish abbey in Ratisbon, which was in even worse straits. From 1660 on, a community of Scots was built up at Würzburg; until 1700 there were usually about a dozen monks in residence or working in Scotland.

Constitutionally, the abbey was subject to the bishop. This prevented real union with Benedictines outside the diocese, but close ties with the Ratisbon Scots were retained and there was a temporary limited union with English monks.

In the 1620s a missionary unit was set up and some monks worked on the Scottish border until about 1640. After 1660 missionary work was resumed but influential Scottish secular priests in Rome prevented the re-establishment of a Benedictine mission. The monks aided James VII’s efforts to restore Catholicism; eight worked in Scotland, subsidised by James. The first Scottish Catholic bishop was given important help by the two abbots when they agreed voluntarily to co-operate with him.

The legend was accepted that the Schottenkloster were founded for Scots under Charlemagne. This gave the monks a certain status, which was enhanced by the finding in 1615 of the body of the first abbot, Macarius, renowned for sanctity. A cultus developed, with his feast celebrated and miraculous cures reported.

One monk wrote a book of religious controversy, another was renowned as a Latin poet. The history of the monastery and Macarius was also written. A series of works on the Scotic saints and the Schottenkloster remained unpublished but were not without influence.
The Scots were part of traditional Würzburg life. The bishop's body always lay in St James's before burial, and three abbots were Rector Magnificus of the university. In 1803, with the general secularisation, St James's ceased to exist and no attempt was made to continue or refound the community elsewhere.
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SUMMARY

The Schottenklöster were founded for Irish monks, who retained the name of Scoti after it developed its modern meaning. The remnant was taken over by Scottish Benedictines on the grounds that they, as Scoti, were the rightful owners.

In 1595 they recovered the Schottenkloster of St James in Würzburg from Julius Echter, the great reforming prince-bishop. The new foundation did not prosper, until in 1615 William Ogilvie was elected abbot. Under him it increased in numbers and prestige, then almost everything was lost in the Swedish occupation (1631-34).

Archival material is particularly scarce for the period 1640-60, but the monastery seems to have recovered slowly and it went to the rescue of the Scottish abbey in Ratisbon, which was in even worse straits. From 1660 on, a community of Scots was built up at Würzburg; until 1700 there were usually about a dozen monks in residence or working in Scotland.

Constitutionally, the abbey was subject to the bishop. This prevented real union with Benedictines outside the diocese, but close ties with the Ratisbon Scots were retained and there was a temporary limited union with English monks.

In the 1620s a missionary unit was set up and some monks worked on the Scottish border until about 1640. After 1660 missionary work was resumed but influential Scottish secular priests in Rome prevented the re-establishment of a Benedictine mission. The monks aided James VII's efforts to restore Catholicism; eight worked in Scotland, subsidised by James. The first Scottish Catholic bishop was given important help by
the two abbots when they agreed voluntarily to co-operate with him.

The legend was accepted that the Schottenklöster were founded for Scots under Charlemagne. This gave the monks a certain status, which was enhanced by the finding in 1615 of the body of the first abbot, Macarius, renowned for sanctity. A cultus developed, with his feast celebrated and miraculous cures reported.

One monk wrote a book of religious controversy, another was renowned as a Latin poet. The history of the monastery and Macarius was also written. A series of works on the Scotic saints and the Schottenklöster remained unpublished but were not without influence.

The Scots were part of traditional Würzburg life. The bishop's body always lay in St James's before burial, and three abbots were Rector Magnificus of the university. In 1803, with the general secularisation, St James's ceased to exist and no attempt was made to continue or refound the community elsewhere.
The present work could not have been written without help and cooperation from many quarters. While I am grateful to all who helped, I owe a particular debt of gratitude to Dr Ludwig Hammermayer, Munich, who informed me of relevant material in various continental archives and allowed me to use his own photocopies of documents. This was particularly valuable in the case of material from Erfurt in the Eastern zone of Germany, since I was unable to travel there. Special thanks are likewise due to the Leverhulme Research Awards Trustees for a generous grant enabling me to make two lengthy stays in Germany and Rome and have material photocopied.

The recent hurricane in Glasgow caused severe damage to the printers of The Innes Review and destroyed the off-prints of my article, "Germania Christiana: a seventeenth-century trilogy". It is thus not possible to include the article as an Appendix, although footnotes refer to it there; the reader is therefore referred for it to The Innes Review, vol. 18 (1967), pp. 118-40.

G.A.M.D.
When the monastery of St James in Würzburg was secularised in 1803, its archives were transferred to the Würzburg state archives, where they were split up and distributed among the various repositories. The early deeds were taken thence in 1830 to the central archive in Munich. The later material, which remained in Würzburg, was in large measure destroyed in the air-raids of 1945. Thus all that survives of the monastic archives for the later period is the scattered material which escaped the destruction of 1945. The manuscript volumes in St James's not of an archival nature were, however, given in 1803 to Würzburg university library and have escaped destruction. There is no trace of certain essential records (clothings, profession sheets, and so on). What happened to them in 1803 is not known, unless for some reason they were transferred to, or already formed part of, the episcopal archives.

Since Würzburg was a prince-bishopric, the episcopal archives were also the local government archives. The total destruction in 1945 of the material in them relating to St James's is therefore a double loss, only slightly offset by the survival of some transcripts made by Alexander Reid (for whom see below). In fact, the writing of the history of St James's is very largely the piecing together of isolated items from other sources as a substitute for the use of the main archival sources destroyed.

The following is a descriptive list of the chief repositories of manuscripts investigated. Abbreviations used in the present work are added in brackets to enable anyone using the list of abbreviations to refer to the description and perceive at once the nature of the source.
Many of the more important single items are also mentioned in the body of the work as their composition has a place in the history of the abbey. Abbreviations not in brackets are those in use in the archives themselves.

**Würzburg, State Archives (Wz.SA)**

Original deeds and other papers concerning St James's and Benedictines in general. One large volume is the cartulary of St James's compiled in 1587 and added to later (Copialbuch).

**HV**: Collection of Würzburg Historical Society; one item is the earliest chronicle compiled by the Scots (Chronicon).

**MRA**: Archive of the archbishop-electors of Mainz, in whose territory the Scots abbey of Erfurt lay (MRA).

**Würzburg University Library (Wz.UB)**

Volumes acquired from St James's or relating to the Scots, including many written by the Scots monks themselves. Also the original matriculation register of the university.

Archives in Ratisbon contain material on the Scots abbey in that town and also, to a limited extent, on the Würzburg Scots.

**Ratisbon episcopal archives (Reg.BoA)**

About two dozen large folders, very valuable but difficult to use as they are unfoliated and the position of items is subject to change.

**Archive of former Scots abbey, Ratisbon (Sch.)**

This enormous collection, consisting of over 600 deeds and over 300
folders of MSS, as well as account books and other items, is extremely valuable. It is not practicable, however, to examine more than the most promising folders, as they are unindexed. Two folders contain the correspondence of Abbot Maxwell with the Ratisbon abbot (Maxwell). Since about 1945 this archive has been housed in the episcopal archives but remains a separate collection.

Office of the Rector of St James's, Ratisbon (Regens)

A few documents, apparently belonging to the foregoing archive, are kept here.

Library of St James's, Ratisbon

Valuable MS volumes, not at present available for use as they are in packing-cases until a new diocesan library is built. They were examined cursorily in 1958. A few volumes have not been packed, including the parish register of the abbey (Pfarrbuch).

Historical Society, Ratisbon (Reg.HV)

A small but valuable collection made from apparently casual sources.

Munich, Central State Archive (Mun.HSA)

KU Würzburg: Contains original deeds from before 1400 relating to St James's, formerly in the monastic archives.

KU St Jakob Regensburg: Original deeds relating to the Ratisbon abbey, brought together from various sources (KUSJR).

KL St Jakob Regensburg: Other material relating to the Ratisbon abbey (KLSJR). One item is the cartulary and chronicle of Abbot Baillie (Baillie).
HL Regensburg: One volume is the letter-book of the dukes of Bavaria relating to the Scots abbey in Ratisbon (LB).

Munich, Kreisarchiv

GL: Government documents relating to the Ratisbon abbey.

Munich, Geheimes Staatsarchiv (Mun. GSA)

Correspondence of dukes of Bavaria relating to the Scots.

Munich, State Library

Volumes relating to Scottish and Irish monks in Bavaria.

Edinburgh, Scottish Catholic Archives (SCA)

Ratisbon MSS: A small but very valuable part of the Ratisbon abbey archives, brought to Scotland in the nineteenth century (SCA Rat.). One item is a volume containing at one end a list of Ratisbon abbots with material relating to the period of rule of each (Cat. Abb.); at the other end is a similar compilation dealing with Erfurt abbots (Erf. Tent.).

Mission Letters: An enormous and extremely valuable collection of letters written to or by Scottish missionary priests. Since they are not calendared, only those whose writers had some connection with the Scots abbeys could be examined (ML).

Other volumes and papers relating to the Roman Catholic mission in Scotland.

Edinburgh University Library (EUL).

One volume in the Laing MSS written by a Würzburg monk.
Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (NLS).

Volumes among Advocates MSS written by Scots monks in Germany or relating to Scottish Catholics (Adv.). One of the most useful is Vol. 10 of the Dennistoun MSS, consisting of notes, transcripts and originals collected by James Dennistoun about 1836 for a projected publication on the Scots abbeys in Germany. Some items are to be found nowhere else (Dennistoun).

Other volumes containing descriptions of Würzburg MSS formerly or still in Mount Stuart library (see below).

Fort Augustus Abbey Archives (FA)

A small but important collection from the Ratisbon abbey, brought to Scotland in the nineteenth century.

Archives in Rome contain much relevant material, both because of their general richness and because of the relations of the Scots with Rome.

Vatican Archives (VA)

Various repositories were explored but the almost incredible quantity of unindexed material makes it impracticable to do more than follow some promising lead. The Schedario Carampi, a collection of references made by a former librarian for a projected historical work, brought some useful material to light.

Vatican Library (VL)

MSS Vat.Lat: Volumes brought from Würzburg in the last century.

Barb.Lat: Papers and correspondence of Francesco Barberini, cardinal
protector of Scotland for over fifty years (BL).

**Archive of Congregation de propaganda fide, Rome (Prop.)**

*Acta:* Minutes of monthly meetings of the congregation dealing with mission work.

*SOCG:* Original papers relating to the foregoing. Before 1670 there is no way of finding these, except by trial and error, in the enormous and virtually unindexed collection.

Other minor repositories, likewise difficult to use.

*SC Scozia:* Papers relating to Scottish affairs of lesser importance dealt with outside the monthly meetings.

**Archive of Scots College, Rome**

Papers relating to Scots abbeys.

**Archive of German College, Rome**

Entries of Scots in sixteenth-century rolls.

**Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale**

Fonds Latin: Material sent to the Maurists for their projected *Monasticion Benedictimum* (FL).

Fonds Français: Correspondence of Mabillon (FF).

**London, British Museum (BM)**

Occasional MSS relating to Scots abbeys in Germany.

**Düsseldorf, Central State Archive**

Letter-books of Abbot Colchon, in particular one containing drafts of
his letters to the Würzburg abbot (Colchon).

**Darmstadt, State Archive (Darm.SA)**

Original letters sent to Colchon, including those from the Würzburg abbot.

**Wiesentheid, Schönborn family archive**

Papers of Archbishop Johann Philipp relating to the Würzburg abbey (KJP).

**Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique (BRB)**

Volumes containing material relating to the Scots, in particular the Bollandist documents on Macarius.

**Brussels, Archives Générales du Royaume**

Subsidies made to Scots and Irish expatriates by the archdukes.

**Vienna, archive of the Schottenabtei**

Documents relating to attempts made by the Scots to obtain possession of the abbey.

**Constance, Town Archive (Con.St.)**

Material relating to the former Scots abbey in the town and the compensation paid to the Scots.

**Erfurt, Domarchiv**

Archive of the former Mainz diocesan chancery in Erfurt (CG).

**St Gallen, Stiftsarchiv (SG)**

Material relating to the Scots monks.
Münster-Schwarzach Abbey Archives

MS chronicle of the abbey (Pel. Red.).

Oban, R.C. Cathedral House

A few volumes emanating from the Scots abbeys. One of them contains the transcripts made by a Würzburg monk, James Blair (Blair).

Mount Stuart Library

One volume emanating from the Scots abbeys. Also three volumes of the Collections of Rev. Alexander Reid, consisting of notes and transcripts of material on the Scots abbeys made in 1877-79. Part of Vol. 2 is invaluable as it contains material from the Würzburg episcopal archives destroyed in 1945 (Reid).

Glasgow University Library

One volume from the Scots abbeys.

Kirkconnell House, Dumfries

Papers from the Scots college at Douai, in particular the Large Register, which is the contemporary roll of students (Douai Reg.).

Dublin, National Library of Ireland

Extensive microfilms of material in continental archives relating to Scots and Irish.

Of other libraries and archives which were investigated, some contained material on the Scottish monks but not of particular relevance to the present work.

**PRINTED SOURCES**

The abbreviation used in this work will be added in brackets to the title.

M. Wieland, "Das Schottenkloster zu St Jakob in Würzburg", in *AU*, xvi (1863), 1-182. (Wieland)

For *AU* see below. This is the standard work, being the only one, on the abbey and it used the episcopal archives before their destruction. It is, however, more an antiquarian work giving raw material than a digested history. There are also many grounds for lack of confidence in the use made of the sources now destroyed (see p. 98 below).

A summary of Wieland's work is found in J.B. Stamminger, *Die Pfarrei St Burkard in Würzburg* (Würzburg, 1889), 50-64.

M. Dilworth, "Two necrologies of Scottish Benedictine abbeys in Germany", in *IR*, ix, 173-203. (Necrologies)

*Idem*, "Scottish Benedictines at Würzburg: A supplement to the necrology", in *IR*, xv, 171-81. (Necr.Suppl.)

*Idem*, "Benedictine monks of Ratisbon and Würzburg in the 17th and 16th centuries: Emigrés from the Highlands of Scotland", in *Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness*, xliv, 94-110. (Dilworth, "Highland Monks")

The two first-named have established the personnel of the Scots abbeys with reasonable accuracy. The first edited the Würzburg necrology up to
1727, and also the Ratisbon necrology, with biographical notes; the second is a critical commentary on the list of monks given by Wieland and continues the biographical notes after 1727. The third gives more extended treatment to Highland monks.

idem, "Three Scottish Benedictines", in The Downside Review, lxxxii, 233-45. (Dilworth, "Three Scots")

idem, "The first Benedictine mission to Scotland", in The Downside Review, lxxxiii, 60-72, 159-68. (Dilworth, "First Mission")

idem, "The Würzburg Scots and the English Congregation", in The Downside Review, lxxxv, 39-61. (Dilworth, "Scots and EBC")

These three articles consider the relations of the Würzburg Scots with the English Benedictine monks. The latter two edit the text of the agreements drawn up between Scots and English.

idem, "Germania Christiana: A seventeenth-century trilogy", in IR, xviii, 118-40. (Dilworth, "Trilogy")

idem, "Two Ratisbon manuscripts in the National Library of Scotland", in The Bibliotheca, v, 24-32. (Dilworth, "Two MSS")

The first establishes the authorship of the main MS historical works written by Würzburg monks, shows the relation of the works to each other, and describes the extant copies. The second identifies a MS fragment as being by a Würzburg monk and shows another MS to be wrongly attributed to a Würzburg monk.

L. Hammermayer, "Deutsche Schottenklöster, schottische Reformation, katholische Reform und Gegenreformation in West- und Mitteleuropa (1560-1580)",

...
This is the only competent account of the revival of the Scots abbeys in Ratisbon and Erfurt under Ninian Winzet.

This covers the political role and missionary activity of the Ratisbon abbot during the reign of James VII & II, citing a great number of sources, manuscript and printed.

J. Trithemius, *Compendium breve fundationis...monasterii Sancti Jacobi.*

This is the chronicle of the abbey written in 1509. The original is in *Wz*, UB, M, ch.f. 126, fol. 145-55. It was published with a continuation in Trithemius's *Opera pia et spiritualia* (Mainz, 1604), 3-16; reprinted in Ludewig, 993-1004. For Ludewig see below.

G.A. Renz, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Schottenabtei St Jakob und des Priorates Weihest Peter (O.S.B.) in Regensburg", in *SM*, xvi, 64-84 and 9 subsequent issues (1895-97). For *SM* see below.

A calendar of documents relating to the Scotish monasteries in Ratisbon up to 1500, with a still useful introduction taking in the later period. For *SM* see below.

ments relating to Winzet.

J. Scholle, *Das Erfurter Schottenkloster* (Düsseldorf, 1932) (Scholle)

This small book is the only work written explicitly on the Erfurt abbey. It is antiquarian rather than critical history.

A. Hübl, *Die Wiener Schotten und das Mutterkloster St Jakob in Regensburg* (Vienna, 1914). (Hübl)

This pamphlet outlines various attempts of the Scots to gain possession of the Vienna abbey.


This mediaeval account of the founding of the Scotic monasteries centred on Ratisbon was edited, with a still useful commentary, by the Bollandists.

M. Haim, *Beschreibung der Tugend, Heiligkeit, Leben, Absterben und Wunderwercken Macarii* (Würzburg, 1661) (Haim)

A didactic and imaginative life of the first abbot of St James's, but it sheds light on the cultus of Macarius and on the monastery at the time of writing.


A readable account of the Scots abbeys with some useful appendices. It makes no pretence of doing more than present the work of other writers readably and in English.

The foregoing deal explicitly with the Schottenklöster or the Scots monks.
Würzburg local histories and compilations also contain much material on St James's.


A large and valuable collection of source material, mostly ecclesiastical and mainly second-hand, for the history of the prince-bishopric. The four volumes form a set though the latter two are to a great extent a repetition in German of material in the former two.

S. Merkle (ed.), *Die Matrikel der Universität Würzburg* (2 vols. Würzburg, 1922) (Merkle)

The matriculation rolls contain a number of Scots names. Unfortunately unindexed.

J.P. Ludewig (ed.), *Geschichtschreiber von dem Bischoffthum Wirtzburg* (Frankfurt, 1713) (Ludewig)

Contains reprints of early Würzburg histories and compilations. It has other useful material in addition to Trithemius's chronicle of St James's.

A Schott, *Julius Echter und das Buch*, 103-04. (Schott)

An unprinted dissertation submitted to Würzburg university in 1953. The short but useful section on St James's deals with its library in the time of Echter and with gifts made by Echter to it.

C. Wolff, "Die Abtei Münster-Schwarzach in ihren Beziehungen zu anderen
Benediktiner-Klöster im Laufe der Geschichte", in Lumen Caecis: Fest-
schrift...N. Weber (St Ottilien, 1928), 304 ff. (Wolff)

St James's is conspicuous in its absence from this in spite of its
title, but light is thrown on the Scots abbey by the description of events
in neighbouring monasteries.

Ephemeris Neostadiana anno 1631 annotari coepta (Eph. Neost.)

Chronicle of the nearby abbey of Neustadt am Main; it contains
important single references to St James's. It is due to appear in 1968
in WGB (for which see below), edited by Herr Dekan Weiss, who kindly made
his transcript available.

Bundeschuh's Fränckisches Lexikon, Bd.5 (Ulm, 1802), 181-99. (Bundeschuh)

F. Oberthür, Taschenbuch für...Würzburg, 1795, p. 195-210. (Taschenbuch)

These are descriptions of St James's made at the end of the eighteenth
century by sympathetic but not uncritical observers. The former is especi¬
ally valuable as it prints entries from the later monastic necrology which
has since disappeared without trace.

Other articles by local historians and antiquaries will be cited in the
body of the present work. Many useful articles and valuable references
have appeared in the organ of the local historical society, Archiv des
historischen Verein für Unterfranken und Aschaffenburg (AU), including a
double number devoted to Wieland's work in 1863, and in its successor,
Mainfränkisches Jahrbuch für Geschichte und Kunst. The same can be said
of the more recently founded Würzburger Diözesangeschichtblätter (WDBG).
Works on Benedictine history either include the Scots abbeys or throw light on them.


A scholarly account of the constitutional development of Benedictines, perhaps slightly coloured by the author's views on the ideal form of Benedictine organisation.


Readable but very uneven, as it relies entirely on work already in print and easily accessible.


The work was written in 1709 and used reliable sources, hence it is valuable for the seventeenth century.

H.N. Birt, *Obit book of the English Benedictines from 1600 to 1912* (privately printed, 1913) (Birt)

Contains lists of officials and summary biographies of all monks of the English Benedictine Congregation.


Has the faults to be expected of such an ambitious work executed over two centuries ago but preserves information found nowhere else.
P. Volk is the chief historian of the Bursfeld Congregation of Benedic¬
tines, the progress of which affected the Würzburg abbey. Several
articles by him are cited in the present work, particularly "Abt Leonard
Colchon von Seligenstadt (1625-1653) und sein Briefwechsel", in Histor¬
isches Jahrbuch, lvii, 366-84 (Volk, "Colchon").

The periodical, Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktin¬
erordens, contains articles useful for the background of German monastic¬
ism and the history of St James's (SM).

Works on the Roman Catholic church in Scotland after the Reformation
shed light on the background of the Scottish mission and the homeland of
the monks, and also on their relations with Rome.

A. Bellesheim, History of the Catholic Church of Scotland (4 vols. Edin¬
burgh, 1887-90) (Bellesheim)

This remains the best general work although badly in need of revision.

M.V. Hay, The Blairs Papers (1603-1660) (Edinburgh, 1929) (Blairs Papers)

Makes good use of the Mission Letters (formerly at Blairs and now in
the Scottish Catholic Archives, Edinburgh) to depict the state of Scottish
Catholics at home and abroad.

idem, Failure in the Far East (London, 1956) (Hay, Failure)

The earlier chapters give a useful picture of the politics of the
Scottish mission in the later seventeenth century, in spite of the author's
evident bias and even if one does not accept the alleged massive anti-
Jesuit conspiracy uncovered by him.


Very useful although it is raw material rather than digested history.

*Records of the Scots Colleges* (Aberdeen, New Spalding Club, 1906) (RSC)

Lists of the students with some biographical details and a profession list of the Lisbon abbey. The Paris college is omitted, however, while the section on Douai must be used with caution since a later list was printed instead of the contemporary one for seventeenth-century students and the transcript is not without errors.

C. Giblin, "The Acta of Propaganda Archives and the Scottish mission, 1623-1670", in *FR*, v, 39-76. (Giblin)

Gives an almost complete list of references to Scottish affairs in the minutes of the monthly meetings of Propaganda.


Contains information about monks of Würzburg who were associates of the martyr, Ogilvie, and about the beatification process held at Würzburg. Parts of the book need revision.

R.A. Hay, *Genealogie of the Hayes of Tweeddale* (Edinburgh, 1835) (Hay, Genealogie)

Gives a contemporary account of James VII's project, in which the monks were involved, for restoring Holyrood as a religious house.
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Chapter 1
THE SCOTIC ABBEYS IN GERMANY

Irish missionaries in Europe - their voluntary exile - Irish foundation in Ratisbon - its daughter-houses - Irish tradition in Würzburg - foundation of St. James's there - varying accounts of the founding - a few indisputable facts - meaning of Scotus - name retained in Germany - Scotic congregation formed - breaks up in fifteenth century - Würzburg abbey in the middle ages - all monks Irish - Ratisbon abbey becomes Scottish - decline and revival there - Würzburg abbey in German hands - community dies out - abbey given to suffragan bishop.

Würzburg, the principal town in Lower Franconia, lies on both sides of the river Main, a tributary of the Rhine. The chief part of the town stands on low-lying ground on the east bank; the bank opposite climbs abruptly and is crowned by the Marienberg fortress, in whose shadow lies the church of St. James, the Schottenkirche or Scottish Church. This ancient monastic establishment, founded in the twelfth century by Irish monks, was handed over to German monks in 1497. A century later it was given to Scottish Benedictines and remained in their hands until 1803.

It is thus quite possible that before 1595 no monk from Scotland had ever set foot within the monastery of St. James of the Scots in Würzburg. Certainly, until that time the monastery had never belonged to or been inhabited by monks from Scotland. And yet it had been called the monastery of the Scots, or Schottenkloster, since its foundation. To understand how it got its name one must go back to the early centuries of Irish
Christianity when it was the custom for monks to go into voluntary exile and preach the Gospel as they went. The Irish Church was organised on a monastic basis, a fact which greatly influenced their missionary work. Besides evangelising the neighbouring island of Britain they preached and settled in France, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Switzerland and Italy; to this day the memory of their missionary zeal persists in many parts of Central Europe. The name by which they were known and which they used for themselves was Scoti.

About the middle of the seventh century the first monasteries on the Continent for Irish monks exclusively were founded. It is not certain how long they survived or remained Irish: perhaps a matter of a generation, in some cases perhaps for a period running into centuries. Nor is it clear what rule they followed: no doubt the Rule of Columbanus to begin with, then either the Benedictine rule or some mixture of the two. But the stream of monks leaving Ireland for their peregrinatio, or voluntary exile, pro Dei amore, although it may have slackened at times, never dried up. By the middle of the eleventh century the chief scene of their activities was what we now call Germany, and here, at Ratisbon on the Danube, was founded the Irish monastery of Weih-Sankt-Peter in 1075-76.  

1 For Irish monks on the Continent in general, see F. Ó Brien, "The expansion of Irish Christianity to 1200: An historiographical survey", in Irish Historical Studies, iii, 241-66, and iv, 131-65; L. Gougaud, Christianity in Celtic Lands, chap. 5: The Irish abroad; J.P. Kenney, Sources for the early history of Ireland, 187-89, 224-25 and chap. 6: The expansion of Irish Christianity; J.P. Fuhrmann, Irish mediaeval monasteries on the Continent.

2 For this foundation and the monasteries which stemmed from it, see also Kenney, op. cit. nos. 443-45; Renz; Vita Mar; W. Wattenbach (ed. Reeves), "The Irish monasteries in Germany", in Ulster Journal of Archaeology, vii, 227-47, 295 ff; A. Gwynn, "Some notes on the history of Irish and Scottish Benedictine monasteries in Germany", in IR, v, 5-27; idem., "The continuity of the Irish tradition at Würzburg", in WDGB, xiv/xv, 57-81; D.A. Binchy, "The Irish Benedictine congregation in mediaeval Germany", in Studies, xviii, 195-210.
Its founder was an Irishman from Donegal named Muiredach MacRobartaig, usually known as Marianus Scotus, who is to be distinguished from the better-known contemporary Marianus Scotus celebrated for his *Chronicle*. After the death of the Ratisbon Marianus in or shortly after 1080, the monastery he had founded flourished to such an extent that a larger monastery, St. James's, was built in Ratisbon about 1110. There were certain peculiarities about the original foundation of Weih-Sankt-Peter: it was subject in some way to the German abbess who had donated the property, nor is it clear that the rule followed there was Benedictine. The new foundation, however, was very different. It was an abbey, it certainly followed the Rule of St Benedict, and it was an independent community. More than that, it received in the first years of its existence the privileges of exemption from the bishop's jurisdiction and from all temporal overlords save the emperor himself.

A most remarkable period of expansion followed, in which no fewer than seven foundations were made in German lands alone in the space of fifty years from about 1135: St James in Erfurt, St James in Würzburg, St Giles in Nuremberg, St James in Constance, Our Lady in Vienna, St Nicholas in Memmingen, Holy Cross in Eichstätt. Irish monks from Vienna established themselves in Kiev, and probably the houses in Ireland which are recorded later as connected with the Ratisbon group of monasteries were likewise founded during this period of expansion. In Ratisbon itself Weih-Sankt-Peter continued in being but was a mere priory dependent on the new abbey of St James's. Bulls of favour and privilege from the holy see, letters of protection from the emperors, and benefactions from lesser personages continued to be bestowed, showing the favour in which the Ratisbon abbey

4 The evidence for Marianus's known dates is given in Dilworth, "Marianus", 126, 138.
was held. In fact, St James's in Ratisbon deserves to rank as one of the important founder abbeys of the middle ages.

All the houses grouped round Ratisbon observed the Benedictine rule, which by this time, thanks to its qualities of orderliness and moderation, had supplanted its rivals. This Irish Benedictine vitality also absorbed or channelled into itself all the zeal for peregrination of the Scoti. Henceforth these were the only Irish monasteries in Europe. They were, however, an end as much as a beginning. They represented the last burst of vitality, before it petered out, of the Irish missionary movement which had begun several centuries previously and had been one of the most potent factors in the evangelisation of Europe. It was not mere chance which determined Ratisbon as the centre of this monastic activity. The first missionaries in the region were Scoti, and Ratisbon was a centre of Irish activity in the early missionary period. It was a town with a continuous Irish tradition.

Würzburg also had a continuous Irish tradition perhaps even more striking. The apostle of Eastern Franconia was St Kilian, an Irishman who was martyred there with his two companions about 689. In 752 his relics were translated by the first bishop of the see to the cathedral, which was dedicated in his honour. Würzburg became a place of pilgrimage for the Scoti, as well as being a centre of their literary activity. The famous eighth-century codex of St Paul's epistles, with its glosses in Old Irish, belongs there, besides a number of lesser manuscripts. A well-known scholar, Clemens Scotus, worked at Würzburg in the early ninth century. Marianus Scotus the Chronicler went there to be ordained priest

---

5 The works listed in note 1 consider it in this light.
6 See also J. Emmig, "Irish monastic activities in Eastern Europe", in IER, lxxv, 394-400.
7 Besides the works of Gwynn and Kenney already cited, see A. Gwynn, "Ireland and Würzburg in the middle ages", in IER, lxxviii, 401-11.
at the tomb of St Kilian, and there is reason to believe that Marianus of Ratisbon likewise visited his tomb. In 1085 an Irish bishop, who was apparently head of a small community of monks, died at Würzburg. David Scotus was master of the cathedral school in the early twelfth century and was said to be still living there in 1137. It is also possible that when the Benedictine abbey was founded in Würzburg it was intended to serve as a hostel for Irish pilgrims to the tomb of St Kilian.

The founders and benefactors of St James's in Würzburg regarded the Benedictine monks as continuing the Scotic tradition and stated that it was out of devotion to their own patron Kilian that they made over their gifts to his compatriots. The position of the Irish monks in Würzburg, and of their Scottish successors after the Reformation, cannot be understood except against the background of this tradition going back to the eighth century and the apostle of Franconia, St Kilian.

Würzburg, therefore, was a natural place for founding a daughter-house of Ratisbon, but it should be realised that the town had Irish connections, and within living memory also an Irish monastic community, independently of Ratisbon. The accounts of the founding of St James's in Würzburg vary according to whether they emanate from Ratisbon or not. In Ratisbon, towards the end of the twelfth century, was composed the *Vita Marianii*, which was more than a life of their founder as it contained an account of the foundation of their daughter-houses. According to this the bishop of Würzburg, Embricho, made grants of land on the outskirts of the town to the Ratisbon monks, whose fame had spread to Franconia. Christian, abbot of Ratisbon c. 1133-51, sent a group of monks with Macarius, a well-known scholar, as abbot. The holiness and austerity of Macarius are described;
in particular it was his habit never to drink wine. Once, when visiting Bishop Embricho and being pressed by him to take a glass of wine, he changed it into water and so drank it, to the great edification of his host, who made a solemn public pronouncement on the miracle. The death of Macarius was later heralded by a tower of fire rising from the gate of the monastery into the sky. 8

A later account is found in the Libellus de Fundatione Ecclesiae Consecrati Petri (the usual Latin for Weih-Sankt-Peter), a late thirteenth-century compilation made at Ratisbon which contains much apocryphal material but is based in part on some genuine earlier Irish source. This too makes Macarius out to be a Ratisbon monk, although the account is a product of the Celtic imagination at its most vivid and can be disregarded. The only help it gives is in associating Macarius with both Embricho and the emperor Conrad, which posits a date of between 1136 and 1146. 9

One of the abbots of the Würzburg monastery in the early sixteenth century, shortly after it had been taken over by German monks, was the celebrated scholar Trithemius. In one of his historical works Trithemius gives the date 1139-40 for the founding of the monastery, 10 but in another version of the same work he has 1134. 11 It is, however, in his Compendium of the history of St James's in Würzburg that Trithemius deals explicitly with the foundation. He gives an account very different from that of the Vita Mariani. Instead of Macarius being sent from Ratisbon, he came, already a Benedictine, from Ireland to Franconia with two companions and was blessed as abbot by Embricho in 1139. Trithemius also gives the text of

8 Vita Mar. 370.
9 Libellus, f. 71v ff.
10 Annales Hirsauinienses (1601). No page reference is needed as it is a year-by-year chronicle.
11 Annales Hirsauinienses (1690).
a deed of Embricho in 1140 in which the bishop relates how he went to Mainz and was accosted by a Scotic monk named Christian, who begged him publicly to establish a house for *peregrini Scoti* in Würzburg. This was done, and the first abbot, Macarius, changed water into wine in the presence of witnesses, as a result of which a prebend in the cathedral was made over to the monks as an endowment. All this is in the deed. Trithemius then narrates three other miracles, one of which was worked in the presence of Pope Eugene III (1145-53) in Rome. Then, in 1153, Macarius died.

Apart from the names of Macarius and Embricho and the miracle of the wine and water, this account differs completely from the Ratisbon one. Trithemius can be suspected of bias in his silence regarding the Ratisbon abbey, for at the time of writing German monks had been occupying the Würzburg monastery for only a dozen years and he would not want to draw attention to its apparently unjust severance from the Ratisbon group of houses. He was also writing almost four centuries after the event, while the Ratisbon account dates from 1184-85, and he does not reveal his source for the other miracles of Macarius. On the other hand, he quotes documents which are still extant and gives names and dates for Macarius's successors which can be checked in them, while the chronology of the Ratisbon account is quite unsound.

Therefore, leaving aside his silence as regards Ratisbon, Trithemius's is by far the more reliable narrative. The foundation deed of 1140 is a forgery perpetrated in the years 1170-80 but the next document he cites, concerning a grant of land by Embricho in 1142, is genuine. The name of Macarius, however, is not mentioned in it. We are thus left with two

---

12 In Mun. HSA, KU Würzburg, 6470 ff. Many are transcribed in *Copialbuch* and calendared in Wieland, 135 ff.

or three indisputable facts. The Scotic monks were in Würzburg in 1142.
Within less than fifty years there were accounts of the first abbot, Macarius, and the miracle of wine and water, emanating from both Ratisbon and Würzburg but differing in other respects. By 1184-85, when the Vita Marianar was compiled at Ratisbon, the Würzburg monastery was linked to Ratisbon (whether or not it had been before), otherwise it could not have been claimed as a daughter-house.

It might be as well at this point to comment on the word Scotus. No scholar nowadays disputes that Scotus in the early middle ages signified an Irishman; its most accurate translation would be Gael or Gaelic-speaker. The term was thus also used to denote the Gaels who had left Ireland to settle in Dalriada (what is now Argyll). Scotus signified a native of the Gaelic-speaking area of Ireland and North Britain, and Scotia denoted the area itself. Primarily the latter term would refer to Ireland and secondarily to the colony or extension of the fatherland - call it what one will - in North Britain. After the Norman Conquest, however, a change in meaning took place: men began to distinguish between Scotia (North Britain) and Hibernia (Ireland). The Dalriadic settlement from Ireland gave its name to the country north of Forth and Clyde and eventually to the whole of present-day Scotland.

In Ireland the tradition remained that they were the original Scoti even though by the end of the twelfth century the term was no longer applied to anyone but a Scot from North Britain. On the continent, however, the Irish monks of Ratisbon and its daughter-houses continued to use the old name; they called themselves, and were called, Scoti in their legal documents throughout the middle ages. To this day their monasteries

14 See Gwynn, IR loc. cit. 12-13; WDGB loc. cit. 70-71.
are known as the Schottenklöster. There was naturally a certain degree of confusion. As early as the twelfth century, for instance in the Vita Mariani, these monks who continued to call themselves Scoti used the name Hibernia to designate their homeland.

The remarkable expansion of the Irish monasteries centred on Ratisbon was followed by a process of consolidation which may have begun from within but was certainly reinforced from without. In 1185 the pope decreed that the abbots were to visit Ratisbon annually and there receive instructions concerning regular observance. Thirty years later, in 1215, the Lateran Council issued a decree from which the present-day organisation of Benedictine monasteries into groups (called congregations) originates.

It ordered that the black monks of each kingdom or province should unite and should hold general chapters every three years to legislate for all their houses. The Scotic abbeys, however, were provided for separately by a special bull of Innocent III: instead of belonging to the local congregation, they were formed into a congregation according to nationality, irrespective of locality. Each abbot was to be under the direction and authority of the Ratisbon abbot, who as abbot general had considerable powers of jurisdiction and discipline, and all were to attend a general chapter at Ratisbon every three years. It is worth noting that Benedictines were never strong in Ireland itself, and this congregation based on Ratisbon was by far the most important body of Irish Benedictines there has ever been. After the founding of a priory at Kelheim on the Danube not far from Ratisbon in 1232, there were ten monasteries in German lands and at least two dependent priories in Ireland.

This Irish congregation remained in reasonably good condition for
almost two hundred years. The Ratisbon abbot maintained his position as abbas matricularius, visitator et corrector of the other houses. His abbey was exempt from all spiritual and temporal rulers except the pope and emperor; the other houses were, in theory and to a large extent in practice, subject to the Ratisbon abbot. There is evidence of a general decline in the fourteenth century but it was not until after 1400 that the congregation began to break up. There is no doubt that the recruits coming from Ireland were fewer in number and poorer in quality. Probably by this time the smaller Irish houses in Germany had hardly any community or none at all. The houses at Memmingen, Eichstätt and Kelheim ceased to be monasteries, while the abbeys at Nuremberg and Vienna were handed over to German monks in 1418.

The general chapter held at Ratisbon in 1479 established the situation within the congregation for the following decades: it enacted that all elections of superiors were to be held at Ratisbon and that no German could be made a superior unless all the Irish abbots consented to it and no Irishman was available for appointment. Clearly the monasteries with no community were meant. By now only the Ratisbon abbey had a community, from which superiors of the various houses were chosen.

The congregation suffered a further blow when in 1497 the Würzburg abbot died leaving no monk behind him and the bishop brought in German monks instead. At the dawn of the sixteenth century the once flourishing congregation of Irish monasteries had dwindled to the three abbeys of Ratisbon, Erfurt and Constance and the priory of Weih-Sankt-Peter in Ratisbon. Only the first-named had a community, and a very small one at

---

15 See also U. Berlière, "Les chapitres généraux de l'Ordre de St. Benoît, Vi: Écossais d'Allemagne", in Revue Bénédictine, xix, 68-75. The important documents are transcribed in Baillie and Copialbuch or calendared in Renz.
that, from which was chosen a man to live as titular superior without any subjects in each of the other three houses. Probably the unsatisfactory state of the temporalities was as much to blame for this situation as was lack of recruits.

During the previous three centuries the Würzburg abbey had been at times the most flourishing of all the communities. It had received a bull from Celestine III in 1195 confirming it in all its privileges and property, and it received other favours and privileges, but not such as would infringe the rights of the Ratisbon abbot-general. Würzburg was one of the more important Irish monasteries, possibly because it was beside the resting-place of St Kilian and the one nearest to the English Channel. The fifteenth century, however, brought trouble for the Würzburg monastery as it did for most of the others. The buildings were largely devastated in the feud between townspeople and bishop in the years 1397-1400 since they lay so near the bishop's fortress-residence. Conditions in the episcopal city continued to be unsatisfactory, with the result that the monastery's observance and economy both declined, although there is evidence at times of a quite large community and of repairs made to the buildings. From about 1460 on, however, the abbot lived practically alone in the monastery.

The priory of Rosscarbery in County Cork seems to have been founded from Würzburg and was thus directly dependent on it. In 1354 the prior and monks of Rosscarbery swore obedience to the abbot of Würzburg and in 1378 they thanked him for visiting their house in person when he could have sent a delegate instead. We again find the prior of Rosscarbery ask-

16 For Würzburg in particular, see the works by Gwynn already cited; Wieland, 12-14, 119-24, 145-78; Copialbuch.
17 Oegg, 358-60.
ing the Würzburg abbot for a visitation in 1454. In the fifteenth century the abbot of Würzburg had also the right of presentation to the Irish monasteries in Memmingen and Constance but, probably in the case of Memmingen and possibly also of the other, this was due to the decline in their fortunes. The general chapter of 1479 already mentioned declared that the Würzburg abbot had the right of presentation to the abbeys of Constance and Memmingen and the priory of Roscarbery but with certain restrictions. A letter of the abbot of Ratisbon a month later makes the position clearer: Constance and Memmingen are dependent on Würzburg, and the Würzburg abbot can make visitations, appoint administrators and so on, but this is without prejudice to the rights of the abbot general as superior over Constance and Memmingen. There was evidently, at least at this period, some sort of hierarchical order in the congregation, and Würzburg stood high in it.

Undoubtedly there had been times when the abbot of Würzburg was an important churchman. He was nevertheless subject in matters of discipline to the Ratisbon abbot and was obliged to attend general chapters there. The houses distant from Ratisbon naturally fell to some degree under the domination of the local bishops. This was perhaps nowhere more so than in Würzburg, where the bishop was also the temporal ruler, being Duke of Eastern Franconia and thus one of the princes of the Empire. Not only that, but the prince-bishop resided in the Marienberg fortress a few hundred yards away from the abbey. From 1268 on, it was he and not the Ratisbon abbot who carried out visitations there, while the oath taken by Würzburg abbots after election entailed comprehensive submission to him. It was the bishop who was largely responsible for introducing German monks

18 For Memmingen, see F.L. Baumann, Geschichte des Allgäus, II, 420-23.
into the abbey in 1497.

Throughout the centuries from their foundation all these monasteries had Irish communities. It is so strange a situation that one might be inclined to doubt it, but the evidence for it is continuous and overwhelming. In spite of being on German soil they did not accept German recruits, and in spite of their continued use of the name Scoti all their links were with Ireland. It became more and more common to add some phrase like vel Hiberni as a sort of gloss to Scoti in documents, and occasionally one finds Hiberni or a similar word used alone, but right to the end they retained and used the title of Scoti. It is perhaps too much to say that no German was ever a monk in one of these houses, just as it is too much to say that nobody from Scotland ever was. As long as there was linguistic unity between Ireland and the Scottish Highlands - and such unity persisted into the seventeenth century at least - a novice from anywhere in Gaelic-speaking territory would surely be acceptable. Examples are known of Scoti from North Britain going to the Continent before the Ratisbon houses were founded; others from Scotland could equally well have entered those houses later. But although possible it is unlikely, since Rosscarbery, the recruiting centre, was right at the south of Ireland. 19

The retention of the title of Scoti by the Irish monks was to have fateful consequences. The abbot in Ratisbon was involved in a dispute with the bishop in 1514; both parties appealed to the pope, and the outcome was a bull the following year deposing the Irish abbot on the ground that he was not a Scot and appointing as abbot in his place a Scottish secular priest named John Thomson. 20 The affair becomes less surprising when

19 Dilworth, "Marianus", 131-33.

20 For the dispute and the early Scottish period, see K.T. Gemeiner, Regensburger Chronik, IV, 1514-20; Dilworth, "The Schottenklöster at the Reformation", in McRoberts, Essays, 241-44; idem, "The first Scottish monks in Ratisbon", in IR, xvi, 180-98; Necrologies, 178-82; Hammermayer, Reformation, 149 ff.
it is realised that Scots traders were numerous in the town and district. They had been receiving citizenship of Ratisbon since 1493, which meant they had influence and an assured position. In 1500 they had entered into an agreement with the Irish abbot for the erection of a confraternity of Scots with an altar dedicated to St Andrew; fourteen Scots, of whom four were secular priests and one of these a graduate, signed or were mentioned in the deed. One must surely credit the Scots resident in Ratisbon with some influence in the affair, especially since a version of history claiming these monasteries as founded for Scots was circulating in manuscript and was soon to appear in print. Undoubtedly the Ratisbon Scots were in good faith, for the very name of the monasteries proclaimed their supposedly Scottish origin.

The significance of the situation in the Irish congregation can now be appreciated. The canonical position of the abbot of Ratisbon as abbot general gave the new Scottish abbot control de jure over the whole congregation; the lack of any community in the other houses meant that there was no opposition to his assuming this control de facto. Indeed the only opposition came from interested parties in Ratisbon who had hoped to gain possession of the abbey themselves. It was not until 1520 that Thomson was in undisputed possession, by which time he had appointed Scots to be superiors of the other three houses in the same way as the Irish chapter used to do. Everything continued as before except that the nationality of the monks was different, the Germans being apparently quite indifferent as to which particular island in the Atlantic was the homeland of the Scotic monks.

For a number of years the Scottish community at Ratisbon flourished,
but the new congregation thereafter fell on evil days. Two of the four houses were destroyed by war, leaving only the abbeys of Ratisbon and Erfurt. The former of these was in great measure destroyed by fire, the latter was without any Scots monk for many years. When the reformed religion was approved in Scotland by act of parliament in 1560, the Scottish Benedictine Congregation was all but extinct and various interested parties endeavoured to obtain possession of the Ratisbon abbey. A new dawn was about to break, however. A Scot was appointed abbot by Rome, and once again the traditional position of the Ratisbon abbot was to be of vital importance, for he saw himself as the rightful superior general of all the monasteries which had belonged in former times to the Scoti. No matter who had them now, they belonged by right to the Scots and if justice were done would be restored to them. One such monastery was the abbey of St James in Würzburg.

The history of the Würzburg abbey in the meantime had hardly been brilliant. We are fortunate in having an almost contemporary account by Abbot Trithemius of the transfer to German monks which, after allowing for his bias in regarding the transfer as justified, we can easily accept as accurate. In this the transfer is not depicted as a removal of the monastery from the Irish but as an introduction of German monks to initiate reform. Suitable Scoti were also to be admitted if any were found. The bishop, Laurence von Bibra, brought in three monks of the abbey of St Stephen in Würzburg, which belonged to the Bursfeld observance. No new abbot was appointed, and they were subject to the abbot of St Stephen's. The revenues, adds Trithemius, barely sufficed to support two monks, the buildings were ruinous, and necessary furniture was lacking. Bishop

21 Compendium.
Laurence was very generous to the monastery, renovating the church and making donations of necessary gear.

In spite of protests from Ratisbon the German monks remained. They had only a prior there until 1504, when a monk of St Stephen's became their abbot. He attended the general chapter of his congregation as abbot of St James's in 1506 but resigned the same year and returned to his own monastery. Trithemius, who had already been abbot of another monastery for twenty-three years and was an influential man, was brought in to succeed him and ruled until his death in 1516, conferring real distinction of St James's, as he was the paragon of his age and country. Indeed, so remarkable were his attainments that he is said to have been the prototype of Dr. Faustus. In 1513, towards the end of Trithemius's rule, the monastery was joined to the Bursfeld Union, which meant that it bound itself to accept the discipline of this German reforming congregation's general chapters and visitations. Bishop Laurence confirmed this the following year in a document which shows that the move was made with his consent if not at his instigation. 22

Trithemius's successor 23 had four monks from St Stephen's but only three attended Bishop Laurence's funeral in 1519. In the Peasants' War of 1524-25 the monastery was plundered and burned. It is probably after this that the monks of St Stephen's found the effort to keep up the Scotic monastery as well as their own too much for them. When the abbot died in 1535 a temporary superior came for a year, then there was an abbot who ruled until 1542. His successor, who belonged to the abbey of Michelsberg in Bamberg, died five years later in May 1547, leaving no monk in the

22 Wz. SA, Urk. 124b/125; printed in Gropp, I, 168-69.
23 For the German period at Würzburg, see Wz. SA, Admin. 477/10499, f. lrv; AU, xviii, 173, 193-98; Chronicon; Wieland, 15-16, 124-27, 179-81; addition to Compendium (Ludewig, 1004).
monastery. One was sent from St Stephen's but remained only some months. This was the end of St James's as a German monastery.

In 1548 George Flach, the suffragan bishop and incidentally a Benedictine, was made administrator, not in the sense of being a temporary religious superior, for there were no monks, but to look after the property and derive an income from it for his own use. Part of the revenues were also applied to other purposes. Flach died at the end of 1564 and was succeeded by the deposed abbot of the neighbouring abbey of Schwarzach. Finally, in 1566, the new suffragan bishop, Anton Reß, was given the monastery to provide him with a residence and an income.

This was the state of affairs when a new and capable Scots abbot was appointed to Ratisbon. It is really no surprise if one considers the upheaval undergone by Germany during this time. It has been calculated that in the Reformation period monastic life came to an end in no fewer than 416 Benedictine houses in Germany, 130 of them being monasteries of black monks. Würzburg diocese like others had suffered from the religious strife, but in 1573 was appointed the great reforming bishop, Julius Echter, who set out to revitalise the religious life of his territory. With him ruling the diocese, the restoration of the Scotic monastery was a feasible project.

Chapter 2
ATTEMPTS TO REGAIN THE LOST ABBEYS, 1576-83

Lesley and Winzet in Rome - state of two Scots abbeys - Lesley's efforts for recovery - Winzet appointed to Ratisbon - efforts to recover other houses, 1578 - Echter's favourable attitude - Winzet's success in Ratisbon - his efforts to gain other monasteries, 1581 - Echter again sympathetic - Erfurt abbey regained - Winzet's efforts, 1583 - obstacles in Würzburg - hopes of success there - failure in Vienna.

The train of events which led to the occupation of St James' in Würzburg by Scottish monks can be said to have begun in 1575 when John Lesley and Ninian Winzet went to Rome together. Lesley had held various important offices in Scotland under Queen Mary, finally becoming Bishop of Ross; he followed Mary into exile in England and acted as her ambassador to both Elizabeth and the regent Moray. In 1571 he became involved in the Ridolfi plot, was imprisoned in the Tower of London and under threat of torture betrayed his associates. His credit destroyed, Lesley was released in January 1574 and went to France, where he renewed acquaintance with Winzet and tried to serve Mary's interests in such a way as not to harm Elizabeth's. Although he never succeeded in winning back entirely his former credit with Mary and his fellow Scots, she appointed him her ambassador to the papal court of Gregory XIII. In autumn 1575 he set off for Rome, and in his retinue was Ninian Winzet.

Winzet, possibly the most outspoken and most successful of the apologists for the old faith in Scotland, was a learned man, a secular priest

1 For the careers of Lesley and Winzet and the events in Ratisbon and Erfurt up to the departure of Lesley for France in the winter of 1578-79, see Hammermayer, Reformation, 176-221. Other references are intended to be supplementary to this work.
and the schoolmaster in Linlithgow. Obliged to flee from Scotland in 1562 because of his controversial writings, he proceeded to enjoy a distinguished academic career at the Sorbonne, where he was the president of the German nation. Most of 1571 he spent in England, serving Queen Mary in some confidential capacity, and during this time he revisited Scotland. He returned to Paris, then in 1575 took a degree in theology at Douai in Flanders, a town which was already becoming known as a counter-reformation centre for English-speaking exiles. Later that same year he went with Lesley to Rome.

The pope, Gregory XIII, was eager to launch a counter-reformation offensive against Scotland and England by all and any methods, political, military, missionary. Here Lesley and Winzet were neighbours of the English Catholic exiles who planned to found a second seminary in Rome after the model of the one which was already so successful at Douai. In 1576 Scottish Catholics were making efforts to found a similar establishment; this was the seminary founded at Paris a few years later, which eventually moved to Douai and remained in existence until the late eighteenth century.

In the same year, 1576, Lesley and his friends in Rome had their attention drawn to the Scottish abbeys in Ratisbon and Erfurt, both of which were in critical circumstances. The Erfurt abbey had had no Scots abbot for fifteen years and was being administered by an official of the diocese, while the Ratisbon establishment had been the subject of very unflattering reports from the legate Ninguarda and the Scots Jesuit, John Hay, in 1574-75. They criticised both the canonical position of the abbot, Thomas Anderson, and his personal life. In the spring of 1576 Anderson died,
leaving only one professed monk and one novice in the house, most probably his own nephew and son respectively. The town senate undertook the administration of the abbey, but the Scottish citizens and traders in Patisbon appealed to Rome to entrust the administration to them and appoint a Scottish abbot in order to ensure that the abbey stayed in Scottish hands. Nor were their fears groundless, for various interested parties wished to possess it; the most formidable of these was the Jesuits, who planned to set up in Patisbon one of the colleges which they were establishing all over Europe.

A memorial was drawn up by Lesley, apparently before the news of the latter developments reached him, in which he petitioned the pope to have the Scotic monasteries in Germany restored to his nation. The information which Lesley provided is a curious mixture of reasonably accurate information and very inaccurate hearsay, but it is worth giving at length as it reveals something of his plans and motives. The memorial lists the monasteries that belong by right to the Scots: they are Vienna, whose last administrator was a Scot (where Lesley got this from, it is hard to imagine); Würzburg, now under the charge of the suffragan bishop; Erfurt; two in Cologne; St Gallen; Fischingen, near St Gallen; and finally Ratisbon, where the superior is a Scot even if nobody knows whether he was legitimately appointed. We know that the two monasteries in Cologne had not been Irish since the eleventh century; St Gallen had had few or no Irish connections since its famous founder almost a thousand years before, while Fischingen in the canton of Thurgau was never at any time a Scotic monastery. On the other hand, the details about Würzburg and Ratisbon are accurate.
Lesley wanted to have the monasteries to provide livings for Scotsmen in exile for their religion, educate young Catholic Scots and help restore the Catholic religion in Scotland. He had discussed the matter with Cardinal Morone, who left Rome at the end of April 1576 to act as papal legate at the Diet which was due to open in Ratisbon in July, and had asked him to intercede with the emperor, the elector of Mainz and the duke of Bavaria to get the abbeys handed over to the Scots. If this proved difficult, at least part of their income should be allotted to Scottish students or a seminary for Scots, to educate young men who could then return to conduct their apostolate in their native land; when the present German occupiers died, the monasteries could then be given back to the Scots.2

The vicissitudes in Ratisbon need not be described. While the Diet continued its course and the various parties struggled to gain possession of the Scots abbey, Lesley was working in Rome for the appointment of Ninian Winzet as abbot. He produced another memorial for the German congregation of cardinals3 and at the end of 1576 formally petitioned the pope to appoint Ninian Winzet to the abbacy in Ratisbon. By a bull of 13th June 1577 Gregory XIII did so. Winzet received the Benedictine habit and abbatial blessing at the hands of Thomas Goldwell, the Marian bishop of St Asaph's resident in Rome, and set off for Ratisbon, where he arrived on 9th August. The unsuccessful claimant supported by the Scots citizens, one William Chalmers, likewise a secular priest, was appointed abbot of Erfurt soon after. He too had acted on behalf of Lesley and had investigated for him the state of the Erfurt abbey. The recovery of the two abbeys for his nation must be considered an outstanding diplomatic success.

2 VA, Arm. 64, Tom. 11, f. 484-85.
3 VA, Arm. 64, Tom. 28, f. 196.
of John Lesley.

Within less than a year Lesley and Winzet were making systematic efforts to obtain possession of other Schottenklöster. Lesley was the principal in the affair, and at this point events in Scotland itself influenced the activities of the exiles. On 12th March 1578 the resignation of Morton from the regency was proclaimed in Edinburgh, whereupon the pope decided to send Lesley to Scotland to make use of the opportunity. Lesley intended to travel through the German lands and work for the recovery of the Scotic abbeys before continuing on his way to France. Mary Stuart supplied him with letters for the emperor and the duke of Bavaria, asking for their help and commending in particular Ninian Winzet, whom she styled her confessor, while Gregory, having made Lesley his ambassador to James VI, gave him letters of recommendation addressed to various monarchs. It is apparent throughout the negotiations, now and later, that full use was made of the expressed desires of the unfortunate Mary, the position of Lesley as her ambassador, and the prestige of Winzet as her confidant.

In August, his History of Scotland completed, Lesley set off northwards. He visited the Archduke Ferdinand at Innsbruck on the way, and in Bavaria was kindly received by the duke, who likewise gave him letters of recommendation. By the end of September he was in Prague, where on his own admission the recovery of the abbeys was not his sole business with the emperor Rudolf II on Mary's behalf. Lesley's claims to the Schottenklöster were based on their title of 'Scottish'; no doubt he was entirely...

4 LB, f. 243.
5 LB, f. 233.
6 Printed in Hewison, I, cix, cxiii; CSP Scot. V, 289-90. The original sent to the duke is in LB, f. 231 and is quite different in structure from the draft printed.
7 LB, f. 240.
8 LB, f. 247.
convinced that they had belonged to his nation since their foundation, and few of the men with whom he negotiated were in a position to know he was mistaken. Rudolf accepted his arguments, promised Mary that he would help, and on 8th October issued a document calling on those concerned to see that the monasteries were returned to the Scots. The most desired abbey was that of Vienna, where German-speaking monks were still in possession. Lesley delegated the negotiations for this to a Scot, Thomas Guthrie, then set off westwards to Bavaria.

By 1st November Lesley was in Ratisbon, and he and Winzet set out for Eichstätt together. The difficulty they met with here was that Abbot Anderson in 1568 had agreed to accept an annual sum, since most of the income of the Scotch monastery had been allotted to the diocesan seminary founded two years previously. Lesley did not even succeed in obtaining free places for one or two Scottish students in the seminary but had to be content with a small sum payable annually to the Ratisbon abbot. In his negotiations at this time over the Nuremberg abbey, which had been German for a century from 1418 until the town became Lutheran, Lesley met with no success whatever. It was his declared intention to proceed from Eichstätt with all speed to transact the pope’s business in France, but he visited various German bishops on the way, notably the prince-bishops of Würzburg and Mainz. For the former he had commendatory letters from the pope and the duke of Bavaria, while Mary herself had written to the elector of Mainz.

9 Original in SCA Rat. C 7, 12a; printed in Hewison, I, cxii; II, xvii.
10 LB, f. 251.
11 LB, f. 279.
12 LB, f. 241r.
13 Printed in Hewison, I, cxvi; CSP Scot. V, 290.
The bishop of Würzburg, Julius Echter, was not unaware of the plans and activities of Lesley. The nuntio Delfino had apparently approached him on behalf of William Chalmers in 1577, and Echter had duly interceded for him. Now Lesley arrived to petition for the restoration of the abbey in his own town and for his help in regaining the two abbeys in Cologne. Echter received him kindly and showed himself favourable to the idea of restoring the Würzburg abbey. Lesley then proceeded on his way, leaving it to others to carry on the negotiations for the realisation of the project, as he had done in the case of the Vienna abbey several weeks previously. He did, however, write to Echter from Paris about the Cologne abbeys the following June.

A list of the Schottenklöster was drawn up by the Scottish monks of Ratisbon, at some time in 1578, for the benefit of Lesley. It included all the houses of the old Ratisbon congregation except Kelheim, and a few apocryphal ones in addition. The notes on Vienna and Würzburg are interesting: the Vienna abbot had only four or five monks, so the Scots wished to gain possession at least when he died, and the emperor Maximilian (who died in 1576) had promised restitution; the Würzburg monastery was in the possession of the suffragan bishop, but would not be difficult to acquire as the prince-bishop desired to have labourers for the Lord's vineyard. This was probably a fair summing-up of Julius Echter's apostolic outlook even if the writers were over-sanguine about the ease with which they could gain possession. The list mentioned William Chalmers as being in Erfurt, but in fact Chalmers was unable to endure conditions there and was obliged

14 Hamermayer, Reformation, 209, 241.
15 ibid. 219-20.
16 ibid. 245; NB, III, 2, p. 269.
by poverty and the hostility he encountered to leave the town towards the end of September 1578. Indeed Chalmers and Lesley probably arrived in Prague about the same time. It is possible, though hardly likely, that Winzet protested against Chalmers's appointment — certainly the later Scottish monastic historians thought he did — as Chalmers had not been elected from and by the Ratisbon community and had not acknowledged the rights of the Ratisbon abbot-general. Already in December 1576 a memorial to the pope had emphasised the Ratisbon abbot's superior position. Nevertheless Chalmers performed a useful function in going to Erfurt and showing that the traditional occupants of the Scottic abbey still claimed their property.

After the departure of Lesley from Germany, Winian Winzet was left with most of the responsibility for pursuing the negotiations. His own abbacy in Ratisbon was successful from the start. Within a short time he had won the confidence of the ruling duke of Bavaria and of his son who succeeded him, and had struck a firm friendship with Erasmus Vendius, the secretary of the dukes. Their help and patronage tided him over many of the initial difficulties, as his letters to them show. Ninguarda, the nuntio in South Germany and, for a time, administrator of the Ratisbon diocese, was his firm supporter and helped him to recover the alienated property of the monastery. The Jesuits were likewise his friends and allies. By March 1580, according to a visitation report of Ninguarda, there were six monks besides the abbot in St James's, and they had established some form of college for the instruction of Christian youth. The monastery was poor but the religious observance was good, adds the report.

In 1581 Winzet was once more actively engaged in the work of regaining

---

18 VL, MS Vat. Lat. 12159, f. 6r.
19 Printed in Hammermayer, Reformation, 245-46.
the lost abbeys. His own monastery was still the only one in the possession of the Scots. Nobody had succeeded Chalmers at Erfurt, while Lesley's delegate had been unsuccessful in Vienna and an imperial decree of April 1580 had decided against the Scots. In the autumn of 1581 Winzet set off on journeys which lasted two months and took him to the north and west to visit the prince-bishops of Würzburg and Mainz and the authorities in Nuremberg and Erfurt. Minguarda supplied a letter to take to Bishop Echter, reminding the latter of his kind reception of John Lesley three years before and saying that Winzet, as abbot of the Ratisbon mother-house, now had the duty of continuing the work begun by Lesley. Both Minguarda and Echter were zealous Catholic reformers, and accordingly the letter praised Winzet's achievements in restoring monastic life and sound studies in Ratisbon and begged Echter to help him to regain the Würzburg abbey. The most interesting thing in the letter is the mention of a plan of Winzet's which he will explain in person, a project which will please Echter, be useful to his diocese and have Minguarda's own active backing.

What this project was we do not know. Possibly it concerned putting the Würzburg abbey to some educational use. By 5th November Winzet was back in Ratisbon and writing to Vendius about the limited success of his mission. He had been impressed by Echter's learning and character and heartened by his favourable reception, for the bishop professed himself willing to restore the abbey to the Scots on the death of Anton Hess, the suffragan who was at present in possession, provided there was sufficient revenue to support a community. At Nuremberg, on the other hand, the case was hopeless. In Erfurt there seemed to be no obstacle although the monastery itself was desolate; the Ratisbon community had just elected their

20 The decree and Guthrie's rejoinder are printed in Hewison, II, xxi ff.
21 LB. f. 279.
22 LB. f. 277-78.
senior monk as abbot of Erfurt and he would shortly set out on his mission.

This was John Hamilton, a former monk of Paisley who had become Winzet’s prior in Ratisbon.\(^23\)

The traditional relationship between the Scottish abbeys in Ratisbon and Erfurt was now restored. A year later, in January 1583, the suffragan (or perhaps one should call him auxiliary bishop) of Würzburg died.\(^24\)

Echter thereupon transferred the financial administration of the abbey to his own exchequer.\(^25\) Winzet too went into action.\(^26\) Already by early April he had been in Würzburg and discovered that difficulties still lay ahead. The chief obstacle was the rival claim of the German Benedictine monks of the nearby abbey of St Stephen’s. Winzet discussed the matter with his rival fellow-abbot and was shown the state of St James’s by him. The German pointed out that the Scots had voluntarily abandoned their abbey almost a hundred years before, since when all its abbots had been German and most of them had been from St Stephen’s. Winzet returned home and in Easter week asked the duke of Bavaria for letters of recommendation to the emperor and Bishop Echter, to help him to regain the Vienna and Würzburg abbeys respectively. The reasons he gave were the supplication made by his queen and the plight of Scottish priests exiled in Europe; and he added that in Würzburg the suffragan bishop who had held the abbey for twenty years was now dead.

The duke did not provide the desired letters at once, and three months later Winzet sent Vendius an urgent reminder about them. Meanwhile, on 8th June, the abbot of the Vienna monastery had died and an Augustinian friar in Vienna had written to Winzet, evidently by arrangement, to tell

---

23 For him see Necrologies, 183, where the date of election needs correction. The capitular document testifying to his election is dated 12th January 1582 (Sch. Urk. 79)
24 *AU*, xviii, 194.
25 *Ser. Abb*; Gropp, II, 419.
26 For the events of 1383 the source, unless otherwise stated. is LB.
   f. 283-307.
him the news at once and saying that now was the moment to realise his plans. Ninian set off for Vienna, leaving his prior, John James Whyte, who will play a prominent part in this narrative later, in charge at Ratisbon. At the end of July Whyte wrote to Vendius that Winzet was desperately awaiting the necessary letter at Vienna, while he himself hoped to have the letter for Bishop Echter very soon and had instructed the messenger to wait for it. Evidently, too, the Scots had not given up all hope of success in Nuremberg, for Winzet had sent copies of documents issued in their favour by emperor and nuncio, to help the duke to draw up letters to Julius Echter and the town senate of Nuremberg.

The duke's secretary drew up the letter for Echter on 1st August and sent it to Prior Whyte the next day. It was no merely formal document; after mentioning the desire of pope, emperor and Scottish queen for the restitution of the abbey, and recalling the evangelisation of Germany by Scottish saints and the plight of their exiled successors, it speaks at length of Ninian Winzet's achievements in Ratisbon. At once Whyte had the letter taken to Würzburg, where the bishop showed it to the abbot of St Stephen's. On 7th August the abbot penned an energetic reply to Echter, which the latter despatched with his own reply to the duke's letter the following day. The messenger was delayed and did not deliver them to Whyte until 5th September. Immediately the prior sent them on to Vendius with an urgent request to be told their contents as soon as possible since he had received no reply to his own letter to Echter.

The two letters are long but most informative. The gist of the abbot's is that the Scots - it did not enter his head that the previous Scoti were not Winzet's countrymen - had of their own free will and through
their own fault lost St James's. It had been incorporated into St Stephen's, which had thereupon spent considerable sums of money to enable it to house a small German community. It was now a German monastery, and the abbot could not agree to any change in its status without the consent of the other abbots and communities in the province. Echter is therefore begged not to inflict injury on his own people by handing St James's over to foreigners, but rather to advise the Scots to drop their negotiations.

One can see the abbot's point, that his predecessors had spent money on St James's to repair the ravages of neglect by the Scotti, although in fact the German period of occupation had hardly been more inspiring than that of the Irish; and no doubt he was right in saying he could not agree to give up the house without consulting his fellow abbots. It is clear that St Stephen's had lost no time in establishing its claim to the Sotic abbey, even if the bishop were to control its revenues. We know too that the German monks had advanced their claim before Bishop Ress died, for there is still extant a list of the German abbots of St James's ending with Ress, who at the time of writing had it for life. It is evident that the German monks drew up the document, and they mentioned money spent on St James's by their own abbey.27

The bishop's letter likewise accepted that the Scotti in Würzburg were identical with the present Scots in Ratisbon, for he acknowledged the debt of gratitude owed to the Scots by Franconia. The return of the Scots would also help religion but the abbot of St Stephen's would be gravely disappointed. St James's had indeed, said Echter, been badly administered by the Scotti and therefore entrusted by the bishop of the time to St Stephen's so that at least the church services would continue. The

27 Wz. SA, Admin. 477/10499, f.1. A catalogue description of a document since destroyed (Wz. SA, Misc. 1146) mentions the interest of the Ratisbon Scots and the monks of St Stephen's in these years.
shrunken revenues had been insufficient even to keep the church in repair, and the income, which was scarcely 200 florins a year, would have to be used for rebuilding the church. Nevertheless Echter has a proposal, which he had put to Winzet in person. He does not want to keep the Scots out of Franconia, which owes so much to them, especially now when they are exiles; and yet, for several years to come, the income of the abbey will not support a community. Therefore he suggests that the Scots should occupy the Schottenklöster in Erfurt and perhaps some other places, where the finances offer more scope; they can then transfer part of the income for use in Würzburg. He would see to it that the abbot of St Stephen's was not opposed to the acceptance of some Scots in St James's.

Undeniably the qualities of Julius Echter show through in this letter. He acts speedily, he consults the abbot of St Stephen's, he gives definite information about the income and the impossibility of supporting a community with it. He makes a constructive proposal and undertakes to see that the German abbot is willing, and not merely coerced, to accept the Scots. The letter marks an important step forward in the negotiations of the Scots to occupy the Würzburg abbey, even though twelve years were to elapse before the plan became a reality.

It only remains to say that Winzet himself was unsuccessful in Vienna. He had composed his eleven reasons why the Scots should have the Vienna abbey, and he had received the desired letter from the duke, signed 23rd July, praising among other things his educational establishment in Ratisbon. But all was in vain. Then, in August or early September, when he was on the point of setting off homeward to Ratisbon, he fell seriously ill and was at death's door for some time. Indeed he was not fully recov-

28 Both documents are printed in Hewison, I, cxviii; II, xxiii. See also HübI, 16-19; CV, 86-92.
ered by the following May. As far as acquiring monastic premises for the Scots was concerned, Erfurt was Winzet's only success, and in this he merely consolidated the position already gained in principle by Bishop Lesley. Nevertheless, and more important, he also prepared the way for the recovery of the Würzburg abbey.

29 LH, f. 325, 331.
Chapter 3

SUCCESS IN WÜRZBURG, 1584-95

Changes at Ratisbon - Whyte, Irvine, Hamilton - traditional story of restoration at Würzburg - a later invention - papal brief to Echter - subsidy demanded from St Gallen - achievements of Echter - method of founding new monasteries - restoration ceremony, April 1595 - accounts of the restoration - conditions accepted by Scots - horarium laid down - property donated under conditions.

In the years following 1584 Minian Winzet was in his late sixties. There is no evidence that he continued his efforts for the recovery of any of the Schottenklöster. He had the task, despite continued ill-health and financial worries, of ruling his slowly growing community in Ratisbon and of keeping watch over the monastery in Erfurt. The college he had founded, which the Duke of Bavaria had said might develop into an important seminary and which at the end of 1583 had up to a hundred students, also occupied his energies, although in 1588 the Jesuits removed at least some of its scope when they founded their college in Ratisbon. In 1585 Abbot Hamilton of Erfurt died and in his place the Ratisbon chapter elected Richard Irvine. Then in July 1592 John James Whyte was elected coadjutor abbot of Ratisbon, with the right of succession to Winzet. The election documents speak of Winzet's serious state of health; he was seventy-three that year and in fact died two months later, in September. Clearly he wished to hand over the reins of government before he died, and his epitaph in the Abbey church speaks of him "legitimately and canonically" providing

1 LB, f. 366; Mun. GSA, K.s. 3292, 4.8.1590.
2 LB, f. 316; Mun. GSA, l.c. 11.7.1590; Hewison, II, xxiv.
3 LB, f. 375.
4 Reg. BOA, Fasz. 5.
a successor. Thus in the years after 1592 Whyte was abbot in Ratisbon, and Irvine abbot in Erfurt. These two men and a third, Francis Hamilton, were to play the leading part when the Scots finally gained possession of St James's in Würzburg. It is worth noting that all three were learned men.

John James Whyte was born at Ardlawhill, near New Aberdour in Buchan. In January 1574 he was admitted to the German College in Rome at the age of twenty-two, left in November 1576 and was already a monk at Ratisbon in 1578. Thus he must have known Winzet in Rome and he became one of the first members of Winzet's community. He was already prior in 1583, having no doubt succeeded John Hamilton in this office during the winter of 1581-2, and he held it throughout the remaining ten years of Winzet's abbacy. Evidently, too, he enjoyed a reputation for theological scholarship, for when it was decided to hold a public disputation between Catholic and Protestant champions in the episcopal residence in Ratisbon, the expatriate Scot, Whyte, was chosen to represent the Catholic side. The disputation took place in two sessions, in January and February 1588, and Whyte's Theses Theologicae were printed. In July 1592 the community elected him to be Winzet's coadjutor and successor; then, on Winzet's death two months later, he duly succeeded as abbot.

Richard Irvine was born at Stackheugh, on the Irvine burn near Langholm in Dumfriesshire, into the border clan of Irvine whose head resided at Bonshaw. The date was probably some time before 1560. He matricula-
tored at St Andrews in 1574, became bachelor two years later, and graduated as master in 1578. According to a later source, he had been in the employ of Lord Herries and attended on Herries's son at St Andrews. In February 1579 we find him in Paris receiving written leave from Archbishop James Beaton to receive the sacrament of confirmation and all holy orders from any bishop. He must have gone straight to Ratisbon, and in 1584 he was novice master there. In June the following year the community elected him abbot of Erfurt.

Francis Hamilton entered the Scots college at Pont à Mousson in Lorraine (later transferred to Douai) in 1587. The register describes him as being 'of Steanhouse' and belonging to Edinburgh. This must mean that he belonged to the well-known family of Hamiltons of Stanehouse in Lanarkshire, since the Stenhouse at Liberton near Edinburgh had no connection with the Hamiltons, and in fact he used the Stanehouse arms. His first appearance in a Ratisbon document is at Whyte's election in July 1592.

At this election five monks took part in addition to Vinzet and Whyte, while Irvine was at Erfurt. This does not indicate any notable increase in numbers, but probably all were priests and there may have been student monks and novices in addition. The most serious obstacle to an increase in the community was no doubt the limitations of the revenues. The same obstacle stood in their way at Würzburg, while the revenues at Erfurt were too small to allow any residue for Würzburg as Echter had suggested. In the years 1586-88 an account was drawn up of what the monks of St Stephen's in Würzburg had spent on the Scots abbey and had received in return.

---
9 Early Records of the University of St Andrews (SHS, 1926), 285, 175, 179.
10 Necrologies, 196. The biographical details in Ziegelbauer, IV, 190 must be rejected.
11 G. Good, Liberton, 131.
12 His seal on Wz. Sa, Urk. 50, 24.
13 Wz. SA, Admin. 477/10499, f. 3 ff.
One gets the impression from the documents that it was not so much a vindication of their rights to the abbey as a calculation of what they were due in the way of compensation, and this seems to be confirmed by the action of Bishop Echter's officials, who in 1587 began to copy the most important documents in St James's into a register, a proceeding which incidentally has proved of inestimable value to the later historian. During this time Bishop Rese's successor as suffragan was living in St James's and had been carrying out his ordinations there since December 1584, but when he died in 1590 no new suffragan was appointed.

One can surmise that this is why Winzet wrote two letters, in 1591 and the following year, about the restoration of the monastery to the Scots. Unfortunately no details of the letters have been preserved. Nothing more is known after this until 1594, when, according to the traditional version of the abbey's history, occurred a semi-miraculous happening which resulted in the return of the Schottenkloster to Würzburg. A Diet was held in Ratisbon, which Echter as prince-bishop of Würzburg attended. He lodged in St James's with the Scots monks, where naturally Abbot Whyte spoke to him about the Würzburg abbey. Then the bishop fell ill of so violent a fever that the doctors were unable to do anything and his life was in danger. In his extremity he vowed to God and St James to restore the Würzburg Schottenkloster to the Scots if he recovered. Recover he did and kept his vow. In early 1595 Whyte sent him some Scottish monks, who on St George's day were solemnly installed in St James's.

Such a story is naturally to be regarded with suspicion, even if one is hardly justified in rejecting it out of hand. A Diet was in fact called in 1593 to deal with the Turkish menace and lasted well into the summer.
of 1594. But if one accepts the story it must not be divorced from what preceded and what followed. The traditional version contains no hint of the negotiations of Lesley and Winzet, yet, as we have seen, Echter had proposed eleven years previously that Scots monks should be received in Würzburg if they could provide means of support for themselves. The chief effect of his visit to Ratisbon, granted that this was in fact the decisive factor, was to induce the bishop himself to make notable financial benefactions. Nor did the incident sweep Echter off his feet; on the contrary, he acted very much in character and with considerable deliberation.

There are, however, external grounds for considering the story to be a later invention. Trithemius's Compendium of the abbey's history was adapted and continued by the Scottish monks. The first version extant, written shortly after August 1679, does not contain the story of the illness but merely says that Echter restored St James's to the monks of the nation that had brought the faith to Franconia. A second adaptation of the chronicle, written in 1690, includes the story. It should be noted that the reason for the Diet, the Turkish menace, and even the name of the Turkish ruler, Murad II, are correctly given. Nevertheless it seems incredible that the chronicler of 1679 would have omitted the story if he knew it, so we can conclude tentatively that it came into being between 1679 and 1690, almost a hundred years later. It was certainly not current in 1631 when someone, presumably a Scots monk, drew up a summary list of abbots of St James's and remarked that Echter restored the monastery to the Scots in 1595 at the request of the pope and the Ratisbon abbot.

19 Chronicon.
20 Ser. Abb.
21 BRB, MS 7627-74, f. 327; printed in Scottish Notes and Queries, ii (1888-89), 20-21.
The first certain intimation of renewed efforts to restore the abbey does in fact concern the pope. It comes from a brief of Clement VIII to Julius Echter, dated 8th October 1594, which to all appearances is a reply to a communication from the bishop. Clement has heard of Echter's desire to restore the Scottish monastery and approves of the plan as it will contribute to the worship of God (no doubt a reference to the choir office) and help to preserve the Catholic faith in Scotland. However, since there is such a lack of Scottish priests and monks, he wants the revenues for the next eight or ten years to be used to support a seminary for young Scots of noble birth; they, on completion of their studies, will become monks and will also do missionary work in Scotland. In this way there will be no delay before St James's begins to do some good despite the obstacles. Like so many documents illustrating the history of the Scots in Würzburg, its significance is difficult to assess since it has survived in isolation and, as it were, out of context. All we know is that six months later monastic life began once more in St James's with three monks, which is hardly enough for any community life.

A curious episode about the same time is probably connected with the plans of the Scottish monks. The ancient abbey of St Gallen was, like St James's in Lisbon, a consistorial abbey, which meant that an abbatial election was confirmed by being announced by the pope in a consistory of cardinals. In the autumn of 1594 a new prince-abbot was elected, who was informed by Cardinal Paravicini from Rome on 12th November that the agents of the Scottish nation there had petitioned to have part of the abbey's revenues assigned to their college. The reason given, of course, was that St Gall, founder of the abbey, was a Scot. Paravicini said he had obtained

22 VA, Arm. 44, Tom. 39, f. 309.
the concession that it would be enough if two Scottish students were subsidised by the abbey at the Jesuit university of Dillingen in South Germany. The new abbot's agent in Rome warned him that Paravicini would delay his confirmation in consistory until he replied but that the pope would not expect him to give money except of his own free will. The nuncio, for his part, advised him to reply that he would see about it after his election was confirmed. The abbot, however, wrote angrily to his Roman agent refuting the Scottish claims and saying, among other things, that if he did start subsidising students they would be German secular priests, not Scots.23 The matter had not been settled by the end of the year, for on 4th January a laconic minute of the monastic chapter stated that the Scots in Rome wanted five hundred ducats yearly, then wanted two Scots to be supported at Dillingen, and the abbot had written to Rome.24

Had this anything to do with the refounding of the Würzburg monastery? One can do little more than guess. Batisbon and Scottish monks are nowhere mentioned, except when the abbot denies that if a Scot is professed in St Gallen he is to be chosen as abbot rather than the others.25 Evidently someone had been making such a claim. It was only eighteen years since John Lesley had presented his memorial at Rome claiming St Gallen for the Scots, but Paravicini's letter does not explicitly say that the Scots college to be subsidised was in Rome. The Scots College in Rome was founded by bull of December 1600, and the efforts to preserve its forerunner, the Scottish hospitium, are said to have begun with the arrival of Bishop William Chisholm in Rome in 1596.26 It is thus very doubtful whether the Roman college can be meant, especially when two subsidised places at

23 SG, Bd. 359, f. 43; 57-80.
24 SG, Bd. 303, f. 343.
25 SG, Bd. 359, f. 59.
26 IR, xii, 9-14, 143.
27 Although a later chronicler in St Gallen thought so (SG, Bd. 308, f. 37).
Dillingen, many hundreds of miles away, were reckoned a satisfactory substitute. Were those in Rome so eager to have two Scottish secular priests trained? There is no reason for thinking so. It would be much more plausible to suggest a connection with the Scottish plans for Würzburg. The cardinal's letter was written only a month after the papal brief spoke of the lack of Scottish priests available for the foundation, and Dillingen was within comparatively easy reach of Ratisbon. The time, the place and the implications of the Scottish version of Schottenklöster history all point to the Scottish monks in Germany, but in the absence of evidence we can only surmise.

Before describing the refounding of the Scottish abbey, it would be as well to consider the achievements of Julius Echter as prince-bishop of Würzburg. When he took charge of the see in 1575, half of it had become Protestant, while the half that had remained Catholic was characterised by laxity and ignorance. He took the spiritual interests of his territory as his primary aim in life, and set out to restore Catholicism and introduce necessary reforms. To this end he made alliances with Catholic princes, then inaugurated a programme of winning back those who had fallen away from the old faith and forcing those who preached Lutheranism or adhered stubbornly to its teachings to leave his territories. The Catholic organisation was built up by reforming the clergy and religious houses, publishing suitable books, and by repairing all the old buildings and constructing new ones. It was Echter who founded the University, which quickly gained an international reputation and is still flourishing, as well as the famous Hospital in the town. Churches, seminaries and religious houses owed their origin or reconstruction to him. At his own expense,
in his forty-four years of rule, he built or rebuilt over three hundred churches. 28

Thus, Echter in 1573 found a territory that was going over to Lutheranism or dissolving into religious chaos. He was at once the spiritual and the temporal ruler, being bishop of the diocese of Würzburg and duke of Eastern Franconia (the title of all the bishops), and four decades of energetic reform and strong action against objectors, with the temporal arm in perfect accord with the spiritual, transformed the situation. He has deservedly been known by such titles as the Great and the Solomon of Franconia. The refounding of St James's took place at the exact midpoint of his long rule and cannot be viewed in isolation from Echter's reforming activities. It is clear that he wanted to have another monastery which would provide fitting divine worship and sound theological study. The standard biography of Echter says indeed that the bishop's kindest care was for the Scottish abbey, but the force of the statement is greatly reduced by the author's devoting precisely eleven lines out of 667 pages to St James's and wrongly calling it St Andrew's abbey. 29

A word should also be said on the procedure for founding a new monastery. Benedictines differ from other religious orders in that their communities are usually more or less independent of each other. The novice when making his profession binds himself to a particular community; in fact Benedictines are not a religious order, technically speaking, but a confederation of communities. When a community undertakes the establishment of a new monastery, a certain number of monks are sent to inaugurate monastic life there. The traditional number is six or twelve; the traditional metaphor is that of a swarm of bees leaving the hive and establish-

29 G. Frhr. von Pülnitz, Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn (Munich, 1934), 344.
ing a second hive elsewhere. Novices are accepted for the new foundation, who include allegiance to it when they make their vows. After a time, when it is decided that the new foundation is viable, it is given its independence, and the founding members either return to the mother-house or transfer their vow of stability or allegiance to the new monastery. Until this granting of independence the mother-house and its foundation form a composite unit, with a fair amount of come and go between them.

This general description, considerably modified however by the traditions of the old Scotic congregation and by the position of Benedictines in the diocese of Würzburg, gives a picture of the Scots abbey in Würzburg in the two decades after 1595. It is, at least nowadays, not usual to elect an abbot in a new monastery until it is seen to be viable, yet one was given to Würzburg immediately, presumably because the Ratisbon Scots were used to electing abbots to houses, such as Erfurt, in which there was no monastic life at all. This also happened, incidentally, elsewhere in post-Reformation Germany where disputes over church property between Catholics and Protestants were common; a titular abbot with one or two monks would be put into a monastery to keep it from falling into Protestant hands. It is not usual to make or accept conditions such as the Scots (as we shall see) agreed to in 1595; they are to be explained by a determination that the sad state of the later Irish period should not recur, and by the unusual degree of control exercised by bishops of Würzburg over monasteries in their diocese.

On 30th April 1595, in the presence of the notable persons of Francodia and the cathedral canons, the monastery of St James was solemnly restored to the Scottish monks. The newly appointed prior, Francis Hamilton,

30 Volk, "Colchon", 378-79.
delivered an oration in Latin, \( ^{31} \) interlarded with long passages from authors and Greek quotations. His text, taken from the Vulgate 103rd Psalm, concerned the cedars of Lebanon in which the sparrows make their nests. The founders and restorers of St James's were the cedars, the Scots monks the poor sparrows driven from their own nests by heretics. In 1134 Bishop Embricho had sent to the Ratisbon abbot for Scottish monks, and now Bishop Julius had sent for the same to Abbot Whyte (who is present and listening, said Hamilton).

The first Scottish chronicle merely cites Hamilton's printed oration as testimony of the ceremonies on the last day of April, then states that Richard Irvine was appointed the first abbot. The later chronicle, \( ^{32} \) having recounted the story of Bishop Echter's illness, gives a much more elaborate account, according to which three Scottish monks went to Würzburg in 1595: Richard Irvine, Francis Hamilton and John Stuart. They were to wait for other Scots due to arrive very soon from Ratisbon; then, when there were enough monks to hold an election, they chose Irvine as abbot. The various drafts show hesitation over Stuart's surname but in fact these three were the foundation members. The rest, however, is almost certainly guess-work on the part of the compiler, who was unaware that Irvine was abbot of Erfurt and refers to him as a simple monk. We shall also see that the three Scots remained alone for at least a year. The election no doubt took place in Ratisbon, where the chapter had elected all abbots since 1479. For some unknown reason, too, the compiler of this chronicle changed the date of the ceremony from 30th April to St George's day, which is the 23rd.

Delivering an oration twenty years later, on one of the most solemn

---

\( ^{31} \) Later printed (copy in NIS); reprinted in Gropp, I, 516-24.

\( ^{32} \) Chronicon and Ser. Abb. respectively. See p. 345.
occasions in the whole history of the monastery, the suffragan bishop described the return of the Scots. The monastery, he said, was rebuilt from its ruins and elegantly equipped with cells, refectories and libraries; a new roof and twin towers were given to the church; then finally a new colony of monks was brought in; and all by the generosity of Julius Echter. This is probably the most accurate summary of the train of events. Having rebuilt the monastery and church of St James's, Echter offered it to the Ratisbon Scots who had been petitioning for its restitution. Perhaps he did so while attending the Diet at Ratisbon or as a result of his visit there, but the Scots came on his terms and not on theirs.

In a solemn deed drawn up on 2nd May 1595 John James Whyte, abbot of Ratisbon, and Richard Irvine, abbot of Würzburg, bound themselves to stringent conditions. They declared that through the troubles of the times and the negligence of former abbots, Scots had ceased to reside in the monastery; that the revenues were so diminished that few, if any, monks could be supported; that the church had been struck by lightning and partly burnt out, so that there had been no choir office for a long time and the building was all but deserted; that but for the care and benefactions of Julius Echter in rebuilding the church and augmenting the income, the monastery would be in hopeless case. Therefore with the advice and consent of the bishop, and after discussion of the matter in the monastic chapter, the two abbots decree as follows, in order to prevent any recurrence of the former sad state of affairs: Five Scottish monks as well as the abbot must reside in the monastery. If the full number is lacking, and not made up within six months, the bishop and his successors

33 Gropp, I, 687 (from which the NS account in Wz. SA, HV f. 178, fol. 520v is derived). For the occasion, see p. 312.

34 For full text see Appendix A.
will be free to make up the six by introducing German monks, and in an abbatial election the most suitable person shall be elected, be he German or Scots. In order to perform choir office fittingly and provide for the instruction of novices, all six monks will be priests or at least in major orders or ready for ordination within a year. All will be good and useful men, and one is to teach theology publicly in the university. The bishop will be free to carry out a visitation of the monastery each year, either personally or by delegate, with full powers of jurisdiction and correction, in the same way as he is wont to do in all the monasteries of his diocese.

The two abbots declare that they have asked the bishop and the dean and chapter to add their seals since everything has been enacted by their consent. The dean and chapter duly affix their seal for 'greater corroboration', as they term it. Julius accepts the Scots' promise, and confirms the 'aforesaid constitutions' as conforming to the statutes and customs of the diocese, and likewise appends his seal. This can be regarded as the foundation charter of the new community. The condition regarding number of monks to be made up regardless of nationality has echoes of the papal document of 1497 introducing German monks into St. James's, and it is noteworthy that Whyte styles himself merely abbot of Ratisbon and not abbot-general of all the Scottish monasteries in Germany. The new foundation was clearly made on Echter's terms.

A visitation of some kind was in fact carried out that first year, 1595, and a horarium laid down for choir duties and study. The brethren were to rise at 3 a.m. for Matins; this would be over by 4, and they were then to study until 5.30. Lauds, Prime and what the horarium terms

35 In Compendium.
36 Reid, f. 118v.
first Mass (no doubt to allow all to receive communion and to provide for the neighbouring townspeople) took them to 6.30. From then until 8.30 they were to attend lectures and so forth, and return to the monastery for the sung conventual Mass at 10. Dinner, the main meal of the day, followed. The next duty mentioned is Vespers at 2. From 3 p.m. to 4.30 there was a second period of lectures, then the Office of the Dead was said, and supper was at 5 o'clock. Compline was said, and all retired to rest. A final note adds that, on Sundays and feast days when the brethren did not attend lectures outside, the whole office was to be sung solemnly and Vespers were to be at 3 instead of 2.

These regulations show Echter's concern for two things, the public choir offices and clerical studies, for they legislate for nothing else. The monks would have their own customs or constitutions, as well as regulations made by the ruling abbot, for other monastic duties. There would be periods of private prayer and spiritual reading, while in a small community each member would have many things to see to. On the other hand, one can presume that dinner was about 11 a.m. and was followed by an hour or so of compulsory recreation. The horarium was drawn up to fit in with the public lectures at the university, just across the Main from the Scottish abbey. One can perhaps make some allowance for the fact that the people of Würzburg, at least nowadays, seem to rise earlier than the Scots. There is, however, no doubt that it was a severe enough regime by modern standards.

A small folio volume, beautifully neat and clean, has also survived from this time. It contains a list of the property handed over to the Scots and constituting the revenue of St James's, and the list is intro-
duced by a copy of a deed of gift by Julius Echter, dated 11th September 1595. It reminds posterity that the abbey and its property had been all but annihilated by bad administration and that the monastery has been restored so that divine worship may once more be carried out there. The sealed register of property and revenue has been handed over to the abbot and community, who in turn have bound themselves and their successors not to alienate, sell or mortgage any of the property but to look after it well, so that it may increase rather than diminish. Julius ends by wishing the Scots good fortune and blessing, and calls on his successors to be equally friendly.

This brings us to the end of 1595. The first Scots were in residence and everything, to use a modern phrase, had been carefully tied up. Little seems to have been left to chance by the three regulating documents: the conditions accepted by the two Scottish abbots, the horarium established by the bishop, and the detailed list of property with the promise not to alienate. Together they effectively dispose of the myth that Julius Echter, under the influence of his semi-miraculous recovery from a dangerous illness, simply threw open to the Scots the gates that had been closed to them for so long. On the contrary, there was much careful legislation, and Echter was to continue his benevolent despotism until the early vicissitudes of the foundation were over.

37 For full text see Appendix B.
Chapter 4

LINKED WITH RATHISBON, 1595-1614

Anderson's report on the abbeys - new recruits - Douai students become monks - Abbot Irvine resigns - Whyte as administrator - Hamilton's brief rule - Echter's settlement, 1605 - negotiations in Constance - Whyte's deficiencies as superior - coadjutor abbot in Ratisbon - Ogilvie elected abbot of Erfurt - Algeo's misrule in Ratisbon - relations between the two abbeys - communities interchangeable - Echter's ultimatum - Ogilvie elected abbot of Würtzburg.

Within a year of the Scots' arrival in Würtzburg we have light shed on them from a Scottish and quite unexpected source. In April 1596 a Presbyterian minister, Master David Anderson, compiled a report on the dangers threatening the Kirk from the plans of Scottish Catholic expatriates on the continent, and in it he gave a prominent place to the three abbeys in Germany.¹ His information about these, impressive in its accuracy, adds important details about the Scottish background of the monks, although it also has some puzzling features. The information about Ratisbon and Erfurt can be passed over briefly. Anderson gives correctly the names of abbot, prior and two monks in Ratisbon; another monk, Adam Simpson, is corroborated by a note in the Douai register, while a sixth man, James Bog, will be discussed later. For Erfurt Anderson correctly gives John Walker, Irvine's successor in the abbacy, as the only monk.

At Würtzburg the three monks are correctly named and expressly mentioned as being the only three in residence: a striking and confidence-inspir-

¹ Adv. 45.3.10 (Folio XLII, no. 34). Printed in T. McCrie, Life of Andrew Melville (1819), 524 ff. and in Hamermayer, Reformation, 246-53.
ing case of agreement with the monastic chronicle. The birthplace of the abbot is correctly given as near Dumfries, while Anderson's statement that he was a servant to the old Lord Herries and attended his son Edward at St Andrews is corroborated by the appearance together of the two names Richard Irvine and Edward Maxwell on the matriculation roll of St Salvator's. The report also correctly links Irvine with Archbishop Beaton, saying that the latter sent him to Ratisbon. It is equally accurate as regards Francis Hamilton, who is termed prior. Anderson reports that Hamilton had been at Pont à Mousson and called himself a Hamilton of Stanehouse but seemed rather to belong to the Hamiltons of St Andrews; the Douai register, as we have seen, likewise called him 'of Stanehouse' and also 'Edinburgensis'. The remarks about John Stuart, however, are puzzling, for he is called a boy of about eighteen, born near Glasgow. If this is correct he later received high office at an extraordinarily early age, and Anderson says nothing about his reputed noble birth.

The degree of trustworthiness of Anderson's report is important, because his is the first clear reference to relations of the monks with Scotland and to their counter-reformation plans. He says that the Scots abbots were seeking leave from Rome for some activity in Scotland, including the bringing of boys back to Germany, for which purpose a meeting was held in April 1596 with Bishop Echter. Echter and the bishops of Ratisbon and Salzburg, adds Anderson, had all promised to educate a number of these boys, who would do missionary work in Scotland or become monks and enable the Scots to recover other lost Schottenklöster. Whatever the truth of this part of Anderson's report, the ambitious project was never put into effect, though it probably does show in which direction the thoughts of the

2 See p. 34, n. 9.
Scots monks were turning.

In these early years Francis Hamilton attended Würzburg university. He matriculated in August 1596, then in that and the following year defended theological theses and was awarded his bachelor's degree. John Stuart also matriculated at Würzburg university in March 1598. That same year occurs the first mention of other monks besides the three founder members, namely John Bog and William Ogilvie. The latter was to be the greatest Scottish abbot of Würzburg.

The Douai register offers both corroboration and a measure of perplexing contradiction as regards the Scots monks. The list which has survived from this time is not a roll in which students entering the Scots college were inscribed on arrival. In 1598, when the college was more or less wound up through lack of funds, the rector, Fr William Crichton, compiled a list of students accepted in the earlier period at Pont à Mousson and later under his own rectorship in Flanders. The comments he added were intended to show the status of the students at the time of writing in July 1598. No fewer than five concern the Scots abbeys, two of whom offer no difficulty: Francis Hamilton, now prior at Würzburg; and Adam Simpson, mentioned in Master Anderson's report. The other three were Robert Hill, who had left Flanders only a year before; John Ogilvie, sent very recently to the Ratisbon abbey; and Alexander Bog, said to be either a soldier or a monk in Germany. The question arises whether the last two are to be identified, in spite of the difference in forename, with the Ogilvie and Bog at Würzburg. In the case of Ogilvie the evidence will have to be considered later as the matter is of some importance.

3 Merkle, 37.
4 For details see p. 330.
5 Merkle, 43.
6 Wieland, 105; Necr. Suppl. 174.
7 RSG, 2, 4, 5, 7.
In spite of receiving new recruits, however, the Scots community had not got off to a good start. On 7th July 1598, after three years and two months of rule, for the sake of solitude and monastic quiet (so the chronicle puts it) Abbot Irvine resigned his office into the hands of the bishop; certainly he returned to Ratisbon and for the next thirty years lived there or at Kelheim, the former priory which still belonged to the Ratisbon abbey, as a simple monk. We know that Bishop Echter and Abbot Whyte were on good terms, and the previous November Echter had asked the abbot to give board and lodging to some of his officials attending the Diet in Ratisbon. Whyte now took on the administration of the Würzburg abbey himself. Where he lived during the next four years, when he was abbot of Ratisbon and administrator of Würzburg, we do not know; all the chronicle says is that he had the 'domus torcularis' or wine-press constructed. He did, however, lay a foundation stone in the Würzburg monastery in 1600.

In 1602, shortly before Whitsun (26th May), Whyte resigned the administration, and Francis Hamilton was elected abbot on 6th July. Who elected him we do not know, but possibly the election took place at Ratisbon as the Würzburg community was still very small and it was Whyte who commend- ed Hamilton to the bishop. Hamilton was no more successful than Irvine had been. He ruled the abbey for about two years according to his own testimony a dozen years later, and according to other testimony he did not do it very well. This puts the end of his rule in the summer of

8 Chronicon.
9 Sch. Urk. 568; BL, 8627, f. 5, 17.
10 SCA Rat. C 7, 19a.
11 Ser. Abb.
12 Necrologies, 194.
13 Chronicon: Reid, f. 112r. The dates given for Hamilton's rule in the 1631 list (p. 36 supra), 1599-1602, must be rejected.
14 MRA, Stift 2613 / K.735, p. 55.
15 Ibid. 35.
1604, but it was not until a year later that Echter promulgated his settlement of the abbey's affairs. Possibly some monk appointed by the bishop acted as administrator in the intervening year. The various sources mentioning Hamilton's resignation are not easy to reconcile, and the matter will be discussed later.

The original of Echter's settlement of June 1605 has survived. Since the monastery was in debt and with no prospect of becoming solvent, it was arranged that Hamilton should depart until the debts were paid. Only three monks were to remain; other monks and all other persons were to go elsewhere. Regarding the number of monks, the turgid German of the document is not clear but seems to say that there were six in addition to servants, and not six persons all told. John Stuart was appointed to be the superior of the other two monks who remained and to see that the church services laid down ten years before were kept up. To save the monks from having to absent themselves from their monastery, the care of their properties was entrusted to the bailiff of St Stephen's, who was to provide the three Scots yearly with a hundred florins and a tun of wine; with what remained he was to pay bills, keep fifteen florins a year for himself, and repay a loan of three hundred florins from the bishop's exchequer at the rate of a hundred a year. Another of the monks who stayed, William, was to take charge of domestic affairs and help the bailiff as much as possible.16

This declaration bears the seals of the bishop and Abbot Hamilton, and it is fairly obvious that Bishop Echter's guiding authority was behind the arrangement. No doubt the other monks went back to Ratisbon where they belonged. A year later Whyte, who was in Würzburg, gave Hamilton, 16 Wz. SA, Urk. 50.24.
Bachelor of Sacred Theology, leave to reside in any monastery he chose or in any Catholic locality where he could wear the religious habit. As Echter had freed Hamilton from all obligations to Würzburg, so did Whyte free him from all obligations to his community. Indeed, in the document giving Hamilton his freedom, Whyte not only called himself abbot-general but said he had power over the other Scottish abbots even to the extent of removing them and spoke of his two communities in Ratisbon and Würzburg.  

Thus, ten years after its foundation, there were still only three monks in St James's and its state was very unsettled. Now begins a period in which the fortunes of the Ratisbon and Würzburg abbeys were inextricably tangled, with Whyte residing in Würzburg once more and leaving his own abbey in Ratisbon in the care of others. At this time, too, an effort was made to obtain the restoration of the former Scottish abbey in Constance, which had been demolished in 1530. The proceedings show clearly that the two Scottish communities were not separate bodies.

The negotiations over Constance will only be touched upon insofar as they throw light on the Scots in Würzburg. In September 1607 Abbot Whyte, writing from Ratisbon, says that he has sent two monks to negotiate: Adam MacCall, who had been prior at Ratisbon for some years, and John Stuart, a man of noble birth but nobler still for learning and piety. Thus Stuart, a founder member of Würzburg and later superior there, was now a delegate of the Ratisbon community. One reason for opening the negotiations at Constance, as given in the petition delivered there, was that there were more monks professed at Ratisbon than the revenues would support. That numbers had increased was undoubtedly true, while the finances were not altogether sound, to judge from a papal document of July.
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17 MRA, l.c. 7.
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1608 regarding the recovery of illicitly alienated monastic property. 20

The negotiations were in full train when Whyte, on 2nd May 1608, appointed Fr Adam MacCall administrator in Ratisbon. This seems an extraordinary step, and indeed one does find Whyte doing extraordinary things. He gave as reasons his age and infirmity and the fact that he was compelled to live at Würzburg. He himself retained the power of visitation and correction and of deciding in cases of dispute between the administrator and community, but MacCall was to hold office as long as Whyte was abbot. 21

A month later John Stuart was given full powers to negotiate in Constance. 22 Stuart completed the negotiations, which resulted not in the restoration of the abbey but in compensation for its loss. On 4th March 1609 the Ratisbon Scots approved what he had done and appointed Adam MacCall to take his place. 23 MacCall as administrator then concluded a formal agreement that same month with the approval of the nuntio. 24

There is one very strange feature of the Constance affair, which has little connection with Würzburg but should be touched on briefly as it sheds light on Abbot Whyte's behaviour as a superior and goes far to explain why his projects seldom prospered. In March 1609 one Patrick Stuart appears suddenly, signing himself as subprior; moreover, he acts with MacCall in the final negotiations with the Constance town authorities and the nuntio and signs the formal agreements. Improbable though it may appear, this Patrick was a novice at the time and was refused admission to profession when his year's probation was completed; otherwise we must accept the even less likely explanation that two different Patrick Stuarts appear in St James's, Ratisbon in 1608-9 and neither is ever heard of again.

20 KUSJR, 84.
21 Con. St. KS, 1.e. f. 91.
22 ibid. f. 27.
Patrick, a priest already, took the habit at Ratisbon on 5th September 1608 and Whyte wrote to him from Würzburg exhorting him to persevere. The following August, when the year of noviciate was almost over, six monks at Ratisbon were in favour of accepting him and three against, but Adam MacCall, the administrator of the abbey, considered that these three opposed Patrick's admission out of prejudice.

Not so Whyte: in a letter from Würzburg to the three he said harsh things about most of the other six and ordered Patrick to be dismissed. A month later he wrote an open letter to the community at Ratisbon complaining of MacCall's audacity and impudence in trying to circumspect his (Whyte's) authority and accusing MacCall of conspiring with Patrick against the abbot and some of the brethren. Patrick promptly appealed to the papal legate, who instituted an official process. The end of the affair, in November 1609, was rather an anti-climax. Both those who favoured and those who opposed Patrick's profession agreed that the revenues could not really support an extra monk. Accordingly, he decided to depart in peace, the community testified to his good character, and Patrick Stuart's brief appearance on the Ratisbon stage was over. But sinister light is thrown on Whyte's prudence and qualities of leadership. He had written harsh things about half his monks and had openly quarrelled with and denounced the administrator whom he had installed only a year previously. The impression is given that he was a man who acted first and thought afterwards, and that he was the sort of superior who delegated duties without defining them and then interfered in his subordinates' execution of them.

25 Reg. HV, R 91, f. 81.
26 ibid., f. 79-80.
27 KLSJR, 13.
28 Regens.
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About the same time, and possibly as a result of the quarrel with MacCall, Whyte took the first steps in a matter which was to involve Ratisbon in untold trouble for twenty years: he applied to the holy see for permission to resign or else have a coadjutor elected. The draft which has survived is not dated but Whyte speaks of its being the seventeenth year since he assumed office, which means it can be attributed to 1609 or within a few months of it. He says he is worn out with age and wishes to have, before his death, a coadjutor with right of succession or else to resign and let a real abbot be elected at once.\textsuperscript{31} It should be noted that Whyte was in his late fifties and was to live for twenty years longer and be involved in Ratisbon affairs for ten of them.

The proceedings would not be of much relevance for the history of Würzburg, had it not happened at a time when the two monasteries were still very much interconnected. The abbot of Ratisbon was also the abbot-general of the congregation. It would therefore be as well to say a word about coadjutor abbots. A coadjutor abbot, unlike a coadjutor bishop, has almost complete control of his monastery; the abbot himself retains merely a few more or less honorific functions. Then, when the abbot dies, the coadjutor takes the title of abbot and continues to exercise the control which he has in fact assumed some time previously. A coadjutor can be elected when the abbot feels himself unequal, or is considered by higher authority to be unequal, to the burden of office. It is in reality much the same as resignation or deposition but preserves the outward semblance of delegation. On 10th March 1611 the Scottish monks of Ratisbon and Würzburg elected Fr Benedict Algeo coadjutor to Abbot Whyte,\textsuperscript{32} but that it was not a normal election of a coadjutor abbot, at least according to

\textsuperscript{31} SCA Rat. C 9, 1.

\textsuperscript{32} KUSJR, 85. The name is now written Auldjo (Mecrologies, 184; Black, 17, 36).
modern norms, is evident from later events.

We have no information about the Scots in Würzburg at this time, except that we can be reasonably sure their number was less than six. The community had, however, one outstanding man, William Ogilvie, who had taken his vows for the Würzburg abbey, a fact which is explicitly mentioned in several documents. He was prior and cellarer in Würzburg when on 28th November 1611 the Ratisbon chapter elected him abbot of Erfurt to succeed James Winzet, nephew of the famous Ninian. Abbot Whyte presented him to the archbishop of Mainz for confirmation by a letter which reveals a great deal about himself. He says he had instructed his coadjutor and monks at Ratisbon to hold the election, and the tone is of one acting a part and enjoying it. Whyte evidently saw himself as the grey eminence controlling the affairs of the congregation through his deputies while himself remaining out of the battle line because of his advancing years. We shall meet the same tone in several of his effusions.

Ogilvie was confirmed as abbot of Erfurt on the last day of January 1612, and the following autumn he was carrying out a visitation in Ratisbon, where Algeo's appalling misrule was already having its effect. Whyte, in virtue of his office as Visitor General of the Scottish monasteries in Germany, had delegated Ogilvie to perform the task. On 19th October Ogilvie declared that the alienation of the former priory at Kelheim by Algeo was illicit and therefore revoked. Twelve days later Whyte issued a declaration, which he promulgated in chapter on 7th December. There was unanimous agreement at the visitation that Algeo should be removed from office, so Whyte deposes him, sentences him to imprisonment and appoints Ogilvie administrator of Ratisbon in his place. There are touches of

33 E.g., MRA, l.c., 43-46.
34 Ibid. 29 ff; Necrologies, 183.
35 GG, f. 93.
36 MRA, l.c., 21-34.
37 Reg. BOA, Fasz. 33.
Polonius in the document, and indeed one of Algeo's offences was calling Whyte a silly old man.  

This arrangement did not last long. Ogilvie went to live at Würzburg and Algeo was restored to office. Little more than a year later, on new year's day, 1614, William Ogilvie and the combined communities at Ratisbon and Würzburg addressed a letter to Abbot Whyte saying that they had warned him when Algeo was restored as coadjutor the previous year and that they would appeal to Rome if he did nothing about it. The following May the Ratisbon monks delivered a letter of their own to Algeo, which does not concern the history of Würzburg directly but throws light on the background against which the Würzburg affairs must be seen. There had been dissen¬
sion in Ratisbon ever since Algeo's election; apparently no monk in priestly orders apart from Whyte himself had voted for him and there had been fraus (or mendacity of some kind) in the matter of his confirmation as abbot. We can judge what they complained about in Algeo's rule by their demands that he should himself obey Whyte and keep within the limits of the authority allowed him by Whyte, and should render an account of the revenues during the past months.  

The relations between Ratisbon and Würzburg at this point are worth examining. The joint election of Algeo and the joint protest about his misrule show that the abbacy of Ratisbon was a matter affecting their common interests. Five monks of each house signed the protest, and it is an indication of their involvement that the document had to be taken 140 miles to let both communities sign. The same document has the words: 'We...who are members of the Scottish congregation', while Whyte in a letter a year later to the archbishop of Mainz affirms that the three Scottish abbeys

38 BL, 8627, f.4.
39 SCA Rat. C 8, 5.
constitute one congregation and work together. In writing that in 1615, Whyte was reckoning without Julius Echter, although it was no doubt an accurate statement of the feeling among the Ratisbon monks.

We do not know where Whyte resided until the end of 1614 but it was probably, for part of the time at least, in Würzburg. The communities were largely interchangeable. The Ratisbon monks went to Würzburg to do their theological studies before priesthood. William Ogilvie, a monk of Würzburg, was abbot of Erfurt and, for a time, administrator of Ratisbon. Richard Irvine, having been abbot of Würzburg, was living in Ratisbon. John Stuart, having been prior of Würzburg and then the Ratisbon delegate to Constance, was prior at Ratisbon in 1612 and prior again at Würzburg in 1614. The Ratisbon monk, Alexander Armour, who had been prior at Würzburg in 1612 was back at Ratisbon as prior in 1614, and another Ratisbon monk, Hugh Wallace, had gone to Würzburg to be cellarer. All this was no doubt Whyte's arrangement, stimulated by an understandable desire on the part of his monks to get away from Algeo.

The protest against Algeo has the names of five monks at Würzburg, followed by the words 'and the rest of the community'. This may be merely added as the examination candidate who has run out of facts adds 'et cetera', but it suggests that there were others, perhaps novices or aspirants, in the house. At any rate Bishop Echter's patience ran out and he issued peremptory orders to the Scots in his town. He said he had instructed them nineteen years previously, when the monastery was rebuilt from its ruins, to have six professed monks in St James's, of whom three were to be priests, and that his predecessors in the see had ordered the number to be made up by German monks if no suitable Scots were available. In spite of
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this there were not enough monks to provide the masses and choir office as he had arranged, nor had the community an abbot. So he delivered the ultimatum that they were to elect an abbot capable of seeing to the choir offices and the monastic property, in particular the vineyards, and of paying off present debts and avoiding future ones; if no Scottish monk was capable of this they must elect a German. And until the number of monks increased they must follow a different horarium, which he proceeds to lay down. The chief differences were that Matins and Lauds would be at midnight, and the duties following the morning period of lectures were to be an hour later.\footnote{45 Wz. SA, Urk. 50.24.}

It is difficult to see how midnight office, with a period of sleep before and after, helped to make up for a shortage of numbers. One is at liberty to speculate on the bishop's motives: is the whole document to be taken at its face value or not? Was he merely concerned about having six monks, or did he want to free the monastery from the unfortunate Whyte, whom he must have known well by this time, and the possible depredations of Whyte's coadjutor and successor as abbot-general, Algeo? If the latter, did the Würzburg Scots themselves instigate the bishop to intervene so that they could free themselves from Whyte and Algeo? Whatever the truth of the matter, everything worked out most conveniently. Hamilton, who for years had not been living at Würzburg but was, as far as one can judge, still technically abbot, resigned in 1614;\footnote{46 See p. 67.} Echter gave his ultimatum in November of that year; and two months later William Ogilvie was elected abbot by the Würzburg monks and not by the Ratisbon chapter. He had been living in Würzburg since 1613, seemingly to allow the Erfurt revenues to be used for paying off debts in Erfurt while he resided elsewhere.\footnote{47 Scholle, 39; MRA, \textit{ib.} 35-38.}
Precisely what his status was in Würzburg is difficult to make out. He does not seem to have been superior, for three other monks in turn were prior during these years. With his election at Würzburg as abbot of Würzburg, however, the monastery became independent of the Ratisbon motherhouse and entered on a period of prosperity and progress.
Chapter 5
INDEPENDENCE AND GROWTH, 1615-23


On 22nd January 1615 the community elected William Ogilvie abbot of Würzburg and at once requested Bishop Julius to confirm his election. This is a formality attendant on abbatial elections, and one can gain an idea of the status of the abbey from the name of the confirming authority.

Six members of the community requested the confirmation: Hugh Wallace, prior; Adam MacCall and William Gordon, priests; Gabriel Wallace, a lay-brother; Robert Forbes, a professed monk not yet a priest; and Thomas Duff, a novice.¹ This is almost the same community as had protested against Abbot Algeo's misrule twelve months before, except that John Stuart, the prior, had died,² Adam MacCall had come from Ratisbon, and Thomas Duff had entered the noviciate. These six and Ogilvie can be regarded as the foundation members of St James's as an independent abbey.

Another event took place at this time, which gave the Scots a great deal of publicity and renown, at least locally, and no doubt had considerable effect on their morale. In fact it must have been a contributing

¹ Reid, f. 112r; Wieland, 105-06. The surnames have to be worked out from other sources (Necro. Suppl. 174-75), and Wallace was not necessarily prior at this time.
² Unless otherwise stated, dates of death are in Necrologies.
factor to the period of progress and fervour which began with Ogilvie's election. The event was the re-discovery of the body of Abbot Macarius, the founder of the monastery. The grave was discovered in February 1614, and some time later the bishop decided to transfer the remains to a place of honour in the abbey church. Accordingly, on 1st February 1615, only ten days after Ogilvie's election, they were exhumed. Echter, who had prepared for the event by following spiritual exercises together with the monks, marked the occasion by presenting the monastic library with some books. It has been suggested that the election of Ogilvie was due to the desire to give fitting honour to Macarius, but, plausible as this is, the ultimatum delivered by the bishop in November 1614 said nothing about Macarius although there seems no reason why Echter should not have mentioned the matter if he considered it important.

On 31st May the solemn translation of the body to the choir of the abbey church took place. Probably popular devotion to Macarius as a saint began to grow at once, although we have no contemporary evidence of it, and went hand in hand with the growth of the community under their new and competent abbot. Julius Echter in his declining years must have felt himself recompensed for his trouble and his benefactions to the Scots; they in their turn must have felt themselves called to play an important role in the church. A monastery is as susceptible to influences of leadership and esprit de corps and sense of purpose as any other human institution.

There were six monks besides the abbot in January 1615. The laybrother, Gabriel Wallace, died the following year but the novice, Thomas Duff, persevered and made his profession, and was followed in the novic-iate by at least one other novice, Alexander Baillie, who likewise perse-

3 For a full account see chap. 17.
4 Schott, 103-04.
vered and was professed in 1617. The bishop attended the choir office on the patronal feast-day, St James's, 25th July 1616. Noticing that the monks were using the Roman breviary, he procured copies of the newly published Benedictine breviary and presented the professed monks, six in number, with one apiece. A year later Julius Echter, having ruled his diocese and duchy for forty-four years, died on 13th September 1617. More than anyone else, he had made it possible for the Scots to establish themselves in Würzburg, and when his body lay in St James's before burial according to the age-old custom, a vigorous and growing community attended the obsequies. Thomas Duff, who wrote Latin verse on each and any occasion, composed two poems which appear to be a dialogue between himself and Ogilvie: he wanted to be professed but the abbot was replying that the monastery supported seven poor men and could not support an eighth. This apparently trivial bit of verse illustrates the most important truth that the size of the community depended directly on the state of the monastery's economy.

Echter's successor, Johann Gottfried von Aschausen, had been provost of Würzburg cathedral before becoming bishop of Bamberg in 1609. With the encouragement of his friend in Rome, the famous Cardinal Bellarmine, he made consistent efforts to reform his diocese, which needed it badly. On being appointed to Würzburg he retained his former see, so that he was prince-bishop of two contiguous territories, and he convoked a synod of the Benedictines in his two dioceses in the week 12th-18th December 1618. Ogilvie, having been summoned like the other abbots, duly attended with his prior, Hugh Wallace. The synod proceeded to legislate in considerable detail for the various aspects of monastic life, then those present
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accepted all the decrees for themselves and their absent brethren and signed the documents. The Scots were not singled out in any way. They too accepted the horarium (in which, incidentally, matins began at 3 or 4 according to the day and not at midnight) and much detailed legislation on monastic observance and even on the habit they wore. In fact the statutes have survived in a manuscript book of spiritual exercises written by the recently professed Thomas Duff for his own guidance and benefit. Whether they regarded themselves as belonging to a separate Scottish congregation or not, the Würzburg Scots were now integrated into the German Benedictinism of Franconia.

In January 1615 when William Ogilvie was elected abbot of Würzburg, he was abbot of Erfurt but had been living for some time in Würzburg. Hugh Wallace was also present at the election. Two or three months later there was a rather peculiar dispute going on over the Erfurt abbacy. The first we know of it is a petition from Ogilvie and two Germans to the archbishop of Mainz, in whose diocese Erfurt lay, saying that the abbey revenues could not support any monks and asking him not to appoint Francis Hamilton, Ogilvie’s predecessor at Würzburg, to the position as he had not been a good administrator while at Würzburg. Instead they wanted Ogilvie to continue as before, retaining the title but living at Würzburg and so allowing the Erfurt finances to improve. On 23rd April the archbishop agreed and said there was to be no election.

This makes what followed rather grimly humorous. The very next day the Batisbon chapter elected Hugh Wallace abbot of Erfurt, and Abbot Whyte presented him to the archbishop for confirmation. The letter of presentation explained that the three Scottish monasteries constituted one

10 Wz. UB, M.ch.q. 51, fol. 136-41.
11 Unless otherwise stated, the source is MRA, Stift 2613 / K.735, p.3-134.
12 Scha. Urk. 89.
congregation and it was considered desirable for Ogilvie to resign the abbacy at Erfurt and take on that at Wurzburg as it was his monastery of profession and the monks there were young. Anyone who knows of Julius Echter's ultimatum to the Scots in Wurzburg must smile at this; and the hollowness of Whyte's language is demonstrated even more forcibly by subsequent events, for Wallace simply remained at Wurzburg as Ogilvie's prior.

In January 1616 three German abbots petitioned for Hamilton's appointment, and he likewise petitioned on his own behalf. The archbishop asked his officials in Erfurt if they considered it expedient to have a new abbot appointed; they replied firmly in the negative. Hamilton appealed again in August, and this time Ogilvie was asked for his opinion, which naturally was unfavourable. Hamilton waited a year before appealing yet again. This was in September 1617, and two months later the new bishop of Wurzburg wrote on Ogilvie's behalf to the archbishop of Mainz asking for a new abbot to be appointed to Erfurt. The election of Wallace two and a half years before was evidently considered still valid; he was confirmed and installed as abbot of Erfurt. One notes with amusement that the proceedings were instituted on 25th November, the day before Ogilvie wrote his letter of resignation.

Francis Hamilton now disappeared from the history of the Scots abbeys, leaving behind him a reputation for learning. Wallace, however, clearly preferred to be a real prior in a real monastery under an effective abbot rather than to assume abbatial dignity with no monks and next to no income. At any rate he remained in Wurzburg, where he attended the synod of abbots in December 1618, signing himself as Hugh Wallace, abbot designate of Erfurt and prior of St James's, Wurzburg. He was to be abbot of
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Erfurt for a further fifteen years but spent most of the time away from Erfurt, and in 1626 had been absent for so long that the diocesan officials put in an administrator.  

The letters of Ogilvie and Hamilton over the affair provide valuable information about Würzburg, some of which has been quoted already. In addition they say quite a lot about Hamilton's career. We are told elsewhere that on leaving Würzburg he spent three years at Munich in the service of the dukes of Bavaria, then returned to Würzburg, stayed in St Stephen's and asked the prince-bishop for a parish. In 1609 he received a parish near Erfurt in the diocese of Mainz, where he had been for seven years when he made his second appeal. Ogilvie replied to this that Hamilton could not be abbot of Erfurt until he was reconciled to the order and was elected by the Ratisbon chapter. His reply was passed on to Hamilton, who reacted with an outburst about Ogilvie's ingratitude and the treatment he had received from Echter. What was more to the point, however, was Hamilton's insistence that he himself had never resigned the Würzburg abbacy and had never given any reason for being deposed, even though his dississorial letter of 1606 mentioned his resignation.

In September 1617, when Hamilton made his last appeal to be made abbot of Erfurt, he produced a remarkable document. It was a notarial copy of an agreement signed and sealed by William Ogilvie and dated 5th October 1613, to the effect that Ogilvie would resign the Erfurt abbacy into Hamilton's hands as soon as he (Ogilvie) was confirmed as abbot of Würzburg. The copy was dated 30th August 1617, five days before Hamilton wrote his final appeal, in which he pointed out that such an exchange was not simoniacal and was common practice in Italy. The document presents
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difficulties which it is not easy to resolve. It is hard to see why Ogilvie should have made this illicit agreement unless he had a shrewd idea that he would be elected abbot of Würzburg but thought that Hamilton's status as still technically abbot impeded an election. In other words, Ogilvie might have been bribing Hamilton to resign. But against this is Hamilton's own denial that he had ever resigned.

In any case, why did Hamilton not produce the document before, for instance when he denounced Ogilvie's ingratitude in the summer of 1616? If the document is genuine, then Ogilvie is guilty of Machiavellian double-dealing, which does not seem in character. If, as seems more likely, it is a forgery (it has, incidentally, no notarial docquet), then Hamilton, and possibly also a notary, were conspiring to defraud. As to Hamilton's resignation, the most reliable sources (unfortunately no original documents have survived) say he did so in 1614. The most probable explanation is that Julius Echter induced him to, or simply decided that Hamilton's request for letters of freedom in 1606 constituted resignation. An absentee abbot like Hamilton would not have stood in Echter's way for long.

The Würzburg abbey was growing in numbers and prestige; the single Erfurt monk, the abbot, was living in Würzburg; what was happening at the mother-house in Ratisbon? It was getting further and further involved in a series of troubles and upheavals. The documents concerning the affair are innumerable - a striking illustration of the recognised truth that in the history of monastic life the scandals assume an undue significance because of their documentation. Algeo's election as coadjutor abbot in 1611 was puzzling enough. Only Abbot Whyte himself, of those who were priests, had voted for him; the notarial instrument of the election was

16 Chronicon: Reid, f. 112r. Wieland, 127 gives date of resignation as 22nd June 1609, after which he went to Munich, but this conflicts with Hamilton's own account.

17 Unless otherwise stated, all material comes from SCA Rat. 08, 09; Reg. BOA, Fass. 33; BL, 8627, f. 3-45.
signed by only four of the eleven electors; \(^{18}\) and Algeo had managed to have the election confirmed by the bishop of Ratisbon without obtaining special authorisation from Rome. He was deposed at the end of 1612 but reinstated the following year by Whyte. By February 1615 Whyte was again siding with his monks against Algeo and speaking of the need to elect a new coadjutor.

The key to much of the trouble, now and later, is the desire of the aristocratic bishop, Albert von Törring, who ruled the diocese of Ratisbon from 1613 to 1649, to gain control of St James's. At some point the nuntio in Vienna had delegated his own papal jurisdiction over the abbey to him. In March 1615 the bishop tried to force the monks to accept Algeo; when they resisted he imprisoned five of them, seemingly the whole community apart from Whyte. One escaped and called in the Lutheran town authorities, who released a second monk; the latter attacked Algeo and stabbed him, and the town senate refused to surrender the culprit. \(^{19}\) At some point, too, the abbey had been mortgaged to the Protestant senate.

The nuntio now intervened to threaten the monks with excommunication; they appealed to the emperor on behalf of their imprisoned brethren. Then in May Rome ordered a visitation, which does not seem to have taken place. At any rate the community instituted a process against Algeo at Rome in June 1615. Ratisbon was an imperial free city but the territory outside it - in fact, the town at the other end of the bridge across the Danube - belonged to the duke of Bavaria. He now sided with the bishop and seized any monk found in his territory. He also arrested all the monastery's goods and revenues outside the town, with the result that the monks were soon in desperate straits.

\(^{18}\) KUSJR, 85; BL, 8627, f. 39.

\(^{19}\) Gumpelzhaimer, 1062. For the subsequent process see Munich Kreisarchiv, G.L. 3347/30, f. 88-231.
In May 1616 sentence was passed in Rome against Algeo, but the nuncio and the bishop prevented its execution. Alexander Armour, the prior, who had been in Rome to further the case (and seemingly also to obtain confirmation for himself as the new coadjutor) returned to Ratisbon, where the arrest of the goods continued as before. Scottish monks had been forced to leave Ratisbon as they had no means of support, while Algeo was living in Stadt am Hof, the suburb of Ratisbon just across the Danube, and receiving all the income for himself. He was willing to hand over the abbey to the bishop in return for his support, reserving only a liferent for himself.

As the situation dragged on and got worse, an observer in Ratisbon described the principals. Whyte, he said, was a good man but senile and had always lacked firmness as a ruler. His monks were badly trained, unstable, and quite possibly not even really Catholics. Algeo was a good and intelligent man - when sober; in his cups, as he often was, he acted foolishly and would give away anything. Algeo had lost his case at Rome because of his uncanonical status, but this was something which could be remedied. A bull was eventually issued on 23rd August 1617 in his favour, and was put into execution on 30th January 1618. It confirmed that Algeo had been elected coadjutor and was to become the ruling abbot when Whyte demitted office. The latter now made a formal declaration of his resignation and handed over his keys, making only one reservation: that the pope should have the right of reformation if the new abbot's rule proved unsatisfactory. Algeo was now abbot for life, and the monks present accepted him as such; among them on this occasion was William Ogilvie.

On the following Trinity Sunday Algeo received the solemn abbatial blessing

20 KUSJR, 87.
and was invested with crozier and mitre. The ceremony took place in the Franciscan church in Ratisbon, and the assisting prelates and ministers were all Germans.

A settlement was thus reached in Ratisbon, although hardly a peaceful one, nor did it prove to be a lasting one. The nuntio Carafa carried out a visitation of the abbey in February 1623, and from the acts he issued it is clear that monastic observance had deteriorated sadly. One enactment concerned the Scots in Würzburg: Alexander Baillie of Würzburg was to be prior and cellarer as long as the nuntio saw fit and was to render an annual account to the nuntio.\(^\text{21}\) A papal document of 1623 lets us see the state of the abbey finances. It had mortgaged monastic property to Protestants (no doubt the town senate) for 8000 florins, and the creditors were threatening to foreclose, so leave was given to borrow the sum from Catholics at a rate of interest of not more than 6 per cent.\(^\text{22}\)

There was still some coming and going between Ratisbon and Würzburg. Adam MacCall, who held the office of cellarer at Würzburg when Ogilvie was elected, was back in Ratisbon as cellarer in 1619;\(^\text{23}\) Alexander Armour, Algeo's prior, had expressed the wish to live at Würzburg to Carafa, and in return Baillie was coming to Ratisbon. Alexander Baillie, born in 1590 into the family of Cambroie in Lanarkshire, had gone abroad for his further education like many another young Protestant. Having enrolled in the Protestant university of Helmstedt in North Germany in 1612, he made his way that same year to the Scots College in Rome. In November 1615 he took the monastic habit in Ratisbon, then in the throes of the dispute with Algeo, and on Abbot Whyte's advice went instead to Würzburg, where he made his profession in November 1617 and became prior within less than five

\(^{21}\) SCA Rat. C 9, 7; Baillie, f. 26-27.

\(^{22}\) KUSJR, 89.

\(^{23}\) ibid. 88.
years. He was certainly a competent administrator, as his later career shows.

Onlookers at Würzburg were also interested in Ratisbon. Thomas Duff's muse was usually kindly, but his compositions on Algeo are vitriolic. One poem consists entirely of pejorative words beginning with the same initial letters as Petrus Algeus; another considers his names and declares that Algeo (which means 'I freeze' in Latin) fits him but Benedict (meaning 'blessed') is the direct contrary of the truth; a third effusion informs us that Algeo, like Judas, had red hair, but Judas sold his master for money while Algeo had done so for wine.

As we have seen, Whyte finally ceased to be abbot of Ratisbon in 1618. A letter to him from Ogilvie, dated 27th September but with no year given, belongs to this time. Whyte had written announcing his arrival in Franconia, and Ogilvie replies deploiring the hardship Whyte has to suffer in his old age and the shame his importunity casts on the Scottish nation. The prince-bishop of Würzburg, he says, has already written to the bishop of Ratisbon to suggest means of supporting Whyte and the Ratisbon monks. He himself has to support ten monks in Würzburg and cannot receive him, even for one night, and the abbot of St Stephen's is likewise adamant.

It is evident from the letter that Whyte was persona non grata in Würzburg, and Ogilvie advises him strongly not to come. The letter also throws light on one aspect of the troubles in Ratisbon, for Ogilvie says it is dishonourable for Algeo and the bishop of Ratisbon to cast out Whyte in his old age: Algeo because Whyte had simply resigned the monastery to him without the consent of the monks, and the bishop because Whyte had given him authority over the abbey against the wishes of the brethren. This last

24 Necrologiae, 198; Ziegelbauer, IV, 129; SHR, xxiv, 237. Ziegelbauer says he was also at Heidelberg university but he is not in the lists (SHR, v, 67-75).
26 Reg. IV, R 91.
probably signifies that Whyte, in order to end the sequestration of the abbey revenues, yielded to the bishop's pressure to acknowledge him as superior.27

The letter is slightly softened by Ogilvie's advice to the old man to find a fixed lodging before winter, in which case he himself will make some contribution, and by a rather perfunctory apology for writing as he does. Another letter on the same subject and likewise undated, this time from Whyte to Algeo, has also survived. The old man is saying that the bishop of Würzburg does not want him in Franconia and that Ogilvie denies ever promising unconditionally to take him in.28 We know one particular grievance entertained against Whyte by the Würzburg monks: it was that he had, as superior general, squandered the compensation for Constance and not given any of it to their house.29 Whyte eventually retired to the abbey of Frauenzell in the Oberpfalz, where he died in 1629.30 One notes with pleasure that Duff wrote a sympathetic poem to the old abbot in his declining years.31 The comment on Whyte in the Ratisbon necrology sums up the tragedy of his career: doctior quam felix - a gifted man whose lack of discretion brought unhappiness to himself and others.

The sad state of the Ratisbon house in 1623 is very much relevant, because it was in that year that the two monasteries embarked on a joint missionary enterprise. The ascendancy among the Scots had clearly passed to Würzburg, and the leadership and initiative came from Ogilvie; the events, too, were linked with a celebrated namesake of his. John Ogilvie, the Jesuit priest who is the only Scot in the post-Reformation period officially honoured by Roman Catholics as a martyr, was hanged at Glasgow Cross on 10th March 1615, seven weeks after William Ogilvie's election at Würz-

27 Reg. BOA, Fasz. 33.
28 ibid.
29 Indiculus, f. 39v.
30 Necrologies, 184; Cat. Abb.
31 Duff, f. 60r.
burg. Two questions must be asked. Why did persons associated with the
t martyr in Scotland become Benedictines at Würzburg and not Jesuits? and
who was the John Ogilvie sent from the Douai college to Ratisbon in 1598?

The first question includes within itself the question of whether the
two Ogilvies were related, which has been suggested. No answer to this
seems possible, however, since the family background of both is unknown;
indeed, doubt has been effectively cast on the assertions usually made
about the martyr's family and even on whether his real name was Ogilvie.32
The martyr's biographers have also assumed that he was the John Ogilvie at
Douai, whereas this too is very doubtful.

Briefly, there was no reason for the Douai student to go to the Ratis-
bon abbey except to become a monk, since Winzet's college had ceased to
exist, yet there is no hint that the martyr had any Benedictine background.
Secondly, if the Douai student was the martyr, one would expect some com-
ment in the register, especially since comments were added to other entries,
yet there is none.33 Was the student, then, William Ogilvie? It is the
fallible Wieland, citing documents no longer extant, who lists John Bog and
William Ogilvie under the year 1598. To identify the latter with the
Douai student, one must assume that William was a religious name, although
the first clear case of a novice assuming a religious name was Peter Algeo
becoming Brother Benedict in 1604. On the other hand, William is the
only Ogilvie recorded at either Ratisbon or Würzburg, while the mention of
Ratisbon and not Würzburg as the destination of the student is not a diffi-
culty, granted the interdependence of the two houses.

The identification of William Ogilvie with the Douai student must
therefore be regarded as a possibility and nothing more. We know a few

33 Douai Reg. f. 140-41.
facts about William's background. Abbot Whyte, in presenting him as abbot elect of Erfurt, described him as being of noble birth and as having earned the regard of princes and prelates in Franconia. Since both Würzburg and Mainz were prince-bishoprics in which bishop and canons were scions of the local nobility, and social position was inextricably entangled with ecclesiastical office, birth and social accomplishments were important. The Latin *nobilis*, however, did not necessarily imply possession of a title; a son of the smallest laird was described as *nobilis* at Würzburg or Ratisbon. Ogilvie used the arms of the Ogilvies of Deskford both on a new building he had erected and in the university roll when he was elected Rector. This, too, is inconclusive as all Scots abbots used arms connected with their family name. The martyr, incidentally, likewise described himself as being of noble birth. Francis Hamilton claimed that he had converted William Ogilvie to Catholicism and been the instrument of his becoming a monk; the Douai student was also described as a convert from Calvinism.

All the early mentions of William Ogilvie at Würzburg are uncertain. After Wieland's unverifiable reference under 1598 come the testimony to the election of an abbot of Erfurt in 1603, signed by William Ogilvie among others. But the original is lost and there is something wrong, because another signatory is Benedict Algeo, who was not professed until 1605. Ogilvie may be the William given charge of domestic affairs at Würzburg in 1605, or the William at Erfurt in 1608, but William Gordon may be meant. He may have been prior at Würzburg in 1606, since there is a document attributed to him as Whyte's prior in 1618 (a quite impossible date) and a document with apparently the same content is listed under 1606. It

34 GG, f. 93.
35 MRA, l.c. 61 ff.
36 Erf. Tent.
37 Reg. HV, R 91, f. 76.
38 Necro. Suppl. 174, 175.
39 Wieland, 61.
is rather strange that the background and early career of the greatest Scots abbot of Würzburg should be so obscure. Until his election as abbot of Erfurt in December 1611 there is no incontestible fact of his monastic career, while all we can say of his background is that he was not of lowly birth, was a Protestant and probably belonged to the north-east, where Deskford is.

The first associate of John Ogilvie the martyr to come to Würzburg was John Mayne, 40 who was born in 1583 in Glasgow and brought up a Protestant, took the matriculation oath at Glasgow university in 1598 and was awarded his degree the following year. At some subsequent point he became a Catholic. When Fr John Ogilvie began his ministry in Glasgow in September 1614, Mayne received the sacraments from him; when Ogilvie was captured in October, Mayne along with others was likewise arrested and condemned to death. As they were in the same prison, it was to Mayne that Ogilvie sent the narrative he had composed about his own imprisonment, together with a covering letter for the Jesuit provincial in Austria. Mayne, having collected what information he could from eye-witnesses about Ogilvie's sufferings, added it to the narrative. The priest was hanged, the others had their sentence commuted to exile. Mayne went to Bordeaux and delivered the narrative with his own continuation to the Jesuit authorities, who promptly had the whole thing printed. With him Mayne also had a letter from Ogilvie commending him to all Catholics on account of his condemnation and sufferings for the faith.

It is not clear if Mayne was a practising Catholic before John Ogilvie arrived in Glasgow. The indications are that he was, but he was himself to declare later that Ogilvie reconciled him to the Catholic church.

---

40 For Mayne see Necrologies, 197; Brown, passim; Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis, III, 62-63, 8. The spelling Mayne is preferred as being the southern form (Black, 574, 590).
One difficulty of all missionary accounts in Scotland during the early seventeenth century is the ambiguity of such terms as 'reconciliation' and 'conversion'. An account by one who lived with Mayne later (unfortunately known only through the not always reliable Brockie) says that he was married and a Protestant but was converted by John Ogilvie. His wife died and he began to study for the priesthood, doing his philosophy at Douai and his theology in Rome. After becoming a monk he brought his only daughter from Scotland and she entered the Cistercian abbey of Himmelspforten near Würzburg. The story is highly suspect but the Douai lists are defective for this period and there is partial corroboration of his family circumstances. On 10th November 1616 John Mayne in Flanders appealed to the archduke ruling the country for financial help. Among the circumstances of his imprisonment and exile he recounted that he had had to leave his country with his wife and children and had now used up all he possessed, so that he and his family were reduced to great necessity. The treasurer was instructed to make him one payment of 150 livres.

Mayne was certainly at Rome for a short period in 1619, then he entered Würzburg, where he assumed the religious name of Silvanus and made his profession, probably in 1620-21.

When Mayne first went to receive Ogilvie's ministrations in September 1614, he was in the company of one Robert Hegate, who was also imprisoned and sentenced. Hegate had a young brother, James, aged twelve, who had not been brought up a Catholic, for fear that he might unwittingly betray the family. James frequently visited his brother in prison; he also ran messages for Ogilvie and was present at the latter's execution. When he was fifteen, that is, in or around 1617, he went to Douai to be educated.

41 Brockie, ad Ratisbon.
42 Brussels, Archives Générales du Royaume, Papiers d'Etat et Audience, 2646, 2582.
as a Catholic. Another student at Douai was the young Richard Tod, who was taken there by his father; and the father carried with him a letter of introduction from John Ogilvie, written in Edinburgh in August 1614, asking the rector to admit the boy.

In January 1623 Mayne was in Douai, where he had fruitful contact with two institutions, the Scots College and the English Benedictine monastery. The Douai register says succinctly that a certain James Scott went with Hegate and Tod to become a monk at Würzburg at the beginning of January 1623. They travelled with Mayne. A few months later two more seminarists, Edward Maxwell and Robert Maclean, left for Würzburg, saying that they had been granted entry when Mayne passed through Douai and had now been told to come by Abbot Ogilvie. The rector asked for some proof of this, which they produced and he kept. Maclean was about eighteen, Maxwell perhaps three years younger. The whole affair needs a little explanation, especially since the Jesuit authorities in Douai were not pleased, which it is not easy to provide. On the face of it the most obvious explanation would seem to be that William Ogilvie's rule at Würzburg attracted men like Mayne, and that Mayne's persuasiveness and reputation as a confessor of the faith were added to the renown of Würzburg to induce the students to go there.

There was, however, another important result of Mayne's stay in Douai, even more important than the obtaining of five promising novices, of whom four persevered. This was contact with the English Benedictines of the priory of St Gregory's in Douai. Unlike the Scottish abbeys, which had existed on German soil for centuries and had become Scottish almost by accident, the English monasteries had been founded in the early seventeenth

---

43 Brown, passim.
44 Ibid. 305.
45 Douai Reg. f. 148v, 150r. The texts printed in RSC, 15, 17, 18 are less full and give Mayne's name wrongly as Magnus.
century and with the specific purpose of engaging in missionary work in England. Douai, being an important counter-reformation centre, was a natural place for such a monastery. When Wayne went to Douai he lodged with this mission-minded Benedictine community, and when he returned to Würzburg with the three students he also took with him three letters from the English monks, all dated 16th January 1623.

The first of these was an open letter from Fr Rudesind Barlow, president of the English Benedictine Congregation, to all the Scots monks, the next was a letter from the prior of St Gregory's to Abbot Ogilvie, and the third was a formal document admitting the Scots to fellowship and a share in all spiritual benefits. The most important of the letters is the first, which outlines a plan for organizing missionary work in Scotland under the aegis of the English Congregation. Briefly, the Scots monks were offered the same faculties and privileges as the English possessed, and they would be subject to the English superiors while on the mission but could be recalled at any time by their own abbot.

The second letter is perhaps significant in being addressed to Ogilvie personally, thereby emphasizing who among the Scots was providing the motive force. The remaining document, the Fraternitatis Charta, as it styles itself, establishes a close union of fellowship between the monks of the two nations and promises fraternal help and hospitality in all English houses to any Scots monk furnished with letters of credence. The Scots replied with two documents signed by all three abbots: by Algeo at Ratisbon towards the end of June, then by Ogilvie at Würzburg a month later. Hugh Wallace also signed at one of these places, no doubt Würzburg. One document accepts the English proposals gratefully, the other
extends a similar Charter of Confraternity to them.46 The Scots had now committed themselves to definite missionary activity involving Lisbon as well as Würzburg, and Algeo was, at the very least, co-operating with the plans.

46 The whole correspondence is edited in Dilworth, "First Mission" (see Appendix).

In his letter to the Scottish abbots in January 1623, the president of the English Benedictine Congregation had said that the influx of aspirants from Douai would enable the Scots to spare monks for the Scottish mission. The numbers at Würzburg have been quoted already: there were six professed monks in 1617, to each of whom Bishop Echter gave a breviary, and there were ten at some time after 1618 when William Ogilvie refused to take in ex-Abbot Whyte. In June 1625 Ogilvie decreed that the edition of the breviary donated by Echter was to be the one used in the Scots abbey, and he bought seven more copies of it as the number of monks had doubled since Echter made his gift. There were thus a dozen Scottish monks in Würzburg in 1625; as the new entrants advanced towards the priesthood Ogilvie could spare half a dozen monks and still fulfill the requirements

1 Copialbuch, f. 153r.
laid down in the foundation charter of 1595.

The Würzburg Scots did in fact continue with their missionary plans, but no longer under the auspices of the English Benedictines. They had enthusiastically accepted the offer of their English brethren in the summer of 1623 and then, less than a year later, had both the pope and the cardinal protector of Scotland exerting themselves to promote a purely Scottish scheme. In the absence of indications as to what lay behind this change of front, one can only presume that the Scots thought themselves capable of setting up a mission of their own and that their patrons in Rome approved of the idea. On 17th April 1624 the congregation of cardinals called Propaganda, founded not long before to take charge of all missionary work, gave very favourable consideration to it, and the minutes speak of it as being a request from the Scots. Ten days later the pope, Urban VIII, supplied Silvanus Mayne with a letter to Emperor Ferdinand II asking him to restore the Vienna Schottenkloster to the Scots. There is no mention in it of the Scottish mission, merely of the injustice suffered by the Scots in being deprived of their lawful possessions at a time when they were undergoing persecution and exile for their religion. Cardinal Francesco Barberini, nephew of Urban and his successor as protector of Scotland, also gave Mayne a letter, while the bishop of Vienna, Cardinal Klesl, then in Rome, wrote commending Mayne to his officials in Vienna.

Apart from the prominence of Mayne in the negotiations in Douai and Rome, there is very little reference to Würzburg as the source of the motive power behind these efforts. The three Scots abbeys and their communities are mentioned together as if of equal importance, although the abbot of Erfurt had no community and was living in Würzburg. As for Algeo,

---

2 Mission plans and work will be dealt with fully in later chapters, and source references given.
one can at least say in his favour that he co-operated in these constructive propositions and either dutifully signed or allowed his name to be used. Mayne was commissary of all three abbots in the Vienna affair. With him, however, he had a third letter which indicates the real state of affairs: it was from the prince-bishop of Würzburg, also interceding for the Scots and commending the zeal and monastic observance of Ogilvie's community. Mayne went to Vienna in June or July and delivered the three letters with his own appeal to the emperor. The appeal is interesting, for after giving the usual version of the history of the Scoti on the Continent, it outlines the situation and plans of the Scots. Their monasteries are inadequate to house the number of excellent young men from the Scots seminaries who ardently desire to embrace the most exact form of Benedictine observance and to work for the conversion of their countrymen in Scotland and Poland; therefore the Scots want to have the Vienna abbey restored to them in whole or in part, in order to introduce reformed observance there and help the Scottish mission. The appeal was signed by Mayne in the name of the three Scottish abbots, as well as by the protector of the Scots monks, the Count von Althan, leader of a German military order.

The emperor, on 1st August, referred the petition to his counsellor for such affairs, who on 3rd September delivered his judgement that the Scots had no valid claim. Ferdinand ratified the judgement and ordered Mayne and the nuncio, who was acting for the pope, to be informed of the decision. Ecclesiastical politics in Vienna afford some help in understanding the background of the affair but lie outside the scope of this narrative. It is clear, however, that the key to the Scots' motives lies in the influx of novices into Würzburg and the mission scheme. In fact,
had the Viennese monks understood the background in Ratisbon and Würzburg, they would have realised that their monastery was in danger whenever the Scots had constructive proposals for some counter-reformation project. It had been the case when Lesley and Winzet were re-establishing Scottish monks in Germany; it was certainly the case now; and a further attempt was to be made fifty years later when the abbot of Ratisbon planned to set up a seminary for boys from Scotland.

Mayne's mention of Poland in his petition is most interesting, because if he was responsible for drawing up the appeal it is the first sign known to us of the flaw of character which ruined his plans: a refusal to make-do with the means at hand, and a stretching out for the two birds in the bush. Propaganda were soon to discover this for themselves. The nuntio in Vienna had been instructed to obtain information about the Scots monks, as a result of which it was decided to set up a mission unit of seven monks under the direction of Mayne. Accordingly, in April 1625 a bull granting him various powers was despatched to Würzburg. Mayne, however, did not set out for Scotland and almost two years later he made further requests to Propaganda, some of which they granted. In the summer of 1628 they reassured the bishop of Würzburg that Mayne was still subject to his ordinary superiors; Mayne himself they ordered to go to Scotland at once. A year later, in August 1629, as he had not yet set off, his commission was revoked and Abbot Ogilvie was appointed mission superior in his place.

Mayne did not, as far as we know, now go to Scotland as a simple missionary but attached himself to Erfurt and in December 1630 was transacting business armed with a commendatory letter from Abbot Wallace. That same year he was making detailed proposals for the reform of the Scots in

4 Sch. Urk. 90.
Germany, probably for the introduction of the stricter observance of the Lorraine Congregation.\(^5\)

Two accounts belonging to a much later date indicate that the Scots did not give up their efforts in Vienna because the emperor decided against them. When the Ratisbon abbot was engaged in a similar attempt in 1678 he related that the nuntio (in 1624) reacted vigorously against the decision and succeeded in obtaining an offer to have six Scots educated in Vienna or the equivalent in cash. Mayne, however, would not accept the offer as he still hoped to gain possession of the abbey and thought this in any case too small a cut of the abbey’s revenues.\(^6\) In 1630, according to Fr James Brown writing about twenty-five years later, the Scots were again, or still, trying hard in Vienna with the backing of Urban VIII. The bishop of Vienna, however, persuaded the emperor to make a compromise settlement, and the Scots were offered a lump sum of 3000 florins, which they appear to have refused. Then the wars put an end to the negotiations.\(^7\)

Probably these negotiations should not be viewed in isolation from similar disputes going on in Germany over monastic property. On 6th March 1629 the famous Edict of Restitution was promulgated, the result of the ascendancy of the Catholic imperial electors and the emperor’s religious advisers. Among other things the Edict declared Catholics justified in demanding the restoration of church property misappropriated since 1552, and the execution of the Edict was entrusted to imperial commissioners, exclusively Catholic. Not unnaturally the Catholic gains from the Edict were considerable. It also happened that in the years after 1626 Jesuits and Benedictines in south Germany were engaged in a struggle for the posses-

---
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sion of monastic property. This will be considered later as it is important for the development of the congregation movement among German Benedictines; here it is sufficient to say that the Jesuits responded eagerly to the Edict, and although the commissioners had been instructed to restore confiscated religious houses to the order which had founded them, the Jesuits endeavoured to secure these for themselves when they considered the old orders incapable of administering them satisfactorily. 8

That undoubtedly is the background to the attempt of the Würzburg Scots to secure the old Irish abbey of St Egidius (or Giles) in Nuremberg. This was the Scotic abbey which had become German in 1418 and been handed over to the town senate in 1525, and which Lesley and Winzet had made fruitless efforts to regain. We know of the attempt only through the correspondence between Francesco Barberini and the nuntio in Vienna, Pallotta. 9 On 9th June 1629 Barberini wrote to Pallotta; the Scots were about to apply to have their former monasteries, and in particular that in Nuremberg, restored to them, and Pallotta was to further their requests with the emperor when asked to do so by the Würzburg abbot. The nuntio replied at the end of the month expressing his willingness but saying that the nuntio in Cologne, to whom he had just sent the imperial letters directed to the commissioners for putting the Edict into execution, would be able to help them much more. On 8th December William Ogilvie's prior arrived in Vienna bearing a letter from Barberini, likewise dated 9th June; he was kindly received by Pallotta and promised all help. One of Barberini's letters has a passage, originally in cipher, telling the nuntio that the Jesuits were competitors in the case of the Nuremberg abbey.

The reader cannot help being struck by the warmth of Barberini's

8 CMH, IV, 109-14.
9 BL, 6223, f. 154; 6219, f. 49, 104; NB, IV, 2, p. 202, 237, 411.
language in favour of the Scots and by Fallotta's eagerness to help in a matter which touched the protector of Scotland so deeply. For all that, the affair came to nothing. It may be the commissioners discovered that the loss of the abbey had taken place before 1552, in which case the request for its restoration would be automatically turned down, and there was no appeal from the commissioners' decision. In any case the invasion of south Germany by the Swedish army in 1631 put an end to the working of the Edict. As far as we know, the episode had no lasting effect; its only significance is to demonstrate the genuine good-will of Barberini towards the Scottish monks and the vitality of the Würzburg community at this time.

These same years had seen the prestige of William Ogilvie and his abbey grow. In November 1627, the bishop of Würzburg ordered a visitation to be conducted in the ancient and important abbey of Schwarzach, not far from Würzburg, as a result of which he released from office both the abbot, whose health had been failing for some time, and the aged prior. The bishop then appointed Ogilvie to be administrator. Ogilvie held this post until the following year and on St Benedict's day, 21st March, he received the vows of a novice there. In June 1628, however, the German abbot died; an election was held and Ogilvie departed from the scene, to the undisguised delight of the Schwarzach chronicler. His short administration was not uneventful, for the accusation was made against him to the bishop that he had used Schwarzach assets to build up his own abbey.\footnote{Fel. Red. 276-78.}

Whatever the truth of this unlikely charge, the fact remains that Ogilvie must have stood high in the regard of the prince-bishop to have been entrusted with these duties in preference to native German prelates. Another
office he had was that of judge in the special court for the degradation (that is, demoting from the clerical state) of clerics accused of witchcraft.\textsuperscript{11}

At this time, too, Alexander Baillie (whom we last heard of appointed cellarer at Ratisbon) produced a book of religious polemic, printed in English at Würzburg. The dedicatory epistle, dated St Mungo's day 1628, is to William Ogilvie, who, having discharged his office with 'great dexterity...both in the affairs of this Abbacy, & in sundry implantments & weaghtie maters belonging to the prince & whole nobilitie of Franconie, hath deserved to be chosen as most worthy of al the Prelates in the diocese to be made Lord & Administrator of that noble and potent Abbacy of Swartzach, not without the immortal honour of al our Scottish Abbacies here in Germanie, & of our whole nation elsewhere'. Baillie speaks in the book of the relics of Macarius and the miracles attributed to the saint, as a result of which the abbey church was frequented by the people of Franconia.\textsuperscript{12} Macarius was also slowly but steadily finding a place in the printed literature of Europe as his Life was printed by a growing number of writers.

In May of the same year a preliminary enquiry for the beatification of the martyred John Ogilvie was held in Würzburg since two of the chief witnesses to his ministry and sufferings were Frs Silvanus Mayne and James Hegate, monks of St James's. Both were summoned and examined,\textsuperscript{13} and their connection and friendship with the martyr made public; the part played by Mayne in particular, and his steadfastness under sentence of death, must have gained him renown in this Catholic province. Incidentally, when giving evidence, Mayne described himself as being in the act

\textsuperscript{12} P. 75-76. For the book see p. 336.
\textsuperscript{13} Brown, 285 ff.
of setting off for Scotland to strengthen the Catholics in their faith
and win back heretics.\footnote{14}

Ogilvie's monks had also begun to play their part in the university
life of Würzburg. Four young Scots matriculated in 1624-25, and in 1626
the first place among the graduates was gained by Richard Tod, one of the
recent arrivals from Douai. In November 1628 Abbot Ogilvie was elected
Rector Magnificus of the university; the original matriculation roll has
a picture of his coat-of-arms and his motto, 'Non est mortale quod opto',
to be translated roughly as 'What I choose is undying'. During his year
of office Ogilvie's prior, Robert Forbes, and the poet-monk Thomas Duff
also matriculated.\footnote{15} In fact, in these years the Scottish abbey of St
James occupied a more important position, and enjoyed a greater prestige,
than perhaps at any other point during its occupation by the Scots. The
bishop praised its observance; materially, too, it was flourishing.
Ogilvie built a three-storey dwelling place for the monks, as well as set-
ing up an outside gate and building beside it a guest-house,\footnote{16} on which
one can still see his coat-of-arms and the date 1627. Clearly he aimed
at removing the occasions of monks associating with externs.

Most of Ogilvie's achievements, however, were soon to be wrecked when
the wars of religion reached south Germany. The imperial army came to
Erfurt in June 1631, to be followed by the Protestant army of Gustavus
Adolphus three months later. We are fortunate in having an eye-witness
account of much of the campaign by a Scottish officer in the Protestant
army, Colonel Robert Monro.\footnote{17} Erfurt was captured without bloodshed on
22nd September but eight thousand men were quartered on the town and its

\begin{footnotes}
\item[14] Brown, 294; J. Forbes, Jean Ogilvie, Ecossais, Jésuite (Paris, 1901),
229.
\item[16] Ser. Abb.
\item[17] Expedition with the Scots Regiment, London, 1637 (STC. 18022). The
passages cited are from Part II, 76-82.
\end{footnotes}
religious houses. The Scots monastery, however, seems to have escaped lightly.\textsuperscript{16} A short time later the Swedish army was advancing on Würzburg, and one of the most striking incidents in William Ogilvie's whole career took place at this point. As the Swedes closed in on Würzburg in mid-October, the bishop and many of the notables fled.\textsuperscript{19} Ogilvie played a prominent part in the deliberations of those who remained, was chosen as their delegate and, in the words of Monro, capitulated to the King on behalf of the Burgers, who were granted the same terms as Erfurt. A modern writer draws a verbal picture of Ogilvie meeting the king with the keys of the city in his hands, presenting them to him in the name of the bishop and the terrified citizens and succeeding by his pleading in assuaging the king's anger.\textsuperscript{20}

On 14th October Ogilvie and a town official left the city to spend the night as hostages in the Swedish camp, and the next morning the gates of Würzburg were opened to the Swedes. Even if the townpeople thought a Scot more likely to gain favour with the Swedish king than a native Franconian, it is still a remarkable tribute to the position Ogilvie had made for himself in Würzburg. Colonel Monro records the incident and adds his comment: 'Here also we see that of old our Nation was much esteemed of abroad, especially the Clergie, who in all Kingdomes, as in Germanie, had their Cloisters, as here, and at Erfurt, and he was a Scots man, that brought the Christian Religion first into Francoonia, but was evill rewarded, being afterwards murthered.' Even a Protestant soldier of fortune claimed St Kilian for the Scots.

A tax of 80,000 imperials was laid upon the town; as Monro had said of Erfurt, 'the people were not troubled except in their means.' Then,

\textsuperscript{16} J.H. von Falckenstein, \textit{Historie von Erffurth} (Erfurt, 1739-40), 704; Scholle, 40.
\textsuperscript{19} Unless otherwise stated, the narrative of the Swedish occupation is from Gropp, II, 149-62; III, 424 ff.
\textsuperscript{20} T.A. Fischer, \textit{The Scots in Germany}, 80, 160.
on the 16th, the newly installed officials took an oath of loyalty to their captors. The town of Würzburg had surrendered, but the bridge over the Main was destroyed and the Marienberg, the fortress on the steep ground on the west of the river, held out. As Monro points out, whoever held Würzburg commanded the Main and hence all Franconia, so the Swedes set out to reduce the Marienberg. A vivid picture is painted of the attack on the fortress. 'Situated on a rock, and one arch of the bridge over the river being broken, it almost seemed impregnable. Moreover the guns of the fortress swept every approach...Only a single plank stretched from arch to arch fifty feet above the rapid stream, and yet the Scots, under Sir James Ramsay and Sir John Hamilton, succeeded, partly in boats, partly filing across the bridge in swift succession, to carry the outworks, after which the success of the final attack by the Swedes was assured.' 21 This was on 18th October. The next day, having installed a strong garrison, the Swedish army departed for Frankfurt.

The Scots abbey lay beside the fortress and in fact was on the fringe of the network of fortifications. The community was scattered. Two monks, Robert Forbes and a cleric not yet ordained priest, James Brown, found refuge in the ancient abbey of St Gallen across the Swiss border. 22 There were only three monks in the abbey in October 1633. 23 The Swedish forces remained in occupation for three years. The hostile soldiery was quartered in the town and its religious houses and was not averse to looting. It was also the systematic policy of the Swedes to plunder the libraries and send the booty back to Sweden. Uppsala university library owes a large part of its treasures to this enlightened barbarity. The library of the Jesuit university was transported there, and a small but

21 ibid. 81.
22 Indiculus, f. 40r.
23 AU, viii, pt. 2, p. 72.
valuable collection of manuscripts from it found its way into the hands of Archbishop Laud and thence into the Bodleian Library at Oxford. The Scots abbey, however, was spared, no doubt owing to the continued presence of Abbot Ogilvie. Probably his presence also saved the abbey church from the desecration suffered by other churches. He was one of the four clerics appointed by the occupying authorities to deal with church affairs.

The recapture of Würzburg by the imperial forces was as dramatic as its occupation by the Swedes, and once again Abbot Ogilvie played an important part. On 18th October 1634, the third anniversary of the capture of the Marienberg, a pre-arranged plan was put into effect. It was agreed that as many of the garrison as possible should be pleasantly occupied that evening by their involuntary hosts. Accordingly, when the imperial soldiers forced an entry, they had little difficulty in capturing the town. Ogilvie was entertaining the highest-ranking officers from the garrison at table in his monastery, which stood so near the citadel, when the attackers rushed in and overpowered them.

The town had suffered cruelly. Since the bishop was still absent, four Inspectores were appointed to administer church affairs; Ogilvie was the first-named among them. The citadel still held out but surrendered three months later, in January 1635. The following September Ogilvie died, and with him in the monastery were only two other monks. His epitaph in the abbey church described him as dying in old age and a man who had been a good financial administrator and deserved well of Franconia.

25 Gropp, III, 451. This is also shown by Walde's silence (see previous note) on St James's library.
27 Gropp, III, 481; Taschenbuch (1795), 201-03.
28 AU, xiii, 285.
29 CMH, IV, 245-46; Gropp, III, 481.
30 Wz. UB, M.ch.f. 260, fol. 101v; Wieland, 40.
Some assessment of William Ogilvie's character should at least be attempted, even though we know remarkably little of the man himself. That he got on well with the prince-bishop and nobles in Franconia, as Abbot Whyte had said when presenting him as abbot of Erfurt, is really self-evident, for he could not otherwise have been so successful. Two most derogatory judgements on him have survived but in each case one can suppose evident bias. The Schwarzach chronicler in 1628 says that Ogilvie already regarded himself as abbot and administered the abbey to his own advantage. It is a plain fact that monks do not like having administrators from other abbeys imposed on them, and evidently Ogilvie did not succeed in overcoming this disadvantage. In 1632 the bishop of Ratisbon asked that Ogilvie should not be brought in to look after the abbey there as he was probably tarred with the same brush as Abbot Algeo.\(^{31}\) As a judgement this is surely extraordinarily wide of the mark, because a greater contrast could hardly be imagined than between Ogilvie and Algeo. Probably the bishop knew that Ogilvie would be a most uncompromising opponent of his own designs to control the Ratisbon abbey.

Undoubtedly Ogilvie did not suffer fools gladly. His treatment of Francis Hamilton over the Erfurt abbacy, and his refusal to accept Whyte at Würzburg after the latter's final resignation, hint more at ruthlessness than at a spirit of forgiveness. But we cannot really judge; perhaps Ogilvie saw the issues too clearly to allow himself to be swayed by feelings. He appears as a man of decision and incisive character, with the initiative, for instance, to live away from Erfurt when he saw that the revenues needed a chance to recover. The alleged illicit pact with Hamilton, followed by intrigue to prevent his accomplice from getting his

\(^{31}\) NVPC, 43, 24.9.1632.
share of the spoils, namely the Erfurt abbacy, does not square with what we know of him. That Ogilvie could command loyalty is shown by Hugh Wallace remaining at Würzburg as his lieutenant after 1615 instead of going to Erfurt. And finally, when a man is successful in a spiritual office and shows no ambition in other directions, one can infer that he is not merely a good administrator but a spiritual man. Although we know nothing that touches William Ogilvie personally, he stands out as a leader of men in a spiritual setting.

In these years Ratisbon fared worse than Würzburg. Once again the documents are so numerous that only the briefest outline can be given. In May 1627, having evidently fallen out with his former allies, Abbot Algeo fled. He was arrested in the territory of the duke of Bavaria and handed over to the bishop of Ratisbon, who imprisoned him in his castle at Werth and tried to make him sign a document of resignation. Algeo held out for fifty-one weeks before doing so. He was then committed to custody in the nearby abbey of Oberaltaich but escaped and made his way to Vienna, where he appealed to the nuntio, Pallotta. In November 1628 Pallotta asked for the documents of the case, which after some delaying tactics the bishop eventually produced. A legal process was begun and dragged on until in August 1630 the verdict was given in Algeo's favour. The point at issue was whether the bishop had the right to act as he had done with Algeo, who was subject directly to the holy see.

Although right in law, the decision was likely to prove disastrous for the monastery if it meant the return of Algeo. Francesco Barberini, the cardinal protector of Scotland, foreseeing the outcome of the process, therefore intervened. He instructed Archbishop Rocci, the legate who had

32 Unless otherwise stated, the documentation is from NVPC, 43; Reg. BOA, Fasz. 33; BL, 6219; 6223, f. 229; 8627, f. 44-55; SCA Rat. C 8, 4, 6; C 9, 9-12; NB, IV, 2, p. 332.
been sent to the meeting of imperial electors in Ratisbon,\textsuperscript{33} to do nothing in favour of Algeo since it was his (Barberini's) intention to help the Scots abbey. Rocci accordingly, on hearing the verdict, did not put it into effect. The nuntio in Vienna wrote to Barberini on 10th August 1630 to tell him that the decision was in Algeo's favour, but he added that Ogilvie and his monks at Würzburg, as well as the Ratisbon monks, had stated their case against Algeo. The affair had engaged the attention of the Würzburg monks from the beginning. Almost two years before, in October 1629, one of them (no doubt Ogilvie)\textsuperscript{34} had written to Barberini to say he had heard the bishop was endeavouring to be appointed administrator of the abbey. The writer begged Barberini not to allow this, since it would spell ruin for the Scots, for not only had the bishop been trying for years to get the monks to accept his jurisdiction but he was responsible for the present calamity as he had put in Algeo as abbot.

Barberini was as good as his word. On 11th November 1630 Pallotta informed the Ratisbon prior, Alexander Armour, that Algeo had resigned but was to be compensated for the expenses he had incurred in Vienna and to receive an annual pension as long as he remained away from his abbey. The Scots had other difficulties, too. That same week they had been appealing against the reformed Franciscans (known as Observants), whose minister general was in Ratisbon and wanted to obtain St James's for his order.

Armour, the prior, had been acting as administrator of the Ratisbon abbey since Algeo's arrest. By this time Hugh Wallace had left Würzburg for his own prelacy at Erfurt and had even collected some subjects, among them Silvanus Mayne. On 27th March 1631 Wallace and his monk John wrote to Barberini from Gorizia, on the present Italian-Yugoslav border. They

\textsuperscript{33} CMH, IV, 679.
\textsuperscript{34} BL, 8627, f. 44. The signature has been cut off.
had been forbidden by the holy see to proceed to Rome but were the delegates of the Ratisbon community, who wanted Wallace as their abbot and promised to introduce the reformed observance of the Lorraine congregation, which was already being followed by the Erfurt Scots. Barberini replied a fortnight later praising the Scots' good intentions and allowing them to have an election.

His action was premature and no election took place. Armour continued to administer the abbey during the difficult days of 1632 when the movements of the armies brought hardship to the town. In June troops had been quartered in the monastery and on 1st July Armour died, so the nuntio suspended the obligation of paying Algeo's pension and made a temporary arrangement whereby the senior monk acted as superior. By January 1633 Abbot Wallace had left Erfurt and come to Ratisbon, where the community wanted him as superior, while Alexander Baillie was once more cellarer there, having fled from Würzburg when the Swedes advanced on Franconia. In June the nuntio appointed Wallace administrator after telling the monks that no election could be held until Algeo sent his resignation directly to the holy see. This was the situation when the war came to Ratisbon.

We have an excellent account of the events from Baillie. The Swedes captured the town in November 1633, imprisoned the bishop and forced all the religious houses to pay for his ransom. Wallace was imprisoned, the other monks fled. When the town was re-captured in July 1634 Wallace was released but died of the plague a few weeks later. The first Scots to return were Baillie and Brother Kilian Oswald, who had apparently been a novice at Würzburg. Baillie wrote to the scattered monks to get them to return and in December was appointed administrator at their request by

35 Baillie, f. 34v, 37rv, 40r.
36 Necrologies, 197.
Barberini. His qualities showed themselves at this juncture as he set out to restore order and solvency from the ruins. The methodical accounts of his administration during 1634-35 are still extant.

What brought Baillie's administration of Ratisbon to an end was the death of his own abbot, William Ogilvie, in Würzburg on 17th September 1635. On the following day a Würzburg diocesan official drew up a list of the community present and absent, which agrees with the account written by Baillie. Only Edward Maxwell, who was prior, and Thomas Duff were in residence. There were two priests on the Scottish mission, William Gordon and Audomarus Asloae; Silvanus Mayne, Robert Forbes and James Brown (the latter still not ordained) were in Rome; Alexander Baillie was in Ratisbon; and a ninth man, William Maxwell, had been sent to Ireland for his health, which seems as good a reason as any at this time. In October 1635 Edward Maxwell died, leaving Duff the poet the only monk present.

At the end of November the suffragan bishop wrote to Baillie in Ratisbon asking him to summon all Würzburg monks to their abbey. Baillie agreed and promised to come himself, and also, being concerned (as he said) for the monastery of his profession, wrote to Rome. Then, in early February 1636 he set off for Würzburg, and Silvanus Mayne was appointed administrator of Ratisbon in his place by Barberini. Mayne had taken Abbot Wallace's place at Erfurt; then, being himself expelled by the town authorities, who had been given possession of all religious houses by the Swedes, he found refuge in Rome.

37 SCA Rat. C 9, 13.
38 KLSJR, 12.
39 Reid, f. 112r; Wieland, 107-08. See note at end of chapter.
40 Baillie, f. 40r; Wieland, 107. See note at end of chapter.
41 Wieland, 128.
42 SCA Rat. C 9, 14; Baillie, f. 40.
43 Brockie, ad Ratisbon.
When Baillie arrived in Würzburg he found that a German administrator had been put in. By 3rd May, however, half a dozen monks had assembled, and on 10th June 1636 they elected Robert Forbes abbot. Of Forbes we know little except that he had entered Würzburg not long before 1614, had held successively the offices of cellarer and prior under Ogilvie, and after the Swedish invasion had taken refuge in St Gallen. He had gone to Rome at the end of 1634 as the agent of the Swabian congregation of Benedictines in order to get approbation of their privileges. The parties opposed to this, however, proved too strong and he was replaced in April 1636, after more than a year of fruitless endeavour, by the English Benedictine procurator in Rome, Fr Wilfrid Selby, who was no more successful than he had been.

Hopes ran high that Ogilvie’s former cellarer and prior would follow in his distinguished abbot’s footsteps. Only Erfurt still lacked a superior, and on 26th September Mayne wrote from Ratisbon to the chancellor there explaining that they were awaiting the arrival of monks from Scotland and Switzerland before holding an election. Then, on 13th November 1636, Baillie, who had returned from Würzburg, was elected abbot of Erfurt by the Ratisbon chapter, consisting of four monks who had survived Algeo and the Swedes. All three Scottish abbeys now had superiors, and before them lay the task of repairing the ravages of war and rebuilding from the remnants. It should be observed that both Ratisbon and Erfurt now had superiors who were Würzburg monks professed by William Ogilvie.

44 Reid, f. 112r; Baillie, f. 40v; Wieland, 128-29.
45 Necrologies, 197.
46 Molitor, II, 321-27; Weldon, 37.
47 GG, f. 101r.
48 Sch. Urk. 91, 92; Baillie, f. 40v; MRA, 141-44.
NOTE

Wieland says that William Maxwell was in Scotland for his health, but the transcript in Reid shows that the original had Hybernia. For the death of Edward Maxwell, Wieland has 1635 but gives as his source Bundschuh (V, 197), who had 1658. The date 1635, however, is shown to be correct by Baillie's contemporary chronicle, which Wieland did not use.

This may serve to show the difficulty of either relying confidently on Wieland or of rejecting him outright. Until it was discovered that the Reid MSS contained transcripts of originals used by Wieland and now destroyed, it would naturally be assumed that 'Scotland' was a correct transcription or translation; and until Baillie's chronicle was examined for Würzburg material, one would naturally assume that Wieland was in error in giving a date which disagrees with the source he cites for it.
Chapter 7

DOUBLE CRISIS AT RATISBON, 1637-41.

Würzburg abbot dies - Asloan summoned from Britain - elected abbot - his background - danger at Ratisbon - Mayne's imprudence - Asloan goes to Ratisbon - is elected abbot there - obliged to return to Würzburg - leaves Baillie as administrator - deficiencies of Baillie's narrative - plan to sell Erfurt abbey - Baillie whitewashing bishop - emperor tries to supplant Scots - bishop tries also - Asloan still abbot of Ratisbon - historians misled by Baillie.

When the year 1637 began, all three Scots monasteries had superiors and the work of reconstruction could go on, even if their communities were small and the wars were not yet over. Baillie's first task at Erfurt was to regain possession of his abbey from the town senate, which he did.\(^1\) Almost two years later, however, he had been compelled to go to Würzburg because of the enemy garrison in Erfurt.\(^2\) In Ratisbon Mayne continued as administrator and not as abbot, presumably because the ex-abbot Algeo had not yet given his resignation directly to the holy see. Würzburg, too, suffered a major setback at the end of 1637 when the new abbot, Robert Forbes, died on 4th December without having yet received the abbatial blessing.\(^3\)

Once again preparations were made to elect a new abbot, and absent monks were summoned to Würzburg. The community had dwindled sadly since the days when Ogilvie saw that his dozen monks each had a breviary. The necrology records a number of deaths in the years 1630-36. The dates given

\(^1\) Cat. Abb; Brockie, _ad Erfurt_; Scholle, 40.
\(^2\) _MRA_, _l.c._ 139-40.
\(^3\) _Chronicon_; Reid, f. 112r.
do not fit in altogether with what we know from other sources, but it seems that all four monks who came from Douai in 1623 and persevered were dead by 1636. Abbot Ogilvie and his prior Edward Maxwell had died within a month of each other in 1635. Of the monks of Würzburg who survived, two were superiors, of Ratisbon and Erfurt respectively, at least one of the two missionaries remained in Britain, and the deacon who had gone to Ireland for his health does not re-appear in the records. The resident community under Abbot Forbes must have been very small, and now Forbes himself had died.

One of the two missionaries was Audomarus (or Omer) Asloan. On receiving the summons from Würzburg he left his mission and wrote to the bishop of Würzburg from London on 16th February 1638. Apparently he was coming to Würzburg to take care of the abbey, and it is quite possible that he was the only responsible person available for the task. Asloan waited for over a month in London, hoping, as he wrote to the bishop of Würzburg in March, to get a letter addressed to him from King Charles. At this time, of course, the king had considerably more to occupy him than the requests of a Scottish missionary priest; in fact, never had the religious affairs of Scotland gone worse for Charles. It was seven months since the occasion on which Jenny Geddes is supposed to have thrown her stool at the head of the officiant reading from the new Prayer Book in St. Giles's. The National Covenant was being drawn up and signed during these same weeks that Asloan spent in London. Charles was absent from the capital, and we know in fact that he was at Newmarket for over two weeks between 20th February and 7th March, and perhaps longer. We also know that he was back in London by mid-March, but evidently he did not grant Asloan an audience.

4 Wieland, 129.
5 Reid, f. 112v.
6 RMS, ad loc; CSP Domestic, ad loc.
for the latter says nothing of Charles's return.

Towards the end of March Asloan got tired of waiting, commissioned a noble friend to deal with the matter of the letter, and set off for Germany. At Gravesend he was delayed by contrary winds, so that he did not reach Germany until late April. From Hamburg on 30th April, old style, (a reminder that Germany had the new calendar whereas England and Scotland had not), he sent a third letter to the bishop. He explained the reasons for his delay and added that even now he had been told he could not proceed to Würzburg without a safe-conduct. His purpose in writing, he said, was to assure the bishop that there was nothing half-hearted in his efforts to reach Würzburg and help his monastery of profession. He made his way across war-torn Europe, passing through France, and eventually arrived at Würzburg.

It certainly seems clear that Asloan had not been summoned merely to record his vote in the election, and it comes as no surprise that he was elected abbot on 20th July 1638 and blessed, together with Alexander Baillie, in November. The new abbot was a man of about forty-four. There is a discrepancy of a couple of years between his tombstone, which says he was in his 68th year in 1661, and his portrait, which was made in 1641 and purports to be of Asloan in his 46th year. The tombstone is no longer in existence but a copy made of its inscription describes him as dying in his 52nd year of profession. Since he died in January 1661, this places his profession in 1609-10, when he was sixteen at the most, which is not impossible as he left Scotland in his fourteenth year. He is, however, not

7 Reid, f. 112v - 113r.
8 ibid. 112r; Wieland, 129.
9 Haim, A 7r.
10 Gropp, II, 302; MRA, l.c. 139-40.
12 Wz. UB, M.ch.f. 260, fol. 101v, 108r; Wieland, 41.
13 Haim, A 6r.
mentioned in the Würzburg documents of 1614 and 1615; the first record we have is of his matriculation, as a professed monk, at Würzburg university in March 1624.\textsuperscript{14} He would thus appear to be one of Abbot Ogilvie's recruits when the Würzburg community was doubling its size. For almost ten years before his election as abbot he was a missionary in Britain.

Mention of Asloan's missionary work brings up the question of his family background. The monastic historian Brockie describes him as an Englishman who had been educated from his youth in Würzburg and had been a missionary in Scotland and England.\textsuperscript{15} It is, however, reasonably certain that he was the son of the laird of Garroch, about a mile and a half west of Dumfries, a property which had belonged to Asloans since at least the mid-fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{16} The name is the one nowadays written Sloan.\textsuperscript{17}

His brother, George Asloan, entered the Douai Scots college in 1606, graduated in arts two years later and was doing his theology there in 1609,\textsuperscript{18} but returned to Scotland without being ordained. When a priest was indicted for saying Mass in Scotland in 1613, it was George Asloan, son of the laird of Garroch, who had served it.\textsuperscript{19} In 1616 he entered the Scots College at Rome, was ordained there and departed for the Scottish mission in 1619.\textsuperscript{20} After working in Northumberland and Galloway, he became a monk at Würzburg, where his brother was abbot.

It seems clear that there was one George Asloan, who was brother of the abbot. An apparent discrepancy over his mission field in the Douai and Rome accounts is easily explained by his working on both sides of the

\textsuperscript{14} Merkle, 147.
\textsuperscript{15} Brockie, \textit{ad} Würzburg.
\textsuperscript{16} P.H. McKerlie, \textit{History of the Lands and their Owners in Galloway}, V, 240.
\textsuperscript{17} Black, 34, 732.
\textsuperscript{18} RSC, 9, 13, 105.
\textsuperscript{20} RSC, 105; Gordon, 517; \textit{Blairs Papers}, 248.
The only lingering doubt arises from the complete lack of cross-reference between the various sources: the remark on the ordination of the Douai student (a later addition in the register) makes no mention of Rome, the record of the trial of the mass-priest makes no mention of the server having been at a Catholic college abroad, the Rome register does not say that Asloan had been at Douai. One must, however, presume it was the same person since both the record of the trial and the Roman sources say he is from Garroch, and both the Rome and Douai accounts say he died in the monastery where his brother was abbot.

The laird of Garroch's second son was called George and in 1631 was served heir to certain lands as his elder brother, John, had died without issue. It is tempting to identify this John with the abbot and say that, being a professed monk, he was considered by his Catholic family as non-existent where inheritance was concerned. Several things effectively dispose of this hypothesis. The Catholicism of the family needs proof; George Asloan in 1616 needed a dispensation from the impediment of heresy and/or heretical parents. The abbot, too, must have been younger than George, who graduated in arts in 1608. Finally, one would normally assume that a name like Audomarus was a religious name, and thus John would be his forename; in monastic documents Audomarus alone would then be found. But the abbot invariably used both and in fact usually put Audomarus first. Abbot Asloan belonged to Garroch but was not John the first born.

A year after Asloan began his long period of office as abbot, the Scots monastery in Ratisbon was again plunged into serious crisis. Alexander Baillie, at this time abbot of Erfurt, gives a coherent account of events but a seriously deficient one. There seems to have been a con-
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piracy of silence about certain matters, for not only does Baillie pass
over them but documents which should be in the Ratisbon monastic archives
are not there. As a consequence the received history of the Ratisbon
abbey gives a false picture of this period. On 26th October 1639 Silvanus
Mayne died, leaving in the Ratisbon monastery only one monk, Macarius
Chambers, professed the previous year. A second monk, George Wedderburn,
on hearing the news, returned to Ratisbon and together they wrote to Baillie
asking him to come and take charge. Baillie dutifully set off, making
a detour to call at Würzburg, and he and Aslean and two Würzburg monks then
travelled to Ratisbon together. The cause of the alarm was not merely the
lack of Scots monks there but the attempt being made by some parties to
take the monastery away from them.

We have two contemporary descriptions of Silvanus Mayne. One of them,
supposedly by the George Wedderburn just mentioned, is preserved in Brock-
ie's *Monasticon* and must therefore be treated with the extreme caution
requisite for all unauthenticated material handed on to posterity by that
fertile author. Much of it is in fact highly suspect, although Wedderburn
is said to have spent fourteen months in Rome with Mayne when both were
refugees from Germany; also, it is couched in the language of hagiography.
For instance, it is the only source which says that Mayne was married and
had a daughter who became a nun near Würzburg, and it is hardly credible
that, as the account claims, Mayne in his noviciate kept the rule in its
primitive rigour and not as later custom had tempered it. This would be
quite contrary to the practice of any noviciate, which aims at making the
aspirant fit in and not stand out. We can note that Mayne is said to have
continued with these ascetical practices and that Wedderburn regarded him

25 Brookie, *ad Ratisbon, 1639.*
highly for them. The same esteem is apparent in the other account of Mayne, by Alexander Baillie, but Baillie also relates his imprudence as administrator of Ratisbon. Being zealous for discipline and reform, Mayne began at great expense to pull down part of the monks' living quarters and rebuild it. He had only two monks, and Baillie remarks that it was quite the wrong time for such operations.  

The work was still incomplete when Mayne died. We can recognise the same man as failed to lead the missionaries to Scotland because he planned something better, and who refused the compensation in Vienna because he hoped for more. As administrator of Ratisbon he appealed for help to the earl of Arundel, Charles I's ambassador to the emperor, and a letter from Barberini to the duke of Bavaria commending the Scots may be the result of another such appeal. It may also have been a sign of the approaching storm. No doubt Mayne's imprudence was at least a partial cause of the attempt made to seize the abbey. For some reason Baillie does not mention this attempt, perhaps because he was writing in Ratisbon and wished to be tactful, but we know of it from the letters of Asloan and the bishop of Würzburg, Francis von Hatzfeld und Gleichen.

On 26th November 1639, precisely one month after Mayne's death, Bishop Francis wrote to his fellow bishop in Ratisbon saying he had heard from Asloan how certain religious and clerics in Ratisbon wished to give the Scots abbey to a different nation and religious order, and requesting him earnestly to protect the Scots. Asloan, the bearer of the letter, was kindly received when he presented it, as he told Bishop Francis. The Ratisbon monks now postulated Asloan as their abbot. This is the technical term used when the person elected is not eligible for election accord-
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ing to the letter of the law, as Aslo an was not, being already abbot of Würzburg. We know of the election from a second letter of Asloan’s to Bishop Francis, written in mid-December, in which he says that Rome had not yet replied in the matter of the postulation. In the meantime he had been summoned to the bishop’s chancery in Ratisbon, where a certain dean, after accusing him of slandering the Ratisbon clergy to the bishop of Würzburg, inveighed against the Ratisbon monks’ interpretation of their privileges, their poor observance, the scandalous behaviour of Algeo, and so on. Asloan’s comment was that he was right about Algeo but the privileges and exemption from the bishop’s jurisdiction still held good.  

Presumably the monks at Ratisbon had held an election because they knew of Algeo’s death in an Austrian monastery in May 1639, and had not attempted to hold one earlier because they knew he was still alive. An undated letter from the Ratisbon monks informs us further about the election. It seems to be addressed to the Ratisbon diocesan officials, who had asked them by what authority they had elected Asloan as their abbot. They replied that they had postulated him as soon as Mayne died, and as this was invalid without the holy see’s confirmation they had asked the nuncio to appoint him administrator until confirmation came. The pope had rejected the postulation but had appointed him abbot jure devoluto (that is, the right had fallen to higher authority since the electors had not exercised their right properly and timeously), and letters to this effect were on their way from Rome.  

Francis was bishop of Bamberg as well as of Würzburg, and it is clear that he delegated much of the routine Würzburg administration to an auxiliary bishop. On 2nd January 1640 Asloan wrote to this official telling
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him of his difficulties in Ratisbon, caused chiefly by the burden of debt. While he was trying to save Ratisbon for the Scots he wanted his own poor and humble monastery (he uses the expressive word pauperculus) to be spared all important business, and himself to be given good warning if any matters did need to be dealt with. We learn from this letter that Asloan’s election to the Ratisbon abbacy was unanimous and that one of the Würzburg monks taken to Ratisbon was Boniface Strachan, later to be well known as a writer of anti-Irish historical works, who was now returning to Würzburg to receive holy orders.

Asloan seems to have enjoyed the confidence of Bishop Francis but the latter’s officials were not prepared to let the Würzburg abbey remain without a resident superior. On 17th January Asloan wrote to the bishop for the third time. After outlining the difficulties in Ratisbon, he asks the bishop for his opinion and advice: the Scots monks want him to take over the Ratisbon abbey and they feel that this would help the Würzburg monastery too, as the latter can only with difficulty support an abbot. Personally he would rather give up the Würzburg abbacy than continue with a double burden. What is he to do? He also begs to have the date for giving his annual account at Würzburg postponed, since the ecclesiastical officials in Würzburg had designated 18th January for this as usual, in spite of his being absent. The Ratisbon matter should be settled by Easter and then he will satisfy the officials.\(^\text{34}\)

What ensued in the second half of January is not clear. Wieland says that the bishop wanted Asloan to appoint an administrator in Würzburg if he was going to remain any length of time in Ratisbon.\(^\text{35}\) Baillie, who apparently had no scruples about calling a spade a spade where churchmen
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\(^{35}\) Wieland, 130.
outside Ratisbon were concerned, recounts that the hopes they had entertained of the bishop of Würzburg lending them money to pay their debts were dashed, and that Asloan, being compelled by threatening letters from the Würzburg officials either to return or resign, chose the former and set off for Würzburg on 1st February. On that same day Bishop Francis sent a letter to the bishop of Ratisbon commending Asloan as he had been unanimously postulated as abbot of Ratisbon. One can hardly avoid the conclusion that Francis and his Würzburg officials did not know what each other was doing. Baillie now took on the administration of Ratisbon while still remaining abbot of Erfurt. At this time there was real unity between the Scots of Ratisbon and Würzburg, the effect of war and of threat from without, and the three houses were still being administered by monks of Würzburg. Ogilvie's work lived on.

It has already been mentioned that Baillie says nothing about the attempt to give the Ratisbon abbey to other religious. He also says nothing of Asloan's being elected abbot of Ratisbon, and one is forced to consider the trustworthiness of his narrative. After a careful reading of Baillie's account of the events from 1633 on, one sees clearly that it is very autobiographical. He was undoubtedly a good and careful administrator, and there seems to be no reason to doubt the general veracity of his well-documented narrative, but it does tend to show Baillie himself in a very favourable light. His account of the two to three months spent by Asloan in Ratisbon in the winter of 1639-40 is a mere statement of his own part in getting Asloan to take on the administration of Ratisbon, and then of his own assumption of the administration when Asloan was compelled to return to Würzburg. One suspects, too, that the appeal for help was sent
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to Asloan and not to Baillie. Asloan brought two Würzburg monks with him to Ratisbon (another fact known only from his letters) whereas Baillie had none to bring. Most cogent of all, it was Asloan and not Baillie who was postulated abbot by the monks, and unanimously too. When Asloan returned to Würzburg, Baillie was merely the delegate left behind by Asloan, who was the abbot of Ratisbon appointed by the holy see.

The various letters have been quoted in detail to show the evidence for what is omitted or misrepresented by Baillie. But even if the evidence already cited were not conclusive, we would know the true state of affairs from a letter written by Baillie himself to the archbishop of Mainz in May 1640. In it he speaks of the abbot of Würzburg being also abbot of Ratisbon but residing in Würzburg, while he (Baillie) takes his place in Ratisbon. The account he gives of his call to Ratisbon is much more humble than the one in his narrative; he says he was summoned by the Ratisbon monks and the abbot of Würzburg to the election of a new abbot of Ratisbon, and one reason for his now staying there is that it will help to pay the debts of his Erfurt abbey. Baillie was in no mood to aggrandise himself as he does in the narrative he wrote later. The Scots had been discussing ways and means of paying the Ratisbon debts, and Baillie had heard that some of them wanted to sell the Erfurt abbey. Nobody had said this openly to him but he suspected that they would obtain Cardinal Barberini's consent and send it to the archbishop of Mainz. Baillie was warning the latter and begging him not to agree. A month later the archbishop reassured Baillie over the matter and instructed his officials in Erfurt not to permit any such thing to take place. Baillie's endorsement of the archbishop's letter is informative: 'F. Boniface Strachanes and others at

38 NRA, Lade 626, H.1775, no. 1
39 Ibid., nos. 2, 5; Sch. Akten, 41.
Wurzburg presumptuous designes and plotts preveanded and disappointment'.

A second drawback of Baillie's narrative is his mealy-mouthedness where Ratisbon ecclesiastics are concerned. He says nothing about the hostility they showed after Mayne's death, and he actually speaks of himself taking on the administration of the Ratisbon abbey, helped by a letter of recommendation from the excellent bishop Albert. This was the same Albrecht von Törring who had been responsible for so much of the trouble in Algeo's time and had tried repeatedly to gain control of the abbey. Baillie had had dealings with Ratisbon since 1623 and could not have been ignorant of all this. Not only that, but the same bishop was about to exert himself to get rid of the Scots from Ratisbon altogether. The episode concerns the Würzburg abbey intimately, not only because Asloane was abbot of both Würzburg and Ratisbon but also because Würzburg figured largely in the scheme.

The new emperor Ferdinand III held a Diet in Ratisbon which began in July 1640 and lasted over a year, and while he was in Ratisbon he tried to replace the Scots with Spanish Discalced Carmelites. These may have been the same religious in whose favour efforts had been made when Silvanus Mayne died. The first we know of it is a letter from Urban VIII to Ferdinand, who had asked for the Ratisbon community to be merged into that at Würzburg, so that the Carmelites could then be given the Ratisbon buildings. The pope replied courteously on 24th November and said that his nuntio would give a definite answer.

The bishop of Ratisbon next addressed a long letter to Urban on 2nd December; it is extremely tedious to read but tells us most of what we know about the whole affair. The Discalced Carmelites had been in Ratis-
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bon for five years, during which time vain efforts had been made to find a site for them, but none was available nor would the Lutheran magistrates allow any ground to be sold. The emperor wanted the personnel and revenues of St James's to be transferred to Würzburg, which would give the Carmelites a place in Ratisbon, and the bishop agreed with him. For one thing, there were only three Scots monks in Ratisbon, not enough for choir and other commitments, while there was a similar shortage in Würzburg and Erfurt; in fact the three abbeys together contained barely enough monks for one community. It would also be better for the Scots themselves to have one flourishing monastery. The monks do not know German and so cannot help their neighbours or look after their own property; their financial position is bad, their buildings are in disrepair; nor can other monasteries help them, being in a bad way themselves. The bishop does not like Benedictine abbeys, for they scorn episcopal admonitions and prefer the treacherous help afforded by Lutheran civil authorities. All this and a great deal of praise of the Carmelites fill the letter.\textsuperscript{42} This is the bishop whom Baillie's narrative praises.

The Scots knew of the petitions addressed to Rome by the emperor and his ladies and the bishop, and on 11th December they sent a counter-appeal to the cardinal protector.\textsuperscript{43} Asloan also addressed two letters to Ferdinand, the second of them, a most eloquent appeal, on 22nd December.\textsuperscript{44} Baillie's narrative says that Urban VIII and Barberini wrote three times to the emperor, as well as to other persons, in support of the Scots and refusing to give way, with the result that the emperor finally gave up after himself writing three times to Rome and persecuting the monks for nine months. The difficulty over finding a site at Ratisbon was evidently
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overcome, for at some point in 1641 Ferdinand laid a foundation stone for the Carmelite house.\textsuperscript{45} The date 1641 is still to be seen over the outside door of the church.

The letters written by the Scots also show that Asloan was still abbot of Ratisbon. The letter to Barberini was signed Abbot and Community, without any individual names, which shows they had an abbot, who could only have been Asloan. Much more convincing is the record of the two letters from Asloan to the emperor, formerly preserved in the Würzburg diocesan archives and now destroyed. There is no mention of Würzburg from beginning to end, and the second letter is signed Abbot and Community of Ratisbon, again with no individual names. The Scot who copied it in 1877, Alexander Reid, described it as written by Asloan, and it was in the Würzburg diocesan archives; yet it was all about Ratisbon and was signed by the abbot of Ratisbon. The conclusion is inescapable that Audomarus Asloan was still abbot of Ratisbon.

The documents concerning Asloan's election and appointment at Ratisbon are conspicuous in their absence from the Ratisbon monastic archives, just as mention of the same is absent from Baillie's narrative. It is possible, though hardly likely, that it was agreed between Asloan and Baillie to be discreet about the real situation and let it be thought that Baillie was just one more administrator—say, like Hugh Wallace eight years before, who also was abbot of Erfurt at the same time as he was administrator of Ratisbon. In this case we must not accuse Baillie of deliberately minimizing Asloan's role in the struggle to save Ratisbon. But Baillie was not like Wallace. The nuntio in Vienna appointed Wallace because an election could not be held, and we have the document saying so. But in 1640
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Asloan had just been appointed abbot by Rome, there is no record of his resignation, and no record of Baillie's appointment as administrator. Baillie was in fact, as he himself wrote to the archbishop of Mainz, Asloan's vicar or delegate.

Deliberately or not, Baillie was responsible for misleading the historians of the Ratisbon abbey. They used his narrative and accepted its veracity, and any documents concerning Asloan's election and appointment were not in the abbey archives and could not be used to correct his version. Audomarus John Asloan, abbot of Würzburg, was also abbot of Ratisbon, the only time this happened in the history of the two houses. He himself played it down; we do not find him at any time drawing attention to the fact. The Würzburg chronicler, however, copying from his tombstone, reveals the facts to some extent and speaks of Asloan snatching the Scottish abbeys from the jaws of the invaders, both at Würzburg and elsewhere. The invaders were not the Swedes but the Catholic emperor, the bishop of Ratisbon, the Discalced Carmelites; and perhaps, as we shall soon see, Continental and Irish Benedictines were included in the description.
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Germany, though divided, had been highly prosperous in 1618; it took her two centuries to recover from the devastation and depopulation which the Thirty Years' War caused. Würzburg suffered less than many other places, yet the three years' occupation was sufficient to wreck most of what Abbot Ogilvie had built up. Steady income from possessions or investments has always been a necessity for any religious community not earning its keep by salaries, honoraria, school fees, or other such ways. All three Scottish abbeys were in this position and suffered chronically from shortage of means; this directly affected the number of their personnel, with the result that there was usually a direct relationship between the administrative ability of the abbot in the temporal sphere and the quality of the monastic observance. In time of war or other calamities the income of a monastery could be so reduced as to make the upkeep of a community impossible. The number of monks in Franconian monasteries was reduced

---

drastically by the wars, and both the number and quality of novices offering themselves for admission was far below normal. Some indication of the state of affairs is given by the fact that it was not until 1642 that a common table, always considered one of the first essentials of monastic life, was restored at the abbey of St Stephen's, while the great abbey of Schwarzach had only seven monks in 1646. 2

We have an account of the miserable state of the three Scots monasteries at this time, written by Boniface Strachan, the Würzburg monk who accompanied Abbot Asloan to Ratisbon in 1639 and had a hand in the attempt to sell the Erfurt abbey the following year. Writing from Vienna on 20th November 1641 he sent John Soot of Scotstarvet, the director of the chancery in Scotland, an account of the Scottic monasteries in Germany, including the three the Scots still had. 3 He describes graphically the difficulties at Ratisbon, including the attempt of the emperor to dislodge the monks during the recent Diet, and says its revenues can support only one or two monks. The income at Erfurt can hardly support even one monk, while at Würzburg the revenues are very small, being diminished by the continuous wars. The history of the Scottish abbeys in the following years should be seen against this background of severe financial hardships.

There are indications of what Strachan was doing in Vienna. The Scots, we know, made a further attempt to recover the Vienna abbey in 1641 when its abbot died. 4 The date of his death was 27th November, 5 just one week after Strachan wrote to Soot; if Strachan used the old style date because he was writing to Scotland, the abbot had died three days before. There can be no doubt that Strachan was trying to recover the monastery for the Scots. In the passage in his letter on the Vienna abbey he says
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that the Scots could recover it easily but had not the means to support enough monks for their own needs, let alone train more to man other monasteries.

One cannot help being struck by the insecurity of so many religious houses in the German lands in the seventeenth century. Quite apart from the disputes between Catholics and Protestants, as well as between Jesuits and Benedictines, for the possession of old monasteries, there were attempts by new religious orders to obtain other religious houses for themselves (for example, the efforts to oust the Scots in Ratisbon) and attempts by Benedictines to gain or regain possession of other Benedictine monasteries. The Scots periodically tried to recover the Vienna abbey, which was Benedictine, and the Ratisbon Scots were shortly to have other Benedictines making such an attempt against them. The situation may have been healthy in so much as it stimulated religious orders to safeguard themselves by keeping up numbers, but it is very unlike the situation in more modern times.

Throughout the seventeenth century in Germany the monasteries were making attempts to form themselves into groups professing the same observance, known as congregations, or to extend their congregation to include neighbouring monasteries that were not yet committed. Such, for instance, was the Bavarian Congregation, formed after a century of intermittent effort in 1684. Where the bishop retained a tight hold on all the monasteries in his diocese, imposed common constitutions on them and so on, the result was something approaching a diocesan congregation though it was never so entitled; this was the case in Würzburg and some other dioceses. There was also the Bursfeld Union, a revival of the congregation that
raised the level of German monasticism in the late fifteenth century. It was unique in that it aimed to cover the whole of Germany. It had remarkable success but failed in its ultimate object because of the refusal of the strong bishops to relinquish control of monasteries in their own diocese.

This bare outline is essential for the understanding of the negotiations in which Asloan was involved. In April 1642 the abbot who was president of the Bursfeld Congregation died, and the abbots of Würzburg and Bamberg dioceses were cited to attend the chapter which would elect his successor. The abbot of St Stephen's replied that the invitation could not be accepted as they were no longer in the Bursfeld Union, though he personally would like to be. The bishop was then requested to give his abbots leave to attend but he ignored the letter. The person who first wrote on behalf of the Bursfeld Congregation was Leonard Colchon, abbot of Seligenstadt on the Main not far upstream from Frankfurt. He was now elected as the new president in May 1642, a recognition of his zeal and labours for the Congregation.

At once he took the matter of the Franconian abbeys up again with vigour. On 10th June he wrote a pressing appeal to the bishop to allow the Bursfeld Congregation to exact chapter attendance, obedience, submission to visitations, and the rest, from the abbots in his two dioceses in the same way as former bishops had done. With the letter he enclosed a copy of the 1514 document which united St James's in Würzburg in its brief German monastic period to the Bursfeld Congregation. This was the basis of Colchon's appeal: that the Franconian monasteries had once been joined to the Bursfeld Congregation and therefore still belonged to it by right.
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He was continuing his successor's policy of recovering monasteries lost to the congregation and making good the losses it had suffered. A week later he sent a monk to Würzburg to conduct negotiations. The latter was received by the bishop but the only result was a letter at the end of the month from the ecclesiastical counsellors of Würzburg saying that the matter needed careful consideration.

Colchon's emissary to Würzburg had been kindly received by Abbot Asloan, and to the latter Colchon at once turned for help in furthering his plans. Asloan was certainly a good man to use as an intermediary and advocate, for he seems to have inspired the confidence of the bishops of Würzburg with whom he had dealings. He could not do as requested at once, since the unexpected arrival of Alexander Baillie from Ratisbon compelled him to make some journey, but he returned to Würzburg towards the end of July and spoke with the bishop. The latter gave his consent to Colchon's petition and promised to persuade his counsellors to agree. Then, a few days later, he died.

Bishop Francis died on 30th July 1642 and was succeeded by John Philip von Schönborn on 16th August. Within a fortnight Colchon had addressed an appeal to John Philip to ratify his predecessor's decision and had sent it to Asloan to deliver in person. Asloan waited until 16th September for a suitable opportunity to deliver it to the new bishop, who a few days later sent a very encouraging reply to Colchon, saying that he would put the matter to his chapter and expected them to agree. No further progress was made, however, and the following April the Bursfeld chapter addressed another appeal to the bishop. Once again Asloan was asked to help.
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This produced no results, and yet another appeal was made in May 1644.17 Here, as far as we know, the matter ended. Perhaps the new bishop was more firmly in the saddle and was not prepared to relinquish control of the abbeys in his diocese, or the diocesan chapter may not have proved as cooperative as the bishop had expected.

Unfortunately we have only Asloan's side of the correspondence for the autumn of 1642. From the beginning Colchon had made flattering or diplomatic references to the Scottish abbot's zeal for the Bursfeld Union and the fact that St James's belonged to it by right. Asloan, when telling Colchon of his successful interview with the new bishop, reminded him that St James's had in the meantime been united to the Scottish Congregation by the holy see, which would surely strengthen the union among the Scots rather than permit it to be weakened. It seems a fairly plain hint that he would appeal to Rome against any attempt to incorporate the Scots abbey into the Bursfeld Congregation. Rather tactlessly and inconsistently he added that Colchon could show his presidency by giving the poor Scots some financial help. The evidently angry rejoinder from Colchon was met with a respectful and friendly assurance of Asloan's high esteem for the Bursfeld Union, for which he had conducted negotiations so successfully. Nevertheless Asloan again made his point clear: he could not enter the Bursfeld Congregation without infringing the rights of the Scottish Congregation and the privileges granted to it by Rome.

Colchon was not to be deflected from his viewpoint. His appeal of April 1643 to the bishop mentioned St James's and some other abbeys by name, and four years after that, when sending word to the abbot of Schwarzach of spiritual favours received from the holy see, he asked him to pass the in-
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formation to other houses of the Bursfeld Union, including St James's.\(^{18}\)

The Scots, however, were less likely to be convinced at this time than at almost any other period of their history. After the election of Asloan to the Ratisbon abbacy, they were in exceptionally close union, and it was about this time that they decided to form, or re-form, a Scottish Congregation. The only evidence for this consists of a draft petition made out to Urban VIII and mentioning the encouragement to unite given to the Scots monks by his nephew, Francesco Barberini.\(^{19}\) The date is almost certainly after 1640, when the Ratisbon abbey was under sustained attack, and must be before July 1644, when Urban died. Whether it was drawn up before or after Asloan's correspondence with the Bursfeld authorities, his references to a Scottish Congregation show what was in his mind at the time.

We do not know what happened to these appeals. All we do know is that no Scottish Congregation was formed, which is not surprising when we consider that there were almost certainly not a dozen Scots in all. A number of recruits came from the Rome and Douai colleges during these years but not many stayed long. Three students at Rome were dispensed from the mission oath in order to become Benedictines in 1637-39.\(^{20}\) One was Boniface Strachan, whom we have met already; another was Macarius Chambers at Ratisbon; the third, Henry More, may have entered Würzburg but did not persevere.\(^{21}\) Three came from Douai: Gilbert Gordon, who was at Ratisbon or Würzburg between 1636 and 1640;\(^{22}\) Robert Francis Irvine, who was at Würzburg for a time in or shortly after 1643;\(^{23}\) and Alexander Lumsden, who was at Würzburg in 1644-45.\(^{24}\) All three had difficulty in settling on
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one form of clerical or religious life, and all eventually became religious of one kind or another. A few years later, in 1649, Archibald Alexander came from Douai to Würzburg but nothing more is known of him. A better subject was Maurus Dixon, who was professed at Würzburg about 1639 and matriculated at the university in 1641. At some point, too, George Asloean entered the monastery.

Lack of monks does not seem to have been a cause of anxiety at this period, but lack of income must have limited the size of the resident community quite as effectively as any lack of applicants. This presumably is why Abbot Asloean was able to spare men to work elsewhere. At any rate, Boniface Strachan obtained leave from Rome to assist the Spanish ambass-ador in Venice from 1644 to 1645; there is no record that he ever re-turned to Würzburg. The abbey of Schwarzach was desperately in need of men, as is clear from the correspondence of its abbots with Colchon. Fr Benedict, a Würzburg Scot, is said to have been induced by Colchon to go to Schwarzach at some date before 1646; although we do not know who this was, and it seems unlikely to have been Abbot Asloean's brother, it is not impossible. When a new abbot came to Schwarzach in 1646, Fr James Brown became his subprior for three years. This is partial corroboration of the Scottish chronicler's ambiguous statement that Brown held the offices of prior and novice-master in the monasteries of Fulda, Schwarzach and St Stephen's.

The war was still going on, and the armies were still moving up and down the land, commandeering and plundering as they went. Baillie notes how this affected the security and income of the Ratisbon abbey, as well
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as how the finances steadily improved under his own administration. By 1646, he says, it was clear that the abbey could be preserved, and he himself was postulated abbot on 18th January of that year. There is of course no mention of Asloan, but we can presume that the latter had sent his resignation of the Ratisbon abbey direct to the holy see. Macarius Chambers, the Ratisbon prior, was then elected abbot of Erfurt on 12th March. Before Chambers's election was confirmed, Asloan and Baillie agreed on joint action to find novices. Chambers and Fr Maurus Dixon of Würzburg were sent to Paris in mid-June and returned in September with two young Scots, David Keith and John Abercromby. Unfortunately for Baillie, the composite warring armies were all in Bavaria, and the Ratisbon clergy were sorely harassed; Chambers and the two youngers had to go to Würzburg, where Keith and Abercromby took the habit.

It was no doubt when Chambers passed through Würzburg on his way to Paris that Bishop John Philip supplied him with a commendatory letter for his new ordinary, the archbishop of Mainz. The letter, dated 10th June 1646, mentions Abbot Asloan's recommendation of Chambers. The following year, incidentally, John Philip was himself to become archbishop and elector of Mainz while retaining the see of Würzburg. He was thus one of the most important men in the Empire. Asloan, who had his confidence, was a man of some standing in Würzburg and in 1646 was elected rector of the university. Unfortunately the published matriculation lists omit his name but the fact is beyond reasonable doubt.

A document written in Asloan's life-time, that is before 1661, states the fact. The editor of the lists, however, says that, since there is no special page containing the rector's name, the previous rector must
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have continued in office. But that same rector was first elected in 1644, then re-elected the following year, and he has a special page in 1645. Why not, therefore, in 1646? Secondly, the editor himself claims that a double leaf has gone missing, as there is a gap in entries between November 1645 and November 1646.\textsuperscript{36} A similar case occurs in 1629, the year after Abbot Ogilvie was rector; here the editor argues that, since no rector is mentioned, a person who was vouched for by an external source must be held to have been elected.\textsuperscript{37} The same argument holds good in favour of Asloan in 1646. It is clear that the page containing the record of Asloan’s rectorship is missing and that he was Rector Magnificus in the academic year 1646-47.

The year 1646 saw the three Scots abbeys reverting to normal government. Asloan, Baillie and Chambers were abbots of Würzburg, Ratisbon and Erfurt respectively, elected by the usual electoral bodies and each residing in his monastery. The year 1648 saw peace restored to an exhausted Germany. But although things were reverting to normal, references to matters other than routine administration of finance and property at Würzburg in the dozen years after 1646 are scarce in the extreme. Baillie’s narrative hardly mentions Würzburg. Abbot Colchon, president of the Bursfeld Congregation, entrusted Chambers at Erfurt with some business\textsuperscript{38} and arranged for an unsettled German monk to stay with the Scots at Ratisbon\textsuperscript{39} but had no further dealings with Asloan until 1651. Even for this the sole evidence is a reply of Colchon to Asloan, dated 27th March.\textsuperscript{40} Fr James Brown and Bro Placid Keith had spent a few days at Seligenstadt and discussed some matter with Colchon, who advised them that they were unlikely to obtain what they were seeking in the Bursfeld Congregation. They
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had then proceeded on their way towards the monasteries of the Lorraine Congregation. The only clue to the nature of their business is that Colchon qualifies it with the word *pius* and wishes them well in the furtherance of the Benedictine order, which Brown evidently has at heart. We can only guess as to whether they were looking for help for their abbey or had some private scheme in view. The matter may be connected with Aslohan's desire to have the missionary faculties granted to Abbot Ogilvie renewed as he had monks suited for missionary work. Not long before, in May 1650, he had asked the prince-bishop of Würzburg (and Mainz) to act as mediator for him in order to obtain the renewal more quickly.\(^4\)

In Ratisbon meanwhile the Scots were about to be involved in one of the strangest and perhaps most dangerous episodes in their whole history. Intimately connected with it was a man who must surely rank as one of the most extraordinary characters of the century.\(^4\) Juan Caramuel y Lobkowitz, usually known as Caramuel, was born at Madrid in 1606 of international parentage. As a boy he was phenomenally precocious, taking a doctorate in philosophy at the age of fifteen. He became a Cistercian monk in Spain, and in 1634 the general chapter of his order, hoping because of Charles I's milder policy towards Catholics to restore the monasteries that had formerly existed, made him abbot of Melrose and vicar-general for England, Scotland and Ireland. Almost certainly he did not cross the Channel. Instead he went to the Netherlands, where he had a meteoric career in practically every profession except that of monk. In 1645 he became the Spanish envoy to the emperor's court, and three years later defended Prague against the Swedes, putting himself at the head of a corps of voluntaries and being subsequently decorated for bravery. He held

\(^4\) KJP, nr. 517/1.

\(^4\) Caramuel's career is taken from *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, III (Leipzig, 1876), 778-81; *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada*, XI, 693-94; XIX, 893-94.
various ecclesiastical offices at this period: abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Emaus in Prague (now known also as Montserrat after the famous Catalanian abbey, since the emperor had refounded it with Spanish monks), superior general of the Benedictines in Vienna, vicar-general of the archbishop of Prague. He was called to Rome in 1655, became bishop of Campagna and then of Vigevano, where he died in 1682.

Intellectually he was of unparalleled brilliance and superficiality. He knew twenty-four languages and produced inventions in quite unrelated crafts and disciplines. The most conservative estimate of his works puts them at more than seventy; he even instituted a printing press to publish them. They are on all subjects and mixtures of subjects, for instance on solving moral questions by mathematical rules. Unfortunately almost everything he wrote is useless. Ironically, he is known to posterity, and to theologians in particular, because of the notoriety his accommodating views on moral questions gained for him: his contemporary, Pascal, likewise a precocious genius but of more solid achievements, attacked him, and with reason, in his Lettres Provinciales, while St Alphonsus Liguori, who is accepted as one of the greatest of moral theologians, called him princeps laxistarum. The career of this extraordinary man, who held such diverse ecclesiastical and secular offices in so many countries, and whose mind wandered over all the fields of human knowledge, has been given in some detail as it is probably Caramuel's character which was the root cause of the trouble involving him and the Ratisbon Scots.

Caramuel was in Vienna and Prague from 1645 to 1655, and for most of this time he had dealings with Abbot Baillie in Ratisbon. Baillie, as his finances improved, became anxious to obtain the monks whom he could
now support. We have seen how his effort to find novices in Paris helped Würzburg and not his own abbey. His anxiety to have more monks may not have been the initial cause of his relations with Caramuel but it was certainly the reason for their continuance. In November 1647 Caramuel was telling Baillie that he could not spare his prior in Vienna, an Irishman called Fr Columbanus Duffy, unless the move would entail promotion to a higher dignity than that of prior. Two months later he was offering to send Duffy to Ratisbon on condition that he was made Baillie's coadjutor as abbot. In early 1649 he sent him to Ratisbon for a holiday, then wrote to Baillie telling him to keep Duffy as prior and offering to send another Irishman to be a novice; he also warned Baillie of the dangers of having insufficient monks, as the Spanish Carmelites and the Servites wanted to have the Scots' buildings. This was in March 1649; in the following August there had evidently been trouble of some sort over Duffy sending two novices to Vienna, and since Baillie had still said nothing about making him his coadjutor, Caramuel asked for his return.\footnote{Reg. BOA, Fasz. 32.}

There the matter rested for two or three years, but we can note that in 1650 Asloan at Würzburg was speaking of monks being available for mission work in Scotland, and in the following year two Würzburg monks were touring monasteries of the Bursfeld and Lorraine congregations. Certainly Würzburg did not seem short of Scottish monks. In 1651 Baillie approached the English Congregation for help. The president was Fr Placid Gascoigne, who that year was also elected abbot of Lamspring near Hanover. This was an ancient Benedictine nunnery, handed over by the Bursfeld Congregation to the English monks in 1643, and was unique among English monasteries in having, like the Scots, abbots elected for life, instead of priors for a
period of four years as the English constitutions laid down. It was the only English monastery in Germany and its government approached more to that of the Scots monasteries in Germany than to the other English houses. Baillie wanted some form of union with the English, his chief motive being to get a few of their monks and novices. Gascoigne expressed himself favourable to the idea and promised to put the matter to his congregation and send someone to Ratisbon to obtain further information. Nothing more was done, however, so Baillie then had to try some other means.

In March 1652 we get one of the rare glimpses of the internal affairs of the Würzburg abbey, with Baillie at Ratisbon also coming into the picture. Abbot Asloan sent a most troubled letter to Cardinal Barberini in Rome. It had been his aim since becoming abbot, he said, to preserve monastic observance and help the mission in Britain; and accordingly he had doubled the number of monks and also brought young men to Würzburg to enter the house. But the aspirants had left, and certain malevolent monks had been stirring up trouble against him. Having obtained no satisfaction from the bishop, these were now trying to put their case in Rome, while Abbot Baillie was encouraging them and claiming that as abbot of Ratisbon he had the right of visitation in the other Scots monasteries. As Asloan rightly points out, this right had long since been taken over by the bishops of Würzburg and in fact had not been used by the Ratisbon abbot since the refounding of the abbey in 1595. Asloan is appealing to the holy see and asking for a fair hearing either in Rome or before some neutral persons. It is a long letter but tells us precisely nothing about what the complaints, real or invented, of his dissatisfied monks actually were. It can be presumed that the matter did not go much further, as it figures neither in
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Barberini's correspondence nor in Baillie's narrative. A few months later Cardinal Fabio Chigi, the secretary of state in Rome, was assuring Asloian of his good will and patronage. He had known Asloian when he was nuntio in Cologne, and he was shortly to be Pope Alexander VII. Incidentally, he had also in his Cologne days known Caramuel and was to summon the latter to Rome when he became pope.

At this very time Baillie in Ratisbon was at last giving way under the strain and falling in with Caramuel's designs. On 2nd June 1652 he wrote to Duffy, now prior in Prague, outlining his difficulties. He had only three priests and one laybrother; Abbot Chambers had been tried as a possible coadjutor and found wanting, so Baillie had sent him back to Erfurt. Baillie himself had been very ill and this was his grand climacteric, that is, he was in his sixty-third year (a particularly critical time, it was formerly believed, of a man's life). Wishing to have things settled before he died, Baillie promised to appoint the Irishman coadjutor at once, but he was not to tell anyone except Caramuel and the nuntio. There is no mention of what was later declared to be Baillie's main motive in appointing Duffy, namely, the summoning of an imperial Diet to be held in Ratisbon.

The story of what ensued can be put together from Baillie's narrative and the Informatio Juris et Facti composed by the Ratisbon episcopal officials, supported by a few letters and documents which have survived. When it became known that the Diet was to meet in Ratisbon, the bishop ordered that each religious house should have sufficient men in residence to meet the extra needs. Baillie, who was by now keeping his chronicle partly in English, wrote that '...we fearing, not without cause, that our
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small number would be objected, specially having a great concurse of
people in our Kirk in tyme of parlament', he was compelled to ask Caramuel
for the loan of some Irish fathers. He had wanted to get his extra men
from Würzburg but had been 'sett aff (i.e., foiled) sindyry tymes he them
of Würzburg disagreing amang themselves at such an importune tyme'.
With belated tact he crossed this out (or perhaps someone else did) but
left it quite legible. This may be a reference to the trouble which had
made Asloan write to Barberini, or it may even be the reason why Asloan
complained of Baillie. The Informatio merely says that Baillie knew the
abbot of Würzburg could only with difficulty spare any men.

Caramuel, having already some years ago tried to get Fr Columbanus
Duffy made Baillie's coadjutor, and having in vain suggested some form of
union with the three Scottish abbeys, now sent Duffy and another Irishman
on the understanding that Duffy was to be nominated coadjutor abbot. On
18th November 1652 Baillie appointed Duffy his coadjutor for the grave
reasons, as he put it, which Caramuel had explained to the emperor. The
pact was to be kept secret; even Baillie's community did not know of it.
It was of course quite invalid, and Baillie knew it was. Scottish abbots
were elected, as the Informatio said, from and by the monks of the three
Scots abbeys. Duffy and Caramuel did not keep the secret, and naturally
there was an outcry when the news leaked out. Baillie, who was by this
time expecting some Scottish monks from Würzburg, wished to send the two
Irishmen away, whereupon Caramuel arrived and created the trouble that only
a man of his gifts and vitality could. The bishop now became interested
as he claimed to have authority where abbatial elections were concerned.

The matter was apparently not yet public on 3rd February 1653, when
Asloan at Würzburg sent a most cordial letter to Abbot Chambers in Erfurt, promising him some good Franconian wine but not mentioning Ratisbon affairs. On 3rd April, however, Baillie wrote to the bishop admitting he had agreed to Caramuel's plan, and on the 27th he underwent a judicial interrogation. From this the interesting fact emerges that Baillie's own election and confirmation in 1646 had been carried through by the bishop's authority in spite of the abbey's exempt status. The bishop thus had a vested interest in proving the pact with Caramuel and Duffy invalid. With bishop and abbot united, if for different reasons, in opposing the Irishman's coadjutorship, the struggle was gradually won. The emperor and the nuntio decided not to support the Irishman, and the Roman authorities then came to the same decision. One cannot help feeling that Baillie was extremely lucky to be supported by the bishop and to be described in his report to Rome as a gifted but simple man deluded by the wily Caramuel, and better fitted to rule his abbey himself than Duffy would ever be. In fact, when one considers that Baillie offered Duffy the coadjutorship in June 1652, a full year before the Diet actually opened, the suspicion remains that the Diet merely provided a handy excuse for his impulsive action.

The Scots had won the first round but now, as Baillie put it, 'the Irish left not off but begann to seek to be taken on among us as Scottsmen'. In other words, the Irish monks were claiming that they were the rightful owners, since the Scotti who founded the abbey were Irish. This time the proceedings were not extraordinary but consisted of an Irish appeal to Rome and the Scots' rebuttal of their claim; probably Duffy would have gone about things in this way before if Caramuel had not directed the course of events. In fact, approach to higher authority to regain former
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possessions characterised Irish Benedictine activity at this time, and the Ratisbon episode cannot be viewed in isolation. In 1646 the general of the Benedictines in Spain wrote to the nuntio in Ireland asking that six Irish Benedictines, including Columbanus Duffy, should be allowed to recover former monasteries in Ireland and become abbots.\footnote{Commentarius Einnuggianus (Dublin, 1932-49), II, 487.} Two years later an appointment was made to the priory of Rosscarbery, which (incredible as it may seem) was referred to as a dependency of St James's in Würzburg.\footnote{Collectanea Hibernica, ii (1959), 49. See p. 11.}

Besides letters and documents showing the course of the process, the text of the Irish supplication and the Scottish reply to it have survived in a small volume written by a later Ratisbon abbot, Placid Fleming.\footnote{Adv. 29.7.1; additional documentation in BL, 8627, f. 49, 56; Reg. BOA, Fasz. 32; SCA Rat. C 9, 18; Baillie, f. 79v - 80r; Prop. SOCG, 297, f. 245, 298, 300, 396.} The Irish said there were only ten monks in all, including the aged and infirm, in the three Scots abbeys; they wanted half the number of places, so that Scots and Irish would be equally represented in them. Their appeal concerned all the Scotch monasteries, and Ratisbon in particular; the Scottish reply transcribed by Fleming is by Asloan, the Würzburg abbot, who answered the sixteen questions framed by the Irish, then asked nine for them to reply to and added a commentary. In some way or other the Irish monks had had access to the cartulary begun by Bishop Echter's officials and preserved in the Würzburg abbey, for they cited documents from it with the correct folio.\footnote{Adv. 29.7.1, f. 20r, 21v.}

Danger also threatened from the bishop of Ratisbon. Baillie wrote just before Christmas 1653 to Barberini about the bishop's plan to have a seminary for religious in his abbey and saying that the abbots of Würzburg and Erfurt joined with him in begging Barberini to prevent it. The bishop flatly denied that there was any truth in the story and later promised to
protect the Scots. The Irish claim had been referred from Rome to him, and in May 1654 he instituted an enquiry. Chambers in Erfurt was asked to attend but excused himself; perhaps Asloan was asked too, for he wrote to the bishop that month but his letter, though recorded, cannot be found. Certainly, however, he supplied information to support the Scots' case and also communicated with the nuncio. The English monks also played some part on the fringe of the affair. Abbot Gascoigne of Lamspring, no longer president of the English Congregation, journeyed from Ratisbon to Würzburg and took a letter from the bishop to Asloan with him. This association of the two abbots is most significant in view of the union between the Scots of Würzburg and the English Benedictine Congregation which was to be effected a few years later.

Columbanus Duffy was calling himself prior of St John's in Waterford; he was not the only Irishman at this period who held the title, for there is recorded a papal bull conferring it on another Irish Benedictine. The Scots wanted to know who had appointed Duffy as that house was subject to the Benedictines of Bath Cathedral, which as a point of mediaeval history seems to be factually accurate. Duffy claimed too that the Irish monks were expelled from the Schottenklöster under Elizabeth, a claim which Baillie's monks found easy to refute. But doubtless it was not because of their historical accuracy that the Scots won their case, but through the support of the bishop and Barberini.

The status of the three Scots abbeys changed again in 1655. Alexander Baillie, the Würzburg monk who more than anyone had controlled the destinies of the Ratisbon abbey since the Swedish invasion, died on 7th April 1655. Chambers, a monk of Ratisbon, was elected as his successor.
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but retained the Erfurt abbacy by dispensation of the archbishop of Mainz. Erfurt was never again to have an abbot of its own; for a time the Ratisbon abbots were simultaneously abbots of Erfurt, but eventually Erfurt lost its abbatial status and merely had priors appointed by its superior, the Ratisbon abbot. Chambers had not pleased Baillie when the latter had considered him as a possible coadjutor; he was not satisfactory as Baillie's successor either.

For most of the decade 1650-60 there is an almost complete dearth of information about the Würzburg abbey. There are a few references to individual monks: Maurus Dixon, prior in 1653; Flacid Keith matriculating at the university in November 1654; Fr Benedict Asloan dying in 1656. When the curtain lifts again in 1660-61 we find that the union with the English Congregation had just been ratified and that, of the six resident monks, two were very recently professed and two belonged to English monasteries. In other words, shortly before Asloan's death his community had apparently dwindled down to almost nothing.

The monastic chronicler, writing about thirty years after Asloan's death, praises him unreservedly. Asloan, he says, was a kind man, patient and easy to get on with, loved by all and in particular by Bishop John Philip, elector of Mainz. He built a fairly elaborate guest-house, had two altars put in the church and made out new account books. His tombstone says that after ruling for twenty-three years he left his abbey in a flourishing state. There is only one reason for doubting the objectivity of the praise bestowed on him, and that is the small size of the community he left behind him. We can ignore the comment of the chronicler, who adverted to this and blamed Cromwell's persecution. Quite apart from
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the fact that persecution would drive recusants overseas rather than keep
them at home, the numbers of students at the Scots colleges do not seem
to have fallen off. The drop in numbers at Würzburg makes one wonder
what significance is to be attributed to hints of trouble in the monastery
or to references to Würzburg monks engaged outside their monastery. Was
there some serious flaw in Asloan's government?

What little evidence there is points in the abbot's favour. When a
community numbers half a dozen, the death of two members makes a differ¬
ence: Fr Benedict Asloan died in 1656, and Fr James Brown in March 1658.60
The drastic shortage in numbers, as far as one can judge, was a quite
recent development, since Asloan had been applying for mission faculties
in 1650 and had lent monks to Ratisbon during the Diet four years later.
In the autumn of 1658 there occurred a most illuminating incident. Two
young men, William Baillie and a former Presbyterian minister, Alexander
Gordon, arrived from Rome to enter the novitiate at Würzburg. Asloan
accepted Baillie willingly but, as he was expecting four youths who had
arrived at Amsterdam on their way from Scotland to Würzburg, he directed
Gordon to Ratisbon. There Abbot Chambers consoled the slighted Gordon,
gave him the monastic habit and wrote to the rector of the Roman college
saying what he had done. Asloan had the last laugh, however. Gordon
soon left and thereafter admitted freely that his only purpose had been to
spy on Catholic institutions.61 The episode not only shows that Asloan's
judgement was far sounder than Chambers's but also that Asloan took steps
to remedy the lack of monks. He had sent Maurus Dixon to Scotland for the
purpose,62 the first example we have of such a commission. He also took
positive action in his last year of office to stabilise the condition of
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his monastery and provide a successor for himself, as we shall see on consideration of the union with the English monks.

A portrait of Abbot Asloam, painted when he was in his forties, has survived. The subject has a head and hands large in proportion to his body. His moustache and little tuft of a beard are black although his hair is receding. He is certainly not handsome. He has a long nose, thick lips and a large jowl but the wide-open eyes have a calm and intelligent expression. Unless the painter was lacking in the basic skills, the abbot's body was inclined to be dwarf-like but he was a person to be reckoned with. This rather ugly little man, who could win the affection of his monks and of the patrician prince-bishop, had preserved a testimonial from his fellow missioners to his good work while on the mission. 63 His letters and his actions, little though we know of either, give the impression of competence. Colchon, the president of the Bursfeld Union, said he would have been pleased if Asloam, who was so good at carrying burdens, had been elected in his place.64 Allowing for the amenities of letter-writing, for this was in a letter to Asloam himself, it is not likely to be too far-fetched. After all, Colchon had chosen the Scot as his agent in a most important negotiation, and the event showed his choice to have been wise.

The only evidence in his disfavour is the trouble with his monks in 1652, corroborated to some extent by damaging remarks made not long after by James Brown about the monastic observance in St James's.65 His remarks, which cannot be accepted without reservation, are far outweighed by the testimonies in Asloam's favour. The Schwarzach chronicle records the great help rendered by Asloam to their abbot, 66 while a Scots Jesuit who
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visited Würzburg in 1652 wrote that Abbot Asloan was 'ane brave man and mickle esteemed'. 67 Michael Haim, a Würzburg cleric who wrote a book on Macarius, praised Asloan highly in the dedicatory epistle. On balance we must conclude that Audomarus John Asloan filled the office of abbot very competently in exceptionally troubled times.

67 Blair's Papers, 151.
Chapter 9

RESTORATION AT WÜRZBURG, 1660-79.


The year 1660 forms a natural division in the history of both the Roman Catholic mission to Scotland and of the Scots abbey in Würzburg. In the case of the former the reason is the Restoration of Charles II, an event which had little direct influence on the Würzburg Scots. What gives the year its significance in their history is the combination of several factors. Before his long rule came to an end, Abbot Asloan made an agreement with the English monks to provide the Scots with help, should it be needed, and also an outlet for their missionary zeal. The help was not needed for long; the community began to grow and aspirants continued to enter the monastery. From this date extracts from the visitation records have been preserved, so that we have a reasonably accurate picture of the community from now on. Even if the agreement with the English Congregation was not of sufficient importance in itself to make the year an outstanding one, 1660 nevertheless marks the beginning of a new period for
the student investigating the history of the Würzburg abbey.

The documents of the agreement between the Scots of Würzburg and the English Benedictine Congregation\(^1\) consist of twelve Articles of Union signed by the Scots and followed by approbations signed by various English officials. The Articles themselves are written in the first person, and one paragraph concerns a purely Scottish affair. Evidently the Scottish monks drew up the Articles; an approbation was then added and signed by Abbot Gascoigne at Lambspring on 7th September 1660; then they were taken to Würzburg and signed on 15th October, five weeks later, by Asloan and two of his monks. Gascoigne signed in his capacity of Procurator General of his congregation in Germany, appointed with full powers by the general chapter of 1653. It seems clear that the chapter had deputed him, the only abbot in the congregation and the superior of the only English house in Germany, to undertake negotiations with the Scots. The request emanating from Ratisbon in 1651 for some form of union had thus not been forgotten, as Abbot Baillie thought, but had been referred to the next general chapter; or perhaps Abbot Asloan of Würzburg had also requested something similar. Certainly it gives added significance to Gascoigne's visit to Würzburg in 1654. A year after the two parties to the agreement signed, the Articles were referred for confirmation to the English general chapter held at Douai. Six monks deputed by chapter to consider the matter declared themselves in favour of it on 1st September 1661. Two days later, when the Articles had been read in a plenary session of the chapter and formally approved, the president general and the secretary of chapter signed an official declaration to this effect and added the great seal of the congregation.

\(^1\) Edited in full in Dilworth, "Scots and EBC" (in Appendix).
There is a marked difference between these Articles of Union and the agreement made by Scottish and English monks in 1623. Both agreements have the same mission arrangement: any Scot sent by his abbot to the mission will have those privileges and faculties which English monks have, and will be subject to English authority for the duration of his missionary work. But here the likeness ends, for whereas the earlier agreement contained merely a general affirmation of confraternity and spiritual union, the new pact was a thorough-going and comprehensive affair providing for 'union and incorporation' and dealt with fundamental points. Some of the Articles legislate for what is to happen when monks live in a monastery of the other nation: payment of travelling expenses is to be arranged between the superiors of the respective houses; monks are to wear the habit and follow the customs of the monastery where they are residing at the time; they have the same voting rights as other monks in the monastery where they reside.

There is an important limitation, however, to the free exercise of voting rights: only a Scot is to be abbot of Würzburg, and only an English monk is to be superior in an English monastery. To this article some copies of the Articles add a clause declaring one of the signatories, Fr Maurus Dixon, to be elected coadjutor abbot to Asloan with right of succession. The insistence on a Scot 'always and infallibly' being abbot of Würzburg is considerably weakened by the limiting clause 'provided he is suitable' found in some copies, and the infallibility is further called in question by an article requiring any English monk appointed abbot there to see that Scottish novices are brought into the house.

Other articles deal with the facilities and organisation of the
English Congregation that were lacking to the Scots. The latter are to be free to attend the English general chapter or not. The financial levies laid from time to time on the English houses are not to be obligatory for the Scots, who will instead use their discretion as to whether they contribute or not. If the English procurator in Rome or elsewhere transacts business for the Scots, he is to have expenses refunded as well as receiving a fee for his services.

The jurisdiction and rights of the bishop of Würzburg are mentioned several times, and the subjection of the Scots to his authority stands out clearly. His approval, as well as that of the holy see, has been necessary for the union; he has power to remove abbots for grave canonical reasons; the election of Maurus Dixon needs his consent. In fact this subjection to the bishop prevents any more thorough assimilation of the Scots to the English Congregation; because of it they are not to be bound by the English statutes in the same way as the English monasteries are. The Scots are, however, willing to accept an unofficial visitation by the English president general once every four years (his term of office), but at the expense of the English with possibly some financial contribution of their own.

We can now turn to a consideration of the motives for the union and the immediate consequences of it. Fr Maurus Dixon later declared that the English monks wanted to have help from the Scots in the staffing of their northern missions but, although one cannot rule this out, the Scots were the immediate beneficiaries. There are revealing references in the agreement to the lack of men and means at Würzburg. The final article arranges for English monks to help, should they be required, with the

---
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instruction of novices at Würzburg and in any other pressing need which might arise later. A clause making this a reciprocal agreement is added at the end, but it is going to be shown that English monks were at once required at Würzburg and at least one was already there.

Why did only Würzburg monks enter into the agreement when it was the Ratisbon abbot who had first suggested it? The answer to this would seem to be, not that the situation in Ratisbon had improved, but that the ineffectual Abbot Chambers was not likely to enter on anything so constructive. One can also ask why there was a lapse of seven years between Abbot Gascoigne's commission in 1653 and the signing of the Articles. The year 1660 suggests that the Restoration had something to do with the pact. Cromwell had made Scotland subject to English enactments and stimulated the desire in Scotland for union with England. Both countries welcomed Charles II back in the early summer of 1660; no doubt Scots and English recusants abroad were even more pleased than their Protestant compatriots at home. Both Scottish and English monks would naturally look forward to the new opportunities given them to help their homeland, and they had perhaps never before been so united in aims and sentiment. Abbot Gascoigne's approbation expresses the hope that the union will provide solace for 'our common fatherland Great Britain', and the president general also speaks of 'our fatherland Great Britain'. But the Scots do not mention this aspect, when there was no reason why those who drew up the Articles should not have expressed what they had in mind.

There is, however, one concrete reason for the monks of Würzburg wanting to use the resources of their more affluent English brethren in 1660. The key is provided by a list of the resident community in Würzburg at the

3 G. Donaldson, Scotland, James V to James VII, 356-57.
time of the episcopal visitation made on 4th February 1661. Abbot Asloan had
died on 24th January, three months after signing the Articles, and the
only Scots priests left in residence were Maurus Dixon and Placid Baillie,
the two who had signed the Articles with him; there were also two Scots
novices and two English monks. The six resident monks in February 1661
were Maurus Dixon, aged 43, professed 23 years and a priest for 16;
Placid Baillie, aged 28; Anselm Touchet of St Gregory's, Douai, professed
in November 1643; Placid Shaftoe of Lambspring, professed in December
1655; Macarius Brown, aged 22, professed on 1st November 1660; and
William Dunn, aged 17, professed the same day. The last two are explicit¬
ly described as Scots. 4

There may have been two other monks of Würzburg not in residence.
Boniface Strachan is listed in the Ratisbon necrology as dying in 1664,
though nothing is known of him after his period in Venice. Placid Keith,
who is found in no necrology, is said to have been in Poland in 1662. 5
The possibility that he was working among expatriate Scots cannot be ruled
out. The Würzburg necrology for this period is too imperfect for any
drama conclusion to be drawn that the omission of Strachan and Keith from
it means they severed their connection with the abbey at some point before
their death.

It is reasonable to suppose that the young monks Brown and Dunn were
two of the four youths who had travelled from Scotland in the autumn of
1658. Abbot Asloan was ill for some time before his death. 6 The most
likely explanation of the agreement with the English monks is that he wish¬
ed not only to bring in recruits but to see to their training. The list
of February 1661 states that Shaftoe had been in Würzburg for two years

4 Reid, f. 119rv. The profession dates of Touchet and Shaftoe are from
Birt, 55, 60.
5 Wieland, 108.
6 Haim, A 8v.
and says nothing about how long Touchet had been there. It would certainly seem that one of them was novice-master, for Dixon was cellarer during these years and Baillie had himself entered the monastery very shortly before.

It is at least possible that by profession the list really means reception of the habit, because the years since profession in the case of both English monks are overstated. On the other hand, mathematical accuracy was clearly not aimed at in these visitation lists; most probably the figures are those given by each monk to routine questions put by the visitors. If we take the terminology of the 1661 list as accurate, the two young Scots had begun their novitiate a year before November 1660, and the pact was confirming what was already happening in practice; if, as is possible, they were awaiting admission to the novitiate at the time, the final article calling for help with the training of novices is easily explained. When he signed the Articles, Asloan, with only three months to live, seems to have been trying to provide for the future. Hence the election of Dixon as coadjutor with right of succession, although this was not ratified until after Asloan's death, and hence the insistence that Würzburg was to be preserved for the Scots even if an English abbot were elected through lack of Scots.

Audomarus Asloan died in the night of 24th-25th January 1661 and was given a place in various German monastic necrologies. Dixon administered the monastery, as probably he had been doing during Asloan's illness, and arranged for an election, which took place on 25th February, three weeks after the visitation. It was no doubt a foregone conclusion that Dixon should be elected. The new abbot, although he used the English spelling

7 Haim, A 7v; Dilworth, "Scots and EBC", 57.
8 See p. 379.
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10 Fel. Red. 333.
of his surname, was a Scot, possibly from Berwick or the Lothians, where there were Catholic Dicksons at the time. He had studied philosophy and theology at Würzburg university, had been prior and cellarer, and had successfully accomplished missions to Paris and Scotland to bring back recruits. Dixon was perhaps the only choice, but he seemed qualified for the office of abbot.

In the light of what he said later about the English monks and their missions, one suspects that Dixon did not altogether approve of the union. It does not seem to have had any important consequences except in missionary work, and as soon as Dixon was elected he turned to other sources for help. The abbot of Schwarzach had reason to be grateful to the Scots for the help given to his predecessor in office by Asloan. He was present at Dixon's election and granted his request for the loan of one of his monks, Fr Maurus Boudetius, who now went to live with the Scots and was cellarer, in succession to Dixon himself, for almost two years.

The next year the German abbey helped still more. Alan Chisholm, who had been a soldier, entered the monastery at the age of nineteen and was sent to Schwarzach for his year of novitiate, while a German laybrother, Bro. Joseph Beussel, lived in St James's for a time. Another German monk, Fr Bernard Zinck, taught philosophy in the Scots abbey from 1663 to 1666, and his Theses in logic, which he printed, were defended (presumably at a public disputation) by Brown and Dunn. One is led to suppose that the two English monks left Würzburg fairly soon after Dixon's election. Even if the loan of a German monk as cellarer can be explained by the fact that one was urgently needed to replace Dixon in that office, sending the next
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novice to Schwarzach and borrowing a German professor of philosophy suggests strongly that the provision of the agreement concerning the training of novices was no longer operative.

Dixon was blessed as abbot and took the oath of fidelity to the bishop on 20th August 1662. In the following years two more young Scots, Bernard Maxwell and Minian Graham, joined the community. At a visitation in December 1665 there were present the abbot and four Scots aged from 21 to 26: Dunn, Chisholm, Maxwell and Graham. Baillie and Brown had departed for the mission, and the two English monks are not mentioned. Almost exactly three years later, at a visitation, the same persons were present, with the addition of James Blair and Columbanus Fraser. At the next visitation, in January 1672, yet another two had entered, Mariamus Irvine and Christian Abercrombie, while William Dunn had gone to the mission. At the beginning of 1672, therefore, Abbot Dixon had seven young men, three of them priests, with him in the abbey and three of his monks were working as missionaries. None of the novices since Placid Baillie since 1658 had come from the Scots colleges in Douai or Rome; their numbers suggest that they were the fruit of recruiting errands to Scotland. The only student from either college to enter Würzburg in these decades was John Brown, who came from Douai in 1674 and did not persevere.

Meanwhile, as had happened so often in the last half century, the Ratisbon abbey was once more in a dangerous state of crisis. In the ten years since his election Abbot Chambers had succeeded in squandering what his predecessor had built up, and at the beginning of 1666 he simply departed, leaving debts behind him. He went first to Vienna, then to Bologna, where he found a place in the archbishop’s household. In July

---
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1666 the bishop of Ratisbon forced a visitation of the monks who remained; they protested to the nuntio at Vienna and to Cardinal Francesco Barberini that the bishop (who, incidentally, died within a month) had threatened to drive the Scots out of their abbey and was ignoring their privilege of exemption from his jurisdiction. The only known result of the unfortunate proceedings is that Abbot Dixon of Würzburg was appointed administrator of Ratisbon, and since Erfurt had no abbot but merely a person-in-charge appointed to live there by Chambers, Dixon was superior of Erfurt also. Apart from Chambers himself, monks of Würzburg had been superiors of Ratisbon and Erfurt since 1634, and now the abbot of Würzburg was in charge of all three Scottish houses. He was appointed by the nuntio in Vienna some time between early February 1667, when Propaganda was looking for an abbot to put in, and the following June.

In the course of his duties as superior at Ratisbon, Dixon on 21st November 1669 received the vows of Bro. Placid Fleming, aged twenty-seven. One wonders, did Dixon at the time have any idea of the significance of the event? It was to be the salvation of the Ratisbon abbey. Thomas Fleming, a descendant of the earls of Wigtown, was born at Kirkoswald in Ayrshire in October 1642. After receiving his education in Edinburgh he became a naval officer, and it was apparently in Dublin about the age of twenty-three that he became a Catholic. Not long afterwards he was captured by Moorish pirates and spent some time in captivity before being recaptured and freed by the Spanish. In 1667 he entered the Scots college in Paris, but went to Ratisbon the following year and took the habit. A year and some months after Dixon received his profession, that is, in the spring of 1671, he was ordained priest.

20 SCA Rat. C 9, 19-21; ML, C (Propaganda), 14.9.1666.
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In the summer of 1672 the Vienna nuntio was concerning himself once more with the Ratisbon Scots. If the abbot of Würzburg, he wrote to them, was unable to administer their monastery effectively because of his advancing years (he was fifty-four) and its distance from his own abbey, then a new superior was needed; and if they would send him full information about Chambers, he would see what could be done.24 Exactly eight days later Chambers, in the presence of the cardinal archbishop of Bologne and other dignitaries and a notary, resigned his abbacy of Ratisbon.25 In October the nuntio accepted the resignation and gave leave for an abbatial election.26 Dixon's administration does not seem to have been very successful. Finding himself unable to visit Ratisbon more than twice a year or to stay long when he did visit it, he had appointed Fr Athanasius Chambers, a cousin of the abbot, as cellarer. It was not a fortunate choice, the situation was deteriorating rather than improving, and Dixon himself realised it.27

It was inevitable that Fleming, this gifted, energetic, determined man should rise to the top. He was elected abbot on 5th December 1672 and at once confirmed by the bishop of Ratisbon acting on his authority as the delegate of the holy see.28 This was merely a matter of words: the bishop was confirming the election on his own authority and inserting the phrase as a concession to the abbey's traditional privilege of exemption. But already Fleming had given proof of the sort of man he was: he was just turned thirty, had been in Ratisbon only four years and a priest less than two years, yet he declared that he only accepted his election in accordance with the abbey's ancient privilege of exemption granted by the holy see. The suffragan bishop accepted this, then proceeded to
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confirm the election on behalf of the bishop. Since this was a matter in which the rights of the holy see were involved, the case went to the nun-tio and the Congregation of the Consistory in Rome. Dixon, who had been present at the election, was called on to testify to what had taken place. Eventually the election was quashed, Fleming renounced his confirmation by the bishop, and he was then provided to the abbacy by the holy see. 29 It was, however, not until about twenty years later that he received the abbatial blessing.

Placid Fleming was abbot in Ratisbon for the next forty-seven years, until January 1720. All this time he worked tirelessly to build up his community, improve its economic position, and safeguard its position and its rights. 30 He founded a seminary to ensure a supply of novices for his monastery and thus of missionary priests for Scotland; he restored the Erfurt house and secured professorial posts for his monks in the university there. His correspondence was voluminous, his activities multifarious, his appeals for aid to his abbey unceasing. He is the greatest man produced by the Scottish monasteries in Germany in the course of their existence. Had he been in a more favoured position he would certainly have made his mark in history, but he chose to join himself for life to a poor and struggling institution which was threatened on all sides by powerful interests. His life's work was successful, with the result that his abbey continued to flourish after his death until the Napoleonic era when the secularisation laws extinguished monastic life in most of western Europe.

During Abbot Fleming's period of rule there were five abbatial elections at Würzburg; in other words, as each of five abbots succeeded each
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other at Würzburg, the same effective abbot at Ratisbon was going from strength to strength. The position of the two Scots abbeys relatively to each other was gradually and permanently transformed. Both monasteries had had their ups and downs since Würzburg was refounded in 1595, and on the whole the downs had been more prolonged and more serious at Ratisbon. Several times the Würzburg monks had had to come to its rescue in its dire need. Fleming was elected abbot at a time when its fortunes were at an extremely low ebb. As his vigorous rule began to take effect, his abbey gradually climbed into a position of parity with St James's in Würzburg, then continued to expand in numbers and importance until it was undoubtedly the senior partner in the combination. The days when Würzburg monks could be called to the rescue of their countrymen in Ratisbon were over.

Abbot Dixon, accompanied by Fr Alan Chisholm, had gone to Ratisbon for the abbatial election in December 1672. That same month Fr Bernard Maxwell, the subprior at Würzburg - there does not seem to have been a prior - wrote to Fleming to offer the congratulations of the Würzburg Scots. It is, incidentally, typical of Fleming that he should have preserved his correspondence with Würzburg and so provided an important source for the history of that abbey. Since Maxwell was Dixon's second-in-command and was to succeed him as abbot, there is added importance in his words to Fleming. His election was, says Maxwell, 'most acceptable and gratefull news unto all and every one of us' and the community felt it their duty to congratulate him 'by reason of the former acquaintance and friendship contracted betweene you and us when you was here with us'. They would support Fleming in his efforts to help his monastery and 'our

For a description see FA, Rat. 14, ad Fleming.
power (poor) countrie' and hoped for the 'continuing of correspondence and friendship betwixt the houses as formerly' and also 'increasseing and augmenting of it'.

This letter to a certain extent sets the tone for the succeeding years, although Fleming was too strong a character for relations to be merely pleasant without entailing some measure of commitment to, or re-action against, his activities. Alan Chisholm returned from Ratisbon to Würzburg in October 1673, and Columbanus Fraser went to Ratisbon at the same time; when the former's conduct at Ratisbon was not entirely satisfactory, Fleming seems to have dealt firmly with the offender and informed Dixon of it. It is from Dixon's letter that we know this, and from the same letter we learn something of the difficulties of life in Franconia at the time. This was a period of complicated political and military move and counter-move in Louis XIV's war against the Dutch. The country round Würzburg was clear of the French but still had three imperial regiments in it. The clergy and religious houses were burdened; the Scots had for the last five weeks been compelled to maintain four horses with provender, and their property in the country had been destroyed and their provisions consumed by the soldiers.

The interests of the Ratisbon and Würzburg abbeys coincided, and at times conflicted, with each other in two main spheres: the finding of recruits for their novitiates and the sending of priests to the mission field. The two spheres were closely connected, for not only did the arrival of new recruits enable men to be spared for mission work but it was very often the missionaries in Scotland who found the recruits and even accompanied them on the long and difficult journey to Germany. In this
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matter, of course, Dixon had a start of eleven years on Fleming, and we have seen that at the time of the latter's election he had three monks on the mission and four young men studying for the priesthood.

If the immediate effect of the rapprochement between Würzburg and the English Benedictines was the help given to the Scots in training their novices, another effect, perhaps equally immediate, was the help given by the Scots in the staffing of the English missions. The two monks who were novices in 1660 worked and died in England, so that clearly the advantages of the agreement were not one-sided. Dixon, whose view of the English was disenchanted, asked Rome in 1669 for powers to send his own monks to the mission as he saw fit, but his request met with no response. The question of credentials and powers (or faculties, as they are called) for missionaries will be dealt with elsewhere, but it is necessary to understand that Roman Catholic missionary priests need faculties to hear confessions, absolve from excommunication, and so on; these faculties can only be given by a superior who has received the power to grant them. For most of his period of rule after 1669 Dixon was engaged in efforts to have a Scottish Benedictine missionary unit set up, with power vested in its head to grant faculties to missionaries sent to Scotland.

Lists of resident monks date back to 1661. To them, from 1676 on, is added the correspondence between Bernard Maxwell and Abbot Fleming, and between the two Scots abbots and Rome. In each case only one side of the correspondence has survived, the letters from Würzburg and Germany respectively, but these provide documentation of the community life and missionary plans which was entirely lacking before. In May 1676 Abbot Dixon was giving an account of his abbey. 34 The buildings were in good condition.

34 ML, Dixon, 24.5.1676.
and there were nine monks in residence as well as missionaries. The resident monks were persons of piety and learning, able to teach and conduct activities in public. Bernard Maxwell had gone to Scotland the previous year and returned with some promising youths. The abbey was in a better state than at any time since its restoration. In point of fact Dixon was probably right in this, if one excepts the half dozen years of Abbot Ogilvie before the Swedish invasion, even though his purpose was to show that the monastery was worthy to be given mission faculties for its own members.

While the Würzburg abbot tried to have an organised Benedictine mission established, Fleming at Ratisbon was engaged in begging and planning to promote much bigger schemes. Quite soon after his election he was trying to regain the Vienna abbey or at least obtain substantial compensation for its loss; later he wanted a share of some revenues in Oberpfalz that were earmarked for religious purposes, since, as he pointed out, the Scots monasteries in Germany were too poor to be of much assistance to their fatherland. It was Fleming's plan to have never less than four boys from Scotland studying at Ratisbon. At Würzburg Dixon pursued his own plans and activities in an effective if less ambitious and far-sighted way. Bernard Maxwell set off for Scotland in the late summer of 1676 and offered to do any commissions for Fleming and to find him recruits. He returned to Würzburg at the end of October the following year without having done anything for Fleming as he had not heard from him but with two young men for his own monastery. Other Würzburg monks likewise traveled between Germany and Scotland.

It is apparent that the union with the English had broken down almost
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completely. No English monk is mentioned at the visitations of 1665, 1668, and 1672 (which means that none appeared before the visitators and leads one to suppose that none was present), although Fr Bernard Sanderso, an English monk of Lambspring, died in Würzburg in June 1669.39 Dixon, nevertheless, was still obliged to obtain faculties for his monks from the English Congregation, even though the arrangement became increasingly difficult in practice. James Blair had faculties made out to him in January 1678 by the English president.

In this year, 1678, we have another account of the Würzburg community. Abbot Fleming had invited Maxwell to visit Ratisbon but Abbot Dixon had refused him leave, saying that numbers were too small to permit this. There would soon be only three priests in residence besides the abbot, as Fr Christian Abercrombie was about to go to Scotland for his health, but Fr Ninian Graham was due to return in the summer. At the moment of writing, therefore, the community consisted of the abbot, four priests and four student monks, but Mass obligations were not onerous and did not demand the presence of many priests.40

At this very time Fleming rubbed Dixon the wrong way by suggesting that the two young men brought recently from Scotland to Würzburg should join the Ratisbon community, presumably because Ratisbon had more need of recruits. Dixon was very put out at the suggestion. Bernard Maxwell, who was in constant correspondence with Fleming, told him this and strongly urged him to come to Würzburg and confer with Dixon. It was necessary, he said, for the growth and well-being of the Scottish abbeys that the two abbots should understand each other and remove all misunderstanding, and he makes it clear that he is not referring to the minor matter which occasi-
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ioned his letter but to other 'such mistakes as are apparent between you'. He adds that Dixon would be willing to take trouble to achieve this end but was prevented by age and infirmity from going to Ratisbon, so it was up to Fleming to make the journey to Würzburg. The suggestion was accepted, for Maxwell wrote again three months later to say how glad he was that Fleming was coming.

An outline of the comings and goings between Scotland and Würzburg, and of Dixon's efforts to obtain faculties and help, has been given in order to show the activity and vitality of both abbot and community at this period. Journeys to and from Scotland were a regular occurrence; so was the arrival of fresh recruits. The abbot died on 16th March 1679, aged sixty-one, a considerable age for those days, and less than a year before his death he was still planning and working for the mission. The community at his death numbered a dozen in addition to himself; there were three priests in residence (Alan Chisholm, Bernard Maxwell and Marianus Irvine) and five priests on the mission (Placid Baillie, Macarius Brown, Minian Graham, James Blair and Christian Abercrombie). Four monks were studying for the priesthood in the abbey: Gregory Seaton and Kilian Herries had probably come with Maxwell in the winter of 1675-6, and Augustine Bruce and Boniface Mackie had arrived with him in the autumn of 1677. William Dunn had died on the English mission in 1675, and Columbanus Fraser at Würzburg two years later.

This is the largest number of monks recorded since William Ogilvie bought the extra breviaries in 1625. To have taken up office with a permanent resident community of one priest and two novices and to have so built it up in eighteen years seems an outstanding achievement. Strangely

41 ibid. 30.3.1678.
42 ibid. 22.6.1678.
43 Reid, f. 117v; Maxwell, 30.3.1678, 21.5.1679; ML, Dixon, 24.5.1676.
44 Dilworth, "Three Scots", 239.
enough, the monk who compiled the list of abbots within six years of Dixon’s death merely wrote that he had ruled quite well considering his ability (satis pro sue modulo utiliter) and had repaired a hall on the eastern side of the monastery.45 This faint praise certainly seems the product of bias or failure to grasp what Dixon had achieved. Undoubtedly he had his human weaknesses and limitations. His letters, for instance, show a tendency to take, as far as one can judge, a harsh view of the English monks, and he took offence at Abbot Fleming’s sincere if tactless request. Possibly a psychologist would find something significant in his handwriting, which with its small letters and enormous tails and loops makes his correspondence look like the gambols of eccentric spiders and is very trying to anyone who has to read it.

Bernard Maxwell, however, in his letter to Fleming on the occasion mentioned, gives what is clearly a sound judgement on his abbot: he is ‘a man of his owne humour yet...condescending to thinges which concerne the publike good’.46 The later chronicler, writing eleven years after Dixon died, has much more than his predecessor to say in his praise: a man of great frugality, zealous for the public worship of God and monastic discipline, a lover of study; he bought vestments and chalices and repaired the church roof, bought books and gave encouragement to study, rebuilt the hall, increased the number of monks, and was administrator of Ratisbon and Erfurt for some years.47 This is surely a more fitting summary of his long period of rule.
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Chapter 10

ABBOT MAXWELL'S RULE, 1679-85


Abbot Dixon died on 16th March 1679 and a fortnight later Bernard Maxwell sent word to Ratisbon that the prince-bishop of Würzburg had fixed the date of the abbatial election for 7th August. On 1st April he received a letter from Brussels containing news from England, and one from the Cardinal of Norfolk about mission work. He sent both on to Ratisbon and suggested that Fleming should reply to the cardinal. Norfolk's letter had no doubt been addressed to Dixon, and its being sent to Fleming by the Würzburg prior indicates the position that the dynamic abbot of Ratisbon had now assumed among the Scottish Benedictines. It is not clear what the constitutional arrangement was at Würzburg for the interregnum between the death of an abbot and the election of his successor. Maxwell, who was already Dixon's lieutenant, evidently retained his position and con-

---

1 Since the treatment is more or less chronological, references to Maxwell's letters to Fleming will not be repeated. Unless otherwise stated, this is the source used for the present chapter.
tinued to administer, and this is a common and widespread arrangement; but it also appears that the senior monk, in this case Alan Chisholm, had some say, perhaps even joint control.

It is laid down in St Benedict's rule that monks do not send or receive letters except through the hands of the abbot. In a primitive form of monastic life this is a natural arrangement but it is less natural when letter-writing is an accepted activity of an educated man, and it begins to offer difficulty when a monk is ordained priest and exercises an apostolate in any way or when he has dealings with persons of standing outside the monastery. Conditions of modern life have therefore brought about a modification of the original rule in most monasteries, and even so there are occasions when monks deem it better all round if certain correspondence is not conducted through the usual monastic channels. The point here made is that they are not going behind their superior's back but safeguarding the success of their negotiations or the rights of other parties concerned.

When Maxwell tried to restore understanding between the two Scots abbots in 1678 the letters between him and Fleming were evidently not subject to the inspection of the Würzburg abbot, and Maxwell arranged for Fleming to send his reply to an address outside the monastery. Fleming's address-book, at a rather later date, has four such covering addresses for Würzburg monks. Maxwell now, although temporary superior, did much the same thing again. He said that Chisholm knew nothing of the letters he was enclosing, and the following month when he wrote again he asked Fleming not to mention some further enclosure and to write anything he did not want Chisholm to know on a separate sheet. All was well, he said, but
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Chisholm was curious about letters. It is easy to deduce that Chisholm was not in favour with either of the correspondents, and Maxwell ironically calls him Seigneur instead of Senior.

The abbey at Würzburg presents the usual spectacle of a monastery during an interregnum. Life goes on as usual as far as is possible but arrangements for the coming election assume the greatest importance. Maxwell wrote twice to Fleming, on 21st May and 18th June. In the first letter he mentions the expected arrival of two aspirants, a painter in Amsterdam and a second person still in Scotland, both of whom he had told to come, and in the second he tells Fleming that the young monks had begun their course of philosophy the previous week at their own request. If all the absent monks came for the election there were not going to be enough cells for all. There was little hope of a reply from Flacid Baille lying to the troubled times. Frs Ninian, James and Christian were, however, expected; the last-named had written and Maxwell had left it to him to inform the others of the abbot's death. All this is very typical although an intelligent system of voting by proxy or by affidavit in absentia could have greatly simplified the arrangements.

There is, incidentally, an intriguing postscript to the first letter: the suffragan bishop had given Maxwell a prophecy made by one Bartholomaeus regarding 'the Conversion of our Countrie', and it was enclosed for Fleming's edification. This is evidently Bartholomaeus Holzhauser (1613-58), founder of an institute of secular priests living in common, known as Bartholomites, to whom the Würzburg seminary was entrusted in 1654. But he is perhaps better known for his visionary and prophetic writings, among which was a prediction (produced in 1646) of the execution of
Charles I and the ruin of the Roman Catholic church in Britain for 120 years. It was no doubt this that Maxwell received, for these prophecies circulated in manuscript and did not begin to be printed until the end of the eighteenth century.\(^3\)

When he wrote the second time Maxwell had received no further news from 'Admirall Christian with his squadron', in other words the missionary monks. This letter is chiefly filled with the matter of Fleming's vote. Alan Chisholm had been saying that Fleming could not have a vote in the forthcoming election if he acted as scrutator, that is, one of the officials who counted the votes. A book on canon law had been consulted, which said that it was permissible provided the scrutator cast his vote before he began the count. Marianus Irvine, the scholar of the community, had told Chisholm this but in vain. Maxwell's advice to Fleming was to ignore the objection, because all the other monks wanted him to come and to have a vote; therefore he should come and act as scrutator, and if any difficulty was raised over his vote he could give it to a Würzburg monk or one of his own monks to cast.

It would appear from the election documents\(^4\) that Fleming and his monks were summoned to the election. One must always remember that in Würzburg it was the diocesan officials who made the arrangements for occasions that are, at least nowadays, usually within the competence of the monastery itself or the congregation to which it belongs. Even so, it seems unlikely that summoning the Ratisbon abbot was regular practice or that, even on this one occasion, each monk of Ratisbon was intended to have equal voting rights with the Würzburg monks. On the other hand one must not presume that procedure was cut and dried as it is now; voting

---

\(^3\) CE, VII, 439-40; XIII, 553; Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (2nd edn.), V, 123.

\(^4\) Reid, f. 117v.
was probably less secret, with election by compromise or compromissaries always a possibility.

A copy of the list of those present and absent for the election on 7th August (with James Blair omitted, probably an oversight of the transcriber) has survived, as have notes from the minute drawn up by a notary public. Only seven monks signed this, the three priests already in residence and the four students, from which one gathers that the monks on the mission did not arrive for the election and perhaps also that Fleming and his monks did not vote. Maxwell was elected abbot. It seems a natural and a wise choice, for he had been prior for a number of years, even if technically called subprior, and had administered the monastery after Dixon's death. His letters too give an impression of maturity and breadth of vision.

Of his background we know nothing, but the surname is one of those most frequently met with in the records of the Scots colleges. Probably he came from the south-west, where Catholic Maxwells continued to play a notable part in the life of their church until recent times. He had a cousin, John Brown, in the papal guard, and one wonders if this was the Douai student of that name who was from Galloway and had Maxwell connections on his mother's side and who tried his vocation at Würzburg in 1674. The new abbot had entered Würzburg in 1663 at the age of twenty-two and was thus thirty-eight, with sixteen years' experience of monastic life, when elected. Twice at least since his ordination to the priesthood he had gone to Scotland and returned with recruits for the monastery. When he received the invitation to visit Ratisbon but failed to obtain leave to do so from his abbot, he was very disappointed and considered that the

---

5 ML, Maxwell, 30.8.1681, 22.10.1681. See p.145 supra.
reasons given for the refusal did not hold water. Nevertheless he wrote in the same letter that he was happy at Würzburg and confident that he had the love of his superior and brethren. In spite of his disappointment he could write that the matter of his visit to Ratisbon was a trifle; certainly he did not suffer from the small-mindedness which is the occupational risk of those living a non-active - one avoids the word 'contemplative' - religious life.

He considered the cooperation of the two Scots abbots necessary for the continued growth of the monasteries and their apostolate, and urged Fleming to visit Würzburg to smooth away misunderstandings. Clearly he shared with Fleming the view that growth and expansion were possible and should be aimed at. His judgement on his own abbot, that he had his peculiarities but was zealous for the common good, strikes one as shrewd yet kindly. Thus Würzburg now had an abbot whose qualities commanded respect and who yet had the vigour of youth, being not yet forty. Perhaps even more important, Maxwell was a personal friend of the formidable Fleming and shared his ideas, at least to some extent.

The two abbots were the same age, though Maxwell had entered monastic life five years before Fleming. Nevertheless, Fleming's seven years' experience as abbot gave him the leading role in the partnership and he had also the stronger personality. Maxwell appointed as his prior Fr Mariarus Irvine, who had sent his greetings to Fleming in all three letters written by Maxwell before his election. One can deduce that the new prior and Fleming were likewise on terms of sympathy and friendship. The reign of the new abbot began in an atmosphere of cordiality towards his confrère in Ratisbon. Fleming had sent greetings for Maxwell's name-day, St Bernard's,
20th August; now Maxwell reciprocated the good wishes for St Placid's day, 5th October. He apologised for not replying sooner but had been waiting for his confirmation in the abbacy by the bishop, who was frequently absent, being also bishop of Bamberg. He declared, too, that he accepted Fleming's advice to write not oftener than once a month, just as he would accept his advice in other matters too. The letter is signed 'Your most Reverend Paternities most affectionat and sincere Brother and humble servant'. Only one side of the correspondence has survived but probably Fleming signed in much the same way; 'humble servant' had no more significance than 'yours sincerely' nowadays.

Much of the correspondence between Würzburg and Scotland was conducted through a Scot, Mr. Kennedy, in Brussels. Having heard from him that Fr Ninian Graham was in Holland, Maxwell summoned Graham to Würzburg and also recalled Abercrombie from Scotland, reminding the latter of Fleming's 'New fleete', that is, the recruits for Ratisbon. All this Maxwell retailed to his fellow abbot as well as his hopes to have the new choir, now completed except for the carpenter's work, in use before Christmas.

In reply Fleming told him of the repairs and rebuilding he himself was doing at Ratisbon. When Maxwell next wrote a fortnight later - he wrote four times in October 1679 in spite of his resolution - a wandering monk of Ratisbon, Anthony Gray, had arrived at Würzburg. Maxwell would like to have kept him until his own men came from Scotland, but he sent him on to Ratisbon so as not to run any risk of interfering with Fleming's plans. Anxiety not to stand in Fleming's way or be misunderstood by him is almost painfully apparent in Maxwell's letters. For instance, he had got Kennedy in Brussels to advance money for the journey to Würzburg to the painter.

[6 For Kennedy, see p.276.]
who wanted to come, but he was willing to send him on to Fleming if the latter wanted him as a recruit or the man himself chose Ratisbon.

That same month Fleming offered to send one of his monks to Würzburg, which may have been altruistic but may also have been in keeping with a policy to get rid of unsatisfactory survivors from the bad old days before he became abbot. He told Maxwell that Fr Benedict Hay, a Würzburg monk who had gone to live at Ratisbon some time previously and had had a rather chequered career, was absent without leave. If neither Hay nor his own monks from Scotland came, and so far he had not heard from them, Maxwell was willing to accept Abbot Fleming's offer. He also wanted a decision to be reached on the voting rights of monks not in major orders at abbatial elections in both Scots abbeys, and uniform practice introduced for allotting places in choir and refectory to each other's monks. His own suggestion was 'when exchange of persons is made between our houses, that one of every house shall precede those of the other house although elder, and the rest to goe according to their profession', which seems to mean that one visiting monk should precede the resident monks, but any other visitor would be placed according to his seniority by profession.

Würzburg lies on the direct route from Ratisbon to the Channel. From Würzburg one then goes to Frankfurt, thence up the Rhine to Cologne, and so either to Brussels and the Flemish ports or in a more northerly direction to Antwerp, Rotterdam and so on. It is therefore only to be expected that travellers between Ratisbon and Scotland should pass through Würzburg. Two brothers of Fr Erhard Dunbar, a monk of Ratisbon, thus arrived towards the end of November at St James's, where one of them fell ill, so that it was two or three weeks before they continued their journey.
to Ratisbon. The painter, one Alexander from Aberdeen, likewise arrived on St Andrew's day and asked to be accepted into the Würzburg community. Maxwell wrote a most apologetic letter to Fleming for depriving him of a possible recruit, explaining that it was Alexander's own choice which he (Maxwell) had put into his head when they left Scotland together two years before. But he was determined, he said, not to offend Fleming or be 'emulous' for his own monastery. This, incidentally, is the first time that Maxwell mentions what was to become a recurring theme with him: that the Würzburg monastery could not take any more recruits until its revenues were increased.

It is also at this time that James, duke of York and brother of Charles II, is first mentioned. Maxwell wrote:

'I thought he (Mr Kennedy) had beene gon to Scotland with the Duke of York, by reason I have not heard from him this long time by past ... We hope to heare good news from Scotland shortly since (His) Highe-ness the Duke of York is gon thither and was receaved so gallantly there. If he and our King his Brother understand another weele which I hope they doe, he will I hope with our Scots Lads suppress whatsoever the(y) begin in England'.

The abbot of Würzburg thus knew that James had retired to the Low Countries, where Kennedy was, after the Popish Plot and that there had been differences between James and Charles. On the last day of 1679 Maxwell wrote:

'Things in England have a very bad face for the present, God send better, onely I wish our King and the Duke his Brother may understand another weele, which will be a meanes that affaires may proceede better: onely if the Duke can oblidge our Countymen (who lately re-
ceaved him with a great deale of Joy) that they stand by him, all will goe weele I hopes'.

At Würzburg there was still no sign of the missionary monks returning, but the two abbots were on the best of terms. Maxwell had concluded some business over breviaries for Fleming, and Fleming had concurred in Alexander's receiving the habit at Würzburg. The year 1679 and Maxwell's first months as abbot ended with high hopes for Catholics in Scotland even if in England the outlook was still grim; that at least was how Maxwell, and no doubt many other expatriate Scots, saw it.

In 1680 Abbot Maxwell wrote twenty-one letters to Placid Fleming in Ratisbon. Though they are practically the only extant source, they make 1680 perhaps the best documented year of the seventeenth century as regards the affairs of St James's and give one the opportunity to see a typical year of its life. Maxwell may have visited Ratisbon in January, since he speaks of a letter of his sent from Ratisbon to a cousin in France, but possibly it had been merely sent there for forwarding through the French ambassador, who resided in Fleming's monastery. News reached Würzburg at the end of that month that Macarius Brown, still on the mission in England, had been imprisoned. Even though the panic reaction to the Popish Plot was abating, Maxwell feared that he might be executed. To continue with the personnel of the abbey, Ninian Graham died at some point before March, five days after returning to Scotland; he had set out for Würzburg to take part in the abbatial election but had got no further than Holland. Placid Baillie died at some point before 23rd June, when printed notices of his death were sent to Ratisbon for distribution to Bavarian monasteries.7

7 Dates of death in Necrologies, 199 need correction.
No new recruits came to Würzburg this year but there were four young men pursuing their divinity studies and the painter doing his year of noviciate. One of the students, Gregory Seaton, had bad health and showed a disinclination to study, while the prior was seriously ill in June. The death of two priests in Scotland or England made no difference to the finances of the monastery. In early 1680 Maxwell made out the annual accounts for the bishop's officials and found that, for the third successive year at least, ends did not meet; he knew because he had performed that task for Abbot Dixon. At the end of the year he and his community would not accept Fleming's offer of some young men as it would be difficult to maintain those already in residence and more could not be taken without financial help, and this was unlikely to materialise while the threat of war with the French lasted. This was the 'interval of peace in western Europe during which Louis XIV tried to intimidate his adversaries without drawing his sword'.

Because of the poverty of the Scots monastery the bishop of Würzburg told his officials not to take any money when he conferred the abbatial blessing on Maxwell. Fleming, after almost eight years, had not yet been blessed, being determined to obtain apostolic authority for the blessing yet equally unwilling to pay the official or unofficial fees. Accordingly, when Maxwell asked him to receive his blessing at Würzburg with him, saying that he himself as a subject of the bishop had to be blessed there whereas Fleming could make his choice, the Ratisbon abbot declined the offer. Maxwell then invited Fleming to be present, but in the event he received his abbatial blessing on 15th July at less than forty-eight hours' notice. Perhaps nothing shows the subject status of monasteries in Würz-
burg more clearly than this, when one thinks of what is taken for granted nowadays. Two neighbouring abbots were summoned, at similar notice and without Maxwell's knowledge, to act as assistants, and the ceremony took place in the chapel of the bishop's fortress residence. Probably the date was chosen to fit in with the bishop's journeys between Würzburg and his other diocese of Bamberg. The newly blessed abbot's comment was on the graciousness of the bishop in waiving all fees, inviting some neighbours and speaking in kindly fashion of the Scots. He would, so Maxwell hoped, be a good friend to St James's.

Had Maxwell been incensed with Fleming at the time of his blessing, it would have been only natural. Some words had been spoken or written - we do not know by whom but they evidently emanated from Würzburg - which gave offence to the Ratisbon abbot and his monks. Fleming seems to have expressed his displeasure to his fellow-abbot, who replied in homiletic vein, speaking of the virtues of patience and charity and quoting from the epistles of St Paul. One's impression is that Maxwell was a genuinely spiritual man who read his Scriptures assiduously in Latin and quoted from them with facility in the same language.

Later that month, April, he welcomed the news that Christian Abercrombie, a Würzburg monk, was bringing recruits from Scotland for Fleming. When Abercrombie sent a letter ahead from Frankfurt to announce his arrival, Maxwell forwarded it to Ratisbon, apparently without opening it, to prove to Fleming that he was dealing in a completely straightforward way with him and would make no attempt to keep any of the young men for his own abbey. On 20th June Abercrombie, his four companions and a Würzburg student-monk set off by coach to travel the eighty miles to Ratisbon.

9 All details are corroborated by Chronicon and Gropp, II, 513.
the recruits Maxwell wrote: 'They are very pretty youths as you desired them, and excellent wits and capacities for studyes, and which is the chiefest of all they are already weelle advanced in their studyes having ended their Gramar all of them'. A little later he made the remark that the Scots were now able to be discriminating about applicants, whereas formerly they had of necessity received some 'of small qualifications'.

Maxwell asked Fleming not to keep the two Wurzburg monks more than a fortnight, then wrote a week later to ask for their immediate return because of the prior's dangerous illness. Twice again he wrote, to express his regret that Abercrombie had been unwell and then to beg once more for his immediate return. On 14th July a further letter contained his regret, very mildly expressed, that Fleming had seen fit to keep Abercrombie yet another week, for he would thus not be present at his abbatial blessing. On the 24th Abercrombie was back at Wurzburg and took up important duties as cellarer. Had the boot been on the other leg, and a Ratisbon monk detained after doing the Wurzburg abbot a signal favour, Fleming would not have hesitated to point out the enormity of the offence. Maxwell had sent gifts brought by Abercrombie from abroad, including a pair of stockings; he apologised for them not being black but Abercrombie himself would confirm that he had brought no black ones with him from Scotland. Though only one side of the correspondence is available, it is hard to avoid the judgement that Fleming was somewhat cavalier and Maxwell over-anxious to please.

Permission was given some time in the summer of 1680 for the Scots to celebrate the feast of Macarius, their founder, with a solemn Mass and public panegyric.10 Henceforth the monks would have two days in the year

---

10 Veneration of Macarius will be dealt with fully later.
on which their church was the centre of the townspeople's devotion: 23rd January, the feast of Macarius their founder, and 25th July, the feast of St James. That the desire to solemnise Macarius's feast should be put into effect within so short an interval of Maxwell's election indicates that he was the instigator of the move or at least accepted the wishes of his community. Some literary work was done on the life and miracles of Macarius by the Scottish monks at this time. The matter has special significance since devotion to Macarius was to assume importance far beyond the bounds of Würzburg that same decade.

Maxwell had inherited the problem of how Benedictines were to conduct their apostolate in Scotland. Propaganda in 1679 had decreed that they were to receive faculties from the Prefect of the secular clergy there and might succeed to pensions when the present recipients retired or died. It was an arrangement calling for a great deal of goodwill in its administration to make it acceptable and helpful to the monks. Alexander Leslie, a secular priest who was returning to home after making a visitation of the Scottish mission, was said to be about to pass through Ratisbon, so Maxwell asked Fleming to put the monks' case to him. He also wanted Leslie's backing, extraordinary as it may seem, for the recovery of the pre-reformation Benedictine monasteries in Scotland.

Maxwell's letters contain a great deal of miscellaneous information, much of it of more than passing interest, about local Würzburg matters as well as Scots at home and abroad. The plague was nearing Franconia in October 1680 and a service was held in Würzburg cathedral to stay its course. We know that there were bans on the admission of strangers for this reason during these years. 11 A Capuchin friar noted for his miracles

11 Gropp, IV, 797-98.
visited the town that same month; Maxwell spoke with him and obtained an interview for his young monk, Gregory Seaton, whose health gave cause for anxiety. A learned ecclesiastic in Würzburg, Francis Fabritius, was writing a work on noble families and had borrowed a book of genealogies from the English envoy to Ratisbon through the good offices of Abbot Fleming. Lord Middleton, a Scot who was the English ambassador in Vienna and was later to be one of James II's secretaries of state, spoke with Maxwell when he passed through Würzburg on his way to Ratisbon and Vienna in July, and two months later Maxwell hoped to meet Bevil Skelton, the former English ambassador to Vienna and a friend of Fleming.¹²

There were numerous contacts with Scotsmen. General Count Leslie owed the monks money, and two influential namesakes of his were to be asked to press him for payment. Two brothers named Bruce were coming from Rome to enter the Scots abbeys and were thought by Augustine Bruce of Würzburg to be his cousins from Fife. Erhard Dunbar of Ratisbon passed through Würzburg on his way westwards and again on the return journey, this time with three more recruits for his abbey. A certain Mr Fraser, having decided not to enter the Würzburg noviciate, stayed on several weeks there before setting out for Ratisbon. Christian Abercrombie wrote to Scotland and passed on messages from Ratisbon, just as earlier in the year he had sent news from Scotland, including the deaths of Maxwell's mother and Lady Irvine of Drum. There were also contacts with the English monks of Lamspring: Maxwell wrote to them on behalf of Fleming and received obituary notices of monks which he sent on to Ratisbon. This is a year which there is no reason to consider untypical, one in fact in which there was, if anything, less missionary activity than was usual.

¹² Middleton and Skelton are in DNB.
On New Year's day 1681 the Würzburg abbot wrote to Fleming about 'a Comet star with a tayle wonderfully long' which had been seen over Franconia and was popularly supposed to herald war with the French. The comet, incidentally, is recorded in a contemporary work of astronomy. He wanted Fleming to get some document from the French ambassador, who was living in the Ratisbon abbey, so that the Würzburg Scots would be spared by any French invaders. In the autumn, shortly after the Imperial Diet had threatened Louis with war when he occupied Strasburg, the request was repeated more earnestly. Other troubles beset the abbot of Würzburg that year. Alan Chisholm had become unsettled and in July tried to obtain admission to a neighbouring monastery. The Scottish monks were willing to let him depart but insisted that he must go right away and join the Maurist or Bursfeld congregation, which Chisholm did not want to do. He and his abbot then compromised on Ratisbon, and Maxwell wrote to put the matter to Fleming. A month earlier he had told Fleming that Christian Abercrombie was going back to Scotland and would see to any commissions for him. Fleming's reply was to accuse his fellow-abbot of acting secretively in keeping the news of Abercrombie's departure and Chisholm's decision from him until the last moment.

Maxwell now explained that the decision to send someone to Scotland had been made only recently and that Chisholm had kept his own intentions secret until they were discovered. Again it is a letter full of declarations about the need for fraternal charity and his own determination to preserve it. The correspondence continued but with some diminution of smoothness. The requested document for the French ambassador still did not come, while the scholar Fabritius was complaining that Fleming must be

13 Gottfried Kirch, Neue Himmels-Zeitung...von den zweyen neuen grossen im 1680 erschienenen Cometen (Nuremberg, 1681). Thanks for this confirmation are due to Professor H.A. Brück, Astronomer Royal for Scotland.
14 NCMH, V, 220.
offended with him as there was no sign or even promise of the books he had been requesting from him through Maxwell for almost a year. At the end of December Fleming seems to have said that he would do nothing for the Würzburg monks until he saw what Abercrombie in Scotland would do for him; this, said Maxwell, showed a lack of trust whereas he himself would do anything for Fleming.

Finance was a recurrent worry for Abbot Maxwell. He would have liked to accept more young men for training as monks and hence as missionaries, and was being pressed to do so, but felt unable to take in any more until the abbey’s income increased. Both the Cardinal of Norfolk and Will Leslie (who was the agent of the Scottish clergy in Rome and brother of the Alexander Leslie already mentioned) were given an account of the state of the monastery and its difficulties.\(^{15}\) There were nine monks in residence; the annual revenues did not exceed 600 guilders, a large slice of which had to be given to the prince-bishop’s government in tax, the so-called subsidium charitativum. There were three monks on the mission but no other priest could be spared until the young monks completed their studies, and it was impossible to provide any means of support for the two already in Scotland. Maxwell assured Will Leslie that he would never fail to help in any way he could though for the present he was unable to do any more.

As regards sending another priest this was undoubtedly true, since there were only Marianus Irvine, who was teaching the students, and Alan Chisholm, who was not considered suitable for mission work. The latter, incidentally, changed his mind about going to Ratisbon and was content to remain in Würzburg. The number of young monks had risen to six by the

\(^{15}\) ML, Maxwell, 22.10.1661.
clothing of a very promising recruit, Ambrose Cook, in July. There were twice this number in Ratisbon, as its abbot told Leslie, but Fleming was making prodigious efforts to get support and help; probably what he regarded as Maxwell's timidity was one reason for his irritation with him. Leslie wanted the two Scots abbots to plan mission work together. Maxwell was only too willing to do this, as also to work in complete harmony with the secular clergy in Scotland and have faculties given to his monks by the secular Prefect instead of by the English Congregation. Nevertheless, nothing positive resulted; nor, when Maxwell tried to have a separate Benedictine mission established, did Fleming encourage him in the least.

The monastery had only nine cells, all of which were filled except one kept vacant for Abercrombie, so that James Blair, who was contemplating returning from the mission, would have to accept makeshift quarters if he came. It is perhaps at this time, 1682, that one sees Maxwell's rule at its best. The prior considered the young monks to be good students, from whom some future professors of philosophy and theology might be obtained. Two received the diaconate this year, so the abbey would soon have two more priests. They had talent in other directions too. Maxwell wrote:

'Our young men who now are studying their physicks have this time by-gon applied their spare houres in learneing of figurall and Chorall Cant, and also in the Violl, wherein they have now made such progress that they practise the same now and then in our Church, and after this must doe more frequently, and for their greater encouragement I have made them a New Organ, which is now so far advanced that we have
several times already used it, and I hope before St Benedicts day it shall be compleated.'

Erhard Dunbar at Ratisbon was asked to provide extra pieces of music to add to their repertoire. The rebuilding of the choir in the church had also been completed. Though there was no room for the recruits who desired admission, Maxwell had a plan to build half a dozen cells for monks and a few guest-rooms. The cost, a thousand dollars, was far beyond his means but he had presented a petition to the prince-bishop for help.

Not that everything was perfect. The bishop was absent on St James's day and so did not visit the monastery; his present of 'wine, bread and severall sortes of fishes' was a poor substitute for the favourable answer they hoped for when he came. The painter, Bro John Alexander, ill and confined to bed since the previous December, died on 25th May. There was also a disagreement with Fleming. General Count Leslie of Balquhain, a distinguished soldier in the imperial army, owed the Scots monks some money on account of Fr Benedict Hay, the monk already mentioned who had tired of Würzburg and Ratisbon in turn. Fleming wrote for it without success; so in the winter of 1679-80 did Maxwell. Now, when the bishop sent the fish instead of the hoped-for thousand dollars for St James's day, Maxwell asked his fellow-abbot for what was owing to him on Hay's account. The result was an ominous silence, correctly interpreted by the sensitive Maxwell. On 5th November 1682 he wrote to Fleming that this was his fourth letter yet he had received none in return; if the latter was offended by his request for the money on Hay's account he ought not to be, for it was a contract confirmed between Fleming and Abbot Dixon before Maxwell became abbot. Fleming finally broke his silence in December and gave his reasons

for not paying to which Maxwell answered that he did not accept the reasons but considered the preservation of charity more important and so would drop the matter till they met.

There was a visitation at the beginning of December, merely the routine procedure, and the bishop's officials who conducted it declared themselves satisfied. The list of the community drawn up on the occasion shows no change, for nobody had replaced Alexander the painter. Later in the month Boniface Mackie was ordained priest although he still had part of his course of studies to complete. In the spring of 1683 the little community was struck by illness.

"Bro Kilian, whose deathe hath not a little troubled us all here, he being so very young and of very great expectation as any he hath left behinde him in the Monasterie...his infirmitie was a hott fever or a bastard pleurisie as our Doctor called it, with a stitch in his right syde...but before he dyed it cam to his left side'.

Both abbot and prior fell ill 'of the same infirmitie' and it was only with difficulty that the convalescent Maxwell was able to attend the bishop's funeral after the body, according to immemorial custom, had lain in St James's for the night. Thomas Ogilvie arrived in August to be a laybrother; he could cook and had the qualification, most useful in south Germany, of being able to brew beer. Two months later Augustine Bruce had been ordained priest, and James Blair had returned from Scotland with a fourteen-year-old boy, William Stewart.

When only one priest besides the abbot and prior was in residence, the monastic offices had of necessity to be shared out among the theological students. At the visitation of December 1682 Gregory Seaton was

17 Reid, f. 119v.
cellarer, and Bruce sacristan. The composition of the community changed considerably, however, in the following twelve months. With the ordination of two priests and the return of one from Scotland, there were now six priests in residence; after two deaths and two promotions through ordination, there were only two divinity students; and the tally was completed by the laybrother aspirant and a boy of fourteen. There were soon further changes. James Blair obtained leave to join the English Dominicans in Rome, whereupon his abbot warned Placid Fleming, about Easter 1684, not to give too much credence to him if he called in at Ratisbon on the way. By August, however, Blair had already been to Italy and departed for further pastures new. Blair's departure left nine in residence, but Maxwell complained that only six were of use in choir, because Gregory Seaton through laziness and infirmity was of little help, while the recently clothed Ogilvie, now Bro Joseph, was a laybrother and the boy Stewart could not be expected to help. (One wonders why Maxwell accepted him and not some 'prety youth' who had 'ended his Grammar' like the recruits for Ratisbon).

In February 1684 Fr Benedict Raith of Ratisbon died in the Würzburg monastery. He had been in charge at Erfurt until July 1679, just a month before Maxwell's election, when he abandoned his post and went to Würzburg. There he made his peace with Fleming. He is mentioned in none of Maxwell's letters and was certainly not in the Würzburg monastery in the years which intervened until his death. The prior was again very ill in May of 'a hot fever' and in August caught the Rotflecke (some infectious disease with red spots) from a young monk. It was at this time that Maxwell decided to send Seaton to Ratisbon in the hope that he would

18 The letter is undated but was written shortly after the profession of Gregory Crichton on 25th March 1684 (RSC, 264).
19 RSC, 263.
20 Sch. Akten, 43.
study better there; Seaton went and at Ratisbon he died on 12th February 1685, aged twenty-seven.  

Maxwell himself died a month later, on 17th March. No letters of his to Fleming have been preserved since the previous August, so we have no means of telling whether his death was sudden or followed a gradual decline in health. He did, however, sign a document on 8th February. Similarly, there is no precise information on the community he left behind him, but one can presume that the same four priests were in Würzburg, and perhaps also some monk of Ratisbon in exchange for Seaton. Ambrose Cook was well on the way to the priesthood, and Joseph Ogilvie was serving the material needs of the brethren. The boy Stewart did not persevere, though we do not know when he left. Abercrombie had apparently settled down happily in Scotland, and James Blair had not severed his connection with Würzburg. In fact he spent part of 1685 very profitably from the historian's point of view, copying out English Benedictine documents for Placid Fleming, probably in Ratisbon, where he was in September of that year.

Europe continued to be troubled. The armies of Louis XIV disturbed the peace in the west, while in July 1683 the Turks besieged Vienna. Maxwell remarked at this time on the troops passing through Franconia. The troubled times affected Maxwell and his monastery indirectly. The prince-bishop whom he had petitioned for financial help died in 1683. His successor was sympathetic and told the Scots abbot he would like to help, but his exchequer officials were not eager to make any grant until the general outlook improved. When the bishop and his court attended the High Mass in the Scots abbey on St James's day 1684 and afterwards dined with the monks, they promised help, and indeed this had twice been recom-

21 Pfarrbuch (funerals).
22 Wz. SA, Würzburg Stadt R.A. 86, f. 431v.
23 This is Blair (see abbreviations).
24 Pfarrbuch (baptisms).
mended in diocesan chapter meetings, but they also told Maxwell he must have patience and wait until better times. The abbot had had a like disappointment the previous September when a German general died and was buried in the Scots' church, for although the talk was of the large legacy he had left them, he had in fact died suddenly and intestate.

Abbot Maxwell's rule leaves one with the impression that he found the difficulties and problems confronting him rather more than he could manage. He began his period of rule with the annual accounts failing to balance and he ended it with capital debts. Lack of revenue and accommodation prevented him from accepting the young men who offered themselves, or the boys whom he was asked to train for the religious life. His only solution to the impasse, financial help from the prince-bishop, was impeded by external circumstances. Whereas the more determined Fleming bombarded Rome and Munich for help in circumstances which had originally been even less favourable than at Würzburg, Maxwell accepted his position and failed to break out of the ring of difficulties which beset him. In spite of his ideas for the expansion of the Scots abbeys, his own monastery was, if anything, in a rather less favourable position at the end of his period of rule than at the beginning. And though he tried conscientiously to cooperate with Fleming, he must have found dealings with his tougher and more successful partner very trying. Is it far-fetched to suggest that the difficulties with which he was faced contributed to his death at the early age of forty-four?

The judgement of the historian trying to trace the progress of an institution need not coincide with that of the monks who lived under Maxwell's rule. In this case the assessments do not conflict although they
have comparatively little in common. The chronicler, who wrote a few years later, considered that Maxwell was rendered suitable for his office by kindness allied to humility and tireless zeal for the monastery's well-being; and he built the new choir and organ, and bought chalices, a silver crozier and various books. That he encouraged study, as the chronicle says, is borne out by the constant references in his letters to the progress of his young monks in their divinity and to the scholars who asked him for books or information. It is clear from the same source that he consulted his monks about affairs pertaining to the common good and did not try to rule autocratically. The letters show touches of humour, and we have a very pleasing picture of him fostering the musical talent of his young men and even providing a new organ to encourage them. After various illnesses and trials patiently borne, so the chronicler concludes, he died peacefully in the Lord on 17th March 1685 and was buried in the church in front of the entrance to the choir. Of all the seventeenth-century monks of Würzburg he is the one whose personality stands most clearly revealed in the seventy letters of his that have been preserved, and anyone who reads them will find much to corroborate, and nothing to contradict, the favourable judgement on Abbot Bernard Maxwell made by one of his monks.
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About five weeks before Abbot Maxwell's death Charles II died in London. Four days later, on 10th February 1685, his brother, the duke of York, was proclaimed King James VII at the Mercat Cross in Edinburgh. He was to reign for rather less than four years and in that time was to make strenuous efforts to restore the Roman Catholic faith in Scotland. However much or little one may sympathise with his aims, there can be no doubt at all about his sincerity, and none about the imprudence with which he tried to achieve them. By the end of December 1688 he had departed from the shores of Britain for good, leaving behind him both in Scotland and England an overwhelming majority determined that no Catholic sovereign should ever again rule over them. At Würzburg and Ratisbon the Scottish
monks had shared the high hopes of what the rule of a Catholic king would mean for their church in Scotland. They were drawn into the plans and activities of James as he pursued his purpose, and they shared the disaster of the Revolution. Marianus Irvine governed the abbey at Würzburg for a period almost co-terminous with James’s reign: Maxwell died a month after James came to the throne, and Irvine died a month before James fled to the continent. The history of Irvine’s abbacy can hardly be separated from the rise and decline of the king in Scotland. It also happens that information on the internal affairs of the abbey at this time is sparse in the extreme. No letters of Irvine as abbot have been preserved, so that there is no detailed account of monastic affairs such as came from Abbot Maxwell’s pen. The effect is to throw the progress of events in Scotland into even greater prominence.

The first news of the monastery comes from a letter of Irvine on 1st July 1685. He had not yet been elected abbot but, in his capacity of prior appointed by Maxwell, was administering the monastery. Irvine wrote to tell Fleming in Ratisbon of the arrangements for the abbatical election. The prince-bishop had fixed it for 23rd July but it was thought better to have it brought forward a week so as not to hinder preparations for the feast of St James on the 25th. Christian Abercrombie had written from Scotland, and the change of date would presumably make no difference to him or other monks on the mission. Irvine therefore had got the suffragan to ask the prince-bishop, at the time in Bamberg, to agree to the earlier date. There was the further question of Fleming’s vote in the election, and it was doubtful if the bishop would allow it, but Irvine wanted Fleming and his community to remember the Würzburg monks in their prayers. The abbey

1 Sch. Akten, 320.
had met with a piece of good fortune such as the unfortunate Maxwell had never had: the provost of the cathedral chapter had left the monastery a legacy of 500 florins in return for weekly Masses, and Irvine was going to clear off capital debts with it within a week or so.

At the election, which took place on the date originally fixed, 23rd July, and which Fleming did not attend, Marianus Irvine was unanimously elected. A few days later he matriculated at the university. As with his predecessor, Maxwell, the new abbot bore a name commonly met with among priests at the time; he was, it seems, also related to at least one of them. He had a cousin of that name, possibly a priest, known in Rome in 1674 and was supposedly the brother (perhaps, more accurately, the cousin) of the priest John Irvine called 'Belty'. The Irvines of Belty, near Kincardine, were Catholics and closely related to the Irvines of Drum. The abbot, whose forename was James, may possibly have been the James Irvine of Drum who was at Douai in 1647-50.

He entered Würzburg at some point in the years 1669-71. When Maxwell was elected abbot in 1679, Irvine became his prior and had in addition the duties of teaching the young monks philosophy and theology throughout Maxwell's rule. Fleming, who likewise thought highly of him, wanted to have him as professor for his own students at Ratisbon but Maxwell naturally could not spare him. So once more St James's had a new abbot who was respected for his qualities and stood high in Fleming's estimation. There was one serious drawback, however, and that was Irvine's health: he had been dangerously ill in the summer of 1680, ill again in May 1683 and yet again twelve months later. He died just over three years after his election, and the only time he is mentioned in a source outside Würzburg it is

2 For Fleming's visits to Würzburg, see Sch. Akten, 320, 15.1.1692.
3 S. A. F. 367, where his name is wrongly transcribed as Frum.
4 Merkle, 57, where his name is wrongly transcribed as Frum.
5 ML, Chambers, 11.7.1674. See p. 256.
6 ML, Maxwell, 5.11.1681; Blairs Papers, 257; RSC, 37.
because he was ill.

The election was confirmed by the prince-bishop on 13th September but it was not until June 1687 that the new abbot received the abbatial blessing and mitre, together with four German prelates, at the hands of the bishop. Unlike his predecessor he was not beset with financial worries. The timely legacy had cleared off capital debts, and the Catholic king of Scotland was to give a helping hand. There is a record of 'fees and pensions to officers of State and others signed at Whitehall the 31 Oct 1685, with additional pensions since'. These are payments to Scots, and among the allowances made to churchmen is £100 'to the Abbey of St James in Würzburg'. It was not charity pure and simple, however; the abbey was expected to help in James’s plans for the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith in Scotland.

References to the internal affairs of the monastery are, as has been said, extremely scanty. In January 1687 Irvine is recorded in a letter of Fleming's as being sick of a hot fever, a phrase which Maxwell too had several times used of his prior. In 1688 Irvine built two bathrooms and two chambers above the wine press for the use of the sick brethren and of guests. At least, one presumes that 'bathrooms' is what is meant by hypocausta, the sweating-rooms of Roman baths. That same year the grant of a plenary indulgence for visiting the abbey church on St James’s day was obtained through Fleming, but it does not seem to have reached Würzburg, being preserved in the Ratisbon archives. Fleming, who obtained it from Rome, was going to send it on to Würzburg but apparently did not do so.

Two monks who had come from Ratisbon were in the Würzburg abbey in these years. Augustine Gordon matriculated at the university in autumn
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1686 and received major orders at Würzburg in April and September 1688. The other was an aspirant, Alexander Falconer, who petitioned twice at Ratisbon for the monastic habit (one of the times being in September 1684) but was not considered suitable. He then went to Würzburg and was clothed as a novice by Abbot Irvine. He can be confidently identified as Bro Bernard Falconer, who copied out a volume of spiritual teaching in 1687 at Würzburg but did not persevere. These few references are the sum of what we know of the abbey itself until on 22nd November, 1688 Marrianus Irvine died after only three days' illness. The chronicle records that he died with Christian resignation and deserved on account of his profound learning in philosophy and theology to enjoy a longer life and more peaceful times.

The chief interest during these years is centred less in the monastery itself than in what has been called the triangle of forces: Scotland, Germany, Rome. Fleming had tried unsuccessfully to get himself appointed King James's resident in Ratisbon but he had considerable influence over Sir George Etherege, better known (and indeed better qualified) as a dramatist than as a diplomatist, who succeeded to the position. This was in addition to his friendship with the French envoy, who actually lived in his abbey. It was almost certainly Fleming who obtained from James a pension for both Ratisbon and Würzburg and for the Benedictine monks in Scotland. He was intimately concerned in two projects which affected the Scottish mission and the Scots abbeys very much. The first was the appointment of a bishop in Scotland: Fleming threw his influence on the side of a secular priest, Lewis Innes. The second project was the sending
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of Benedictine missionaries - and more than that, the setting up of a
Benedictine house - in Scotland.

Both matters require fuller treatment elsewhere but one must at least
ask how much Irvine was concerned in them. It was Fleming who lobbied
and wrote indefatigably; Irvine was silent, though the Ratisbon abbot de¬
clared that they would have pressed Innes's candidature together if Irvine
had not been ill. Over the mission to Scotland Fleming wrote and appeal¬
ed for travelling expenses but it was Irvine who supplied more than half
the priests even though the Ratisbon community was now larger than his own.
It would certainly seem that Fleming's plans included Würzburg monks as
well as Ratisbon ones, and it can only be presumed that Irvine was content
to let Fleming make the arrangements.

Christian Abercrombie was already on the mission in Scotland, Macar¬
ius Brown in England, and four other Würzburg monks went to Scotland in
1687-88. Alan Chisholm was thus the only priest left in the monastery
with Abbot Irvine, and an attempt was made to take the abbey away from the
Soct.\footnote{Dennistoun, f. 138rv.}\footnote{ML, Chisholm, 20.5.1689.}
One of the missioners, however, Boniface Mackie, being unwell
in Scotland was back in Würzburg by November 1688, so that when Irvine died
there were six persons in the monastery: Chisholm and Mackie, two novices
and two others.\footnote{Dennistoun, f. 333r.}
A fragment of almost contemporary chronicle comments: 'Happy is he who learns from the troubles of others! Let future abbots
take care that there are never less than six monks in residence, three of
them priests and three clerics'. The context is obviously the distress
caused when James fled and Lord Chancellor Perth was imprisoned, and most
of the Würzburg priests were unable to leave Scotland.\footnote{Dennistoun, f. 333r.}
two kingdoms. It is probably fair to say that what preserved him, so militantly Catholic, for so long was the not yet forgotten episode of the interregnum under Cromwell, and it is probably equally true that what finally decided his subjects to get rid of him was the birth of his son. At least this is true of England, and 'the Revolution was made in England and imported to Scotland'. The birth of a son meant that rule by a Catholic king was not going to be a temporary interlude which could be borne but a regime which would now be continued for unknown generations. It was at this point that the Scottish monastery in Würzburg played a central part in the events that were to decide the history of Scotland and England for the next century and are not entirely without relevance even today.

James had married Mary of Modena in 1673 and three children had been born to them between 1676 and 1682. Christian Abercrombie writing from Scotland in May 1682, for instance, had given the news of Mary's lying-in at Stirling. But no child had survived and it was six years since the birth of the last; it was expected that James would die childless, in which case the heirs to the throne were his Protestant daughters, the offspring of his first marriage. Then, on 10th June 1688, a son was born to Mary and baptised the next day. The event was doubly unexpected since the queen's doctors had miscalculated the date by a month. There was an outcry, and the story was spread that the child was not the son of James and Mary. Various circumstantial explanations were given: it was the child of some other woman, it was smuggled into the palace in a warming-pan, and so on.

On 22nd October the king summoned a large gathering of notables and of persons in his household in order to prove that the infant was indeed
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the son of himself and Mary, and orders were given later for the proceedings to be printed. Three days after the gathering the solemn ceremonies omitted at the child's baptism were performed in the chapel of St James's palace, where the king had installed a community of English Benedictine monks. The next month the duke of Orange, husband of James's Protestant daughter, landed in England and James left for the continent, having sent his wife and baby son on before him. One curious sequel to the episode is that in 1693 the pope, at James's petition, fixed the feast of St Margaret of Scotland on 10th June, the birthday of this child. The celebration of the feast in Scotland was transferred in 1903 to 16th November, the anniversary of the saint's death, but the rest of the Roman church still keeps it on 10th June.

The story of the birth of the Prince of Wales and the subsequent Revolution is very well known in its general outline. One important aspect, however, has escaped the attention of historians, and that is the poor health of the child. The infant suffered from epilepsy or convulsions, like Mary's previous children, and nearly succumbed to them. The doctors did their best, prescribing a concoction made from black cherries, which was supposed to be good for the ailment, in place of the nurse's milk. One is not surprised to learn that the remedy was not successful and the child was expected to die. The queen, however, had heard about St Macarius, the founder of the Scottish abbey in Würzburg, and of the miracles worked at his tomb. Human remedies having failed, divine ones must be tried. Abbot Irvine was asked by Mary to send relics of Macarius at once to London, and on 27th August Bro Joseph Ogilvie set off with them. One piece was placed in the bandages wrapped round the royal infant's head,
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and never again did he suffer from convulsions or show any sign of the
disease. At this distance of time it is impossible to make any firm
judgement on the nature of the cure. Nevertheless the salient facts re-
main: the child was dangerously ill and not expected to live, yet he sur-
vived and the Glorious Revolution took place. And the cure was attributed
to the merits of Macarius of Würzburg.

There are several extant accounts of the episode. That of Joseph
Ogilvie himself adds a second remarkable happening. A Protestant woman
who hid some particles of the relics in her clothing to escape detection
was at once converted to Catholicism and could not rest until she and her
family had abjured their heresy.26 Another account dates from the begin-
nning of 1695 when the earl of Perth passed through Würzburg on his way to
Rome. It was printed in 1741 and said that the Old Pretender (for he was
the infant) still carried a relic of Macarius on his person.27 Yet
another account, written about 1706 when the child was now eighteen and
had had no recurrence of the illness, adds that the papal nuntio in London,
d'Adda, ordered the remaining particles of the relic (that is, those not
placed in the child's bandages) to be publicly exposed for veneration in
the royal chapel. The source of this too was the earl of Perth, who at
the queen's request told one of the Würzburg missionaries to write an
account of what had happened. And, adds the writer, many were the promis-
es made to the Würzburg abbey in honour of St Macarius and in gratitude
for the benefit he conferred, but the rebellion against James prevented
them from being kept.28

At the beginning of 1689 James was in exile, Perth in prison. The
Würzburg monastery had no abbot and only two priests in residence. The
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senior by profession, Alan Chisholm, was left in charge, and it was in this capacity that he wrote to Rome for the grant of an indulgence on the coming feast of St James and told Will Leslie how few monks were in the monastery. The election of a new abbot did not take place until July 1669, fully eight months after Irvine's death. The delay was plainly occasioned by the lack of news from Scotland. By 7th July no letters had come, while only Ambrose Cook had managed to escape to the continent.29 One of the two novices, Bro Isidore Ogilvie, made his profession to the abbot of St Stephen's on 25th July, the feast of St James, and the election was held the following day. It seems clear that the profession and the election were timed so that one more resident monk would have voting rights. The suffragan bishop presided, the abbots of St Stephen's and Neustadt were present together with the noble dean of the cathedral chapter and the bishop's treasurer, and a notary was summoned. In fact the dignitaries present outnumbered the electors, because the missioners although canonically summoned had not appeared. With all due formalities Alan Chisholm the senior, Boniface Mackie the cellarer and Isidore Ogilvie the newly professed elected the fourth monk present, Ambrose Cook, as the new abbot. On 9th August his election was confirmed and he matriculated at the university;30 the following day he received the abbatial blessing in the neighbouring monastery of Oberzell, whose abbot was likewise awaiting his blessing.

John Cook was born in 1660 at Preston in Scotland, presumably either the village near Prestonpans in East Lothian or that near Duns in Berwickshire. Having graduated at a university, almost certainly Edinburgh,31 he became a soldier in the French army and served a year in Rome, then
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entered the Würzburg abbey in July 1681, taking the name of Brother Ambrose. Probably he became a Catholic at some point after his graduation. Abbot Maxwell considered him the most promising of his young monks, for he called him 'a youthe of good expectation' and wrote: 'Our young Master of Arts, now Br. Ambrose, give(s) sufficient satisfaction as yet to all, and studies so weele that he will be best of all the others'. When James VII came to the throne, Cook was nearing the end of his theological studies. Having been ordained priest he was sent in 1687 to take part in the missionary effort in Scotland, where he was chaplain to the Earl of Perth and gained the latter's esteem. When James's reign came to its sudden end, Cook managed to leave Scotland, stayed with the Maurists on his way through France and was in Würzburg by July 1689. When he was elected abbot he was only twenty-nine years old, had been only seven years out of the novitiate and a priest for only four of these.

Superficially the situation bears certain resemblances to that at Ratisbon in 1672, when an abbot not yet thirty was elected to lead a community consisting of a mere handful of monks. The cause of the low numbers at Würzburg, however, was not the misrule of the previous abbot but the too generous response of Abbot Irvine to the request for missionaries. Three of his priests were imprisoned in Scotland. One of them, Augustine Bruce, released after five or six months in prison, arrived back at Würzburg in 1690 and was subsequently - we do not know when - appointed prior. On the way from Scotland he had spent nine months with the Maurists at St Denis. There were two newcomers when Cook was elected: Isidore Ogilvie, very recently professed, and (probably) Placid Crichton. Three others entered the house very shortly after, Gregory Cheyne, Anselm Gordon
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and Maurus Strachan, and a further aspirant, Bernard Douglas, made his profession within the next few years. A few years later most of the resident monks were young and studying theology at the public schools. Würzburg was thus not suffering from lack of new blood, nor was there any load of debt when Cook took charge of the monastery. With the election of a talented young man to the abbacy, in circumstances which were bound to improve as the situation in Scotland returned to normal, one might have expected notable progress at Würzburg; and indeed things did go well for a time.

One of the most interesting features of Benedictine history arises from the looseness of the organisation in what, although it has no central governing body, is termed the Benedictine order. There is no general chapter with power to legislate for the various regions and congregations. In other centralised orders, ideas and reforms might arise in one province but their spread to other provinces is most likely to be the result of their adoption by the general chapter or its equivalent. With Benedictines, however, the spread of ideas could only come about through the zeal of monks seeking to propagate them, or through their voluntary adoption by others who were favourably impressed by them. We have already seen something of the zeal of the Bursfeld monks for propagating their reformed observance; now the ideals of the Maurist Congregation in France were making their impression. The celebrated Mabillon had visited Ratisbon in 1683 and been kindly received by Abbot Fleming, and even before this at Würzburg Abbot Maxwell had referred to the possibility of French (i.e., Maurist) observance being introduced into German monasteries.

Towards the end of 1688 Fleming had begun negotiations to have one of
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his monks accepted for a final year of theology by the Maurists. The monk in question, the newly ordained Augustine Gordon, arrived at Würzburg the following year on his way to France, and Cook took the opportunity to write to Mabillon. After returning thanks for the hospitality he had received from the Maurists, he told Mabillon of his election and how little it agreed with his aspirations for a solitary life. The only solace he had was that perhaps God wished to use his unworthy person as a means for restoring monastic discipline in Würzburg. Cook also wanted the great Benedictine scholar to write to him about the fruits of the Mass and the practice of accepting stipends and legacies for saying Masses, so that, as he put it, nothing contrary to God's honour would be done. The letter concludes with respects and greetings to the Abbot General, the prior of St Denis and Dom Germain and Thierry, and an assurance that never would he, Cook, forget the kindness he had received. Maurist influence was important in two ways at Würzburg: it led the Scots to do historical work, and Cook's reference to restoring monastic discipline meant in fact introducing Maurist observance.

Cook set about material improvements, the concomitant of reforms in observance. They are recorded in detail in the chronicle. In the year of his election he had the hall under the dormitory made into a refectory, with painted woodwork and benches. The next year he bought two large psalters for use in choir, as well as French and Latin books at the Frankfurt fairs. The monastery garden was redesigned, the dormitory was whitewashed and little openings made in the doors of each cell after the manner of the Maurist congregation. Those who are not acquainted with monasteries from the inside should perhaps be told that the so-called dormitory
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is really a corridor of small rooms or cells where the monks live and sleep, and that present-day monasteries drawing their inspiration from the Maurists still have these apertures in the cell doors, so that technically the monk can never be said to be in a private room of his own. Compartments were also made in the library for each monk, and wooden lattices put into the cloister; at least one presumes that library and cloisters are what the chronicler meant by his Greco-Latin musaeum and perestylium. Similar improvements were made in 1691, and the abbot’s room and bathroom were re-decorated.

One of the last things mentioned in the 1690 version of the chronicle was the scheme for union between the Scots abbeys in Germany, which the writer piously hoped might be brought into effect without delay. We have a letter from Cook on the subject to Abbot Fleming, dated 12th July 1690, not quite a year after the former’s election and clearly in reply to a communication from Ratisbon. Having thought several times about it, Cook declared himself resolved to co-operate in the project but dared not let the Würzburg officials know of his intentions. Even if a degree of union such as existed in other congregations was not possible, it was desirable to have some sort of union in Germany and complete union in the mission field, and he would place no obstacle in the way. Eighteen months later Fleming penned an eloquent appeal to the suffragan bishop at Würzburg. To summarise it briefly and passing over the inevitable references to the Scottish apostles of Germany, it contained a proposal that Ratisbon, Erfurt and Würzburg should unite to educate missionaries for Scotland, help each other in case of need and promote good and uniform observance. The suffragan was to tell his prince-bishop that nothing further was in the Scots’
minds, certainly not any infringement of the bishop's rights and jurisdiction, which would be expressly safeguarded.

Nothing came of the scheme, and twenty-five years later Fleming stated that the Würzburg monks refused his offer of union and asked their bishop to protect them from his advances.\(^{44}\) It is unlikely that he was speaking of some different project or occasion, and at first sight Fleming's accusation does not agree with the willingness expressed in Abbot Cook's letter. The obvious inference is therefore that the Würzburg Scots changed their mind. Perhaps Fleming showed himself too masterful and frightened them off, or this may be another illustration of the change that became apparent in Cook himself. Someone, possibly Gregory Cheyne, writing about 1725, described the ups and downs of Cook's career.\(^{45}\) For the first two years Cook held out a strict rule of life for himself and others, then he lost his fervour, began to seek worldly company and allowed monastic discipline to relax as he indulged in feasting and drinking. The tone of Cheyne's account is moderate and in fact glosses over some of Cook's later excesses; it can therefore be considered as objective and it provides a key to much that would otherwise be extremely puzzling. Cook was a man pulled in two directions, an almost classic example of the conflict between good and evil, and the testimonies to his character and abilities vary enormously.

The first accounts we have are favourable. Besides Cook's own letters to Fleming and Mabillon, which are a testimony to his zeal at the time, a rather shadowy character who frequented Würzburg praised him highly. This was Francis Sergeant, an English secular priest ordained at Rome in 1678 and now in his late forties.\(^{46}\) Sergeant stayed in the Scots monas-
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tery from November 1688 until the following May, seems to have been some sort of chaplain to German troops in Württemberg, then went to London in 1691 and was writing from Edinburgh four years later. He was on the best of terms with the Scots in Rome and corresponded frequently with them as well as with Würzburg. At Christmas 1690 he wrote that Abbot Cook was 'a very worthy, compleat and generous Prelate', and eight months later used much the same words of him: 'a most worthy, generous and noble prelate'.

The prince-bishop, Johann Gottfried von Guttenberg, also thought highly of the new abbot. On St Joseph's day (17th March) 1691 Cook celebrated the pontifical Mass *coram episcopo* in the church of the Discalced Carmelites, was invited to dinner afterwards with the bishop, and sat at table in the place of honour, taking precedence over the abbot of Schwarzbach. This may sound trivial but the bishop was a ruling prince, Cook was only thirty-one, and Schwarzbach far exceeded in importance the little Scots abbey. At any rate each copyist of the chronicle thought it significant enough to be included in his narrative.

Ample proof that Cook's first fervour did not last is provided by the visitation acts of August 1693. The preamble mentions difficulties which have arisen in St James's as regards both temporal administration and regular discipline, and some of the enactments suggest strongly that Cook was living in too grand a style. Not more than three men and a boy were to be employed, no guest was to reside if he could not pay for his keep, only benefactors were to be invited to meals, the abbot was to give up costly correspondence (whatever that might mean). Bro Joseph, who had been staying in England and was now in France with letters of exchange, was not to be allowed to impose on the monastery under pretext of expecting a
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legacy in Scotland or to incur too great expenses. Cook's own life had declined in fervour, for he was told to attend monastic duties more regularly, say Mass more often, and not bring women into the premises but conduct necessary business with them in the porch (where no doubt there was a parlour).

The acts urged the abbot to consult his senior monks and chapter before making important decisions, such as buying and selling. This illustrates two trends of his rule: the unsound administration of temporalities and the lack of consideration for his monks. Three enactments told Cook to appoint two confessors and allow the brethren to make use of either, not to impose penitential practices on the monks, and to grant two walk-days each week with an extra drink. This last refers to the practice of going for a long walk together for exercise, and anyone who has done this in a monastic habit will appreciate the point of having something to quench one's thirst on return to the monastery. Further points are that Isidore Ogilvie is to embark on higher theological studies, and the abbot is to see that the monastery doors are locked at night and keep the keys.

This fairly comprehensive series of directions was for the abbot's instruction; there were others for the community. One has to discriminate between phrases or exhortations which are mere matters of form, being found in the Rule or elsewhere, and those which are framed to meet a specific situation. Telling the prior to show good example is most probably a stereotyped phrase, but he was also to observe the pauses in choir recitation (a direction which has no doubt occurred in countless acts of visitations through the centuries) and to proceed with discretion and charity in correcting the brethren. Probably this prior was Augustine Bruce, the
man who knew Maurist monasteries at first hand.

The regulations for the brethren in general concern choir office, food and recreation. The portions to be sung at Matins and Lauds are listed; all else is to be merely recited, but there is no indication as to whether the correction was of a tendency to sing too little or of an overburdening of the brethren by making them sing too much; probably the latter. The monks are to have meat three times a week at dinner and supper, and soup at supper on monastic fast-days, and here the word saltem (at least) indicates that they had been receiving less than this. The regulation about walk days is repeated and a period of recreation for every day except Friday laid down. It is plain that the regulation was made in the brethren's favour, but they are to be careful not to abuse the opportunity for recreation by grumbling or strife. When government is bad, monks quickly become discontented.

The Scots abbey in Ratisbon and Würzburg remained in close contact with each other. Augustine Bruce was two weeks at Ratisbon after leaving the Maurists in 1690, the year in which the two abbots were of one mind on union between their monasteries. Two monks of Ratisbon, Columba MacLenman and Joseph Falconer, matriculated at Würzburg university in the winter of 1694-5; the former took his doctorate in 1695 and was still in Würzburg a year later. The chronicle records visits of Ratisbon monks to Würzburg and vice versa. The earl of Perth, whose chaplain Cook had been in Scotland, visited both abbeys. Having been released from imprisonment in Scotland, Perth made his way by stages to Rome, where he arrived in May 1695.

At the end of the previous November he was in Nijmegen and writing: 'I would fain pass Christmas with Abbot Cook, who lived with me at
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Stobhall, but I fear I shall not reach his monastie'. 52 His party did, however, reach Würzburg by January, where 'my lord and (by dispense) my lady lodged at a convent of Scots Benedictine Monks, of which father Cook, once my lord's chaplaine, is lord abbot'. The bishop too received Perth kindly, then the party moved on to Ratisbon, a town with 'another Scots convent of the same order, where we lodged and were well entertained'. 53 Abbot Fleming noted that Perth passed through before the beginning of February and promised his help to the monastery. 54

Perth was in Rome at the same time as a very strange character, Joseph Ogilvie, the Würzburg laybrother who had taken the relics of Macarius to London. Perhaps the most remarkable thing about him is the influence he seemed to exercise over his superiors. He is probably the person referred to when the English priest, Francis Sergeant, said that Abbot Cook was going to 'send a brother who has been often to and fro and knows all the conveniences, along with me into England'. 55 That was in August 1691, and two years later, as we have seen, Ogilvie had been living in England and was now living in France, at the monastery's expense. In 1695 he was in Rome with Will Leslie, the Scottish clergy agent. Alan Chisholm wrote to Ogilvie from Würzburg asking him to obtain a favour from Leslie and to greet Lord and Lady Perth for him. 56 On one occasion Perth wrote to Leslie: 'Bro Joseph tells me you take care of my Catt'. 57 Since Ogilvie was on friendly terms with the influential Leslie and the noble ex-chancellor, it comes as less of a surprise that the Roman authorities instructed him to take holy orders. At least that was how Ogilvie put it — it was no doubt his own desire — and the Würzburg monastic chapter in February
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1696 accepted him as a clerical member of the house. For a further fifteen months, however, he remained in Rome acting as Leslie's secretary. His stay there finally came to an ignominious end when Fleming proved that he had been tampering with his letters and had sent some of them to Abbot Cook. Ogilvie returned to Würzburg in May 1697 and was rewarded by receiving the tonsure from his abbot.

In September 1697 Fr Macarius Brown died after thirty-four years of work as a missionary in England and left a legacy to his monastery of Würzburg. The following January Abbot Cook and Joseph Ogilvie set out to Scotland to collect it. The story of Cook's delay in returning to Würzburg goes beyond the limits of this narrative but the fact that he went to collect the money himself suggests strongly that the windfall was most welcome, and the monastery was in fact heavily in debt. Cook's administration of temporalities has therefore to be considered, and it cannot be dissociated from his spiritual administration. There are three main sources for the story of the decline: the writings of Alan Chisholm, the letters of Abbot Fleming and the visitation acts of 1693 already described. Chisholm's evidence must be taken with caution, for Perth in 1699 blamed him for much of the opposition to Cook in his own community, adding that he was 'an old dozed (i.e., decrepit) body' led astray by James Blair. On the other hand, much of what he says finds corroboration elsewhere.

According to Chisholm, Cook started off debt free but 'being young elected Abbot he began many things (against the consent of his Conventuals) which he now finds will not succeed'. Much of the blame is laid on Joseph Ogilvie, whose advice Cook followed and who pushed him to contract debts in order to finance his own journeys to Scotland, England, France and Italy.
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By 1699 the debts amounted to 3000 crowns. One can often accept the concrete facts given by Chisholm even though his comments are lurid and overdrawn, as for instance when he adds that Cook never intended to repay the debts and that the monastery was 'as hell' to Ogilvie. Fleming corroborates the facts by saying that Cook by his extravagance had ruined what his careful predecessors had built up and that in eight years he contracted debts of 4000 dollars. The times, however, had not been easy. Francis Sergeant had spoken of armies in Franconia in 1689 and 1691, while in 1695 Chisholm wrote that the monastery had more monks than it could support in time of war and some would have to be sent away. He also said, mildly for him, that the abbot's economy was not as acceptable to the bishop and his visitators as that of previous abbots had been. It can be noted that in 1693–94 an embargo had been laid on goods going into the town of Ratisbon, with the result that Fleming actually had to send half his monks away.

There was a harsh strain in Abbot Cook's character which now began to assert itself. The 1693 visitation gave evidence of his imprudent severity towards his monks. A few years later the bishop appointed Cook to carry out visitations in the abbeys of Schwarzaach and Neustadt; the latter visitation seems to have been made in February 1696. Alan Chisholm declares that Cook's severity made the name of Scot hated, as he tried to force Maurist observance on the abbeys he visited, and that he was hard and unmerciful to the monks of his own and other monasteries while being indulgent to himself. His testimony is backed to some extent by Fleming, who wrote that the bishop persecuted religious and used 'a good freind of myne
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(clearly Cook) to execute his wrath'. Fleming also has a distressing story about Cook's harshness at Schwarzach. The story of Cook's trying to enforce Maurist observance has most probably some foundation, for there are indications of something of the sort in his own monastery (the apertures in the cell doors if nothing else), and both Cook and his prior knew Maurist monasteries at first hand.

There are signs, too, that Cook's rule in his own monastery was harsh, at least towards the younger monks. Of the older monks, Chisholm and Augustine Bruce continued to reside, Boniface Mackie went to the mission about 1694 while Christian Abercrombie seems never to have left it, and James Blair and Joseph Ogilvie lived only intermittently at Würzburg. Among the younger brethren, Gregory Cheyne and Maurus Strachan took a doctorate in Arts at the university in the summer of 1695, having matriculated the previous winter, and appear to have remained at Würzburg during the following years. The others were less settled, as we know from two main sources: the chronicle recording their comings and goings, and a letter of Abbot Fleming in April 1697. Isidore Ogilvie may have attended university after the visitation of 1693; the matriculation rolls for the year are lacking. He spent some time at Ratisbon in 1695, and Fleming's letter refers to his being used like a galley slave. In autumn 1696 he began to teach philosophy in the abbey of Neustadt but departed suddenly five months later. Placid Crichton fled in 1695, was captured and sent to Ratisbon for two months, and a year later went to the abbey of Seligenstadt; Fleming's letter suggests that he had run away for the second time. Anselm Gordon had disappeared without trace when Fleming wrote, while
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Bernard Douglas had been in Ratisbon for ten months and was resolved not to return to Würzburg as long as Cook's rule lasted - which cannot be long, added Fleming. The Ratisbon abbot's source for much of his information is prejudiced - he admitted it was Douglas - but the Würzburg abbey was clearly in a troubled state.

For all that, Cook cannot be written off as a person entirely lacking in merit and good intentions. The bishop, in spite of the visitation acts of 1693 which he personally signed, continued to think highly of him. Not only did he use Cook to carry out visitations, but he delegated him in November 1696 to perform the blessing of the new abbot of Neustadt. Fleming wrote in January 1698 that Cook was in the bishop's favour, while Augustine Bruce, his prior since at least April 1696, thought him the fittest among the Scots to deal with the bishop. And, even if it was his opinion that the bishop was a lawyer and litigious and made use of Cook to persecute other religious, Fleming was still willing to concede that he was a good man. Alan Chisholm gives much the same testimony by saying that the ecclesiastical officials in Würzburg did not like Cook because he sided with the bishop against them. The earl of Perth likewise retained a good opinion of the Würzburg abbot. He considered that much of the trouble at Würzburg arose from the rebellious spirit of the monks, instigated by James Blair in particular, and he tried to offer justifications for Cook's long absence in 1698-99 to the bishop. Fleming spoke of Perth's continued regard for the absent abbot, adding on his own account that Cook 'wants not witt'. The university authorities evidently
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thought so too, for he had the rare distinction of being elected Rector Magnificus for three successive academic years, 1694-97.81

The terminal point of this narrative is the departure for Scotland of its first post-reformation Roman Catholic bishop in the autumn of 1696. This was Thomas Nicolson, who was consecrated in February 1695 but was obliged by circumstances to remain on the Continent. He was in Cologne when, on 20th June, 1696, Abbot Cook visiting the town was directed by the nuntio to his lodgings. Cook and Nicolson travelled together to Würzburg, where the new bishop stayed with the monks for two and a half months. During his stay in Germany both he and Abbot Fleming were in touch with Will Leslie, the Roman agent for the Scottish clergy, and it was incidentally at this point of time that the prince-bishop of Würzburg made Leslie his own agent in Rome.82 The significance of Nicolson's visit to Würzburg is that Abbot Cook agreed whole-heartedly with the changes which the appointment of a bishop in Scotland would entail for his monks on the mission; it also showed that Cook was still capable, in spite of the defects of his government, of pursuing an enlightened policy, acting with decision and commending himself to influential persons.

While staying at Würzburg Nicolson was invited by Fleming to visit Ratisbon. He could not accept but arranged to meet Fleming at Nuremberg, half-way between the two Scots abbeys. He went there with Bruce, the Würzburg prior (the abbot being unwell at the time), on 9th August, only to find that Fleming did not keep the appointment as the letter telling him of the arrangement had been delayed. Accordingly Fleming travelled to Würzburg, where the two Scots abbots and the new bishop spent three days together. The fruit of the meeting is to be seen in a report to Propaganda
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of 13th November 1697. The two abbots would send to Scotland any monks on whose services Nicolson called; they had told their monks to take Nicolson as their sole superior while in Scotland; and Nicolson had full powers over monks in Scotland and could even send them back to their abbeys if they proved unsatisfactory. This, says the report, is most encouraging, especially if other religious follow the Benedictines' example. The Scots monasteries are described as being in flourishing condition in regard to observance and studies, and the two abbots as being meritorious and esteemed by all. The student of Würzburg history can hardly accept this as unconditionally true of Cook and his abbey but it relieves the dark picture considerably. Leslie wanted letters of thanks to be sent to the two abbots, and further letters and even papal briefs to be sent to their patrons, including the prince-bishop of Würzburg. And not without reason, for after the meeting at Würzburg the mission work of religious orders in Scotland would be carried out on a different basis. A new era in the history of the Roman Catholic church in Scotland had begun, and the two Scots abbots had helped greatly to give it a fair start.
Chapter 12

THE BENEDICTINE BACKGROUND

General development among Benedictines - St James's before the Reformation - conflicting forces in 17th century - formation of congregations after Trent - particularly in Germany - attempt to found congregation for all Germany - St James's subject to bishop - union with Ratisbon before 1615 - union with other Franconian monasteries after 1618 - unity among the Scots after 1639 - attempt to found Scottish Congregation - Bursfeld Union tries to enter Franconia - influence of Lorraine Congregation - union with English in 1660 - relations with Ratisbon - fresh attempt to form Scottish Congregation - its failure - Abbot Fleming's summary - real power of Würzburg officials.

It goes without saying that, like all human institutions, Benedictine monasteries and groups of monasteries have developed constitutionally since their early days. From the sixth century, when St Benedict composed the (on the whole) very general provisions of his Rule, to the twentieth century, when all Benedictine monks are listed in the same directory and their abbots attend regular congresses in Rome, there has been constant development and, in the second half of the period at least, a constant movement towards unification. But even now Benedictines do not constitute a religious order, for they have no central superior or governing body; the most that can be said is that the individual national groups or congregations, though differing widely from each other, resemble religious orders in their general organisation. Within most of these, moreover, the local
abbots possess a considerable degree of autonomy. For all practical purposes, most abbeys are independent of each other and of any superior except the holy see. They are also, except in certain minor matters, exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese in which they are situated.

To understand the position of the Scottish monks of Würzburg in the seventeenth century, one must not imagine that Benedictines were organised as they are today, and in particular one must abandon the notion of Benedictines as such being exempt from the authority of the local bishop. Exemption was a privilege granted only to the more important abbeys. St James's in Ratisbon was exempt, was in fact a consistorial abbey, whose abbot had to be proclaimed as duly elected in a papal consistory. St James's in Würzburg had no such privilege.

The status of the Würzburg Schottenkloster before the Reformation was determined by two main factors. The first was the establishing of the Congregation of the Scots. When the Lateran Council in 1215 decreed that Benedictine houses were to unite into congregations on a regional basis and hold general chapters every three years, a special arrangement was made for the Scotic monasteries, grouping them according to nationality and not locality. The head of the congregation, the Ratisbon abbot, had considerable disciplinary powers. The Scotic congregation held together until the fifteenth century, and even when it began to break up after 1400 the Würzburg abbot continued to attend chapters at Ratisbon. In the late fifteenth century, when the chapter of 1479 re-affirmed the unity of the congregation, the Würzburg abbots were Irish monks of Ratisbon elected to their abbacy by the general chapter.
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The other factor was the very real power of the prince-bishop of Würzburg. In the later Irish period it was he, and not the Ratisbon abbot, who carried out visitations; the abbots elected by the Ratisbon chapter took an oath of obedience to him on the occasion of their confirmation; it was he who brought about what he called the reform of the monastery by bringing in German monks in 1497 and who later permitted, or perhaps even arranged for, its union with the Bursfeld Congregation. St James's was thus subject both to the bishop and to the Ratisbon abbot who was head of the congregation. One must be careful, however, not to interpret the word 'congregation' in its modern sense. The Scotic Congregation was a capitular union, that is, its abbots met in chapter, and it was also something much more, because the Ratisbon abbey was the mother-house of the others. Both these types of group, the capitular union and the mother-house surrounded by its offspring, were to disappear with the Reformation.

After the upheaval of the Reformation the Ratisbon abbot continued to look on St James's in Würzburg as a daughter-house and therefore subject in some way to his authority. The seventeenth century was also characterised, particularly in Germany, by the constant efforts among Benedictines to group together for mutual support. The tensions among the Würzburg Scots over their status can only be understood in relation to the traditional role of the Ratisbon abbot, the authoritarian rule of the prince-bishop of Würzburg, and the advances made by the various German Benedictine congregations. To these must be added the desire to share in the good fortune of the English monks, who had established a national congregation on the Continent with ample faculties and privileges for missionary work in their homeland.
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The relations of the Würzburg Scots with the Ratisbon abbey and their own bishop during the seventeenth century have been mentioned time and again in the preceding chapters, for they are central to the history of the monastery. The background to it, however, the movement towards congregations, also needs consideration. The final session of the Council of Trent in December 1563 had legislated for the regular orders and given an impetus to reform in them. One decree in particular had ordered the exempt monasteries to arrange for chapter meetings and visitations among themselves; in other words, the equivalent of diocesan synods and parish visitations was considered salutary for monasteries as well as for dioceses. The decree did not envisage congregations with uniform observance in each monastery but merely the capitular union already prescribed in 1215. Nevertheless it did lead to the formation of closely-knit congregations, which the holy see encouraged as being more susceptible to influence from Rome. The new congregations were real corporate entities, with common statutes for each house and some form of permanent central control. There were basically two kinds, the federal and the centralised. In the former the monk took his vows for his own monastery, which thus became his family, and the monastery had its own abbot elected for life. In the latter the congregation and not the individual monastery was the family of the monk, and each monastery surrendered much of its individuality to the central governing body. Only the Hungarian Congregation is today organised on this basis. The federal type, the one taken up by seventeenth-century German Benedictines, is the form of congregation that has almost universally prevailed.

Attempts by popes and their emissaries to form centralised congrega-
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tions among Benedictines in German-speaking lands were made in the late sixteenth century but came to nought. In the early seventeenth century, however, alarmed by the fate which was liable to overtake and did overtake monasteries without an adequate community, the German abbots themselves pressed for union. Congregations were formed in Switzerland, Swabia, Austria and the dioceses of Salzburg and Strasburg. For the most part these were not exempt; indeed the motive of a bishop in erecting a congregation in his diocese was usually to ensure that monasteries did not join a congregation outwith his control or gain exemption. The history of German Benedictines in the seventeenth century is largely a story of conflicts between bishops and monasteries, and among the most uncompromising bishops are to be counted the prince-bishops of Würzburg.

If the German abbots were opposed by the diocesan bishops in their efforts to form unions, they were impelled to make these efforts by the dangers which threatened them. They had suffered great losses of property at the Reformation and were liable to suffer more through the demands made by the energetic and apostolic Jesuits. Some time shortly after 1626 three Jesuit provincials and about thirty priests met at Ratisbon, with the intention of gaining support among the temporal rulers for their plan to obtain German Benedictine monasteries and revenues for their own use. Some, perhaps the extremists among them, declared that Germany would never prosper until the Benedictines were extinct like the Templars. Already in 1625 a union of all German monasteries had been proposed and had been taken up by the Bursfeld Congregation. Originally the Bursfeld Congregation was due to a reforming movement which had done much to raise the level of German monasticism before the Reformation. Though it had suffered
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severe losses during the Reformation period it still comprised about forty
monasteries, chiefly in Westphalia and the dioceses of Cologne and Trier,
whose abbots attended its general chapter. In 1627 the Bursfeld presi-
dent sought authority from Rome for the uniting of all German Benedictine
monasteries into one congregation. This won the approval of the nuncio
Carafa, and in October 1630 an invitation was sent to the various abbeys
and groups to meet at Ratisbon the following January. In spite of the
strong objections of bishops and temporal rulers the meeting took place
and approved of the plan for union. All were to join the Bursfeld Union,
which had the privilege of uniting monasteries to itself even when the
bishop refused consent. A further meeting was fixed for July 1631 but
was never held, and Rome, under pressure from the bishops and imperial
electors, declared the proposed union null and void.

The situation had been complicated by the imperial Edict of Restitu-
tion in 1629 restoring all property formerly owned by religious bodies and
confiscated from them since 1552. Naturally the Benedictines tried to
regain what was once Benedictine property; as we have seen, the Würzburg
Scots tried to regain the old Scotish abbey in Nuremberg. The Jesuits,
too, made efforts to get former monastic property for what they considered
(and probably with reason) more useful purposes. The scramble came to a
sudden end when the Protestant armies overran south Germany in 1631.
There followed, nevertheless, an energetic battle in print between Jesuits
and Benedictines, the chief protagonist of the monks being a Fr Romanus
Hay (whose name despite its appearance is German and not Scots). The
matter was finally settled by the peace of Westphalia in 1648 by which
whoever had church property on 1st January 1624 kept it. Besides the
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devastation caused by the war, much German Benedictine property was thus once and for all settled under Protestant ownership. But the idea of an extension of the Bursfeld Union had taken hold, and there were to be intermittent efforts among the German congregations to unite. 10

What was the position of the Würzburg Scots in this constitutional struggle? The language found in the various documents can cause confusion, since we find the Scots asserting the existence of a Scottish Congregation and at the same time exerting themselves to form one. The congregation in existence was the union formed in 1215 and of little practical moment in the seventeenth century, while the union they hoped to form was a congregation of the post-Tridentine sort. The best way of answering the question is therefore to observe what actually happened and to note in particular what general chapters the Scots abbots attended and who carried out visitations of the abbey. In both cases the answer is decisive. By and large the Scots abbots attended no general chapters, and it was invariably the Würzburg diocesan officials appointed by the prince-bishops who carried out visitations of the Scots abbey. The conclusion, therefore, is inescapable: St James's, Würzburg, belonged to no Benedictine congregation.

It is possible, nevertheless, to distinguish temporary modifications of this basic position. The re-foundation of the monastery in 1595 was done entirely on the terms of the bishop, who laid down the horarium and imposed stringent conditions for the abbey's continued existence. In spite of this, Bishop Echter allowed the Würzburg monks to have both active and passive voice in the Ratisbon chapter (most clearly seen, perhaps, in the affair of Algeo's coadjutorship) and was willing to let Abbot Whyte
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behave as an abbot general with jurisdiction over the Würzburg abbey.
The first two abbots seem to have been elected at Ratisbon. It was Whyte who administered the monastery when its first abbot resigned, who released Abbot Hamilton from his monastic obligations in 1606, who then lived at Würzburg without being its abbot and tried to control the Ratisbon abbey from a distance. It is possible, of course, that this was because the Würzburg authorities insisted on some sort of abbot being in residence.
All the same, at this time Whyte behaved like the president of a congregation and he used the language of one, calling himself Visitor General with power to remove other abbots from office. In April 1615 he actually said that the three Scots abbeys formed one congregation and acted together for its well-being.

Even at this time, of course, the Würzburg abbey was not exempt, that is, it was subject to the bishop. But monasteries could still be members of a congregation and take part in its general chapters without being exempt. This might have happened with St James's if Whyte had been a successful superior. Instead, as we have seen, Julius Echter issued an ultimatum at the end of 1614, as a result of which the Würzburg monks held an abbatial election in Würzburg, probably the first time this happened.

Echter's successor, a reforming bishop like himself, had already gained experience in ruling the diocese of Bamberg. One of his first acts in Würzburg was to convocate a synod of Benedictines, and he told them, after the solemn opening ceremonies, that he had summoned them for the furtherance of regular discipline and of uniformity among the various monasteries. The monks then accepted, rather than themselves decided upon, proposals for reform and common observance. The text that was drawn up states now
and again that the prince-bishop wanted such and such to be done. The enactments included a very detailed horarium for choir office, meals and study, detailed regulations for food, clothing and recreation, and much else besides. The same liturgical books were to be used, the same ceremonial observed. Little of importance was overlooked, and there were sections on enclosure, silence, the vow of poverty, the noviciate, the sick. The Scots abbot and prior agreed to all this and signed like the rest. St James's now formed part of what was, in fact if not in name, a German diocesan congregation but one without power to arrange its own general chapters and visitations.

The appointment of William Ogilvie, after a visitation in 1627, to administer the abbey of Schwarzach is an example of what submission to the bishop and his officials could mean. Schwarzach had belonged to the Bursfeld Union like St James's and seems to have considered itself as still belonging, but was unable to carry out what this entailed in practice. An attempt by the Bursfeld Union in 1630 to return to Franconia was unsuccessful. Thus, when the war came to Franconia, the abbeys in Würzburg diocese, St James's included, formed a centrally controlled group on their own. The pact with the English Congregation in 1623 was merely a spiritual union together with an arrangement for mission faculties.

After the Swedish occupation the monasteries of Franconia and Bavaria were in a sorry state, nor was recovery possible while the threat of hostilities lasted. The very destitution of Ratisbon obliged the Würzburg Scots to go to its help, so that for a time the superiors of all three Scottish monasteries were monks of Würzburg. This of course did not affect the status of the Würzburg abbey, but the attempts to expel the
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Scots from Ratisbon gave a further impetus to unity. Abbot Asloan of Würzburg had been appointed abbot of Ratisbon by the holy see, following on his election by the Ratisbon community. The Würzburg officials had then told him to return to Würzburg if he wished to remain abbot of his own monastery. He did so, leaving Ratisbon in the hands of an administrator, and so was in the strange position of being abbot of two monasteries simultaneously. The third Scots abbey, Erfurt, although not exempt, was recognised by the archbishop of Mainz to be dependent on Ratisbon. Thus Asloan was legally in control of all three abbeys.

To this must be added the attempt made by the emperor and bishop in 1640-41 to confiscate the Ratisbon abbey and obliged the Scots monks to go to Würzburg. As the legal superior, Asloan was directly involved. There was also the stimulus given by the final success of the English Congregation. English monks who had entered Italian and Spanish monasteries had begun to do mission work in England, then had founded houses of their own, and after much controversy had established a congregation in 1619. It was at first subject to the Valladolid Congregation but the bull _Plantata_ in 1633 recognised its coming of age and granted complete exemption and permanent mission faculties. The bull was first promulgated to the English community at Douai in 1634, then promulgated to the whole Congregation at the next general chapter in 1639.13

The desire of the Scots at this time to form a congregation of the new type is explained by Asloan's position as superior of all three houses like the president of a centralised congregation, the need to unite in order to withstand attack, and the stimulus given by the success of the English monks. Until the chronology is established more precisely, one
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cannot say whether the attempt of the Bursfeld president to re-unite St James's to his congregation was an additional persuasive to form a Scottish Congregation or whether it ran counter to the already explicit plans of the Scots. As we have seen, Asloan in 1642 was perfectly willing to help the Bursfeld Union to establish itself once more in Würzburg but not to have the Scots included in it, though St James's had been joined to it in its German period. He told Colohon that St James's had been re-united to the Scottish Congregation and that the rights and privileges of the Scottish Congregation prevented it from joining the Bursfeld Union. This was unacceptable to Colohon, because the Bursfeld Congregation considered the separation of any member null and void, since monasteries belonging to it had received privileges and had taken an oath binding for all time.14

Asloan's language has misled the chief historian of the Bursfeld Congregation into thinking that the Scottish Congregation resisted Colohon's proposals.15 But no Scottish Congregation had yet been formed and the petition to form one was not granted, if indeed it was ever presented. Its suggestions are therefore of little practical importance. In brief, however, the Scots wanted a congregation with all the privileges granted to the old Scottish Congregation or to modern congregations since, and so have the same favour shown them as was recently shown to the English. The Ratisbon abbot would be president for life and have all competent jurisdiction but could be deposed if necessary; he would also be prefect of their mission to Scotland. There would be a general chapter every five years, which would appoint persons to carry out the annual visitation of the monasteries. The Scots also wanted comprehensive privileges and favours, and the return of all alienated property both in Scotland and on the

15 Volk, "Colohon", 381.
continent. One of the most significant features of the petition is the desire for exemption of the president, the congregation and the individual abbots from the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishops.  

Both the Bursfeld Union and Würzburg ecclesiastics were making efforts to restore monastic life after the upheaval of the Swedish invasion. Franconian monasteries in general took over new constitutions adapted from a Caeremoniale Benedictinum printed in south Germany in 1641. The bishop delegated abbots to join with his officials in carrying out visitations; thus, after the Scots had received a visitation of this sort, Abbot Asloan joined in doing the same in the neighbouring abbey of St Stephen’s. This was in 1643, when the Bursfeld Union was trying to get the Würzburg abbots to attend their chapters and accept their visitations. In this year the Bursfeld authorities put in one of their monks as abbot of a monastery in Würzburg diocese, and he refused to accept the visitators sent by the bishop.  

The Bursfeld Union, however, was fighting against odds that were too great and does not seem to have tried again to enter Würzburg diocese. In 1651 two Würzburg Scots were received by the Bursfeld president, then went on to the monasteries of the Congregation of Lorraine. It is possible that their aim was to inaugurate some sort of union in observance if not in organisation. One of the two was James Brown, in whose historical work, written shortly after 1653, occurs the significant remark that the monks of the Lorraine Congregation would surely help the Scots by training their young men if they were united, si essent uniti. This apparently means the introduction of their reformed observance, which in 1631 was followed by the Scots at Erfurt and perhaps also at Ratisbon. One should  

16 KUSJR, Pass. 9; copy in Blair, f. 131r-142r.  
17 Gropp, II, 168-69.
note, too, that Brown was at Rome and later at Lisbon with Silvanus Mayne, who influenced him considerably and had himself been acquainted with the Lorraine abbeys.\textsuperscript{18} The Lorraine Congregation, however, was one of the centralised type in which the family unit was the congregation as a whole and the local superiors were appointed for a term of years by the general chapter.\textsuperscript{19} It is difficult to imagine that the Scots wanted to lose their identity in such a body, or that it had the faintest chance of establishing itself in the diocese of Würzburg. But the Würzburg Scots felt its influence, no doubt in much the same way as they were influenced by Maurist observance and ideals at the end of the century.

The Union with the English Congregation in 1660 has been described in detail, in its provisions and in its effects. There seems little point in looking for analogies or similar unions, for quite possibly it is unique in monastic annals. Perhaps if an abbot more sympathetic to it than Dixon had ruled Würzburg after 1661 the significance of the union would have been greater. The jurisdiction of the prince-bishop was expressly safeguarded, and it provided for such things as a friendly visitation by the English president every so often in addition to the bishop's visitations. There is no record that an English visitation ever took place or that a Würzburg abbot ever attended an English general chapter. Really the Union provided for English help and opened the door to English influence but scarcely affected the constitutional status of the abbey. Its importance lies in the missionary sphere. Undoubtedly, however, it increased the Scots' awareness of what the English Congregation was and did, and a considerable number of English Congregation documents were transcribed and preserved by the Scots.

\textsuperscript{18} Indiculus, f. 30v, 40v. See p. 123-24.
\textsuperscript{19} Molitor, I, 363-73; Schmitz, IV, 22-27.
In 1652 the Ratisbon abbot had been saying that he had the right to hold visitations in Würzburg. The chances of his doing so after a lapse of almost four centuries, especially in that prince-bishopric, were of course negligible, but it showed that the traditional position of the abbot of Ratisbon regarding the other Scots monasteries had not been forgotten. Abbot Asloan of Würzburg summed up the real position more accurately two years later in his answers to the Irish monks' questionnaire when they were trying to gain admission into the Scots abbeys. Replying to a question on monastic property and revenues, he said that the bishop and his councillors knew about them, because it was their concern alone. Regarding the abbey's status, he replied that at the present time (pro tempore) it was not exempt but it was united to the other Scots monasteries insofar as they were members of the same nation and order, and when they were attacked from without they combined to help each other. It is clear that the Würzburg diocesan authorities did not mind how much coming and going there was between the Scots in Würzburg and Ratisbon, nor how much they co-operated in missionary work, provided it did not affect the status or the observance of St James's. In 1691, only three years after the monastery had sent almost all its priests to Scotland, the bishop in a report to Rome said that Scots monks went as missionaries by his leave.

When, after a century or more of intermittent effort, the Bavarian Congregation was founded in 1684, pressure was put on Abbot Fleming of Ratisbon to join it. This was a matter in which his exempt status was largely irrelevant, because it was usually the exempt abbots who, not being subject to the bishop, took the lead in forming these regional congregations. Fleming resisted, basing his stand on the abbot of Ratisbon being

20 Adv. 29.7.1, f. 5xxv, 39v-40r.
head of the old Scottish Congregation. 22 It was no doubt the formation of the Bavarian Congregation that stimulated Fleming to think once more about a Scottish Congregation. In 1685 James Blair transcribed for Fleming the petition for a Scottish Congregation made in 1640-44 and a summary of it. The originals from which he copied have been preserved. 23 However, his transcript also contained a second summary very like the first but with one great difference: the rights of the bishops were to be preserved. The president's jurisdiction was not to infringe these, abbatial elections were to be confirmed by the bishop, and the congregation was not to be exempt. 24 Since the original of this has not, as far as we know, been preserved, it may well be that it is Fleming's adaptation of the 1640 petition, made to improve his chances with the bishop of Würzburg. Politics, after all, is the art of the possible. On the other hand, there is no mention in his correspondence at this time of any plan to found a Scottish Congregation.

The first sign of such a project belongs to the year 1690. We have seen how Abbot Cook in that year agreed to Fleming's plan, adding, however, 'I durst not lett it be known at our court I had such a thought', and how Fleming in January 1692 sought to enlist the support of the Würzburg suffragan and promised that there would be no diminution of the bishop's authority. The matter was open enough for the monastic chroniclers to record it and express their hope, in writing for Mabillon's collections, that it would soon be accomplished. 25 Writers on the Scots monasteries commonly assert that a Scottish Congregation was formed in 1692. It would seem that the origin of the assertion can be traced back to a writer in 1895, who gives some of the terms of the agreement from a document in the Ratis-

22 FA, Rat. 16a.
23 See note 16.
24 Blair, f. 142r-144r.
25 Ser. Abb. (FL, 12,675, f. 218r).
bon monastic archives. According to this, the three abbots with the approval of their superiors (the holy see, the archbishop of Mainz and the bishop of Würzburg, respectively) formed a congregation. Abbot Fleming of Ratisbon was elected president for life, and thereafter a president was to be chosen every six years by the three abbots and a delegate from each monastery. Provision was also made for the death or resignation of a president in office. Because of the antiquity of the monastery and the privileges granted to it by pope and emperor, the abbot of Ratisbon was to take first place, then came the abbot of Würzburg, and lastly the abbot of Erfurt; and their priors were ranked in the same order.

The evidence is overwhelming, however, that no congregation was formed. The document, which is not to be found, was no doubt merely the draft of an agreement that was never signed. We have Fleming's own testimony that the Würzburg Scots drew back; there is no reference to it in any Würzburg document or writer; the chroniclers of the monastery say nothing of it, neither does Brockie in his Monasticon. When references occur to a Scottish Congregation as actually existing, the word must be interpreted to mean the union brought about by the Lateran Council and not a juridically constituted body. When Ratisbon abbots continued to describe themselves in terms such as 'Matricularius et Visitator' of all Scots monasteries in Germany, the title must be taken as merely traditional, in the same way as modern British coins bear the title 'Defender of the Faith', bestowed on Henry VIII by the pope. Thus, in a compilation sent to Mabillon, probably by Fleming, the Ratisbon abbot is described as formerly having jurisdiction de facto over all Scottish monasteries and still having it de jure. Of course, an abbot like Fleming was always willing to

26 Renz, xvi, 85.
27 For instance, in Abbot Fleming's formula (FA, Rat. 7, f. 5v).
28 FL, l.c. f. 221v.
make his jurisdiction actual once again.

A summary of the Würzburg monastery's status in the seventeenth century, given by Fleming but with less than his usual objectivity, is worth quoting. According to this, John James Whyte, abbot of Ratisbon, recovered the Würzburg monastery at great expense and put in some of his monks. It was not long before these severed all connection with Ratisbon, but finding they could not exist alone they united themselves to the English Congregation. After a time the English realised that they reaped no advantage from their union with Würzburg, so they had it rescinded by Cardinal Norfolk's authority. Fleming therefore invited the Würzburg Scots to join with Ratisbon on the same terms as for the union with the English Congregation, but they absolutely refused and invoked the bishop's protection against all overtures from Ratisbon. The main stages of the monastery's progress are fairly accurately described, even if the picture is distorted. In particular the proposed union of 1692 remains a mystery; the Würzburg monks were in favour of it, yet its subsequent rejection by them or the bishop is not mentioned in the correspondence with Rome that has survived.

It is clear that no Ratisbon abbot after Whyte interfered in the running of the Würzburg monastery. The very real power of the Würzburg officials, on the other hand, is everywhere apparent. They conducted the visitations and arranged the abbatial elections. In 1640 and 1699 they summoned the absent abbot to return. In 1640 we find them exacting annual accounts from the abbot, and it was they who knew the state of the monastic property in 1654. Abbots of Würzburg explicitly called themselves subjects of the prince-bishop. Even the holy see did not interfere in Würz-

29 ML, Fleming, 17.12.1716.
30 ML, Bruce, 15.3.1699; Chisholm, 13.6.1699.
burg affairs, though one finds nuntios and the cardinal protector of Scotland making decisions on Ratisbon, which was exempt from the bishop and thus subject directly to the holy see. Twice Propaganda ordered visitations of the three Scots abbeys in Germany, in 1627 and 1668, in each case at a time when the affairs of Ratisbon were at a very low ebb. Since all three abbeys are mentioned without any distinction, not much value can be attached to remarks in 1668 about their being directly subject to the holy see although the local bishops claimed jurisdiction over them. The remarks fit quite well the situation in Ratisbon at the time but do not fit that in Würzburg. We can be fairly sure that no visitation was carried out by an apostolic visitor in Würzburg, for not only did the bishop have jurisdiction over the Scots abbey; he was also the temporal ruler.

31 Giblin, 46-47, 75-76.

There were many colleges and religious houses of Scottish, English and Irish Catholics on the continent, all of which differed from the Scottish Benedictine monasteries in one important particular: they had been founded as a consequence of the success of the Reformation in Britain and had of their nature a missionary ethos, whereas the Schottenklöster had been founded in the twelfth century, had come into the possession of Scottish monks (at least in principle) before the Reformation and were part of the traditional church life of Germany. Missionary activity was a temporary addition to the claustral life of the Scots monks. The other institutions were counter-Reformation centres of their very nature, the Scots abbeys only by force of circumstances. In spite of this the Scots Benedictines made a contribution, not very large but by no means negligible, to the
missionary effort during the seventeenth century.

It is not easy to determine the extent to which missionary zeal entered into the plans of John Lesley and Ninian Winzet in their refounding of the Scots abbeys. While in Rome, they could not have been ignorant of the counter-reformation efforts of the English Catholics there, nor of the interest of Gregory XIII in recovering their homeland for Catholicism. In his memorial to the pope, among his reasons why the German abbeys should be handed over to the Scots, Lesley listed the education of young Scots who would help to restore the Catholic religion in Scotland, and he added that if the handing over was not possible immediately, at least part of their income could be used to educate missionaries for Scotland. Lesley’s intention, as far as one can make out from the rather vague language, was not that the Scots monks should be missionaries but that they should reside in their monasteries and educate missionaries.

This was the language used in addressing Gregory XIII; the petitions to the German dignitaries for help made less mention of the advantages to Scotland. For instance, of Winzet’s eleven reasons why the Vienna abbey should be restored to the Scots, not one mentioned the benefit to Catholicism in Scotland. This may of course have been merely politic. Lesley did try to obtain free places for one or two Scots students in Richstätt seminary; he and Winzet quite possibly did stress their apostolic aims when they approached Bishop Echter in Würzburg; and there may well have been some potential Scots missionaries educated by Winzet in Ratisbon. Nevertheless, whatever the aims of Lesley and Winzet were, we know of no positive contribution made to the Scottish mission by the Ratisbon abbey during Winzet’s period of rule. The entries in the Ratisbon necrology

1 Source references already given in previous chapters will, in general, not be repeated.

2 Hewison, I, Cxviii-cxx; Dilworth, "First Mission", 63-64.
concerning monks working on the Scottish mission at this time must be disregarded; they are fabrications of the early eighteenth century. ³

In 1594, when Winzet's successor was negotiating successfully for the restoration of the Würzburg abbey, the Roman authorities showed that they linked this with benefit to Scotland. Clement VIII's brief to Bishop Echter praised the project as it would help to preserve the Catholic faith in Scotland, and it expressed the wish that the revenues for the next ten years or so should be used to support a seminary for Scottish monks and missionaries. The attempt made the same year to force the abbey of St Gallen to subsidise a Scottish college or students may also denote Roman interest in the Scottish mission. There is no conclusive evidence, however, that the Scots monks themselves looked on the restoration of the Würzburg abbey as a means of helping Catholicism in Scotland, nor, if one can judge from the conditions laid down by Echter, that he did either.

It is likely, all the same, that Echter and the monks had something of the sort in mind even if it was not put explicitly into writing. The papal brief may have been echoing Echter's prior communication in its reference to helping Scotland. Less than a year after the refounding of the Würzburg abbey the monks and the bishop were conferring on a plan to do exactly this. David Anderson, the Presbyterian minister, reported that the priest Adam Simpson had been sent from Ratisbon to Rome by the Scots abbots to obtain leave for some of the monks to return to Scotland to 'traffic there with the papists' and bring back boys to Germany. This Adam Simpson is perhaps to be identified with one Adam MacCall who makes his appearance at Ratisbon at this time and later spent many years working as a priest in Scotland. The identification is tempting. Both had the

³ Dilworth, "First Mission", 64-65.
forename Adam and were from Edinburgh. Simpson entered the seminary at Pont à Mousson in 1588 and was a monk at Ratisbon in 1598. Nothing more is heard of him, while MacCall took vows at Ratisbon in 1597 and nothing is known of his previous career. For what it is worth, too, the priest Simpson in 1594-5 was in Galloway⁴ and the priest MacCall was to be found there many years later.

Anderson also reported a meeting which took place at Würzburg on 19th April 1596, at the instance of the nuntio in Germany, between Scottish papists and Julius Echter. It is not clear who took part, but presumably the Benedictines are meant since the setting is wholly German. The purpose was to plan the project that Simpson had gone to Rome to get permission for, namely, the sending of some priest to Scotland who would spy out the land and consult with the Catholics there; he would also bring back boys between the ages of twelve and eighteen, of whom some would become monks in the Scottish abbeys and in others which the Scots hoped to obtain, and some would be trained as missionaries by the Jesuits. Echter, said Anderson, had agreed to maintain sixty such youths, the bishop of Salzburg forty, and the bishop of Ratisbon twenty. Anderson thought that either Abbot Irvine or his prior Hamilton would be sent to Scotland that summer, 1596, to carry out the project.

It is more difficult to judge of the accuracy of this information than of the details Anderson gives concerning the monks themselves, for it is corroborated by no known source. That Simpson went to Rome and that the meeting in Würzburg took place seems most likely, since Anderson's factual accuracy is considerable. The list of monasteries to be acquired for the Scots included Vienna and the two at Cologne about which John

⁴ Hammermayer, Reformation, 250.
Lesley had spoken to Echter, but also three which are mentioned nowhere else (though one of them, Mainz, had been Irish and appears in later lists). The figures of the students to be given board, lodging and education by the German bishops are fantastically high and cannot be taken seriously. One feels that Anderson laboured under the handicap of spies who have to rely on rumour or on reports which have not lost in the telling.

Whether anything at all came of these plans is difficult to say. Given the tiny size of the Würzburg community at the time, three men in all, it is unlikely that Irvine or Hamilton could leave for Scotland until some new men arrived - Hamilton, we know, stayed and took a theological degree - while the unsatisfactory progress of the new foundation could not have been conducive to constructive plans. The statements found in print about missionary work done by the monks in the years before and after 1600 are very general and give no source. They are apparently based on a passage of George Conn saying that, around the 1580s, men of various religious orders, including Benedictines, went to Scotland to remedy the lack of priests there. Conn supplies no names and gives no authority for his statement, but he wrote in 1628 and may have known. There is, however, no record of any monk of Ratisbon or Würzburg going to Scotland, and probably no monk spent a long, continuous period in Scotland.

The first certain reference to a Scottish Benedictine in Scotland comes from an almost frivolous source. The monk Thomas Duff was an inveterate rhymer whose poems occasionally got him into trouble. Like a schoolboy who has suffered the confiscation and return of his diary, he wrote in Latin in a crude cipher on the cover of his manuscript volume of poems:

In 1621 Fr Alexander, the prior, took this book from my cell, and the abbot

5 Gordon, v; FR, vii, 119, 121; Bellesheim, III, 391-92. For a reference to a particular (but unauthentic) Benedictine missionary, see Dilworth, "First Mission", 65.

6 Conn, 143-44. For him see DNB.
gave it back to me on 5th April 1622 when he was going to Scotland.' As one can see, the note leaves it in doubt which of the two is meant by 'he', but we can presume it was Alexander Baillie, both because one can hardly imagine the visit of a mitred prelate to Scotland going unrecorded in either Scottish or Francoconian sources, and because Baillie, in his book written not long after, showed signs of knowing contemporary Scotland at first hand. 7

Now, 1622 is one of the important dates in the history of the Catholic church in Scotland, for in that year was founded the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, commonly known under the familiar title of Propaganda, a word which has unfortunately developed unpleasant connotations in modern times. It set out to delineate the world and arrange its conversion or re-conversion to Catholicism. Very briefly, Propaganda has charge of all missionary lands, and when the Catholic church becomes sufficiently strong to stand on its own feet in any territory, Propaganda relinquishes control of it. 'The Congregation de Propaganda Fide has had an amazing history of unbroken success: it has never increased its frontiers; it has never been defeated, not even by the most powerful and best organised religious orders, which in the end it either controls or suppresses; the modern Catholic Church in Scotland owes everything to this Congregation'. 8 This may be true as regards ultimate success; it does not mean that Propaganda has won every round in the fight. In fact, its help to Scotland in the seventeenth century has been summarised as 'too little and too late'. 9 But beyond any doubt Propaganda is of supreme importance in the history of the post-reformation Catholic church in Scotland.

It is unlikely to be a coincidence that the Würzburg Scots took active

7 See p. 338.
9 M.V. Hay, "Too little and too late", in IR, vi, 19-21.
steps towards doing systematic missionary work at the same time as Propa-
ganda set about its gigantic task. It is of course possible, though not
at all likely, that the Scots monks had already made efforts, which have
gone unrecorded. Nevertheless the series of events which began in Würz-
brurg in 1622 cannot be understood without allowing for Propaganda, as a
catalyst if not an active agent.

It needs to be realised that normally Catholic missionaries cannot be
free-lances. The Roman Catholic church is a hierarchic one, the ultimate
superior being the pope, and priests do not usually exercise the powers
received at ordination except by licence of a superior. Certain acts,
such as granting absolution in confession, lifting a sentence of excommuni-
cation or dispensing from a law of the church, are considered to require
also jurisdiction on the part of the priest. It follows, then, that he
requires to be given licence by lawful authority to exercise his ministry
and that his powers are restricted by the terms of the licence. These
powers or licence are called his faculties. Just as the priest cannot
exercise his ministry without faculties, so the faculties themselves can-
not be granted except by a superior who has received power to grant them,
and ultimately the authority comes from the pope himself.

There is nothing very surprising about this when one considers the
legal restrictions that are taken for granted by most people: nobody, for
instance, may drive a car without a licence or practise medicine without a
recognised qualification, ownership of property depends on possession of
title-deeds, and so on. What is surprising is the contrast in seventeenth-
century Scotland between the necessity of having faculties and the very
unsystematic way in which they were granted. Propaganda could give facul-
ties for the countries under its control, but its coming into existence in
1622 did not deprive other bodies of powers they already possessed. Jes-
uits continued to receive faculties for Scotland from their own superiors,
presumably because the General of the Jesuits possessed powers received
directly from the pope to grant faculties for all mission countries.
Hence the bitter struggle between Propaganda and the Jesuits. The super-
iors of the English Benedictine Congregation evidently had power to give
faculties to any Benedictine monk for the whole of the British Isles. In
England and Scotland the efforts of the various bodies giving faculties
for mission work were not co-ordinated. Tension, and at times strife,
naturally resulted, particularly in England in the early seventeenth cen-
tury.

No adequate study of the Scottish mission has yet been written, and
thus the background against which the missionary efforts of the monks must
be seen is in many ways obscure. It should be realised that in the first
decades of the seventeenth century there were never more than seventeen or
eighteen priests in the whole of Scotland. In 1623 there were fifteen,
belonging to five religious orders; not one was a secular priest, although
there had been some seculars on the mission. The secular clergy were
much handicapped by the lack of any organisation, and one way out of their
difficulties was to enter a religious order. There was no co-ordinated
mission, and no general superior or ordinary in Scotland. The first two
English Vicars-Apostolic, when they were appointed, were nominally ordin-
aries of Scotland too, an arrangement that was virtually a dead letter from
the start. The Irish Franciscan mission to the Gaelic-speaking half of
Scotland was, to begin with, controlled from Flanders. This, evidently,

10 Prop. SOCc, 312, f. 60v; BL, 8628, f. 84; C. Giblin, Irish Franciscan
Mission to Scotland, 1612-1646, viii. But see p. 245.
11 cf. IR. xi, 16, 24.
12 Giblin, op. cit. passim.
was the pattern of missionary work in Scotland at the time: small groups of religious, working independently of each other, each subject to superiors on the Continent.

We can now consider the missionary efforts of the Scottish monks. In January 1623, eight months after the Würzburg prior set off for Scotland, Fr Silvanus Mayne was the bearer of letters concerning mission work from the English Benedictines in Douai to the Scots abbots. The English president urged the Scots to set up a mission to their homeland, a project which he said was feasible since there were students in the Scots college at Douai who wanted to become monks and so could replace the priests who went to Scotland. The English Congregation had faculties for the whole of Great Britain and would grant them to the Scots. The same facilities and privileges were offered to the Scots as were available to English monks who belonged to some congregation other than the English (e.g., the Cassinese) but desired to work on the English mission. They would be provided with the necessary faculties to carry out their mission work and given whatever help they needed. While on the mission they would be subject to the rules and superiors of the English congregation but this would not prevent them from transacting any business entrusted to them by their abbots or from being recalled to their own monasteries. They would be eligible for appointment to offices in the English Congregation, attendance at its chapter, and so on. No burden would be placed on the Scottish monasteries, and no share in the rights of the Scots would be asked, except perhaps occasional hospitality for an English monk who was travelling in South Germany.

The three Scots abbots sent a grateful acceptance of the English pro-

---

13 Full text in Dilworth, "First Mission" (see Appendix). The commentary there is supplemented and at times corrected by new material in the present chapter.
posal. They promised that, as soon as replacements could be found, suitable men would be sent to Scotland who would be subject to the laws and superiors of the English Congregation, with the reservation that their abbots could use them for any special business if necessary. This letter was signed at Würzburg at the end of July 1625. The following spring the Scots monks were working to establish a mission of their own.

The gist of their petition, sent to Cardinal Francesco Barberini, was as follows: The monks of Ratisbon, Würzburg and Erfurt, seeing the fruits produced by two of their men who had been sent to Scotland a few years previously, and having at present other men who could be sent, want a mission to be set up, with the customary faculties and under the direction of Silvanus Mayne, a man of exemplary life who had been imprisoned and exiled for his religion. This was drafted into the form of a request to the pope for a mission to Scotland like the other religious orders, with the same favours, faculties and privileges as they had, and was put on the agenda of the monthly meeting of Propaganda held on 17th April 1624.\(^\text{14}\)

The reaction was favourable. The pope gave instructions that the nuntio in Vienna should make enquiries as to which monks were suitable and in particular find out what he could about Mayne.\(^\text{15}\)

We can follow the ensuing correspondence. Barberini wrote three days later: he wanted the nuntio to find out the number of monks available, their education and way of life, choose the most suitable among them, and send their names to Rome. In particular the nuntio was to inform himself about Mayne since it was most important that the superior should outstrip the others in learning and virtue.\(^\text{16}\) On 11th May the nuntio replied that he would obey instructions and send a precise report.\(^\text{17}\) What he did

---

\(^\text{14}\) Prop. SOCG, 384, f. 267r, 268r, 271v.
\(^\text{15}\) Prop. Acta, 3, f. 100r; Töchle, 51-52; Ciblin, 45.
\(^\text{16}\) Prop. Lettere, 3, f. 86r.
\(^\text{17}\) Prop. SOCG, 330, f. 364r.
was to pass the request on to the bishop of Würzburg, Philip Adolf von Ehrenberg. Nothing more was heard until six months later, when the bishop replied to say that in Würzburg there were four Scottish monks suitable and ready for mission work, while others were studying philosophy and theology in order to prepare themselves for the mission. He told the nuntio of Mayne's imprisonment and sentence in Scotland ten years before, then went on to speak of the other Scottish monasteries. In these, he said, were three suitable priests, of whom two had been working successfully during the past years in Scotland; and in the Scots seminaries were students who wanted to become monks in these same abbeys.  

The bishop wrote on 3rd November. The nuntio sent the letter on to Barberini on the 16th, explaining that the fault for the delay was not his, and it was produced at the next meeting of Propaganda on 17th December. One can still see the notes made on the backs of the letters, together with the final minute. It was decided to set up a mission with these seven monks under the direction of Mayne, who had suffered so much for the faith. Four days later fresh instructions were sent to the nuntio. He was told that since there was such a shortage of priests in Scotland it was important for Mayne and his companions to be sent there at once and for the young Scots aspirants to take the habit as soon as possible. The pope being most anxious about this, he was to write to the bishop of Würzburg telling him to see about the missionaries and send their names, and he was to entrust the bishop with the task of seeing that the young monks were encouraged to fit themselves for serving God and their country. The nuntio was told to exercise more than ordinary diligence and to signify where the necessary documents and faculties for the monks could

18 ibid. f. 515rv.
19 ibid. f. 516r.
be sent in order to avoid delay.  

On 11th January the nuntio replied that he had told the bishop of Würzburg about the setting up of the mission and the desirability of encouraging the young monks and that, to save time, the documents should be sent direct to Würzburg through the bishop's agent and not to Vienna. The officials of Propaganda received the letter on 4th February and set about asking the Holy Office for faculties for Mayne and his seven companions to read heretical books, reconcile heretics and apostates and give absolution from various reserved sins and penalties. Two months later a formal document was drawn up in the name of nine cardinals of the Congregation of the Inquisition (or Holy Office) and on 24th May 1625 it was despatched to the bishop of Würzburg for delivery to Mayne. It gave various faculties to him and eight fellow monks, who were to be good and suitable men, assigned to the task by Mayne himself but with the consent of the abbot-general or provincial. What strikes one on reading the document is that the cardinals were more concerned with preserving the integrity of the Catholic faith and preserving it from all possible dangers than with helping the monks to carry out their mission. The faculties enabled them to read condemned books for the purpose of refuting heresy, and to absolve their penitents from the ecclesiastical penalties incurred for heresy or schism, or for encouraging heresy or schism, or for reading or even having condemned books. The faculties were hedged around with clauses which deprived them of much of their value. Heretical books were treated like dangerous radio-active material: for instance, the monks had to tell the ordinary which ones they had so that, if anyone died suddenly, he could see that they were burnt.

22 Prop. SOCG, 312, f. 141r, 144v.
23 Copialbuch, f. 151v.
24 Ibid. f. 152rv.
The letters and minutes have been described in detail to show how the affair of the Scottish Benedictine mission was managed. One cannot help being impressed by the anxiety of the Barberini pope and his nephew to help Scotland and by the efficiency and despatch with which Propaganda conducted its business. The correspondence and notes (written apparently by officials who were perfectly bi-lingual in Latin and Italian) throw much light on how Propaganda worked, at least in its early stages; at no point did it communicate directly with the Scots abbots or Mayne. It issued instructions to the nuncio in Vienna, who in turn communicated with the bishop of Würzburg. It decided to set up a mission of the men chosen by the bishop and it despatched to him the bull for Mayne. If there was consultation between the bishop and the Scots abbots, this apparently did not interest Propaganda, though the bull did in the event provide for Mayne assigning the missionaries himself. The dazzling effect of a legendary name should not blind us to the limitations of Propaganda's powers; it could only work through the diplomatic channels already in existence, and of necessity it handled a German prince-bishop very cautiously. The pressing needs of the Scottish mission could not be allowed to interfere with the rights of one of these princes of the empire. The event, too, was to show that Propaganda, like other mortals, had to learn from experience.

This is a convenient point to consider some questions that suggest themselves. What missionary work were the Scots monks already doing before the bull was issued to Mayne? Why did the English monks make their offer, and why did the Scots accept it and then at once turn to something else? As regards mission work before the end of 1624, the references are
plentiful enough but fail to paint any coherent picture. The Würzburg prior went to Scotland in April 1622. The petition to Propaganda in 1623 spoke of two priests sent there some years before, and the bishop of Würzburg reported that two monks, not of Würzburg, had been there during the previous years. A report on the Scots college in Rome prepared about 1624 said that it was customary to send some monks of Würzburg to Scotland. Another report, sent by two Scots friars to Propaganda in June 1623, said there was one Benedictine in Scotland, the only one from Ratisbon or Würzburg who had gone there, and that Adam MacCall was in Northumberland and ought to be in Scotland. All one can say for certain is that two monks were on the mission and one of them was MacCall, but this must be taken as a minimum. On his way to Scotland MacCall had stayed with the English monks in Douai, and at their request a letter extending his leave of absence was sent to them. He had gone to the mission at some point after 1619, when he was cellarer at Ratisbon, probably about the end of 1620, for he had been twenty years on the mission at the time of his supposed death in 1640. It would certainly seem that he at least had faculties from the English congregation.

Mayne likewise received hospitality from the Douai monks on his way to Scotland but, as far as one can judge, never reached his destination. Instead, he returned to Würzburg with the three Scots seminarists and the English letters. One might suggest that Mayne, sent to Scotland, got as far as Douai and then, struck by the possibilities opened up by English help and an influx of novices, returned to Würzburg instead. Then, as the Scots reflected further on the possibilities, especially since Propaganda had recently been established, they decided that they could run a
mission by themselves. That, at least, is a working hypothesis.

The whole tone of the 1623 correspondence suggests that the initiative came from the English side. One is entitled to ask why. The Douai prior wrote that the English monks desired ardently to be united with the Scots in a mission covering the whole of Britain. Was this purely apostolic zeal, or was it also an attempt to strengthen their own position vis-à-vis either the new Propaganda or other English missionary bodies? The English president told the Scots that members of religious orders experienced difficulty in obtaining faculties at Rome because of opposition both open and secret, a fairly clear reference to the internal strife among missionaries to Britain. In the event, as we have seen, the new pope, Urban VIII, and his nephew, Francesco Barberini, who was protector of Scotland and a member of Propaganda, showed themselves very favourably disposed to the Scots monks. The reply of the Scots referred to the difficulties met with by Mayne at Douai, difficulties which it hinted were caused by the envy of certain parties. It is highly probable that these were the Jesuit superiors of the seminary, who would not have been pleased to see five useful young men going off to be monks, because at this period it was the Jesuits and not the secular clergy who benefited most from the Scots colleges. In fact the relevant entries in the Douai register complain of the disrespectful way in which two of the students, Maxwell and Maclean, demanded their release and they record that the rector kept their letters.

One finds very often that missionary effort was made by the Ratisbon and Würzburg monks in common; one can leave Erfurt out of the reckoning as it hardly ever had a community. The bishop of Würzburg was presumably
accurate in saying that the two men already on the mission were not monks of Würzburg. The condition of Ratisbon under Abbot Algeo was hardly conducive to preparation for a difficult apostolat e, although one student at a Scottish seminary, George Wedderburn, did enter the abbey the following year. To what extent was the state of affairs there responsible for two men from Ratisbon being on the mission already? The charge was to be levelled from time to time against the Scots abbots that they sent difficult subjects to the mission, and it is a fact, then as now, that dissatisfaction with the monastic life leads monks to seek work outside. One can agree that a monk sent out because he is unsatisfactory at home is unlikely to be satisfactory in the mission field, but by no means all monks seeking mission work themselves are likely to be unsatisfactory. If it is instability which drives them to seek fresh work, admittedly the prospects of success are not good. But there is need of some realism here. One is reminded of the character in Ian Hay’s book who said there ought to be a statue to 'The girl who married someone else', since the disappointed young man then departed to some outpost of empire where he performed deeds of valour. In a somewhat similar way one can attribute a fair amount of missionary work done by monks to disagreement with their superior. The point being made is by no means a frivolous one. The fact that a monk goes on the mission because of a disagreement with his superior does not necessarily prejudice his value as a missionary, any more than a young man’s enlisting in the army because of a disappointment in love necessarily prejudices his value as a soldier.

While Propaganda was making its enquiries prior to setting up the Benedictine mission, Mayne had been conducting negotiations, backed by the
pope and his cardinal-nephew, for the recovery of the Vienna abbey. The project was linked with the missionary plans, and Mayne's appeal to the emperor made mention of the influx of seminarians and the scheme to help the Scottish mission. The petition was refused, however, before the bull setting up the mission was issued. There must naturally have been many practical difficulties to overcome before some or all of the nine monks with faculties could set off for Scotland. Nothing was achieved for over eighteen months, and then it became clear that the difficulties were largely of Mayne's own making. Instead of doing the work entrusted to him within the terms of reference, he was trying to organise something bigger and better. In early 1627 he approached Propaganda with several requests.

On 30th January²⁹ the congregation turned down two of them: he was not to add another three monks to his group destined for Scotland, since the arrival there of so large a number in time of persecution would be dangerous; neither was he to send other monks to work among expatriate Scots in Poland, Prussia and Germany, since those lands were so far from Scotland, where he was supposed to be going. Mayne's appeal to the emperor had mentioned mission work in Poland as well as Scotland. In answer to a third request, for a visitation of the three Scottish monasteries, in which he said observance had completely collapsed, the nuntios in Vienna and Cologne were instructed to appoint a visitor from the reformed Lorraine Congregation of Benedictines. That Ratisbon under Algeo was in a sad state is beyond doubt, but Erfurt was not really a monastery and Würzburg was in a flourishing condition. A fourth request was favourably considered: it was for the removal of the clause requiring the consent of the ordinary for the exercise of the faculties, since the said ordinary was

²⁹ Prop. Acta, 4, f. 177v; Tüchle, 147; Giblin, 46-47.
the English Vicar-Apostolic, who was in hiding, and in fact English missionaries were making the same request.\textsuperscript{30} The cardinals exerted themselves to find some solution which would safeguard the Vicar-Apostolic's authority, and on 22nd February\textsuperscript{31} they substituted the consent of the nuntio in France. At this meeting Mayne's application for a subsidy to defray the expenses of the journey to Scotland was granted, and a week later\textsuperscript{32} the amount was fixed as twenty crowns to be paid at once, with a further hundred to follow as soon as the monks set off. The Benedictine mission to Scotland was now under the superintendence of the nuntio in Paris.\textsuperscript{33}

Still Mayne did not go. A further fifteen months passed, and in June 1628 Propaganda was dealing with representations made to them by the bishop of Würzburg that Mayne was claiming as prefect of the mission to be exempt from obedience to his regular superiors. Abbot Ogilvie and the bishop were told that they could exercise their authority over him, because mission work did not exempt religious from ordinary obedience; it merely meant that they could not be removed from office without Propaganda's consent. Mayne also was informed of this and was ordered to set out at once with the companions chosen not by himself but by his superiors.\textsuperscript{34}

Twelve months later he had still not yet set out. Barberini told Propaganda on 22nd June 1629 that Mayne's mission was of no use whatever, both because Mayne had no authority in the Scottish monasteries and because of what the minute cryptically terms other reasons. His prefectship and faculties were withdrawn, and Abbot Ogilvie was appointed in his place.\textsuperscript{35}

A papal brief was despatched that same day to Ogilvie setting up a mission

\textsuperscript{30} P. Hughes, Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England, 341-42.
\textsuperscript{31} Prop. Acta, 4, f. 189v; Giblin, 47.
\textsuperscript{32} Prop. Acta, 4, f. 192v; Giblin, 47, n.24.
\textsuperscript{33} Prop. Istruzioni, I, f. 110v.
\textsuperscript{34} Prop. Acta, 6, f. 76r; Giblin, 47-48.
\textsuperscript{35} Prop. Acta, 6, f. 298rv; Töchle, 247; Giblin, 48.
consisting of him and eight other monks and giving them faculties to be exercised with the consent of the nuntio in France. A meeting of the Holy Office on 2nd August then approved the faculties and granted them for seven years. Both the documents and the faculties themselves are much more workmanlike than those sent to Mayne four years before; Rome was learning fast. It is hard not to feel a certain sympathy for Mayne, whose position had been a most invidious one; but it also seems evident that he was not the right man for the undertaking.

The terms of the bull, as well as the whole history of the episode, make it clear beyond shadow of doubt that Ogilvie was prefect of the Benedictines only and not of the Scottish mission as a whole. The word 'mission' was used in Propaganda documents to denote a mission-field (as in modern speech) but also a missionary unit. Thus one finds the standard phrase, 'the Scottish mission', used beside such expressions as 'the Benedictine mission to Scotland'. When Mayne and Ogilvie were termed 'prefect of the mission', the meaning is that each was prefect of the Benedictine missionary unit. It is perhaps misunderstanding of the phrase which has led to the statement found in print that Abbot Ogilvie was prefect of the Scottish mission.

In the years that followed there were at least three monks working as missionaries, during the period when the Swedish invasions were ravaging their monasteries in South Germany. Ogilvie died in 1635 and the faculties granted by Propaganda expired the following summer. The faculties were not renewed, and we know that in these years the flourishing Würzburg community dwindled. We can agree with the Scottish missionary priest a century later who wrote that the Swedish wars ruined the missionary plans

36 For the full text see Appendix C.

37 Gordon, v. It is apparently from this source that it is repeated annually in the English Catholic Directory.
of the monks.\textsuperscript{38} The bull of 1629 gave faculties for England as well as Scotland, and, as we have seen, the English Congregation claimed to give faculties for both countries to any Benedictine. It was therefore possible to work in either country with faculties from either source, nor was there anything, at least in theory, to prevent a Scots monk having faculties from both sources simultaneously. The expiry of the Propaganda faculties in 1636 thus did not put an end to missionary work by Scottish monks.

A report made at the English general chapter of 1633 listed two Scots monks who had been subjected by their own superiors to the English Congregation superiors for the duration of their stay in mission territory.\textsuperscript{39} When Abbot Ogilvie died two years later, two monks of Würzburg, William Gordon and Audomarus Asloan, were listed as being on the Scottish mission. We also know that Adam MacCall from Ratisbon was on the mission throughout this period; this was explicitly stated in a report to the Vienna nuntio in September 1632.\textsuperscript{40} It is possible that other Scots monks worked as missionaries for a time but, if so, the fact is not recorded. It is therefore most probable that it was two of these three who were referred to by the English general chapter. It is also most probable that one of these two was William Gordon, since he died in the English monastery at Paris in 1638 and is included in the English Benedictine necrology. Gordon, incidentally, was the brother of the first Marquess of Huntly, whose religious vicissitudes had enlivened the Scottish scene for half a century.\textsuperscript{41}

The other Würzburg monk, Asloan, went on the mission in 1628-9, for he had been over nine\textsuperscript{42} and almost ten years\textsuperscript{43} there when he left for Würz-
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\end{footnotes}
burg in the spring of 1638 at the summons of the bishop. From Newcastle, having received the summons, he went to London. The agent of the Holy See at the court of Henrietta Maria was the Aberdeenshire secular priest, George Conn, whose despatches to Rome at this date shed interesting but not altogether edifying light on the Catholic missionaries. It appears, for instance, that Conn himself gave mission faculties. Catholic religious walked openly through the streets of London. Conn feared an incident and complained that they caused scandal as they frequented taverns and were addicted to tobacco. The Benedictines had frequent internal disputes, in which Conn himself was called on to intervene. In particular there was a controversy between the monks of the English and Spanish congregations over a legacy of a hundred crowns. In his despatch of 27th April (o.s.) 1638 Conn described a puzzling incident. There were, he said, great divisions among the Benedictines because those from Scotland did not want to belong to the English Congregation, and the same was true of the Cassinese. The other day he was with the provincial of the English Congregation when the man claiming to be superior of Scotland arrived, with some priests of both parties. Conn let them argue as long as they spoke civilly, but as soon as they began abusing each other he imposed silence and told them that if they had anything to say which would make for peace and concord they could arrange a day and he would gladly listen to them. They departed satisfied and willing to submit their proposals to him. I know, adds Conn, that there is a brief of Paul V dealing with the subject, so I have told them they must obey it or inform the pope of their reasons for not doing so.

One might presume that this Scottish superior in London at the time

44 BL, 8642, f. 114r.
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was Asloan, except that the latter had arrived in London in mid-February and left for Gravesend and Hamburg towards the end of March. Was it then William Gordon, who died later that year at Paris, or the third Scot, Adam MacCall? The subject of the dispute is not known, and it is quite unexpected to find more than one Scots monk in London and disputing with their English brethren.

Carlo Rosetti, Conn’s successor as agent of the Holy See in London, likewise sent regular despatches to Rome. On 12th October 1640 he reported what an informant had told him the day before about the terrible happenings in Scotland. Maxwell, earl of Nithsdale, had alone in Scotland remained loyal to Charles I and had retired to his castles. The Scots, after besieging them for some months, had taken them and had killed forty gentlemen of the name of Maxwell and two priests, a Benedictine and a Franciscan. Nithsdale and his wife had been spared so that they could die a worse death. Living on was apparently considered a worse fate! Some of this information is undeniably accurate. Nithsdale was besieged for thirteen weeks in his castles of Caerlaverock and Threave and then sent word to Charles that he could hold out no longer. Charles told him to capitulate on the best terms he could. Accordingly on 26th September 1640 Nithsdale surrendered, both garrisons being allowed to march out with all the honours of war. Later the two castles were dismantled as Nithsdale continued to take an active part against the Covenant. The story told to Rosetti reads like a rumour based on a substratum of truth. The monks at Ratisbon, however, accepted the story and identified the monk as Adam MacCall; they told the emperor in December 1640 that MacCall after twenty years of work in Scotland converting heretics had been cruelly done to

---

49 BL, 3648, pt. 1, f. 241v-242r; Prop. Socce, 84, f. 109r, 115v.
death by them some weeks previously.\textsuperscript{51} Perhaps we can accept the episode as evidence that Adam MacCall was living in the south-west in 1640 even if he did not meet a violent death there.

MacCall worked in S.W. Scotland, but previous references had been to Northumberland as his and Asloan's field of activity, while Asloan was described as having worked in Scotland and England. The political frontier between Scotland and England was not the most natural boundary, and there was a natural and easy route along the Solway-Tyne valley from Galloway to Newcastle. Probably the three Scots monks worked on both sides of the border, as we know was done by George Asloan, who was a secular priest and later became a monk. He was on the Scottish mission, if not precisely domiciled in Scotland, in 1623-24,\textsuperscript{52} and in 1628 he was living on the frontier and applied to Propaganda for the renewal of his faculties in both kingdoms.\textsuperscript{53} At this time Scotland and England had quite separate civil administrations although Charles I was king of both countries. Nevertheless, the factors making for unity in sentiment had been growing, and the religious and political divisions tended to split the island according to ideology rather than region. English and Scottish Catholics thus tended to have increasingly more in common.

No other names of Scots monks working as missionaries at this time have been recorded. Ironically enough, the only two names which have found their way into print are those of Frs Silvanus and Leander,\textsuperscript{54} but Silvanus Mayne seems never actually to have worked as a missionary in Scotland, while the other is the Welshman Leander Jones, who was twice president of the English Congregation.\textsuperscript{55} With Adam MacCall, as far as we know, the
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missionary activity of the Scots Benedictines came to an end, and the handful of monks in Germany fighting for survival were in no position to continue it.

There is evidence, however, that the missionary ideal continued to animate the Scots in Würzburg. The will was there even if the execution was beyond their powers. In the draft petition for a Scottish congregation drawn up shortly after 1640 they wanted the president of the proposed congregation to be the prefect of their mission to Scotland. The monks would get their faculties from him and from him alone, and would take an oath to serve the mission until their faculties were revoked.56 When the Swedes attacked Würzburg and the community was dispersed, the novice James Brown found refuge at the abbey of St Gallen, where the abbot told him that the Swiss monks had offered to educate two young monks to help with the conversion of Scotland. This was about 1580 and was the result of John Lesley's efforts; the Scots, however, had not taken advantage of the offer.

The abbot also offered to accept Brown into his community, but the latter refused the offer as he would not be able to help Scotland if he entered the Swiss abbey.57

Brown returned to Würzburg when the town was recaptured, and in the years after 1648 wrote a series of works on the Scots and their monasteries in Germany. From these it is clear that he was vitally interested in the expansion of Scottish monasticism with a missionary ethos. He wanted various monasteries, including that in Vienna, to be given to the Scots to supply helpers for the Scottish mission; he reported that the president of the Lorraine congregation and the visitator of Normandy in the Maurist congregation were willing to educate young monks to be missionaries and that

56 Blair, f. 137rv, 143v.
the offer from St Gallen would still be open; he commended the mission work of the English monks.\textsuperscript{58} It is clear, too, that he reverenced the memory of Silvanus Mayne, so it is perhaps to Mayne, in spite of everything, that one should attribute some of the abiding missionary spirit at Würzburg. And certainly the Würzburg monks stimulated interest in the Scottish mission among influential German dignitaries.

In 1650 Abbot Asloam had missionary plans and wrote to the prince-bishop to solicit his help. He had some monks suitable for mission work, so he wanted a renewal of the faculties granted to Ogilvie for the British mission twenty years before as they had long since expired. Since it would be a nuisance, he said, both to the monks and the holy see to have to send in repeated applications for faculties, the Scots were petitioning to have faculties without restriction of time or number of persons, just as other congregations had; and they wanted the prince-bishop to act as mediator for them in order to have the petition granted more speedily. They also wanted the faculty to consecrate chalices and altars as there were no bishops with authority (who would ordinarily do this) in Scotland or England.

Two years later he was appealing to Cardinal Barberini against malcontents who he said were backed by his fellow abbot at Ratisbon. Once again Asloam insisted that one of his major aims since becoming abbot had been to further the mission begun in Great Britain by the Scots monks and that he had accordingly helped this mission and brought young men to Würzburg for the purpose, but his plans had been thwarted. The letter of 1650, with its reference to other congregations, gives the impression that the Scots were going to petition for a mission of Scots Benedictines, irrespec-
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tive of which abbey they belonged to and presumably with Asloan as prefect. Perhaps the petition was never sent to Rome; certainly it was not considered at a monthly meeting of Propaganda as the 1624 petition was, and certainly it was never granted. The plain fact is that the Scots abbeys were not geared to systematic mission work. Any joint action was made difficult by the existence of two abbots independent of each other and with no common body or superior, such as a general chapter, to direct policy.

Asloan spoke as if he had given concrete help to what he twice called not the Scottish but the British mission. Perhaps he did send men to work on the Anglo-Scottish border with faculties provided by the English Congregation, though a report on Scotland in 1655 listed other religious there but no monk. At this period there is a dearth of any sort of information about the Würzburg abbey, and one must be more than ordinarily cautious about arguing from silence. On the other hand, the references to mission work at this date in the Ratisbon necrology are almost certainly fabrications. So too, probably, is Brockie's description of Benedict Raith, a Ratisbon monk, as a missionary during the Cromwellian period. All we do know for certain is that the number of monks at Würzburg was reduced but Asloan acted to remedy the shortage. In 1658 he accepted a student from Rome as well as four young men brought from Scotland by Fr Maurus Dixon, whom he had sent on a recruiting errand. For the monks, mission work and recruiting activity can hardly be separated.

An important development took place in 1653 when the mission of secular priests in Scotland was set up under the leadership of a prefect. Surprising though it seems, secular priests until then had no superior in

60 Brockie, ad Carmelites, Bervie/Inverbervie.
Scotland. Propaganda was informed in 1657 that the Scottish mission had been more effectively served by secular priests than by regulars and that the remnant of Catholicism in Scotland had been preserved by the labours of the former. The historian might agree that this became increasingly true after 1657, but it had hardly been true before then. It is surely a case of the myth being created and influencing the subsequent course of events. The historical scholar Thomas Innes (1662-1744) could write that around 1600 religious 'were brought in to the clergy's assistance and by their procurement', which seems to be either a misreading or a deliberate adaptation of the passage from George Conn already quoted. But, whatever the truth of it, conditions for mission work in Scotland by monks were going to be different, once the body of secular priests was organised.

61 Prop. SC Seczia, I, f. 11r; Giblin, 57.
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Chapter 14
MISSION WORK ENCOURAGED AND THWARTED, 1661-79

Asloan's role - mission work in England - possible pact with English monks
- Dixon seeks missionary powers - Will Leslie - Dixon and Propaganda in correspondence - Gascoigne supports separate Scottish Benedictine mission

Abbot Asloan's rule, which lasted from 1638 to 1661, links together two comparatively well documented periods in the history of the Würzburg abbey and its missionary work, and spans the almost undocumented gap of twenty years between the periods. His monastic career also links two flourishing periods in the abbey's history: he was at Würzburg under Abbot Ogilvie before the Swedish invasion, and the community expanded steadily after his own death. Though numbers were very low at the end of his rule, it was Asloan himself who began the period of growth by having young men brought from Scotland in 1658 and then by signing the articles of union with the English Benedictine Congregation shortly before his death.

By these articles\(^1\) the missionary agreement of 1623 was re-affirmed if not re-established: any Scot sent to the mission was to have the same faculties and privileges as the English monks and was to be subject to the rules and superiors of the English Congregation for the duration of his stay on the mission. He would now, however, have the English faculties

---

1 Full text in Dilworth, "Scots and EBC" (see Appendix).
by right, as a member of the united Scoio-English body. As we have seen, the union had no very lasting effects in Würzburg except in the matter of mission work. Asloan seems to have been, if not exactly an Anglophile, at least one who welcomed union of English and Scots. He had worked in the border lands, was in the habit of referring to the British mission, and inaugurated the union with the English monks before he died. Whether his successor, Maurus Dixon, thought this way is more than doubtful. Nevertheless, even if Asloan's policy was not continued, he had done much to keep alive the missionary spirit at Würzburg and he enabled Dixon to put missionary plans into effect.

A report on Scotland about 1660 lists various secular and religious priests working there but no Benedictine. The monk Placid Keith was absent in Poland in 1662 and was perhaps working among Scottish expatriates. It is, however, in the year after this that reliable information about Würzburg missionary effort begins. Macarius Brown, who was one of the novices when the agreement with the English monks was signed, went to the mission in 1663 and stayed there until his death in 1697, a period of thirty-four years. Every indication is that he served on English Benedictine stations during the whole of the period. Placid Baillie left Würzburg at some time before the end of 1665 and is said to have worked in Scotland and England. The second novice at the time of the union, William Dunn, left for England at some point after November 1668; he died in Northumberland in 1675 and, like Brown, was aggregated to the English Congregation and found a place in its necrology.

Thus by the end of 1655 two monks had departed for the mission.

2 *TR*, viii, 111.
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further two had gone by the end of 1670, as we learn from a letter of Dixon's. The names of only three have been recorded, but these figures are so surprising, considering there were only two able-bodied priests in the community in 1660, that one is impelled to seek a reason. Two of the four worked and died on English Benedictine mission stations; Baillie also at this time would certainly have English Congregation faculties and almost certainly worked in England. A report on the Scottish mission in 1668 includes various religious among the priests working there, but still no Benedictine. The fourth man no doubt likewise had English faculties, but may have been only a short time in Britain, perhaps to bring news and recruits from Scotland.

Why did at least three monks depart to do mission work in England so soon after the union of Scottish and English monks? The English offer of faculties can be viewed under two aspects: an outlet for Scottish missionary zeal, which was of benefit to the Scots, or a means of obtaining extra Benedictine priests for their own missions. The question must be asked whether some unwritten agreement was made between Scots and English, something like: You help us by providing a novice-master and another priest at once, and we will provide men as soon as possible for your mission stations. Certainly this happened in practice, and Maurus Dixon, who became abbot a few months after the articles of union were signed, was later to say that the English solicited the union in order to get priests to supply their mission stations.

We know nothing about work done on the Scottish side of the border by any of these monks. Abbot Dixon evidently did not like the situation, though we do not know precisely why not, and about the middle of 1669 he

6 Prop. CP, 23, f. 178v; Acta, 37, f. 9v ff, cited by Giblin, 74; Gordon, 627.
sought powers from Rome to send monks to the mission as he himself should think fit. Obviously this entailed having the power to grant them faculties. But days had changed in Rome. The person Dixon wrote to was Will Leslie, agent of the Scottish secular clergy in Rome. The letter is lost; all we know is that Leslie did not reply.

The setting up of a mission of secular clergy to Scotland was intimately connected with the appointing of Will Leslie to be their agent in Rome. From about 1650 Leslie performed this function, remaining in the post for over fifty years. As he was a man of intelligence and determination, his influence grew with the years. He was appointed the first permanent archivist of Propaganda and was thus at the centre of the affairs of the Scottish mission. There is no doubt that his life's work was successful. By the end of his career Scotland had a bishop taken from the ranks of the secular clergy, who was in control of all mission work in Scotland; by then, too, the secular priests were the largest and most influential body of missionaries. It is worth emphasising that this was very far from being the case when the secular priests were first organised in 1653.

No adequate biography or assessment of Will Leslie has yet been written.\(^7\) We can reject the picture of him as the cunning old spider sitting in the centre of his web in Rome and scheming the downfall of the Jesuits and all their works.\(^8\) All the same, in Scottish affairs at least, he was a determined opponent of the Jesuits since they were the most powerful body not subject to Propaganda or to the prefect of the secular clergy. It does not seem likely that Leslie would favour the setting up of a Benedictine mission to Scotland when his main object was to make the secular mission supreme. In general, letters sent to Leslie have been preserved but

\(^7\) For him see Gordon, 575-76.

\(^8\) As in Hay, Failure.
not letters from him apart from those addressed to Paris; there is thus no record of his answers to Germany except for what can be gleaned from the ensuing letters of his correspondents. He himself filed away letters received but did not note if he replied. One therefore has to judge as best one can whether the Scots abbots were appealing to a man who was in fact hostile to their plans.

In 1670 an emissary from the Highlands was in Italy seeking help for his Catholic fellow-countrymen, and Propaganda decided to make use of Fr Ephraim Reid, a native Gaelic speaker from Tain who had been a graduate schoolmaster and was now a monk of Ratisbon. It therefore directed in November that letters asking for his services should be sent both to the acting superior at Ratisbon and to Abbot Dixon, who at the time was the administrator of the Ratisbon monastery. Some clerical error was made, for Dixon wrote in January 1671 to Cardinal Antonio Barberini, prefect of Propaganda, to say that there was no monk called Chrysostom and no native Highlander at Wttrzburg. He added that there was a Highlander named Ephraim at Ratisbon whose presence there was necessary, but he would see if he could be spared. Dixon took the opportunity to tell the cardinal about his own wishes and how he had written to Will Leslie asking him to get powers for him from the cardinal protector and Propaganda to send monks to work in the homeland; that was eighteen monks ago and he had received no reply. At the moment there were three monks already on the mission, and one on his way back. If Propaganda, therefore, granted faculties and something to defray journey expenses, he (Dixon) would do all he could to help the mission.

Neither party received satisfaction. Reid stayed where he was and

---

9 For him see Dilworth, "Highland Monks", 96-97.
Dixon was given no help. The following year he repeated his request, again to no avail. The next evidence shows an English Benedictine dignity working in the same direction as Dixon, though perhaps for very different reasons. It is a letter dated 25th February 1675 from the aged Abbot Cascoigne of Lamspring, who had negotiated the union with Würzburg on behalf of the English. Unfortunately it is damaged and one cannot be sure to whom it was addressed, but probably it was to Will Leslie. The relevant passage is worth quoting in full:

'Please also to (sp)ead with him [Apparently Fr Augustine Latham, the English Congregation agent in Rome] about a Mission for the 2 Monasteries of Würzburg and Ratisbon, independent of our President and dependent of their own Superiors, which business I am persuaded you yourself alone can be able to effect: but if any assistance from his Eminence my Lord Cardinal of Norfolk you think to be necessary, I doubt not but Mr Latham will prevail with him to effect what you propose to him and think fitting.

There is speech of an Immediate dependence of their Missionaries to the Congregation de Propaganda fide, in which some difficulty is made. But if it be understood only of a general kind of care and supreme Inspection, requiring some times to be informed how they behave themselves in the Mission...'

Here the damaged letter becomes unintelligible, but the abbot seems to be saying that a loose supervision of the Scots monks by Propaganda should be acceptable. The important point is that English Benedictine authorities were advocating a Scottish Benedictine mission separate from their own.

Not long afterwards, in January 1676, three individual Scots monks

12 ML, Cascoigne, 25.2.1675.
were the subject of deliberations at a monthly meeting of Propaganda. Attempts to obtain Irish priests for the Highlands having failed, the procurator of the Scottish secular clergy (that is, Will Leslie) was asking for Ephraim Reid to be sent. John Irvine, a secular priest who had been on the mission for eight years, wanted to retire and become a monk in Germany; the prefect of the mission seconded his request, and Leslie suggested that Irvine's brother at Ratisbon should take his place in Scotland. Finally, Athanasius Chambers requested faculties for the border country of Scotland and England; he was the Ratisbon monk who had been appointed by Dixon, the administrator, to manage affairs in his absence and he had departed for the monastery of Subiaco after the election of Placid Fleming. Propaganda agreed that Reid should be sent and that Irvine should be replaced by his Benedictine brother; the case of Chambers they remitted to Cardinal Barberini. The interesting point is that nothing whatever resulted from the decisions. Chambers remained in Italy. Reid was actually voted his journey money at a subsequent meeting but was still in Germany at the end of the year, when Abbot Fleming promised to send him to Scotland if a replacement for him arrived. John Irvine never, as far as we know, became a monk although he is said to have died in Germany not long after. Propaganda seems to have been working with less than its usual efficiency at this time. Irvine's brother (perhaps, more accurately, cousin) was presumably Marianus Irvine, who was a monk at Würzburg and not at Ratisbon, and he stayed in his monastery.

It seems that Propaganda - or perhaps, more accurately, Will Leslie - was quite willing to add useful individual monks to the secular clergy mission but was disinclined to set up an independent Benedictine mission.

15 Gordon, 566.
The two abbots in Germany, however, wanted some permanent mission arrangement, and Dixon in particular was growing impatient. In May 1676 he sent Leslie an urgent letter. He had been writing, he said, for seven years and particularly four years before, but had received no reply, and he wondered if the letters had been intercepted. (Certainly they have not survived.) At Leslie's request he gave an account of Würzburg, which has been quoted in an earlier chapter, then went on to speak of the mission and faculties. The passage, although lengthy, is worth quoting in full.

"Our Missionars carryes themselfes very well to the great satisfaction of their paenitents, which causes noe little hatred by the English, as I am informed by one of our religious, whom I send the last year to Scotland about some bussines and returned in Winter with some prettie youthes to be bred in pietie and discipline according to your former Counsell which wee needed not, unlesse to prevene inconveniences, and helpe the Mission by(?) sending and planting one after another...

Be pleased for the zeale you carrie to gods glorie, and the great love to helpe your countrie, to inactuate the foresaid, and procure our monasteries for both Kingdomes faculties, as I offten (sic) desyred, independent of the Englishes or any other, assuring you withall, that noe persons shall be send, that are not qualified mature and exemplar. It is true, that wee had formerly and our Missioners hes for the present faculties from the Englishes, being before some yeares invyted and sollicitated by them to incorporate us amongst them, and supply their residences in England, they wanting then persons for the Mission, but now fearing that wee will incroatch upon them, by our

16 ML, Dixon, 24.5.1676.
increment and our peoples good carriage they seeme to retract the incorporacion and dismember us, whereof, good sir, doubltes you have more information. Therefore once againe for gods cause wee unanimous intreate you earnestly, you will be pleased to concurre and procure us faculties according to the foresaid end, for which god almytllie and the monkes in heaven will reward you, and wee as long as wee leave will never forget you ...'

This was enclosed in a letter of Fleming's and sent to Rome. By mid-August Dixon had received no reply and wrote again to Leslie. 17 He asked what Propaganda intended to do about the Scots monks, as it was not pleased about the English giving them faculties. I desire to know, he said, 'what your mynd and intention is thermanent, being upon that account reected from the Englishe and not accepted or maintained by the Congregation, which seems not to be for gods glorie and conversion of our countrie. Therefore I intreat you good sir, be pleased to impart your mynd, whereby I may take course of our people, who with the assistance of god, may prove good operarii in vinea Domini, and not obiect the day or the morrow, that wee provyde noe persons for the monasteries and countrie, otherways wee must seek recourse and remedie where (we) can ...'

In November Dixon wrote yet again. 18 Fleming had been told by Leslie that Dixon's two letters had arrived and that a reply had been sent to Wurzburg. Accordingly Fleming asked Dixon to pass on this answer. But Dixon had not received the reply from Rome. He therefore asked Leslie to 'reiterate his answer', saying that 'according to your counsell and instruction wee will cooperate to our power'. With this letter he sent a copy

17 ML, Dixon, 15.8.1676.
18 ML, Dixon, 11.11.1676.
of the faculties granted to William Ogilvie as prefect of the mission in 1629, which he said would have been continued but for the disastrous effect of the Swedish wars.

'Wherupon, good sir, you can (easi?)ly see that it is noe noveltie for us to have faculties for the Mission, if it please you to renew or amplifie them it would be most gratefull to us and honourable to you . . .'

Fleming was not at all pleased about this. A month after Dixon, he too wrote to Leslie. 19

'The Abbot of Würtzburg hath written to me, that your letters are not come to his hands and that he hath sent you ane Copie of some old faculties, they formerly had, desiring you to renew them. But sir, I hope that you will procure faculties for both Monasteries, and in procureing of them, have ane speciall Consideratione of the praerogatives and priviledges of this Monasterie, both for its antiquitie, dependance upon the Apostolique See, and the jurisdictione it hath had these many hundred years over all the rest of the Scots Monasteries in Germanie as there Matricular, and the great expense it hath been at not only in defending them but even in Recovering againe to the Natione that Monasterie of Würtzburg which is only ane filiale of this, and tuye planted by it.

Some tyme agoe, your Reverence did writh that we should choose ane prefect of our owne, Bot sir to shane many Inconveniences, I think it ane great deall better that our Religious in the Missione depend upon your prefect, The Superiours hier haveing power to send and re-call them, according to the Necessities of there Monasteries, Bot the

19 Ms, Fleming, 15.12.1676.
speciall poynt that I wold recomend to your reverence is, that you obtaine the faculties for all our Kings Dominions, that is to say... (some words torn)...for it is ane matter of great Concernement to us, which I fear the English will endeavour to hinder als much as they can, If they know of it.'

It was in this letter that Fleming expressed his willingness to send the Gaelic-speaking Ephraim Reid to the Highlands if another monk returned to Ratisbon. He also outlined his scheme for educating four boys at a time in his abbey, and sending some of them at the end of their humanities to the Scots college in Rome. Fleming was now embarking on his plans for founding a seminary for Scots boys in Ratisbon. He was to scheme and strive for this during the next decades but his progress and ultimate success are outwith the scope of the present narrative. It is already clear, however, that the two abbots did not see the proposed Benedictine mission in quite the same light. In reply to Leslie, Fleming wrote again in April 1677.20

'Now I return you Sir many thanks for the favorable expressiones in it and for the kynd promises you are pleased to make us of your Charitable assistance to thir Monasteries. And as to our Mission I fear it will be hard for us to obtaine faculties for England against there will especially sieing the Cardinal is for them, And I think it not our prudence by urgeing it too much to ex(a)sperat them, bot rather to yeild to the tymes, and take faculties for our owne Countrie, excepting ane more favorable occasione to have them extendeit for England also. It is true it will be hard for us to begine ane Mission, yet the haeving of faculties will conduce very much to the good of thir

20 ML, Fleming, 27.4.1677.
monasteries, tho we should only send bot thrie or four from both, for bysde the good they will doe at home, it will kep ane good Correspondendence betuixt our Countrie and thir Cloisters, and be ane means to furnish us alwayes with Religious and youthes to studie, and it will lykways make the Religious apply themselves more diligently to vertue and learning, sieing they can alwayes have the expectatione to be sent home and applyed to the Exercise of there Talent, when sufficently quallified, and it will obtaine us the favour of severall good patrons hier, when they sie us profitable at least in helpeing to propagate the faith againe in our owne Countrie, and many other good effects will follow from it. Bot tho the propaganda will grant us ane formal missione with our owne prefect, yet I am still of the mynd that it is not necessar for us to choyse on(e) for so small ane number as we will have in the begininge but thinks it a great deall (better that?) they depend upon your prefect, and that will both make your prefect (and your?) Missioners to have ane greater kyndnesse for them, sieing they will have there dependance of you, and be as it were on(e) Body, and if therefter any Inconvenience be found in this, the remedie of electing our owne prefect can alwayes be made use of.'

It is helpful to remember that at this time Fleming had sent no monk to the mission, with the possible exception of Anthony Gray, who entered Hatisbon about 1660 and seems to have spent most of his subsequent life wandering over Europe. He is said to have worked for eight years in Scotland,\(^{21}\) and Fleming supplied him with a testimonial that he had worked as a missionary in Scotland and among Scots in Poland before 1657.\(^{22}\) Since there is no record of his activities in any report to Propaganda, one can

\(^{21}\) Necrologies, 187.
\(^{22}\) Sch. Akten, 166.
either conclude that he was not present when a report was being drawn up
or that the compilers of reports tended to neglect, or be ignorant of,
priests who had no particular status. One should bear this in mind when
arguing from the silence about Benedictines in Propaganda sources after
the secular mission was established in 1653.

Gray cannot be said to have formed part of the new community which
Fleming was building up at Ratisbon and which in 1677 was still at a very
early stage of development. Dixon, on the other hand, had been sending
men to the mission for at least fourteen years and had been trying for
eight years to get power to grant faculties to them himself. While Flem¬
ing was corresponding with Will Leslie, Dixon was complaining about Leslie’s
silence to a German dignitary at the Roman court. 23 The latter told him
in February 1677 - this is to judge from Dixon’s reply the following month
- that the English monks had petitioned against the Scots. Dixon said he
had always suspected this even though they tried to persuade him that Pro¬
pagand had reprimanded them for giving faculties to the Scots and had for¬
bidden them to continue granting faculties for England. Strange behaviour,
added Dixon, when the Scots are incorporated in their congregation and
enjoy the same privileges and faculties as members of the same body.

As far as one can make out from Dixon’s reply, damaged into the bar¬
gain, the English monks gave two reasons for their action. As regards the
first, said Dixon, the Scots supplied for the lack of English monks, especi¬
ally in the north, where stipends were lower (which frightened the English)
but the reward was very great (which pleased the Scots). The second
reason seems to have been that Scots and English did not agree and English
priests did not go to Scotland, so why should Scots priests go to England?

23 ML, Dixon, 6.3.1677.
English priests did not go to Scotland because the Scots were poor, said Dixon, and as for disagreement there were quarrels among the English themselves. He thought that if this were explained to Propaganda, undoubtedly it would allow access by Scots and English priests to each other's country, although the Scots, being poor, would not be able to provide for incoming priests unless Propaganda gave a pension to them as it does to the secular clergy. Dixon expressed willingness to work for this arrangement and added a postscript about Abbot Ogilvie's faculties, which were granted for the whole of the British Isles. The copy of them sent to Leslie could be seen, and it would be a good idea to show them to Cardinal Howard. We learn from the letter, too, that Leslie had not yet replied to Dixon.

The desire of both abbots to have faculties for England as well as Scotland is rather puzzling, unless perhaps monks were assured of means of support in the north of England but not in the south of Scotland. One now finds the monks of Würzburg asking explicitly for an annual stipend from Propaganda. But before going further, one should consider William Leslie's side of the correspondence about faculties. Dixon received no answer to his letters from 1669 on. Leslie then wrote in 1676 about something different. Dixon sent two more letters, to which he received no reply although told that one had been sent. He therefore wrote again to Leslie but still got no reply. As for Fleming, he received a letter from Leslie telling him that the reply he wanted had been sent to Würzburg. When he got a second letter saying that the English objected to the Scots being granted faculties for England, he wrote back but was complaining fourteen months later about receiving no answer. Dixon's earlier letters to Fleming, 28.6.1678.
Leslie have been lost but those of 1676-77 reached Leslie and were filed away by him. The reader must judge whether Leslie hedged and equivocated or whether he sent replies which were lost in transit.

Throughout this period the Würzburg abbot had been sending men to do missionary or recruiting work in Britain. Macarius Brown certainly, and Placid Baillie most probably, were in English mission stations all the time, while William Dunn was in one until his death in August 1675. Ninian Graham was in Scotland in the spring of 1678 and expected back that summer; he had left Würzburg some time after January 1672.\(^{25}\) Bernard Maxwell had been in Scotland after 1672 and had returned to Würzburg, probably with two aspirants in the winter of 1675-76. He set off once more in the late summer of 1676 and returned at the end of the following year, again with two aspirants. Christian Abercrombie set off for Scotland at the end of March 1678, chiefly, we are told, for his health. James Blair, having returned to Würzburg not long before August 1678, set out again almost at once. The monk Chambers at Subiaco was able to write with some accuracy that Würzburg monks went freely to Scotland.\(^{26}\) The information about comings and goings is found mainly in the letters of Bernard Maxwell at Würzburg to Abbot Fleming.\(^{27}\) The story of Blair's second journey and his faculties is recorded in a quite different way.

In 1677 Alexander Leslie, brother of Will and like him a secular priest, was instructed by Propaganda to go to Scotland to make a visitation. It was really a fact-finding mission rather than a visitation, as he had no power to make decisions but was to report back to Propaganda. Among other things, he was to make every priest in Scotland show his credentials and faculties and to inform Propaganda of them. Accordingly Alexander

\(^{25}\) Reid, f. 119v.
\(^{26}\) ML, Chambers, 27.4.1677.
\(^{27}\) Maxwell, 14.12.1672, 25.8.1676, 1.12.1677, 5.3.1678, 30.3.1678.
Leslie reported on the secular prefect's faculties and explained that the Jesuit superior refused to show his and actually had the audacity to ask to see Leslie's own. There was, however, one Benedictine, Blair, who showed his credentials.

Abbot Dixon, in September 1676, gave James Blair (or Hepburn, as he was called in Scotland) letters of credence to say that he was going to do missionary work in Great Britain. Then, in January 1678 the English Benedictine president at Lamspring granted faculties to Blair; they were for Scotland only but could be used in England on his journey to and from Scotland provided he was not more than three months on the road. Blair behaved very correctly: the following July he showed the faculties to the secular prefect in Scotland, who signified his approval on the back of them. For good measure Blair also showed them to a Jesuit, Thomas Young, who wrote on them in Latin: 'I see no reason why anyone should object to these faculties.' In spite of this, Leslie reported that Blair's faculties caused a great stir among the Scots, who refuse to recognise English jurisdiction in any way. All this was copied by Alexander Leslie for Propaganda's information.28

Faculties constituted one need of monks going to Scotland; the other was means of support. The great advantage of sending a man to an English Benedictine station was that it solved both problems at once. When both English and Scots came to dislike the arrangement, the abbot of Würzburg had to look for other means of support for his missionaries. Will Leslie was not being very helpful, but Dixon did not give up. In February 1678 the prince-bishop of Würzburg wrote on his behalf to Propaganda.29 Among the workers in the Lord's vineyard in Scotland, he said, the monks from

28 SCA, Visitation Ristretto, f. 19v-20r.
29 Prop. SOC G, 469, f. 100.
the German monasteries held by no means the last place, but the Catholics in Scotland could not support them. The monks therefore wanted Propaganda to supply an annual stipend of fifty crowns as it did for secular priests.

When the secular mission to Scotland was set up, it was given an annual subsidy of five hundred crowns from Propaganda for the support of ten priests, which explains the nature of the bishop's request. Almost three months after the bishop wrote, the secretary of Propaganda informed Will Leslie, who was out of Rome, of the bishop's letter and said there was no way of granting the request since Propaganda wished to subsidise only ten missionaries in the whole kingdom, so that when one died another deserving man would then succeed to the pension. This was not merely obstructive tactics. A general meeting of Propaganda the year previously had decided that two priests could have faculties for Scotland but not a salary for precisely this reason. When the next meeting of Propaganda considered the bishop's request, the secretary outlined the position; the cardinals decided to reply to the bishop that the Benedictines would come up for consideration in due course, meaning presumably when some of the present ten died.

The Würzburg Scots were undoubtly in a difficult situation. Their repeated petition for their own mission, such as William Ogilvie had once directed, received no answer, and indeed the Ratisbon abbot was opposing the appointment of a monk as prefect of it. The English Congregation was refusing to give them faculties for England. Whether Propaganda was behind this decision or not, the result for the Scots monks was the same.

The English president remained willing to grant them faculties for Scotland, but this still left them without means of support in Scotland and (if we

30 Bellesheim, IV, 44-45; Gordon, viii, xii.
32 ibid. 48, f. 114.
can trust Alexander Leslie's report) was unacceptable to the Scots. It seems clear that missionary work based on Würzburg was being stifled for want of outlet. Propaganda, or Will Leslie, seemed willing only to ask for or subsidise individual monks, such as Ephraim Reid and Marianus Irvine, whom it recognised as filling a particular need. Abbot Dixon regarded the prefecture and powers given to his predecessor in 1629 as an argument for the establishment of a similar missionary unit, but the situation had changed since then. Whether Propaganda was still setting up such units in other countries in the 1670s or not, it was unlikely to favour doing so for Scotland.

This was the position when Dixon died in March 1679. He had two monks (Brown and Baillie) on English Benedictine missions, one (Graham) somewhere on the road from Scotland to Germany, and two (Blair and Abercrombie) in Scotland on a temporary basis. That, at least, is the picture given by the letters of Bernard Maxwell, who was soon to be elected abbot.

About two weeks after Dixon's death a letter arrived at Würzburg addressed to him. Bernard Maxwell sent it on to Ratisbon, saying it contained 'not bad hopes from Cardinal Norfolke at Rome' and suggesting that Fleming should reply to it.¹ The cardinal was informing the abbots of a decree of Propaganda that monks going to the mission were to receive their faculties from the prefect of the secular clergy and could hope for one of the ten annual pensions in the same way as the secular priests. Maxwell himself was elected abbot a few months later. None of the five Würzburg monks on the mission came to the abbey for the election, but their number was reduced to two the following year.

Christian Abercrombie was recalled to Würzburg after Maxwell's election and arrived in the summer of 1680, bringing with him some recruits for the Ratisbon community. After escorting them to Ratisbon he returned to his own abbey and resumed his former occupation of cellarer. Ninian

¹ The chief source for Maxwell's period of rule is his letters to Fleming. References to them will not be given.
Graham died early in 1680. He had been half expected back in Würzburg as early as 1678, then expected for the abbatial election. Having left Scotland and travelled as far as Holland, he was told to continue his journey to Würzburg but had spent the journey money on drink. Maxwell remarked, too, that these were not 'the least of his extravagances and miscarriages'. Graham returned to Scotland and died on the fifth day after his arrival there. Placid Baillie died a few months later but no details of his death have been preserved. The only piece of information we have is that Maxwell's letter to him before the election in 1679 was sent to Lambspring and forwarded to Baillie from there. One would surmise from this that Baillie was on an English Benedictine mission station, but against this is the fact that he is not included in the English Congregation necrology.

The Würzburg monk in England, Macarius Brown, was imprisoned early in 1680. Maxwell, who had already commented in two letters on the serious difficulties facing English Catholics as a result of the Popish Plot, was afraid that Brown might be executed as so many others, including two Benedictines, had been. In fact, however, although a Benedictine laybrother, Thomas Pickering, had been executed the previous May, neither of the two men Maxwell mentions, Frs Maurus Corker and Cuthbert Wall alias March, was put to death. Both had been sentenced but were reprieved and remained in prison until 1685.2

Thus, of the five Würzburg missionaries, James Blair, the man whose faculties had been examined by Alexander Leslie, was the only one still on the mission and at liberty. Still no monk of Ratisbon had gone to the mission (excepting always Anthony Gray) but recruits were arriving in the

2 Birt, 68, 76; Weldon, 219, 223.
abbey. Fr Erhard Dunbar, who came from Islay, a place with steady Catholic associations, was a monk at Ratisbon. At the end of 1679 his two brothers passed through Würzburg on their way to join him, four more recruits arrived with Christian Abercrombie from Scotland, then Fr Erhard himself passed through Würzburg on his way north-westwards in September 1680 and returned over two months later with three more youths. In the new year Fleming wrote to Will Leslie in Rome outlining his plan for establishing a place of education for Catholic children, especially those from the Highlands. He had ten boys at Ratisbon studying their 'grammar'. Fleming wanted John Irvine, a secular priest then at Padua, to become a monk at Ratisbon and teach there, since he would thereby be helping the Scottish mission by educating future missionaries.

While Fleming was engaged in laying foundations, Maxwell at Würzburg wanted a working arrangement to be made at once. Alexander Leslie had completed his visitation of Scotland and was expected to pass through Ratisbon on his way to Rome. The Würzburg abbot therefore wrote to Fleming:

'I would wish you also to be instant with Mr Lesly when he shall come concerning the obtaineing to us for the mission faculties and pensions for those that shall be sent thither from our houses and I doubt not but that he may doe much for us at Roome if he retaine that kindeness for us that he seemed to have had when I was with him in Scotland, and the more easily he will obtaine it that the Cardinall of Norfolke did write to us the last yeare if you remember that the Congregation de propaganda fide had decreed that those that were sent from us to those places should have their faculties from Alexander winster otherwise called Mr Dunbar, pensiones vero annuas tum maxime eis sperare licebit,

3 For him see Dilworth, "Highland Monks", 97-98.
4 ML, Fleming, 7.1.1681.
cum aliquid ex senioribus defecerit, these are the Cardinals own words.'

Alexander Winster or Dunbar was the prefect of the secular clergy in Scotland, a position he was to hold almost to the end of the century. There was, however, something else that Maxwell wanted:

'I could wish also that the pretensiones to our monasteries in Scotland were also indued at Rome, and in my opinion now were the best time for agenting such a business for if the times grow shorte-ly better...we may come to have greater opposition.'

It seems extraordinary to find such hopes and plans in 1680, but we have seen that the Reformation continued to be viewed as a reversible process by these émigrés. No doubt, too, the acceptance of the Roman Catholic duke of York in Scotland as commissioner of Charles II had raised their hopes still further, and in fact the duke did establish religious houses when he succeeded to the throne a few years later. Maxwell was even willing to send a monk to Rome to push their claims if Leslie did not support them. He asked Fleming for his views but they must have been less sanguine than his own, for nothing more was heard of the plan. In the event Leslie turned south from Brussels to Paris and so did not visit the Scots abbeys.

By March 1681 Propaganda had considered Alexander Leslie's report and issued its decrees. Perhaps the most important was the allotting of districts to each priest, with the order that he must not exercise his ministry outside it. A great step forward in the organisation of the Scottish mission had been made. It is clear, however, that Maxwell had misjudged the help he could expect from Alexander Leslie. Leslie's bias is obvious. Everything he wrote was designed to strengthen the position of the secular

5 For him see Gordon, 625; Bellesheim, IV, 115 ff.
6 SCA, Visitation Ristretto, f. 2v; Bellesheim, IV, 131.
prefect and weaken that of the religious. His fire is concentrated mainly on the Jesuits, but there was one section on Benedictines in his lengthy instruction: 'Is it expedient for monks to come to the Scottish mission? is there need of them? can they subsist, and if so, how?' Leslie replied that it was not expedient, for three reasons: first, they send difficult people, those not wanted in the monastery; then, there is no way to control them and they disturb everybody; lastly, they refused to send a Gaelic-speaking monk to the Highlands. Clearly the last reason was not the result of on-the-spot investigation but of previous knowledge. Leslie added a suggestion which rather undermines his case against the monks: if their Eminences want to send Benedictines, it will be necessary either to appoint a superior general or to subject them to the prefect of the mission.7

The report is enormously long and only a very few points can be mentioned. The sole monk referred to is James Blair, and that was because of his faculties; no Benedictine is found among the list of priests serving the various places.8 Leslie also reported that there was no movement of priests between Scotland and England, nor should there be.9 Propaganda decided that Leslie should return to Scotland and see that the decrees were implemented. He thereupon said that he needed to make various petitions and receive the answers before he set off. He wanted the faculties of both seculars and regulars to be the same, so that a cause of discord might be removed (since the Jesuits had wider powers than the seculars); the cardinals replied: 'No change just now'. He wanted all regulars to be obliged to show their faculties to the secular prefect on arrival in Scotland; the cardinals replied: 'Decision deferred'.10 In one major way,

7 SCA, Visitation Ristretto, f. 18r.
8 ibid. f. 3r-4v.
9 ibid. f. 18r.
10 ibid. f. 4v-5v.
therefore, the disunity in the Scottish mission remained unremedied.

The Cardinal of Norfolk had succeeded Francesco Barberini as protector of Scotland. Since Alexander Leslie's report had stressed the shortage of priests in Scotland, Propaganda's first decree in March 1681 was that those Scottish priests outside Scotland, secular or regular, who in Norfolk's opinion were suitable for the task, should be sent to the mission.¹¹ That same month Norfolk wrote to Abbot Fleming asking for Ephraim Reid to be sent. Fleming sent the letter on to Reid, who was in charge of the Erfurt house, and about the same time, whether in reply to the letter or not, told the cardinal of his efforts to make the Ratisbon abbey 'serviceable for the Conversione of our Countrie'.¹²

Reid answered that he was fifty and unwell, had forgotten his Gaelic and felt unable to do mission work in the Highlands.¹³ His letter was sent to Will Leslie by Fleming, who added that he would 'dispose' Fr Ephraim to go but could hardly do so until some other help was available.¹⁴ There the matter rested for a time; Fleming was making desperate efforts to get help for his seminary, and very little was forthcoming from Rome, even in the matter of letters of recommendation. One wonders if Leslie considered the sending of Ephraim Reid the touchstone of the Scots monks' sincerity; this was the third time in ten years that the request for his services was made without effect. Fleming continued writing to Rome for help and in April 1682 sent a strong letter to Leslie saying that he had written several times and received no answer.¹⁵ Leslie finally replied in July pointing out the objections to allowing John Irvine, the secular priest at Padua, to take the habit at Ratisbon. This produced a statement

¹¹ ibid. f. 2v; Bellesheim, IV, 131 (where some phrases are omitted).
¹² ML, Fleming, 1.4.1681, 29.7.1681.
¹³ ML, Reid, 8.6.1681.
¹⁴ ML, Fleming, 29.7.1681.
¹⁵ ML, Fleming, 14.4.1682.
from Fleming, who was still annoyed by Leslie's silence, of the measures he was prepared to take to make Ratiston of service to the Scottish mission. In the following year, however, Irvine went to Scotland; one wonders if Leslie had been working for this all along.

Probably as an indirect result of Propaganda's decree about priests outside Scotland, Christian Abercrombie was sent once more to the mission. The manner of his going reveals much of how the Würzburg monks under Maxwell's rule looked on mission work. In or about early June 1661 Fr Alan Chisholm was 'deposing upon his conscience' in chapter that someone should be sent 'and this did give the first occasion of thinking to send any thither so soon'. His abbot suspected that Chisholm was motivated by a hope of being sent himself, but, as Maxwell said,

'Our Fr Alan desired before a long time to goe for the Mission but it was denied in nostro Capitulo by all by reason that he is not thought qualified for such a function.'

Was the Würzburg community always so conscientious about sending only suitable men? We have seen Alexander Leslie's allegations in this regard, and one must admit that they seem to have some foundation. When James Blair returned from Scotland some time later, he was given leave to enter the Dominican order 'upon the acount that he could neither give satisfaction, nor receive satisfaction from our people since his coming here'. Minian Graham is another case in point. Maxwell's remarks upon his conduct have been quoted already. The Cardinal of Norfolk expressed fears (so apparently will Leslie told Maxwell) that the common German vice, drinking, had crept in among the Würzburg monks. Maxwell asked Leslie to tell the cardinal that this was not so and that he would certainly not send any

17 Gordon, 628, 566. This is John Irvine, Cuttlebrae.
such person to the mission. He added, however, that the deceased Ninian Graham, who had been sent home some years before to visit friends, had the vice a little, having learned it among the German soldiers where he served, before coming to Würzburg, and probably the cardinal's suspicion arose from this. If Maxwell's statement is to be taken literally, Graham was not a missionary but was merely on leave of absence in Scotland.

As late as November 1680 Macarius Brown was still in prison in England and Maxwell feared for his life. By the following June, however, he was apparently at liberty, because Maxwell, speaking of Abercrombie's going to Scotland, said it was 'most probable that he pass through a parte of England which I will know after I receave another letter from Mr Browne'. Abercrombie set off in August and by the end of the month had landed at Kirkcaldy and made his way to Edinburgh. From there he seems to have gone to the north-east, since he wrote several times about the Leslies of Pitcaple in Aberdeenshire and the four Highland youths that Fleming wanted to enter his new seminary. Alexander Leslie, who had returned to Scotland, was supposed to be helping to find them. In the autumn of 1682, according to Maxwell, both Abercrombie and James Blair were 'very weele provided with places and have now made many acquaintance and frends to our Order, which if they returne they feare all will be lost'.

The abbot added that Abercrombie did not enjoy good health in Germany and 'wee also neede at leaste one there to correspond with the house here and to agent our little affaires there, all which make me to deliberat whither I shall call F. Christian backe, or let him stay there'. Abercrombie did remain but Blair returned in the autumn of 1683. Unlike Abercrombie, he seems to have worked in the south, for he brought with him a

18 ML, Maxwell, 5.11.1681.
boy recommended by Lady Traquair and told Maxwell of his dealings with the Catholic Baillie Haliburton in Dundee. There were now only two Würzburg monks on the mission, Abercrombie in Scotland and Brown in England, and this was the case for the remainder of Maxwell's rule. Still Fleming did not send any monk to Scotland, but Abercrombie acted as agent and informant for him as well as for his own abbot.

Correspondence between Würzburg and Scotland was carried on through the intermediary of any suitable person who happened to travel from one place to the other, and also through a Mr Kennedy in the Low Countries. This was the man who was later Sir James Kennedy and became Conservator of the Scottish Staple at Veere in January 1683. He was a Catholic and personally known to James VII; he also supplied Maxwell with news and helped travellers to the Scoita abbeys on their way. When Kennedy left Brussels for London in the summer of 1682, Maxwell wrote that correspondence was difficult in his absence. He repeated the remark when Kennedy took up his post at Veere, and four months later lamented that he had had no news from Scotland or England since Kennedy left Brussels. Kennedy's son was later a monk of Aatisbon for a time and then served as a secular priest in Scotland.20

With what faculties did Abercrombie go to Scotland? One would have expected, after Propaganda's decree concerning the monks in 1679, that he went to Scotland and there received faculties from the secular prefect which were not to be used outside the district assigned to him. Since he could not expect to receive one of the ten pensions, he would have to go to a district where the Catholics or some well-to-do person could support him. It is clear, however, that no such arrangement was made. When

19 J. Davidson and A. Gray, The Scottish Staple at Veere, 229-32, 304.
20 Sch. Akten, 320, 12.7.1690; ML, Norfolk, 24,2,1693; RSC, 122.
Abercrombie set off on 5th August 1681 he wrote to Alexander Leslie in Rome expressing his willingness to help and assuring him that the Würzburg monks desired to serve their country.\textsuperscript{21} His abbot enclosed the letter in one of his own;\textsuperscript{22} both men had known Alexander Leslie in Scotland. Maxwell wanted to know what financial help monks on the mission could really expect. Speaking of the decree of 1679 that monks could succeed to one of the ten pensions, he said:

'As to the determination and further declaration of which I earnestly intreate and desire that your Brother and you as two most concerned in that affaire may be pleased to assist us therein and explicite signifie what we may expect by the foresaid Cardinalls deter(mina?)-tion and decree theareanent, which decree if it...have its due effect which I hope it will, it depending altogether in your kindeness to us, and your recommending of us to the foresaid Coledge of Cardinals de propaganda fide, which I doubt not but you will doe: it will prove with time very profitable for our Countrie, for if I could see any way of our peoples subsisteing there, it should be my greatest indea-vour to receave and breede young men for the assistance of the same, and you cannot but sufficiently know how difficill it is to subsist there without any such assistance.'

On 27th September, before this letter reached Rome, Will Leslie, Alexander's brother, wrote to Maxwell on behalf of the Cardinal of Norfolk.

The correspondence between Maxwell and Rome in the autumn of 1681 is difficult to follow since, of the five letters written, two pairs crossed in the post. Naturally, the writers did not get to grips with each other and since their viewpoints were quite diverse the results of the correspondence

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{21} ML, Abercrombie, 5.8.1681 (the date has been altered to 15th August; cf. also Maxwell, 6.8.1681).
\textsuperscript{22} ML, Maxwell, 30.8.1681.
\end{footnotesize}
were inconclusive. We know roughly, from the abbot's reply some time in October, why Will Leslie wrote. Maxwell expressed delight at making Will's acquaintance, even if only by letter. As regards help to Scotland, he told him: 'You shall finde me as willing to concurre thereuntill as any man liveing', and he promised: 'I...would with all my hearte assiste and doe for it to my abilitie.' This was a prelude to explaining that he could not do as the cardinal wished (clearly, to educate missionaries) because of the abbey's limited revenue, and suggesting that the pope might ask the bishop and chapter of Würzburg to help the monastery and thus Scotland.

It is a badly written letter, wandering back and forth from one subject to another, and it is also a begging letter in answer to a begging letter. Maxwell went on to speak of means of support for Würzburg monks in Scotland:

'Moreover I hope his Eminence and your Reverence will also obtaine from his holyness and the Congregation de propaganda fide some assistance for those two that are actually in the Scots mission, and those also who shall be sent after this.'

Then, referring to the 1679 decree, the abbot wrote: 'This I hope you will further, and see to obtaine that it may have its effect, and be put to execution.' He promised on his side: 'For concurring and agreeing with the Abbot of Ratisbon for furthering such good and pious ends I shall never be wanting.'

In the meantime Will Leslie had received the letter sent by Maxwell to his brother and had replied to it (4th October) since Alexander was by now in Scotland. He thus wrote two letters to Abbot Maxwell in a week.

23 ML, Maxwell, endorsed 22.10.1661.
the only two he ever sent him. We know what Will Leslie wrote in the second letter, both from Maxwell's reply and from his description of it to Fleming. To the latter Maxwell wrote:

'Not long since I receaved two letters from Roome from Don Gulielm Leslie, the first from him selfe, and the last an answere to a letter I did write to his Brother Mr Alexander Leslie whom I thought to have beene at Rome...in these letters he informes me of severall things concerning our Mission in Scotland, and first that the Pope and Cardinalls de propaganda fide hath ordered that all Religiose there should have their faculties from the superior of the secular priests there untill we increase so there that we can have a body and a superior of our owne there: my minde he desires to know concerning this, and for my parte I am very weele pleased thereat and for the present I cannot sie how it can be otherwise, your minde and opinion I desire to know with the soonerest.'

Leslie had also told the Würzburg abbot that missionaries must now stay in their own districts and that Propaganda gave a subsidy for the priest in places with the 'fewest Catholiques, for where the Catholiques are numerouse they offer to maintaine their owne priest.' This last is a description of what another decree resulting from Alexander Leslie's visitation meant in practice. The decree itself said that the subsidy was to be distributed by the prefect according to need, a more flexible and sensible arrangement than allotting it irrespective of circumstances to ten priests chosen once and for all.

Abbot Maxwell's reply to Will Leslie's second letter is very long and repeats a good deal of what he had already written to Leslie and to Abbot

---

24 SCA, Visitation Ristretto, f. 3v; Bellesheim, IV, 131.
Fleming, but it deserves to be quoted at some length as it throws considerable light on the position of the Würzburg abbey as regards mission work for the remainder of Maxwell's rule. After expressions of friendliness to Alexander Leslie, who hardly deserved them after his visitation report, the abbot said:

'I returne you by this infinit thanks for the information and satisfaction you give me in your answere to his, as also for your great expressions of kindness to us therein, and as to the distribution of the Priests in the Mission by the Order and command of the Pope and Cardinalls, and of there being all subject to one superiour ad interim, a secular Priest, I for my parte make no difficultie therein, but rests very weele contented therewith: so that with time as you say in your letter crescente numero Religiosorum they may have a superiour of their owne, if God Almightie of his infinit mercie shall grant that the Catholique faithe shall have a footeing there, and that you may see my willingness the more, and also see that we shall not seeke our owne privat interests I shall with the next write to mine there to rest satisfied with the distribution of places your superiour there shall make, and also be obedient to him in every thing lawfull, as they would and ought to be to me, and that they also lay aside all emulation and idle Jarres (jars) about priviledges and such.'

Maxwell was willing to accept a role subsidiary to that of the secular clergy and produced a strange version of history to justify it:

'In former times we have beene so successfully assisteing to the secular Clergie to the glorious conversion of so many Nations.'

The different way of distributing the annual subsidy from Propaganda

25 ML, Maxwell, 5.11.1661.
still left unsolved the problem of supporting monks on the mission. The abbot therefore wanted Leslie and the Cardinal 'to give Orders to yours in the Mission that mine there may have some assistance from them in that kinde...that is if they shall be assigned to such places and persons from whom they cannot expect their full maintenance.' He could send no more monks for the time being and could support no more persons at Würzburg, but was willing to help when it should become possible. He wrote:

'Nevertheless to satisfy your desire it shall be my induavour to procure and receive some highlanders as soon as I shall see a way to maintaine them here.'

Once again he promised to co-operate with Fleming:

'I shall never be wanting, and ever to my power be most willing to any thing that can concerne either the good of our Countrie, or his (Fleming's) seminairie.'

The other problem, that of faculties, was also reviewed by Maxwell.

'We have had this time bygon some union with the Inglish Muncks of our Order and hath (sic) hitherto alwayes had our Faculties for the mission from them who have faculties for all of our Order, for all our kings Dominions, this union is also almost now decayed, only as yet we have our faculties from them ever untill we can have them elsewhere, and if this project succeede betwixt you and us which I hope shall, we will from hence take our faculties from you.'

Thus Propaganda's decree for the monks had still not been put into practice two and a half years after it was issued. Evidently Abercrombie had gone to Scotland with English Benedictine faculties, as had the other monk there, James Blair. Nor did any new arrangement come into force.
Will Leslie never replied to either of the letters Maxwell wrote him. The cardinal and Leslie had wanted the two Scots abbeys to help at once by supplying missionaries, especially Gaelic speakers, and by educating students, especially Highlanders. Both abbeys explained the difficulty they had in meeting the requests and themselves appealed for help, which was hardly to Leslie's liking. Probably we can attribute his silence to this. We can also with some justification be sceptical of the sincerity of the promise to give the monks a prefect of their own when their numbers warranted it, for it does not harmonise with the schemes of the Leslie brothers to make the seculars supreme.

Maxwell had been very expansive, not to say enthusiastic, in his last letter to Leslie. One can see the same man as was so eager, having been elected abbot, to co-operate with and please his fellow abbot in Ratisbon. Naturally he was hurt and disappointed by Leslie's silence. It was about this time that Leslie was treating Fleming in similar fashion over the request for the services of the secular priest at Padua, and we have seen that Fleming dealt firmly with him. Maxwell, a less strong character, complained instead to his fellow abbot:

'I have not heard from Mr Leslie at Roome this halfe yeare past notwithstanding that my last to him required also an answer what he is doing or whether he be deade or hiding I know not, and as for the secular Clergie their kindness to ours in Scotland I hearre not much thereof, and although Mr Alexander Leslie in his letter to me promises all kindness to this place and those of ours there, yet our F. Christian signifies to me that he finds more in words than effect, which I can easily believe for the Clergie now every where are sett
to mortifie the Regulars and if they could subsist without the help of Regulars not only in Scotland but every where now a dayes they would willingly sett them aside (sed haec inter nos).

That was in June 1682. Maxwell was prepared to take practical steps to remedy the situation, as he told his fellow abbot the next month:

'You may easily see and perceive, that if it were not for the promoting of God's glory, and for the good of our houses we have but small encouragemente to receave or accept of any upon their, I mean the secular Clergies, desire or recommendation, since they are and begin to be so particular to us, and if with time we ever intend to send any to our Countrie it seems we must indeavour to obtaine priviledges and faculties for our owne there immediatly from Roome independenter of the Clergie, but I feare they have put a stop thereto by cominge before us, and for to try what can be done in the same it is long since I have had thoughts of sending our P. Prior to Roome to see what can or may be effectuated therein.'

Maxwell's proposal was that the prior, Marianus Irvine, should act on behalf of both Scots abbeys, which would share the expenses involved. He explained, however, that Irvine could not be spared that year. The Ratisbon abbot was evidently not enthusiastic about the proposal, and six weeks later Maxwell wrote again:

'As for our uniteing our selfes with the secular clergie in Scotland it is certaine they will never make us equall with them, therefore it will be necessare for us to obtaine faculties and priviledges for our selfes, if it be possible to obtaine them, and I see no reason they should denye us, since the English monks have the like. It is true
as you specify in your letter that we were united with the English Congregation, at least this house was, as the contract betwixt us and them show which I have by me, but it seems bef(ore) several years they are tyred of us, and desire our companie n(o longer?) for they make difficultie to give us faculties any m(ore).'

At this time, however, Fleming stopped replying to Maxwell for a while, and it was not until August 1683 that the latter broached the subject again:

'Moreover F. Christian is pressing that we should indeavour to procure from Roome faculties for our owne people our selves, and as undoubted-ly you know we have written several times to Rome anent the affaire but never could effect any thing therein, and I beleveve never will untill we send one to Roome for that purpose to agent therein.'

Fleming promptly and actively discouraged the proposal. Only a fortnight later Maxwell was accepting his arguments about the difficulties of the journey and agreeing to defer the plan. No more was heard of it, and Maxwell's rule and Charles II's reign came to an end almost simultaneously with no arrangement for mission work made. Würzburg monks could hardly take up mission work unless they were sure of means of support beforehand. There may have been very few, if any, available for such work but Will Leslie's silence effectively blocked the avenue to it.
Chapter 16

INTEGRATION INTO THE SCOTTISH MISSION ACHIEVED

Changed conditions - Fleming's activity - situation regarding faculties and support - Catholic chapel in Holyrood - preparations for religious house - Fleming supports Lewis Innes as bishop - missionaries sent from Ratisbon and Würzburg - eight monks in Scotland - subject to secular prefect - subsidised by the king - their fate at the Revolution - four remain in captivity - eventually released - Nicolson appointed bishop - agreement with abbots - MacLennan goes to Scotland - four monks permanently in Scotland - abbots' agreement helps the bishop - Will Leslie grateful - Jesuits submit.

When the Catholic James VII ascended the throne and the chancellor, the earl of Perth, became a Catholic, conditions for the Catholic missionaries changed completely even if not immediately. For the monks, support of their missionaries in Scotland ceased to be a problem since a pension was paid to the two abbeys in Germany (£100 each) and the monks in Scotland were also awarded a pension of £200.1 It would seem that these were not paid from 1685 but began later; the important fact, however, is that monks in Scotland had means of support when they did go there. The other, less pressing matter, that of faculties, ceased to be a problem: one cannot imagine there being any difficulty when James was summoning priests to Scotland and the chancellor was actively helping them. This at least was the situation in the second half of James's reign; there is remarkably little evidence of Benedictine missionary activity in the first two years.

1 CSP Domestic, 1689-90, 382-83.
The moving spirit - or at the very least, the person most actively engaged - in promoting work by Benedictines in Scotland was Abbot Fleming of Ratisbon. Maxwell's successor at Würzburg, Marrianus Irvine, either agreed with Fleming's views or fell in with them; there is no evidence that he had any opinions of his own about mission work, such as Maxwell had had on the necessity of the monks getting faculties from their own superiors. On several occasions, too, Fleming expressed himself as acting on behalf of all the Scots monks in Germany, and he seems to have made arrangements for Würzburg monks as well as for his own. Placid Fleming was probably the most outstanding and capable man among the Scots Catholic émigrés at the time, but he had made a deliberate choice of joining his fortunes to those of the poor Ratisbon abbey, and he never went back on it. He was nevertheless intensely interested in all matters concerning his church and country. When a Catholic king succeeded in Scotland, Fleming began at once to make his influence felt in the weightiest matters.

He made two, possibly three, journeys to London, and before the first he obtained faculties from Norfolk. Probably a cardinal protector always had power to grant them. Fleming's were made out to him at Rome on 2nd June 1685 and were valid for England and Scotland, but not Ireland, and for as long as he remained there unless Norfolk revoked them. Thus, far from Fleming having powers to grant faculties to his monks, he had to obtain them for himself. The situation over faculties and pensions was un-
changed in those early days of James's reign. Athanasius Chambers, the Scots monk at Subiaco, was told by Norfolk:

'As to the Scottish Mission all I can doe is to give you faculteys, as I will when you desire to goe theather, but I fear the Propaganda

2 ML, Fleming, August 1682.
3 For Fleming's activity during James's reign, see Hammermayer, Restoration, 65 ff.
4 SCA Rat. A 1, II, 11.
5 ML, Norfolk, 30.6.1685; printed in CRS, xxv, 81.
will not give a Viaticum, nor a maintenance thereof, since that which they give is complained to be to little for those to whom it's applied.'

It is in a letter of Chambers at this time that one finds a reference, perhaps the earliest, to the refounding of a Catholic religious house in Holyrood. James had already fitted up one of the rooms in Holyrood as a Catholic chapel. Now Chambers wrote: 'If the queen's chapel in Edinburgh shall be in the hands of the benedictines as that of London is he (Norfolk) could provide me ther.' English Benedictine monks had been serving the queen's chapel at Somerset House in London since 1662, and James founded a Benedictine monastery in St James's palace when he succeeded to the throne. The general chapter of the English Congregation was actually held there in 1685. It was here three years later that an English Benedictine received episcopal consecration and the baptismal solemnities of the infant Prince of Wales were held. Erecting a religious house in a Scottish royal palace was thus not quite as strange and singular an episode as it appears to be at first sight. It was, to be sure, remarkable enough but can only be considered here in so much as it involved the Benedictines.

Richard Augustine Hay was a Scot who went to France as a boy and later became an Augustinian canon, the order which had held the abbey of Holyrood before the Reformation. In September 1686, having received a commission from his superior to refound the order in England and Scotland, he set off for his native land. The preparations for opening the chapel in the former council chamber at Holyrood were well advanced. The secular

---

7 ML, Chambers, 4, 6, 1685.
8 Weldon, xxv-xxvi, 196, 226, 231.
9 For him see *DNB* and Hay, *Genealogie*, 48 ff. (an autobiographical account).
prefect, Alexander Dunbar, performed the opening ceremony on St Andrew's day, and on Christmas day, 1686 there were solemn services at which Christian Abercrombie was present. Hay recorded that 'Mr Abercrombie, of the Order of St Benedict, a man not much skill'd in singing, did officiat,' and also presided at an evening service consisting of a psalm, a hymn and a litany.  

The opening of the chapel was merely the first step. The old abbey church was still being used as the Protestant parish kirk, so the congregation was given notice to quit the following July as the church was to be fitted out for Catholic worship and handed over to a religious order. At first it was intended for the Benedictines. In February 1687 the French ambassador in Ratisbon asked his king to give a donation to Fleming, who was sending nine persons, including six priests, at Easter to Scotland, where the chancellor had prepared for them a church and small monastery adjoining the royal palace of Edinburgh. Louis XIV duly made a grant towards the cost of the journey. A month later Fleming himself described the group as eight priests, with a laybrother and an organist, sent at Perth's request to make the first public Catholic foundation in Scotland. Hay himself remarked that 'his Majesty was inform'd the Church of Holyroodhouse belong'd of old to the Benedictins.'

The project soon broke down. Fleming wrote to Charles Whiteford, procurator of the Scots college in Paris, at the same time as the Protestant congregation was being ejected:

'I hear that your Canon Regular the Lady Roslins son (i.e., Hay), has hindered us from getting our Church and Residence, and is lykways Disappoynted himselfe tho he made great offers, that the French of

10 Hay's account is ibid. 55 ff.
11 Hammermayer, Restauration, 69, 87.
12 ML, Fleming, 8.7.1687.
his order would not only provyde the place, but even make all the buildings and reparations on there owne expenses; which is more then we are able to performe.'

To Lewis Innes, the principal of the Paris college, he wrote: 13

'As to the Abbey Church I am no wayes anxious nor sollicitous, and Doe with a perfyt resignation submitte my selfe to his Majesties Gracious Determination And it would be no lesse acceptable to me, If the King would be pleased to Doe something for the Monasteries we have as yet abroad.'

No religious order was, in the event, settled in Holyrood, and Fleming summed up the situation for Will Leslie in 1688: 14

'As for the Abbey Church, it being founded for the Canon Regulars, and they makeing great offers, I soon past from our pretension to it, and so much the more easily, that the Jesuits had informed the Court that we were not able to Discharge the Duetie; And now they are as much against the Canon Regulars alledgeing them to be Jansenists.'

The church was nearly ready for consecration when the mob sacked it in December 1688. Meanwhile the Canongate Kirk had been built for the ejected Protestants and remains the parish church until the present day.

In the matter of the appointment of a bishop, Fleming also acted with great energy. A Vicar-Apostolic had been given to England in 1685, which encouraged the Scots to press for the same in Scotland. The Jesuits, however, naturally opposed any candidate hostile to them, if indeed they supported the appointment of a bishop at all, while the parties who did support it were on the whole opposed to the nomination of anyone who favoured the Jesuits in the slightest. Fleming flung himself unequivocally on to

---

14 ML, Fleming, 6.4.1688; printed in Hamermayer, Restauration, 89.
the side of the secular priests who wanted a bishop and one firmly opposed to the Jesuits. It is this, rather than the vicissitudes of the negotiations and the personalities of the candidates, including Fleming himself, which is important for the history of the Benedictine mission and indeed of the Scottish mission in general.

Fleming, when he arrived back in Ratisbon from London towards the end of 1686, had already very firmly renounced his own candidature and applied himself to support that of Lewis Innes, a secular priest who was the principal of the Scots college in Paris. He told Whiteford that he himself was not the new bishop but had procured a more deserving one, adding that Innes 'knowes that the Benedictins were alwayes the best freinds to the Clergie, and there truest Copiae auxiliare in there Necessitie.'

The Ratisbon abbot was confident of the agreement of his colleague at Wurzburg, for when describing his own efforts on Innes's behalf he said: "To the Cardinal, I was somewhat more pressing, and to give it more authoritie, Did writ as Representative of the Regular Clergie hier in Germaine, and hadjoynd the Abbot of Wurtzburg with me, if he had not been sick of ane hott feaver, however as soon as he recovers, his letters shall follow myne."

Even when Christian Abercrombie in Scotland defaulted from the party line, Fleming did not waver. In the spring of 1688 he informed Whiteford: "Pater Abercrombie has joynd himselfe to the Padres (i.e., the Jesuits); This will make a schisme among us, for I am resolved to stand and fall with the Clergie; and sieing Abercrombie has acted in severall things very Deceitfully; and even against mr Innes; he deservers not your Correspondence, or that you should in any wavess Counten-

15 Fleming's part in the affair can be followed in Hay, Failure, 33-37, although the author's judgements on him can hardly be accepted.
16 ML, Fleming, 8.1.1687.
17 ML, Fleming, 21.1.1687.
18 ML, Fleming, 23.3.1688.
James eventually nominated two bishops, Lewis Innes and another secular priest, Thomas Nicolson, but the Revolution, coming before the appointments took effect, put an end to the question for the time being.

Clearly, during his stay in London in 1686, Fleming's efforts concerned the appointment of a bishop and the establishing of a monastery in Holyrood. The sending of monks as missionaries to Scotland must also have been discussed, because immediately on his return he set about getting faculties for them. He asked the Cardinal of Norfolk, as the latter wrote to Athanasius Chambers at Subiaco:

'f. Placicle Fleming Abbott in Ratisbone is returned some time since from London wheare (h)is presence required a shorte voyage, and now he writes of his desire to send f. Ephrem Reed Priour of S. James in Erford, f. Augustin Bruce, and f. James Bruce to Scotland, giving them very good characters for that mission, and desiring I would give them faculteys, as I (releying and charging strictly his conscience) have done for one yeare, with reserve of recaling them without any other reason, but beneplacito; whearefore I desire to have (inter nos) the trewest character you can give me of them, only for to governe my selfe best by. The Abbott desireth a Viaticum for them from Propaganda fide, but heare is nothing to be gotten, since all it giveth annually, was long since determined and distributed on the nominated persons.'

The request for Chambers's opinion is extraordinary, especially since he had left Germany in 1675 before either of the Bruces had entered religion. The interesting point, however, is that Augustine Bruce was a monk.

19 ML, Norfolk, 15.1.1687; printed in CRS, xxv, 82.
of Würzburg. Monks of the two houses were, it would seem, acting together, and Fleming was making the arrangements. This is also the first certain case of any Ratisbon monk taking up mission work in Scotland for almost fifty years.

The figures given for the group to be sent to Scotland by Fleming at Easter 1687 vary slightly among themselves; we can, however, take Fleming's own figures, not only because they come from him but because they are the most detailed. Thus eight priests with a laybrother and an organist were going to Scotland. The question one wants to ask is twofold: Did the number include men already in Scotland, and did it include monks of Würzburg? It is an academic question because the Holyrood project fell through, but eight priests could hardly have left Ratisbon at once and no laybrother, as far as is known, belonged to the Ratisbon community, whereas Würzburg did have Bro. Joseph Ogilvie.

The figures given of monks actually sent by Fleming to Scotland likewise vary, even in his own statements. For instance, in January 1693 he told the Ratisbon chancery that he had sent four priests to Scotland in 1687,20 but two months later he was saying to the abbot of St Gallen21 that he had sent six priests there about six years before, that is, about 1687. Fleming apparently included Würzburg monks in his figures or not, as it suited him. He would presumably have to confine himself to Ratisbon monks when addressing Ratisbon authorities but could include monks of Würzburg when writing further afield. The date 1687 is the one usually found for the departure of the monks, though one can note that at the end of 1686 Fleming told the duke of Bavaria he had sent four priests to the mission the previous spring.22 Like the other sources this was a petition, and

20 Regens.
21 SG, Bd. 321, f. 322.
22 Mun. GSA, K.s.3292, 23.12.1686.
therefore Fleming was trying to awaken sympathy and obtain financial help; he could, for instance, without stretching the truth too far, include Christian Abercrombie, who was in Scotland already, or himself, since he spent part of 1686 in Britain.

We are on much firmer ground as regards monks who did pastoral or missionary work in Scotland in the last year of James's rule, irrespective of when they arrived. There were eight and we know their names. Three were from Ratisbon, the two given faculties by Norfolk and another Gaelic speaker, Erhard Dunbar. Incidentally, when the faculties given by Norfolk lapsed after a year, somebody would undoubtedly renew them; Ephraim Reid remained over a quarter of a century in Scotland. We know in some detail when the five Würzburg monks went to Scotland. Christian Abercrombie was there already. The Würzburg chronicle records that Augustine Bruce and Ambrose Cook were sent in April 1687 by order of James VII.23 James in that year summoned available priests also from other places on the Continent.24 If we take as strictly accurate the chronicler's statement that Abbot Irvine sent four priests to Scotland in 1687-88,25 then it was at this time that James Blair and Boniface Mackie set off. To this should be added the continued work of Macarius Brown in England and the journey of Bro Joseph Ogilvie to London with the relic of Macarius in August 1688. The only persons who remained in the Würzburg monastery were the abbot, who was soon to die, Alan Chisholm, and some student monks not yet priests. This was a really remarkable self-sacrificing missionary effort, and one that put the monastery itself into jeopardy.

We can accept as substantially accurate the statement of a historian of the Scottish mission that the monks did not arrive to help the mission

23 Ser. Abb. (o.23).
24 Gordon, 567.
25 Dennistoun, f. 138rv.
until the second half of 1687. 26 Perth wrote to Cardinal Norfolk in February 1688: 'Of late wee have got over 6 or 7 monks from Germany, some of them very good men and like to prove able missioners. They would fain be upon the same foot as the others.' 27 Fleming was able to tell Will Leslie: 'Our Monks Does pretty well in the Mission, and My Lord Chancellour Declares himselfe Content and Satisfied with them.' 28 Whatever the source of their faculties, Fleming had no wish for them to have a superior of their own but rather to be subject to the secular prefect. The arrangement did not work smoothly, however, because of the heat engendered over the question of a bishop. Fleming had already expressed fears that Dunbar 'will endeavor to revenge himselfe on the Religious we send home', 29 and he informed Whiteford as early as July 1687: 30 'I must tell you in Confidence and sub rosa, that pater Abercrombie, in severall of his letters, has been always informeing me, against Mr Dunbar, and once or tuyce also against mr Burnet, 31 and I haveing ordained my Religious to goe and wait upon mr Dunbar, at there arryval, and receave there Directory from him, as Superior of the Clergie, he endeavored by all means to hinder them, and has been extremely offended with on(e) of myne ever since upon that account.'

There was no longer need of any grant from the subsidy supplied annually by Propaganda, even if Fleming had had to beg for journey expenses. The pension of £200 from the king for missioner monks has been mentioned. At Martinmas 1688 a grant was paid to the Benedictine monks 'whom we ordered to be sent for from beyond the sea.' 32 James's reign and the public

26 SCA, Thomson MS, chap. 1.
27 IR, xi, 62.
28 ML, Fleming, 6.4.1688; Hammernayer, Restauration, 89.
29 ML, Fleming, 29.4.1687.
30 ML, Fleming, 8.7.1687.
31 David Burnet, sub-prefect of the mission, for whom see Gordon, 528–30; Bellesheim, IV, 123–24.
32 J. Harrison, op. cit. 222, citing Treasury Sederunt Book, December 1688.
favouring of Catholicism came to an end simultaneously within weeks of the payment, but it can be noted that this was the largest number of monks in Scotland from the time when the pre-reformation communities died out after 1560 until a monastery was founded in the Highlands in the late nineteenth century.

We are fortunate in possessing an account of the missionaries in Scotland at the Revolution, drawn up by James Bruce at Ratisbon in 1690 for Will Leslie. After explaining that he had not spent very much time on the mission, having made a journey back to Germany with some young men shortly after his arrival in Scotland, and that he 'was never farther west as Stirling nor farther north as clakmannan, or the south syd of fyfe', he gave a summary of the secular priests and Jesuits, and finally of the monks:

"Our Benedictine fathers were but few in respect of the rest father abercromie who resided at aberdene in a gentlemans hous of the name of Irvine has been a good tyme in the missione, and remains stil about the same place uher he uas. father Blaire who had also been in the mission befor some yeirs resided in a gentlemans house near edinburgh called coatts and the gentleman's name Byrrs he remains also still about edinburgh, father Reid stayed some litle tyme about edinburgh and afterwards went north and resided uith the lard of Schivess uher he abyds still for anything wee knou, father dunbar stayed also at edinburgh and then went south into Gallouay where he stayed above a yeir at dumfriess in lieutenant Ratries house to whose troop he was also a chaplaine and went up uith the forces into england but is nou lurking in the hylland hills uith the kings party if there be any yett"

33 ML, Bruce, 1690, f.1r, 3v. The account printed in W. Forbes Leith, Memoirs of Scottish Catholics, II, 149-50 is taken in part at least from this letter but needs some correction: e.g., the two Bruces are confused.
remaining, father cook stayed some tymes at drumond and other tymes at stobhall but is nou come ouer and so is father Georg Bruce who stayed about edinburgh but after the troubles went north with the Master of tarbot uher he uas taken as I said befor and after his Imprisonement came over, father makie stayed not long in the mission for he uas sick almost the whole tyme he uas in scotland having resided at edinburgh, and I stayed some little tyme at edinburgh and then went into Gallouay untill the troubles arose that I returned into edinburgh againe untill I found a conveniency to come over.'

Boniface Mackie was in Würzburg before his abbot's death in November 1688, James Bruce was able to leave Scotland after the Revolution, and Ambrose Cook was at Würzburg in time to be elected abbot the following August. Bruce records that 'Father Cooke made a good successful mission in drumond and stobhall where he reserved severals, and found the people well Inclined'. Probably he owed his position in Perth's household to the fact that he was a graduate of a Scottish university, and certainly Perth always retained a respect for him. These were the only three to escape capture and imprisonment. George (that is, Fr Augustine) Bruce 'uas taken neir Methil and brought to dundie uher he uas keipt above 3 months in prisone and afterwards sett at liberty'. The same correspondent told Leslie in another letter that Augustine Bruce 'came from Scotland...after five or six moneths imprisonment in the tolboth of Dundie; having been sett at liberty by an act of banishment, which (was) past upon him and procured by his own freinds.' He spent 'betuixt eight and ten moneths' at St Denis near Paris and was back at Würzburg in 1690.

The remaining four were not so fortunate and spent longer periods in

34 ibid. f. lv.
35 ibid. f. 2v.
36 ML, S, 1690. Although the leaf bearing the signature is missing, the writer is clearly James Bruce.
captivity. All save Dunbar would probably have been captured fairly soon, and thus a letter which gives the names of four monks in captivity, including Augustine Bruce and excluding Dunbar, presumably refers to those in custody in early 1689. Dunbar was with the troops loyal to James and may have remained with them until they disintegrated in 1690. In February 1689 his abbot, hearing he was safe, sent instructions for him to return to Germany, but four years later Dunbar was still a prisoner. Abbot Fleming in early 1693 appealed to both the Ratisbon diocesan chancellery and the prince-abbot of St Gallen for help, saying that in 1687 he had sent a number of monks to the mission, who had received a pension from the king until the Revolution, and now two monks of Ratisbon and two of Würzburg, five Jesuits and six secular priests were imprisoned and destitute in Scotland. He explained that he had had to send 300 florins to keep them alive, though the monastery had hardly enough bread for its own residents. Fleming added some details of his own two monks. Erhard Dunbar was in prison in Edinburgh; he had not only as a military chaplain converted many hundreds of soldiers but also whole villages to the Catholic faith. Ephraim Reid's imprisonment had been so rigorous that his health was ruined incurably.

Before the end of that year Dunbar was back at Ratisbon and was appointed prior. Reid never returned but remained in Scotland for twenty years more and lived to be over eighty. The two Würzburg monks were also released. James Blair was one of a number of exiled priests who in June 1693 sent a letter from Douai to the nuntio in Paris thanking him for the 'charity' he had sent them during their imprisonment. He

37 Printed in Hay, Failure, 71.
38 ML, Fleming, 22.2.1689.
39 SG, Bd. 321, f. 322; Regens.
40 Sch. Urk. 27 (2.12.1693); Pfarrbuch (baptisms).
41 ML, C (Propaganda 1653-94), 16.6.1693.
arrived back in Würzburg exactly a year later. The last man, Christian Abercrombie, seems to have been the longest in prison. Thomas Nicolson reported in November 1694 that all priests in the hands of the government had been banished and 'Mr Abercrombie the Monk... has 6 weeks to clear affaires and then to be gone.' As far as is known, however, he never left Scotland but, like Ephraim Reid, remained on the mission until his death twenty years later. Of the many hundreds whom he reconciled or converted to his church, one was his own dying father; another, in 1688, was a young man named Strachan, who travelled to Würzburg two years later and eventually became abbot. This is an almost classic example of how an exiled community continued to propagate itself.

Mention of Thomas Nicolson leads to one of the decisive turning-points in the history of the Scottish mission, and one in which the two Scots abbots played a notable part. Conditions in Scotland must have changed very quickly for the better, as far as Catholics in Scotland were concerned, about 1694. Boniface Mackie was sent to the mission from Würzburg at this time, and a report to Propaganda stated that four of the forty priests in Scotland were monks but only the seculars received a pension from Propaganda. Renewed efforts were being made to obtain a bishop for Scotland, and Thomas Nicolson was appointed vicar-apostolic in August 1694. At once Fleming wrote to Will Leslie to offer congratulations and promise that if the new bishop cared to call on his monks as auxiliary troops, they would be subject to his jurisdiction as much as the secular clergy, and Nicolson could also dismiss them if he had the slight-

---

42 ML, T, 6-7.1694 (unsigned but in Fleming's hand).
43 ML, Nicolson, 12.11.1694.
44 'Mr Christ: Aber:', the 'notable cunning man' whom Nicolson met in London two years later (ML, Nicolson, 22.4.1697), is almost certainly the Jesuit, Christopher Abercrombie (Gordon, 514).
45 Necrologies, 200.
46 Necrologies, 200.
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est complaint against them. Nicolson was consecrated bishop at Paris in February 1695 and set off to travel to Scotland but there was a serious obstacle in his way. He had been exiled after the Revolution of 1688, his brother giving security of 3000 florins against his unlawful return; therefore, if he could not obtain a passport from the government in Britain or at least a cancellation of the security, his brother would be in grave danger of financial ruin. The new bishop was obliged to remain on the Continent while various influential persons tried to overcome the difficulty, and it was thus that at the end of June 1696 he arrived at Würzburg as Abbot Cook's guest.

Both Scottish abbots were in agreement with regard to mission work. Nicolson wrote to Will Leslie that he had found Cook both very kind and of the same mind as himself regarding the Scottish mission, and so had been persuaded to stay with the monks. Fleming, too, a few weeks earlier had repeated his promises to Leslie and offered to send a Ratisbon monk, Columba MacLennan, to serve in the Highlands if he received journey money and a pension. It was a valuable offer, for MacLennan was a native of Lewis and had just taken a doctorate at Würzburg university. After other arrangements for a meeting with Nicolson had broken down, Fleming in August travelled to Würzburg, where the two Scots abbots and the new bishop came to complete agreement over mission work by monks. Nicolson gladly accepted the offer of a Gaelic-speaking monk, and Fleming in his account of the meeting to Leslie again described the monks as merely the copiae auxiliares of the secular clergy.

It is the voluntary assumption of this role, one not acceptable to
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54 ML, Fleming, 18.9.1696.
the Jesuits of the time, and the promise of complete subjection of monks to the bishop while on the mission, which makes the activity of the two abbots at this time so important. Nicolson left Würzburg in mid-September, sailed to England that autumn and, after a period under arrest in London, reached Scotland the following summer. Columba MacLennan, having been granted his journey money and a pension by Propaganda, reached the north of Scotland about the same time as the bishop. From there he wrote to Ratisbon asking to have his fellow Gael, Erhard Dunbar, to work with him in the Highlands. Fleming agreed, and Propaganda again made a grant, but Dunbar died in Germany not long after.

The significance of the abbots' agreement was seen in the next few years. James Blair had spent a year in Britain in 1696-97 but had returned to Würzburg, while Macarius Brown died in England in 1697. Three Benedictines were missionaries in Scotland in 1696, and thereafter there were four missioner monks permanently in Scotland: Boniface Mackie and Christian Abercrombie in Edinburgh and Aberdeen respectively, Ephraim Reid at Fyvie (seat of the Countess of Dunfermline), and Columba MacLennan in Knoydart. More important was the encouragement and help given to the new bishop in his efforts to gain effective control of all mission work in Scotland. Nicolson was well aware of the difficulties he faced. In 1695 he petitioned Propaganda to prevent priests already on the mission from retaining faculties wider than those he could himself give. A little later he asked for powers to summon suitable religious to the mission, to examine the suitability of all priests, including religious, and
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assign them to districts as he saw fit, and to dismiss them if necessary. In his desire to control religious, he was following in the footsteps of the English vicars-apostolic. Propaganda had decreed in October 1695 that all religious, even the Jesuits and the privileged English Benedictine Congregation, were to be subject to the vicars-apostolic in everything which concerned the cure of souls. Nicolson petitioned for the decree to be extended to Scotland, where he was the sole vicar-apostolic, and on 27th August 1697 a general meeting of Propaganda granted his request. The Scottish mission now had a single major superior, and the two Scots abbots had not only actively assisted him to gain this end but had voluntarily promised more than the decree laid down.

If Fleming had been the more active in promoting this settlement, it was no less the desire of the Würzburg abbot also. Cook wrote later of his intentions regarding the Scottish mission:

'I am resolved to send none but whom our Worthie Bishop shall motu proprio desire, and of whose behaviour I am sure; and those that are upon the place, he has all power to send them back or retain them as he pleases, and it shall allways be my orders to them that they be the most obedient subjects he has.'

Will Leslie, seeing the success of almost half a century of effort, was not lacking in gratitude. In November 1697 he prepared an account for Propaganda of what the abbots had done and of their excellent relations with Nicolson and the secular clergy, all of which gave excellent hopes for the future (he said), especially if other religious followed the Benedictines' example. Propaganda accepted the recommendations of the
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But perhaps nothing shows the improvement of relationships better than the elderly William Leslie's request to Fleming that a Benedictine should succeed him as procurator of the Scottish mission in Rome. Fleming, hard-headed and quite devoid of worldly ambition, replied that it would be better to have a secular priest who knew Italian and had studied at Rome. There could hardly be a greater contrast with the report of Leslie's brother in 1681 which said it was not expedient for monks to be sent to the mission.

The final act of the drama took place at Aberdeen a few years later. There was now a bishop in Scotland, one who had received powers to control all missionary work and to whom the Benedictines had freely and of their own initiative submitted. The largest and most influential body of missionaries belonging to a religious order also submitted, and on 7th February 1701 the superior of the Jesuits in Scotland signed a formal acknowledgement that Jesuits were subject to the vicar-apostolic in whatever concerned their pastoral work. Christian Abercrombie, monk of Würzburg, was one of the witnesses.

---
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Chapter 17
THE 'SCOTTISH LEGEND' AND MACARIUS

Fictitious early history - Charlemagne legend - supposed Scottish monasteries - details added - accepted by Scots and Germans - developed by expatriate Scots - Kilian and Würzburg - Catholic past glorified - controversy with Irish - practical import for Scots monks - prestige of Würzburg Scots - Macarius already known - finding and translation of body - Sang's guarded language - inclusion in publications by Scots - in German works also - cultus grows in Würzburg - Scots justify the cultus - Bollandists - list of miracles - important books include Macarius - Hain's work, 1661 - story of the miraculous finding - birth of a legend - permission to celebrate the feast - strange features of the list of miracles - three books featuring Macarius - feast kept at St James's - further development - importance for the Scots - development after 1700.

Many aspects of the relations between the Scots and their neighbours in Würzburg have been touched on in the preceding chapters. It goes almost without saying that the position of the Scots in Würzburg was unique, but what was the Scots' own view of their position, and how did the people of Würzburg regard them? The answer is to be found in the first place and in general in the works of the sixteenth-century Scottish historians. The fictitious early history of Scotland can be traced back as far as Fordun's Scotichronicon compiled towards the end of the fourteenth century. This remained in manuscript, however, until the early eighteenth century, and it is therefore principally to the printed histories that one looks for the
circulation of the widely believed stories about the achievements of the Scots in Germany. The stories might have their origin in the Scotichronicon (or its sources), but they owed their circulation in Europe to the printed word.

In the fictional history the first Scottish king ruled in 330 B.C., Scotland was converted to Christianity in 203 A.D., and there was an unbroken line of kings from 330 B.C. down to the reigning Stuart dynasty. All that concerns us here, however, is the story of Christian Scots on the Continent. Fordun included an account of the Franco-Scottish alliance according to which Achaius, king of Scotland, made a pact with Charlemagne, and then William, Achaius' brother, fought for Charlemagne in Europe.¹

The Scotichronicon also told of the monastic foundations made by Sts Fursey and Foillan in Gaul and Belgium, the martyrdom of St Kilian at Würzburg, and the career of Marianus Scotus the Chronicler in Germany.² All were called simply Scots by Fordun, though nowadays we should call them Irish. The Scotichronicon was amplified about the middle of the fifteenth century by Walter Bower, and one of the additions states that William, brother of Achaius, founded many famous Benedictine monasteries in Germany. Bower lists the places where these were. Ratisbon, Erfurt, Nuremberg and Vienna are included, while Würzburg appears twice, in its Latin form Herbipolis as well as a latinised form of the German name.³

John Major's History of Greater Britain was printed in 1521. Major was comparatively cautious and moderate but even his work included the fictional account of the Franco-Scottish alliance and the foundations made by William. To this he added the details that they were fifteen in number and were to be presided over by Scottish monks only.⁴

¹ Ed. W.F. Skene (Historians of Scotland series), Lib. III, cap. 48.
² Ibid. Lib. III, cap. 37, 44; Lib. IV, cap. 47.
³ Ed. W. Goodall (Edinburgh, 1759), Lib. III, cap. 57.
⁴ Lib. II, cap. 13.
History of the Scots, published in 1527, was much less cautious. The alliance with Charlemagne was chronicled in circumstantial and fictitious detail, concluding with the foundation by William of monasteries in Germany and Italy in which none but Scots were to be monks or abbots. And, says Boece, there are yet sundry abbeys in Germany in which William's instructions have been followed unchanged.\(^5\)

The king of Scotland accepted this view. In 1528-9 the Scots abbot of Ratisbon visited James V at Stirling, and as a result James sent several letters to dignitaries in the Empire asking that the monasteries founded by William should be restored to the Scots.\(^6\) It has to be remembered that the Ratisbon abbey was made over to a Scottish abbot by a papal bull in 1515 on the grounds that the monasteria scotorum belonged rightfully to Scots and had been wrongfully acquired by Irish monks. The Scots and the Roman authorities accepted this view; the Germans whom it concerned either accepted it or were obliged to conceal their disagreement. Perhaps one may repeat at this point that the Scoti on the continent in general had been Irish, as had been the Ratisbon group of monasteries from their foundation down to 1515.

In 1533 the German Catholic theologian Cochlaeus could speak of gratitude for the missionary work done by Scots in Germany,\(^7\) and seven years later the Scottish Lutheran Alesius (Alexander Alane) said in an address to Frankfurt university that Germany had been evangelised by Scots.\(^8\) This belief was given explicit expression in print by John Lesley in his History, which he published in 1578 in the midst of his partially successful exertions to have the Scotic monasteries restored to the Scots. Not only is the story of William's foundations repeated but the Scotic saints Columba,  

\(^5\) Lib. X, fol. CXCV r.  
\(^6\) IR, xvi, 192; The Letters of James V, 157-58.  
\(^7\) Ibid. 241.  
\(^8\) IR, i, 53.
Gall, Kilian, Colman and even the Englishman Boniface, all of whom laboured in German lands, are explicitly called Scots.\(^9\) With Lesley and his protégé, Ninian Winzet, the legend reached maturity as far as the monasteries were concerned. The documents which illustrate the efforts made in the years 1576-78 to have various monasteries in Germany restored to the Scots contain this version of history.\(^10\) The German dignitaries accepted that their country received Christianity through the apostolic labours of Scottish missionaries and that monasteries founded for the exclusive use of Scots had in the course of time been handed over to German monks or put to other uses. There was as yet, however, little discrimination between houses which had been German since Carolingian times and those which had belonged to Irish monks comparatively recently. Thus the abbot of St Gallen, the eighth-century monastery which was named after an Irish saint but had probably never been an Irish house, was importuned to give help to the Scottish exiles.

The handing over of the Würzburg abbey to the Scots in 1595 must be seen against this background. The event was considered to be a return of the monks who had held the monastery until a century before, as a restoration to the nation which had brought Christianity to Franconia. In this connection the acceptance of St Kilian as a Scot was of considerable significance, for he had preached the gospel in Franconia and been martyred there, his body lay in Würzburg cathedral and he was the patron of the diocese. Not only that, but the Scots monastery had been founded in honour of St Kilian and for his compatriots, its church contained an altar of St Kilian,\(^11\) and so on. The name of Kilian, their patron saint, has never ceased to be held in honour by the people of Würzburg, while, in the seven-

\(^9\) Lib. IV, 47, 54, 60, 61; Lib. V, 65.

\(^10\) See, for instance, Hewison, I, cix-cxx; II, xvii-xxiv.

\(^11\) Wieland, 42-43.
teenth century at least, Kilian was a fairly common surname.\textsuperscript{12} The view of the Scots monks and of the citizens of Würzburg was that the Scots had returned to an ancestral home. The oration delivered by Francis Hamilton when the Scots were solemnly installed in St James's did not fail to stress this point.

The beginning of the seventeenth century saw a great strengthening of this 'Scottish legend' among the educated through the power of the printed word. A type of literature came into being which was a natural development of Bishop Lesley's History, namely, the Scottish Catholic exiles' glorification of their country's Catholic past. They claimed thirteen and a half centuries of heresy-free Christian history before 1560, during which Scotland was a second Thebaid, a nursery of saints and scholars, who not only shed lustre on their homeland but took the light of the gospel to most of western Europe. The first work of this kind was George Thomson's De antiquitate Christianae religionis apud Scotos, a short treatise published in 1594 and given wide circulation by its inclusion in a well-known work in 1607.\textsuperscript{13} The German lands figured particularly in it, and naturally a fairly prominent place was given to St Kilian; the fact that Scots monks still lived in their old monasteries in Germany was held up both as a remnant of ancient glories and a proof that the claims made were valid.\textsuperscript{14}

Thomson added little that his predecessors had not said, and he wrote before the Würzburg abbey was given to the Scots. It was not long, however, before Dempster, George Conn and Camerarius produced less moderate works of this type. The latter two gave special mention to Würzburg, where, as they said, Kilian's compatriots had returned to their rightful

\textsuperscript{12} G. Meyer-Erlach, "Der Name Kilian", in Die Mainlände, iv, 43; Merkle, passim.

\textsuperscript{13} A. Possevinus, Bibliotheca Selecta (Cologne, 1607), II, 394-98. There is a very imperfect translation in SHS Miscellany II (1904), 117-32.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid. 127-28.
inheritance in 1595.\(^\text{15}\) Naturally the Irish reacted strongly against this wholesale appropriation of their saints, hence the bitter controversies between Scots and Irish during the first half of the seventeenth century. On the whole, the Scottish version held the field in seventeenth-century Germany, probably because the monks bore the name of Scot rather than through the power of their misapplied erudition in arguing their case. The effect of a name like Bonnie Prince Charlie or Bloody Mary is infinitely stronger than learned arguments. The more scholarly among the Germans were to scout some of the fantastic legends and try to distinguish between Scotland and Ireland, but by and large the Scottish version was accepted. Their German neighbours might be scornful of the poverty or shortcomings of the Scots, they might even at times consider that the Scots had outstayed their welcome, but never did they look on the Scots as intruders who had no right to be there.

For penurious exiles this must have been of incalculable psychological benefit. There is no need to emphasise how the Scots remained entrenched in their belief and expressed it on all possible occasions. Its significance for their literary productions will be considered elsewhere. In the material sphere it was of use to them, since it emboldened them to make petitions, in which it was invariably expressed, while gratitude to the Scottish nation undoubtedly stimulated Germans to make benefactions to the monks. There was even a popular belief, of which the Scots made use, that the Empire and the Scots monasteries had been founded together and that one would not survive the other.\(^\text{16}\)

It should not be thought that the identity of the Scoti was a merely academic or sentimental matter. The Scots had obtained possession in

\(^{15}\) Camerarius, De Scotorum Fortitudine, 163, 216-19; Conn, 40-41, 45.
\(^{16}\) Indiculus, f. 16r.
Ratisbon on the grounds that it was a Scottish foundation, had pressed their claims in Würzburg on the same grounds and had them accepted by Bishop Echter. They continued to believe that the now German abbey in Vienna was theirs by right; the letter of Rudolf II in 1578 admitting their claims in principle was frequently mentioned in their writings and petitions. They lived in hopes, as their historical compilations show, of receiving help or compensation from monasteries with a Scotic history, real or fictitious. They even hoped that some of these might be restored to the Scots. The replacing of Scots monks by Germans was seen as a reversible process, as was the Reformation and the expulsion of the monks from their houses in Scotland. Certainly pre-reformation categories and relationships were considered as still valid. It may have been sentiment which led the great abbey of St Gallen to give help to Scottish monks, but it is rather surprising to find Rosscarbery Priory in Ireland described by Irishmen in 1648 as a dependency of Würzburg, which it had been in the fifteenth century. If the Scots could claim houses lost to their nation in the course of time, so could the Irish. It was essential for the Scots that their version of history should be accepted.

The attempts of Irish monks to regain possession in Ratisbon in 1653-54 have been described in some detail in an earlier chapter. There seems to have been no such attempt made in Würzburg, perhaps because of the very different status of monasteries in the prince-bishopric. The prestige of the Scots in Würzburg must also be taken into consideration. That they enjoyed greater prestige than the Ratisbon Scots in the second quarter of the century is shown, if by nothing else, by their inclusion in the works of Conn and Camerarius, where Ratisbon is hardly mentioned. Their pres-
tige as Scots was also greatly enhanced by the events and publications relating to their founder, Macarius.

Macarius must have been quite well known at Würzburg, at least among the educated, in the first years of the seventeenth century. Two mediæval accounts of his life circulated in manuscript, embodied in the *Vita Mariani* and the *Libellus*, respectively. Three works of Trithemius containing the story of Macarius also circulated in manuscript, the *Compendium* of the history of St James's and the two versions of the *Annals of Hirsau*; he had written these works while he was abbot of St James's in its German period. Two influential printed books likewise mentioned Macarius. The celebrated but anti-clerical Bavarian historian, Aventinus, dealing with the foundation of the Schottenklöster, wrote that the bishop of Würzburg summoned the learned and abstemious Macarius to his town and built a church for him; this work was published posthumously in 1554. Shortly afterwards, in 1565, Eysengrein published his book on ecclesiastical writers, giving one for each year. Under the year 1139 he had St Macarius with the story of the miracle from the forged foundation charter of St James's, taken apparently from Trithemius's *Compendium*, and to Macarius he attributed a work *de laude Martyrum*.

Nobody should underestimate the influence of either a manuscript or an early printed book. Eysengrein's paragraph on Macarius's surely apocryphal work was to be cited over the centuries, even in the entry on Macarius in the *Dictionary of National Biography* in 1893. In 1595 was published a book listing Benedictine saints and notables, among whom was Macarius; the source cited was Trithemius's *Annals of Hirsau*, clearly the first version since the date 1140 was given. That same year Francis
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Hamilton spoke of Macarius in his oration at the ceremonial opening of the monastery; one of his sources seems likewise to have been the Annals of Hirsauc, but the other version giving the date of foundation as 1134. In 1595, it should be remembered, neither version was yet in print; Tri-themius's works evidently had influence while still in manuscript.

That Macarius was the first abbot of the Würzburg Schottenkloster and had changed wine into water was one of the things the educated, or at least the learned, South German was supposed to know, even before Trithemius's account of his life was printed. There now appeared the historical and the spiritual works of Trithemius, published in 1601 and 1604 respectively. The former included the first version of his Chronicle of the ancient abbey of Hirsauc, in which under the years 1139-40 were accounts of the founding of the Würzburg monastery for the compatriots of Kilian and of the miracle worked by its first abbot, Macarius, when he turned wine into water. The spiritual works included his Compendium of the history of St James's from 1139 to the sixteenth century. Presumably this was included among the spiritual works because of the prominence it gave to the life and miracles of Macarius. At some time, too, probably in that decade, Macarius was given a place in the collections of Possevinus, the learned Jesuit who reprinted George Thomson's little treatise. Macarius was now far better known than when the principal accounts of his career were in manuscript only.

In 1614-15 there took place in Würzburg a remarkable sequence of events, which may or may not have been influenced by the publication of Trithemius's accounts of Abbot Macarius. These were the finding of Macarius's tomb, the solemn translation of his body to a place of honour.
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in the monastery church, and a series of miracles attributed to his merits. One is entitled to ask how far the finding of the tomb was due to Trithemius's drawing attention to it and its inscription, especially as a story of its miraculous discovery was later published, but one is unlikely to obtain a satisfactory answer. The best plan, therefore, is to deal with the documents in chronological order, rather than with the sequence of events as given in later documents, and to hold back comment until the documentary evidence has been given. In this way one hopes to avoid accepting the later interpretation of events in place of a record of them, and one also traces the growth of the interpretation. There will be gaps in the record but this is preferable to having them wrongly filled in.

The events of 1614-15 are vouched for by contemporary documents. The first is what appears to be a sort of diary entry recording the finding of the body of Macarius on 26th February 1614; presumably it is contemporary. It states simply that the saintly first abbot of St James's was found on that date, that he had changed wine into water, had died in 1152 and had lain hidden for 462 years. The next evidence is Julius Echter's inscription in a book on 1st February 1615 when he came to St James's for the exhumation of the body, though the inscription itself is not evidence for the exhumation. The third testimony is the oration delivered by the suffragan bishop of Würzburg, Eucharius Sang, on 31st May 1615, on the occasion of the solemn translation of Macarius's remains from the old chapel where they had lain to the monastic church. At the beginning of his oration the bishop repeated the Scottish version of history (taken, apparently, from George Thomson) in which the heresy-free
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Scots brought the gospel to other nations, witness Boniface, Colman and Kilian. The later Scottish monastic writers, incidentally, were to quote this passage of Sang frequently. To these three saints the bishop added a fourth, Macarius, and then proceeded to give his life at considerable length from Trithemius. The finding of the body, on the other hand, receives little space. Macarius, says the bishop, was buried in the place from which he has been taken today; for some years his name and memory were forgotten in this city, it was even forgotten in which part of the old chapel his body lay, but God did not wish it to remain longer in an obscure place. As to the fact that we do not venerate his relics by exposing them on altars or wearing them in lockets, as we do with other saints, the reason is that he has not yet been canonised by the holy see. When that happens, we will not fail to venerate him.

This is guarded language, especially in a flowery oration. It tells us that there was no veneration paid to Macarius and that his burial place was unknown. Evidently, therefore, the place had been discovered and the authorities had decided to remove the body to a more honourable position. The bishop says neither how the tomb was discovered nor why the body was moved; the remark 'God did not wish it to lie any longer in an obscure place' tells us nothing. One may well ask: would the bishop, who quotes Thomson and Trithemius with such fervour, have omitted all mention of supernatural intervention leading to the discovery, and of supernatural events taking place after the discovery, if he had known about them at the time? Whatever one's conclusion, from now on the 'Scottish legend' in Würzburg had acquired greater strength and new lustre.

The story of Macarius naturally found its way into the works of the
Scots glorifying the Scottish Catholic past. Dempster's *Menology* in 1622 omitted him, but two other works by the same author published that year gave him mention.\(^{28}\) In Dempster's *History* printed posthumously in 1627 Macarius was given considerable notice.\(^{29}\) To the volume attributed to Macarius by Eysengrein Dempster added two more, and he informed the reader that Macarius's family was still in Argyll. For this sort of thing, of course, Dempster can be ignored. He cites Trithemius and Possevius, for Macarius was now in the printed literature of Europe. Then comes the remark 'His body is said to have been translated to the middle of the church'. Dempster in Italy had heard something about the translation of 1615, but the story was still simple and devoid of details.

In 1628 George Conn's work spoke of the Blessed Macarius, famous for miracles,\(^{30}\) and three years later Camerarius included Macarius in a calendar of Scottish saints with his feast on 19th December.\(^{31}\) One can distinguish between writings containing only the biography of a saint (which are not merely academic as they are intended to edify) and those furthering devotion to him or at least describing the devotion that exists towards him. The technical word for this devotion is *cultus*. There is no hard and fast distinction to be drawn between the two types of writings, but attributing a feast-day to Macarius, as Camerarius did, implies that he had a cultus recognised as legitimate by the Church.

German hagiographers at once began to include Macarius in their collections. Matthew Raderus, a Jesuit, gave him a place in 1624 in a volume on Bavarian saints and cited the previous literature, both manuscript and printed.\(^{32}\) One of his sources was the manuscript history of Jerome
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Grünewald, a Carthusian writing near Ratisbon about 1616, who related what the Scots abbot of Ratisbon had told him about the recent discovery of the body. Raderus now printed this; the translation was also becoming known. A dozen years later another writer on Bavarian history, Andrew Brunner, described Macarius's career and the foundation of St James's, adding a marginal heading: The Sanctity of Blessed Macarius the Scot. It should perhaps be remarked that Aventinus and Trithemius called Macarius an Irishman, and therefore authors like Raderus did the same, but this would hardly affect the spread of Macarius's fame.

Macarius was also steadily acquiring greater significance among the Scots monks. A dozen years after the translation Alexander Baillie stated in his book that the Scots' church was frequented by the people of Franconia because of Macarius's relics there. In the autumn of 1637 Gilbert Chambers, on receiving the monastic habit at Ratisbon, took the name of Brother Macarius, and one can be sure that he and the other Scots who later took the name were called after the Würzburg abbot and not after some ancient saint from the Middle East. It is probably no coincidence that Chambers's superior at the time was Silvanus Mayne, a monk of Würzburg. When Abbot Asloan appealed to the emperor in December 1640 he quoted a prophecy of St Macarius that Germany would not defect from the Catholic faith as long as the Scots remained there. The draft petition for the formation of a Scottish Congregation, belonging most probably to the early 1640s, also shows that the cultus of Macarius had developed greatly. The travesty of classical Latin in which the petition is written makes the exact sense difficult to determine, but the petitioners wanted a plenary
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indulgence to be granted, under the usual conditions, to those who visited their churches on certain days. An addition was made in the case of Würzburg; this was 23rd January, when the relics of St Macarius exposed in the church are honoured by a great concourse of the people. 38

Other documents date from this period too. One of these, consisting of arguments that the cultus of Macarius was licit, has survived only in a late transcript, which was possibly taken from a copy made in 1679 although two references to the works of Trithemius as being composed a hundred and thirty years before show the original date of the document to be about 1640. 39 A decree of Urban VIII had forbidden the veneration of persons as saints unless certain conditions held good, such as cultus going back over a century, inclusion in the writings of the Fathers, or longstanding approval by pope or ordinary. The Würzburg document sets out to show that in Macarius's case these conditions are fulfilled. 40

The evidence is chiefly from documents: the foundation charter of St James's, a calendar and a necrology, both three centuries old, belonging to the Scots abbey in Ratisbon, and some of the printed works mentioned already.

Until it is known what sources the principal author cited, Trithemius, used for his account of Macarius, the cautious historian will not willingly attribute a date earlier than Trithemius's day to much of it. Here, however, the point is not the reliability of Trithemius's history but his place in the chain of testimonies to the cultus of Macarius. The foundation charter mentions the miracle of the wine and water and Macarius's reputation for holiness. The fact that this document, still extant, is a forgery does not invalidate it as testimony; it merely means that we must
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attribute the testimony to the date of fabrication, that is, about 1170-80, and not to the supposed date of foundation. There would seem to be no reason for rejecting the Lisbon calendars, and thus we have evidence for the fourteenth century too. Other evidence for the period before 1595 is produced: Trithemius's account book, still extant, in which he mentioned expenses for work done on the tomb of Macarius, a mid-sixteenth-century German administrator seeing to the repainting of Macarius's picture on a pillar in the church with the word Saint prefixed, and a group of three stone statues in the church representing the Madonna, St Benedict and St Macarius. The latter has a hand upraised in blessing, denoting (says a later writer) the miracle of the wine and water.

All this may not amount to very much but it shows that there was a tradition of veneration paid to Macarius. It is easily understandable that Macarius and his tomb had fallen into oblivion in the sixteenth century when Würzburg was on the brink of becoming Lutheran and St James's lay in ruins. Whatever one concludes about the seventeenth-century development of the cultus, veneration of Macarius was not itself an invention of the Scots. And about 1640 the monks, for some reason, did a certain amount of research to produce evidence for this and to prove that the cultus was lawful according to the norms laid down by the holy see.

Seventeenth-century hagiography can hardly be discussed without mention of the Belgian Jesuits, called Bollandists after the most celebrated among them, who formed the massive project of publishing the Acta Sanctorum, or critical editions of the Lives of saints. The work was to follow the calendar and deal with each saint under the date of his feast. The two volumes of the Acta Sanctorum for January were published in 1643, the inten-
tion being to cover the remaining eleven months systematically and as soon as possible. This no doubt accounts for documents of these years relating to Macarius in the Bollandist archives. The first, sent in 1645 by Peter Reichard, a Jesuit professor at Würzburg university, is in the hand of Maurus Dixon and consists of the Life of Macarius, taken from Trithemius and Bishop Sang, and a list of miracles worked at his tomb since the translation in 1615. There were four miracles in 1615, seven in 1617, one in 1618, one in 1619 and two in 1622, a total of fifteen in the years following the translation. A final miracle belonging to 1643 is added, and a note explains that there is popular devotion to Macarius and that numerous other miracles were worked, the record of which has been lost through the wars and the deaths of the monks. Some of the monks of the time are still alive but they think it best to confine themselves to the miracles committed to writing rather than risk inserting any unauthentic ones.

It is beyond the scope of this study to pass judgement on the sanctity of Macarius or the authenticity of the miracles. The acceptance of these, however, and the growth of the cultus concern the history of the Scots intimately. The impression is given that someone recorded the miracles up to 1622, then the matter was neglected until the list was asked for over twenty years later, when a final recent miracle was added to the list. Two miracles concerned noble families connected with bishops of Würzburg, while important officials are cited as witnesses, some of them still alive at the time of writing. Many of the characteristics of saints' shrines are in evidence: petitioners ask to speak to the monks or beg their prayers, sometimes at their request the tomb is opened and a silver reliquary containing Macarius's head is brought out, the grateful recipients of fav-
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ours return and make *ex-voto* offerings. Whatever one's conclusion as to
the genuineness of the cures claimed, they could hardly have been the in-
vention of the monks. The Scots accepted the miracles and made the most
of them, but they did not invent them.

In the following year, Reichard had been in touch with Abbot Asloan,
who told him that Macarius was reputed a saint and had his tomb in a place
of honour in the church but that no *Life and Miracles* existed (meaning,
obviously, no ancient *Vita*). The date of this, July 1646, is confirmed
by the Jesuit's remark that a former student of his had recently been sent
from Würzburg to Paris to look for recruits. 46 We know that Maurus Dixon,
who had studied at Würzburg university, set off on this mission in June
1646.

Three important publications were produced not long after, in the
space of half a dozen years. In 1655 the well-known Benedictine writer,
Bucelinus, published his *Menology*, which remained the classic work down to
modern times. Under 24th January he gave an account of Macarius, 47 citing
as sources Trithemius and Abbot Robert Forbes, who supplied much informa-
tion both in writing and by word of mouth; 48 Forbes had died in 1637.
The three volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum* covering February appeared in 1658.
The *Vita Mariani* was printed in full with a commentary under the 9th, the
feast of Marianus Scotus, founder of the Ratisbon *Schottenkloster*, and thus
the most important mediaeval source for Macarius was now in print. Then,
three years later appeared the book which was the most influential of the
three since it was devoted entirely to Macarius, the only one of its kind
in the seventeenth century.

In July 1660 Bolland's fellow-workers set out on a literary journey
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through Germany and Italy, in the course of which they visited Würzburg. This is perhaps what stimulated Michael Haim, doctor of theology and parish priest of St Burkard’s in the vicinity of the Scots abbey, to publish a life of Macarius in German in 1661. The work is extremely rare and there is no copy traceable outside Würzburg. One might wonder how it was possible to fill almost two hundred printed pages, even small ones, when so little is known about Macarius. But the book is frankly didactic. A chapter on, for instance, one of Macarius’s virtues consists of a sermon on the virtue coupled with the remark that Macarius was an example of it. Episodes are invented, such as Macarius attending to the spiritual welfare of the ship’s crew when he sailed from Scotland to Germany. Haim tells us that Macarius as a boy did not spend Sunday on the streets picking up bad language, which will surely make anyone smile when he reflects that the saint’s boyhood was passed in twelfth-century Ireland.

The only useful part is at the end, where Haim considers the seventeenth-century events. He gives the story of the finding of the body in detail. Gabriel Wallace, a Scots monk of great holiness, was in the habit of sleeping for only three hours and spending the rest of the night in prayer and watching. He led a most penitential life and wore an iron chain, which became half embedded in his flesh and was preserved after his death. Often, while praying at night, he heard angelic music and song in the place where Macarius lay buried, and came to the conclusion that it must mean something. He told his superior, who thought Macarius might perhaps be buried there and commanded him to investigate. He did so, began to lift the stones and found the grave and the body, with various inscriptions or writings showing that it was Macarius, who had turned wine
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into water. The discovery caused a great stir in Würzburg.

Haim goes on to tell of the present suffragan bishop in Würzburg, named Söllner, who in 1614 was studying the humanities and often recreated with the Scots student monks in their monastery, sometimes in the very chapel, ruinous and used as a wood store, where Macarius lay. Hearing of the discovery, he went to see for himself; he saw the skeleton, was filled with feelings of awe, and a beautiful odour came forth from the grave and inspired in him great devotion to Macarius. His Lordship, says Haim, was willing to testify to this under oath. For these and similar reasons Bishop Echter had the body taken with all solemnity to the choir of the church.

What is one to think of Haim's account? Gabriel Wallace was in fact a monk of St James's in 1614, and men were still living in 1661 who remembered the finding of the body. One of them, the suffragan bishop, was willing to testify under oath, not to the way in which it was found but to the impression made by the finding. Haim could hardly have printed this last had it not been true. Could he have printed the story of the miraculous finding if it was a later invention? Or, to put the question differently, could a later invention so have gained credence that it could be printed while persons who had lived through the events of 1614 were still alive?

The question here is not whether Gabriel Wallace in fact wore an iron chain, spent most of the night in prayer and heard angelic music where Macarius's body lay. It is rather whether he and everybody else believed the story of the finding at the time or whether it came into currency later. If it was current at the time, the amount of truth in it is a subject for
investigation even if not one offering much hope of success; if it came into currency later, it can be dismissed as an invention. In favour of its early currency is the undoubted fact that something must have induced Bishop Echter to make the solemn translation. To this must be added Haim's citing the living suffragan bishop as witness to the stir caused by the finding, and his juxtaposition of the whole story of the miraculous finding. Clearly the bishop and others who had lived through the events accepted the story in 1661.

Against this is the complete lack of reference in the 1615 oration to anything out of the ordinary about the finding. The translation could have been due to nothing more than finding the epitaph described by Tri- themius about 1510: 'Here lies Macarius, first abbot of this church, through whom God changed wine into water.' Dempster had heard before 1625 (when he died) of the translation but apparently not of any miraculous events. Camerarius in 1631 was in exactly the same position. In 1645 Dixon made out a list of the miracles following the translation but said nothing about any events before it. Quite apart from the nature of the events (which sound like stereotyped hagiography, in the bad sense of the word), is it likely, or even possible, that they were known in Würzburg in 1615 yet Dempster and Camerarius had not heard of them fifteen years later, while Bishop Sang and, later, Maurus Dixon in Würzburg did not consider them calling for mention? The more one reflects on this, the less likely it seems. Far more likely is that in the forty-seven years between the finding and Haim's book, even while elderly people in Würzburg could remember the translation, the legend came into being.

Haim's book contained a list of miracles, the same as the list made
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out by Dixon, but omitting the first, and based probably, as we have seen, on some list compiled by 1622. He also tells of relics of Macarius sent by Abbot Asloan to Cardinal Francesco Barberini, and of other relics venerated by the Jesuit professor, Reichard. The Macarius story had reached maturity. The liturgical celebration of his feast, however, still had a long way to go. In the year 1679-80 this was advanced a decisive step forward.

On 22nd December 1679 the abbot and monks of St James's petitioned the bishop's councillors for permission to celebrate Macarius's feast with a solemn sung Mass and panegyric and to announce it from the pulpit beforehand. The reply is not clear, because the surviving document breaks off abruptly in the middle of a sentence. It said, however, that unless the feast had been kept from time immemorial (for canon lawyers, a century) with a Mass of the saint even if not with solemnity, the Scots would have to show that Macarius had at least been beatified by the holy see, and the request could then be considered again. Although the power of local bishops in the matter of reputation for sanctity has been restricted by the legislation of Urban VIII in 1625... and here the document ends abruptly. The word 'although', however, suggests that the officials were modifying their refusal. Certainly, whatever it was precisely that they were saying and whatever the Scots replied, the outcome was satisfactory.

At some later date the Scots addressed themselves to the bishop. He had given them leave a few months before to celebrate the feast of St Macarius, so they, not wishing to go wrong, were asking what rite and solemnity they could use and in particular whether they could announce it to the people and give a panegyric. One should interpret the language of
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these requests and replies in the light of legislation controlling strictly all authorisation for public veneration of saints. This is doubtless why the Scots mentioned the public panegyric and public announcement in particular. The reply came on 2nd October 1680. They could continue the cultus of the Blessed Father Macarius in their church and celebrate his feast on his day of death, 23rd January, with public solemnity and a festive sermon if there was a concourse of the people. This is a legal Latin document, almost certainly drawn up by canon lawyers, and as such must be carefully interpreted. Leave is given to continue the cultus, not to inaugurate anything, and it is confined to this one church. We shall perhaps never know if the Scots had been keeping the feast liturgically already.

It cannot be a coincidence that the Scots produced their version of the Life of Macarius in the same year as they petitioned for his feast to be solemnly kept. At least three extant MS copies contain the 1679 version. It is probably no coincidence either that Abbot Maxwell assumed office that year. The Life is the same as its forerunners, namely, an account of the saint's life taken from Trithemius, the miraculous finding by Gabriel Wallace, the translation, and the miracles worked at the new tomb. There are one or two curious features about the list of miracles. The fifteen between 1615 and 1622 are the same as in the earlier lists except that one has been inserted. On the tenth day after the translation, that is, in June 1615, a large bone was seen in Macarius's old tomb although the contents of it had been thoroughly sifted at the time of the translation and many visitors had inspected the tomb without seeing it. It was duly taken to the new tomb. Now, even the most ardent believer in miracles
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prefers them to have some purpose. The Scots in 1679 would surely not have invented so pointless a story, but where did they get it from after sixty-four years? Perhaps it was in the original list and was omitted by Dixon and Haim, who saw no point in recording it. A second curious feature is the omission of the 1643 miracle mentioned in the earlier lists, as well as of a miracle in 1661 recorded in one MS. The list thus jumps from 1622 to 1674, which has one miracle, then there are two in 1679, the year of writing, and a concluding paragraph to the effect that cures and thanksgiving for cures are an almost daily occurrence. But this list of miracles, with its gap of half a century in the middle, was copied and recopied by the Scots.

In 1679, too, the Benedictine Bucelinus published a chronicle of his order, in which, under the years 1614-15, he gave space to the finding of Macarius's body and the subsequent miracles, quoting from Haim. This was the third Benedictine publication in a dozen years to feature Macarius. The earlier two were like each other in that they took only one saint for each day and were illustrated. In each of them Macarius was promoted to being the principal Benedictine saint on 24th January and was portrayed sitting at table with the pope and seeing in a vision the collapse of his church tower in Würzburg. This was a story in Trithemius's Compendium. The second of the two productions is hagiography of the worst type, with the lushest of language and a wealth of fictitious incidents and conversation pieces, the pious equivalent of a historical novel.

Bernard Maxwell wrote to his fellow Scots abbot in Ratisbon telling him of the permission to keep Macarius's feast with solemnity. Presumably January 1681 was the first time it was done. Nothing is said about this
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occasion in Maxwell’s surviving letters, but he describes how in January 1682 there was a conourse of people and a sermon preached by a Jesuit. A year later he told Fleming that the congregation was reduced because of bad weather but was still good. The keeping of the feast of Blessed Macarius by the Scots on 23rd January had become an annual feature of Würzburg life.

There are many gaps in the documents and the chain of evidence, but what has survived is enough to show the growth of a cultus from nothing to a widely popular, officially approved veneration, with public liturgical solemnity but confined to one particular church. Its development is fascinating to watch. Two other miracles are recorded for the early 1680s and two for 1688, one of the latter being the cure of the infant Prince of Wales. The cures listed from the beginning mention epilepsy and diseases of the head more frequently than other afflictions, which is probably why King James and his queen sent for a relic of Macarius. The request shows that Macarius’s cultus was widespread; the subsequent cure attributed to him helped to spread it still further. Before the end of the century the Scots were observing two feasts of Macarius, the feast itself on 23rd January and the translation on 31st May, possibly with permission from Rome, which Abbot Maxwell had been asking Will Leslie to obtain as early as the autumn of 1681.

This concludes the story of Macarius as far as the scope of this work is concerned. The significance of it is its effect on the status of the Scots in Würzburg. One can imagine the sermons that were preached: about the Scot Kilian bringing the gospel to Franconia, the Scots abbey being founded in Kilian’s honour, and its first abbot, the Scot Macarius, still
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working wonders by divine favour in Würzburg. They, the Scots monks, were following in the footsteps of Kilian and Macarius, they were heirs to a long and noble tradition.

There is much more that could be said about the cultus of Macarius, for instance, on the various days ascribed to his feast, but it would take one too far from the history of the Scots. One might also show that this example of the growth of a cultus was not unique but could be paralleled in that century and that part of Germany. Macarius became known among Scottish Protestants, too, if not for the same reasons, and was given a place in George Mackenzie's *Writers of the Scots Nation* in 1708 and eventually in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

A few words should be said, however, on the subsequent story of Macarius. His cultus developed further in the eighteenth century. In 1731 a confraternity of St Macarius was formed, which received grants of indulgences from Rome. His remains were taken from their tomb in 1771 and set on an altar dedicated to him, then in 1818, when St James's was no longer a monastery, solemnly translated to the Marienkapelle in the market square. There were special ceremonies and veneration during the octave of his feast, and he was regarded as one of the patron saints of Würzburg. Devotion to St Macarius lasted into the twentieth century, and he still has a place in the diocesan calendar. In 1945 the remains were damaged in the air-raids, taken to a place of safety and somehow lost. Thus ended the story of Macarius, but in the Marienkapelle is still to be seen the stone tombstone of 1615, with an effigy of Macarius bearing in one hand a crosier and in the other a wine beaker.

Perhaps the last word should rest with the Bollandists. In the re-
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63 For the later period see Reid, f. 105r, 107-08; Gropp, II, 123-27; H. Dünninger, "Processio Peregrinationis", in *WDGB*, xxiii, 105-06; *Verehrung des heiligen Makarius* (Würzburg, 1907), 28-47.
print of the February volumes in 1735, their commentary added a note to
the relevant passage in the *Vita Mariani*: 'We shall deal more fully with
him under 19th December, which is the day of death of Bl. Macarius.' 64
The Bollandists were accepting Macarius as a saint, even if not a techni-
cally canonised one, and as worthy of inclusion in their scientific pro-
duction. On the other hand, the documents on Macarius from their archives
were placed under the heading of 19th December together with some other
lesser-known saints, and the names were followed by the significant word
Omissi. 65 The volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum* for December have not yet
appeared, but when the one dealing with 19th December is published, it is
unlikely that Bl. Macarius, Abbot and Confessor, will have a place in it.

64 *Vita Mar.* 371, note d.
65 BKB, MS 8979-82, f. 1r.

From the point of view of study and scholarship, the Würzburg abbey was given a very fair start indeed. The Ratisbon abbot who set it on its course was John James Whyte, a man with a considerable reputation for theological learning since it was he who had been chosen as the Catholic champion in a public disputation with a Protestant theologian in Bavaria. The first Scots abbot of Würzburg, Richard Irvine, was a graduate of St Andrews. The first prior, soon to be elected abbot, was Francis Hamilton, who quickly gained a reputation for scholarship. Hamilton delivered the speech at the official opening ceremony of the monastery, a Latin oration containing quite lengthy passages from authors, both pagan and Christian, as well as Greek quotations. We can presume that nobody in the audience was left in any doubt as to Hamilton's classical education. The oration was printed and so preserved for posterity. It would have survived to the twentieth century as a rare pamphlet but was given wider circulation by

1 References given in previous chapters will, in general, not be repeated.
being included in an eighteenth-century collection of Würzburg material, whose learned editor describes Hamilton as a man of great erudition and eloquence who knew Greek, and the oration as being learnedly and elegantly delivered. 2

Rather more than a year later, in August 1596, Hamilton matriculated at Würzburg university and that same year he defended a thesis on the invocation of saints for the degree of Baccalaureatus Biblicus. The printed synopsis of 84 pages, 3 dedicated to Whyte, did not omit to mention the latter's theological studies in Rome and his public disputation with the Protestant champion at Ratisbon. Less than a year later Hamilton, now with a degree, defended a thesis for the further degree of Baccalaureatus Formatus, on the legitimate veneration of saints by sacred images. 4 The word thesis is used in each case for want of a better one; he does not seem to have written a dissertation but to have announced propositions which he was prepared to explain and defend. This was what we would now call post-graduate work, for he was already a priest and was prior, as the title-page in each case declared. The publication of the theses gained Hamilton a place in Ziegelbauer's list of Benedictine theologians. 5

A year later the third member of the community, John Stuart, matriculated. Almost certainly the Scots were aiming to fulfill the condition made by Bishop Echter in the deed of foundation, that one monk was to teach theology publicly in the university. It is a fact, however, that all professors in Würzburg university, except in medicine and law, were Jesuits right up to the suppression of the society in 1773. 6 The Jesuits were zealous and learned men but did not err in the direction of welcoming

2 Gropp, I, x.
3 De Sanctorum invocatione... (Würzburg, 1596). Copies in EUL, BL.
4 De legitimo Sanctorum cultu per sacras imagines... (Würzburg, 1597). Copy in BM.
5 See p. 65, n. 13.
6 A. Lindner, Die Schriftsteller...des Benediktiner-Ordens in Bayern (Regensburg, 1880), I, 27.
collaborators from outside their ranks. No Scot seems ever to have had a teaching post at Würzburg university. The same appears to be true also as regards Salzburg university, founded in 1623 by the joint efforts of fifty-seven Benedictine abbeys; no seventeenth-century Scot taught in it, although an occasional Schwarzach monk did so.

The part played by the Scots in the life of Würzburg university was, nevertheless, at times quite considerable. The election of three abbots as Rector Magnificus has already been mentioned. The matriculation of monks who were clearly students is very unevenly distributed. After the two Scots at the end of the sixteenth century there is a gap until the arrival of aspirants from Douai, when, in 1624-25, four monks matriculated to study theology and physics. One of them, Richard Tod, gained first place among the Masters in 1626. Leaving aside the rectorship of Abbot Ogilvie, there are only two matriculations in the next sixty years: Maurus Dixon and Placid Keith, in 1641 and 1654 respectively. In 1686 Augustine Gordon of Ratisbon matriculated in order to study theology and canon law, then in 1694-95 four Scottish monks, two from Ratisbon and two from Würzburg, enrolled as students of theology or metaphysics.

It is not a particularly distinguished record, but one has to remember that a number of monks, such as Silvanus Mayne or Ambrose Cook, were graduates of a Scottish university. At the beginning of the century some had followed the Scottish custom of completing their education at a continental university; such were Alexander Baillie at Helmstedt and Thomas Duff (probably) at Braunsberg. Others had studied theology at Rome, like James Brown during the Swedish occupation of Würzburg or, more usually, as students at the Scots college before becoming monks. There is always danger

7 *ibid.* I, 25; Molitor, I, 382-83.
8 Wolff, 307.
9 Bellesheim, III, 456.
in trying to equate formal training with scholarship or indeed with any of
the fruits of true education. Marianus Irvine, for example, may or may
not have pursued a course at some institute of higher studies but there is
no doubt about his dedication to the study and teaching of philosophy and
theology. All in all, taking into consideration the letters which the
monks wrote and the subjects they wrote about, the notebooks they filled
and the texts they transcribed, one gains the impression that the level of
education and scholarship was at least adequate. The monastery produced
no well-known scholar or writer - Wieland was right in saying that Tri-
themius was the only famous one\(^{10}\) - and aimed at no works of erudition such
as the Maurists produced, but the climate of learning in it bears, at
least, comparison with monasteries today and was probably infinitely better
than in sixteenth-century monasteries.

The Würzburg Scots had the inestimable advantage of a good library,
and also the particular benefit afforded through the famous scholar Tri-
themius having been abbot of the monastery in its German days. When St
James's was secularised in 1803, sixty-eight manuscript volumes were trans-
ferred from its library to the university library.\(^{11}\) Roughly two thirds
belong to the sixteenth century or earlier, and of these a fair number are
known to have belonged to Trithemius or to have been actually written by
him. A catalogue of the monastic library about 1615, made out on twenty
blank leaves of a folio manuscript volume,\(^{12}\) has survived. According to
this, there were then twenty-nine manuscript volumes in the library;
whether the others dating from before 1615 were not yet in the possession
of the monastery or were simply omitted from the list, it is impossible to
say.

\(^{10}\) Wieland, 99.
\(^{11}\) O. Handwerker, "Ueberschau über die fränkischen Handschriften der Würz-
burger Universitäts-Bibliothek", in AU, lxi, 62.
\(^{12}\) Wz. UB, M.ch.f. 130, fol. 2-20.
Though the library of Trithemius had been broken up before the Scots arrived in 1595, one can surmise that a residue of it formed the nucleus of the monastery's collection of printed books. The catalogue of 1615, the only surviving one from the Würzburg of Julius Echter, lists about three hundred books arranged according to subject into six classes (theology, patristics, history, etc.), some of which are divided into sections. There are also alphabetical lists of two of these classes. It should be noted, too, that the catalogue may not be complete, because some leaves have been cut out from the volume, possibly after the lists were compiled. An analysis of the books would be outside the scope of the present work, and the library has of course been long since broken up, but in spite of the rudimentary nature of the catalogue and its apparently haphazard procedure in giving dates of publication, one can see that the books cover the whole period from the fifteenth century to 1615. A quarter at least were published in the twenty years since the coming of the Scots, and the proportion was no doubt in reality higher, because a great many do not give the date of publication. Scottish writers are included in the list: Sir John Skene, James Gordon the Jesuit, the Basilikon Doron.

Books published since 1595 were obviously acquired by the Scots, who no doubt also acquired books published before that date. Some books in their library were brought from Ratisbon to Würzburg, perhaps by the first pioneer community. One of the previous German administrators had had a stamp with the abbey coat-of-arms made for the covers of books; this the Scots continued to use until 1620. There is in fact ample evidence, including the catalogue, for the interest taken by Ogilvie's community in the library. Bishop Echter, too, showed his zeal for theological studies.

13 Wieland, 66; Schott, 103.
14 Schott, 104.
On 1st February 1615, on the occasion of one of the ceremonies in connection with the translation of Macarius's newly found body, he gave a number of books to the library, and in one of them, a volume of St Cyril of Alexandria, he wrote with his own hand that the gift was made in order that the monks should devote to *lectio sacra* the time left over from their spiritual duties.  

When the Swedes came Ogilvie remained in Würzburg and indeed was *persona grata* with them. The library of St James's was spared, with the result that (say) the autograph works of Trithemius are still in Würzburg today and not in Uppsala. Later abbots added to the library; of Maurus Dixon and Bernard Maxwell the chronicle states expressly that they encouraged study and bought books. The inventory made at Dixon's death in 1679 listed five hundred volumes of some size, excluding small books. The library continued to develop, as we know from various descriptions at the end of the eighteenth century, which was the age of literary "Journeys". One of them put the number of books at eight thousand and considered it the most valuable, even though not the largest, collection in Würzburg.

The monastery had other treasures too, for example, the manuscript prayer-book said to have belonged to Mary Queen of Scots. In 1795 the monks had formed the intention of making a gallery of their notable paintings. Though we do not know when these were acquired, it is possible that the earlier ones were in St James's before the end of the seventeenth century. A list of the most notable portraits was sent to Edinburgh and passed on to the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland in 1788, while in the following decade a Würzburg antiquary also described what he found.
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15 Schott, 103-04; A. Wendehorst, "Die Dekanatsbibliothek zu Karlstadt am Main", in *Die Mainlände*, v, 11-12.
16 Wieland, 67.
17 Bundschuh, V, 194.
18 Wz. UB, M.p.th.d. 2. For a description see IR, xv, 96-97.
19 IR, vi, 145; *Taschenbuch* (1795), 200-01.
There was a portrait of General Alexander Hamilton, who fought under Gustavus Adolphus, by Van Dyck; one of Mary Stuart, supposed to be an original; busts of James I, II, III and V on wood, thought to be by Holbein; a portrait of James VI and his queen; portraits of Abbots Trithemius and Aslozan. All have disappeared or were destroyed in the air-raids of 1945, except for that of Mary Stuart, which has the execution scene inset in one corner and is certainly not an original. Some paintings formerly in St James's may have been by John Alexander, of the well-known Aberdeen family of painters, who died as a monk of Würzburg in 1682, aged only twenty-four.

The monks made use of their library. Naturally those studying for the priesthood would do so, especially if they were doing their theology at home, as for instance they did under Marianus Irvine. Those already ordained no doubt used it too, particularly the few who wrote learned works. Trithemius may have been the only well-known writer belonging to St James's but there were some lesser lights among the Scots. Francis Hamilton can hardly be called a writer, however, even if he did have three booklets published in his name; the first was a spoken address which was later considered worth printing, and the others consisted of bald lists of statements which he was prepared to defend for a degree in theology. In 1612 John Stuart, like Hamilton a founder member of the Würzburg community but now prior of Ratisbon, proposed to write a life of Mary Stuart. The German Jesuit historian, James Gretser, commended his proposal and told him where material could be found for it, but Stuart died two years later without, as far as we know, embarking on the project.

20 Aslozan's portrait was, however, already reproduced (see p. 101.)
21 Now in a store-room of the Residenz. One must presume it is the picture formerly in St. James's.
23 As he is in x, 124; McRoberts, Essays, 272.
24 Bellesheim, III, 450-51.
The only literary composition which was printed and which we know for certain was written by a Würzburg Scot was a book of religious controversy by Alexander Baillie, published at Würzburg in 1628 and bearing the uncompromising title: *A true information of the unhallowed offspring, progresse and impoisoned fruits of our Scottish-Calvinian gospel and gospellers.*

It goes without saying that Baillie's purpose was to instruct his readers and convince them that Calvinism was wrong and Catholicism right, and he wrote the book because he thought he could achieve something by it. The particular reason for the book, however, was that 'not long agoe some travelling Scotsmen', having come to Würzburg, 'crave earnestly' to be instructed in Catholic teaching. So said Baillie in the dedication to Abbot Ogilvie, and he said something very similar in his Preface to the Reader: that he himself and others had learned to doubt the truth of Calvinism, had come abroad and freely turned Catholic. The book was written in a hurry. Even if there had been no reference in the Preface to the 'importunity and haste' of the travelling Scots, the reader would realise this, for in the first part of the book the letter \( w \) is represented by \( \text{vu} \), and \( h \) is italic. In the middle of printing the book the printer obtained the letters he wanted from Frankfurt. In Würzburg, of course, Gothic type was used for German, while Roman type would only be used for Latin, in which \( w \) is not found and \( h \) occurs less frequently than in Scots or English.

The language of the book is English, but with enough Scots spellings or words or turns of speech for the Scottish Text Society to have published extracts from it.  

Baillie's style is fluent and fairly straightforward, at its best when the subject-matter is homely and concrete. Some pieces of homespun wisdom, which have the appearance of proverbs or folk sayings,
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25 STC, 1202. Copy in NLS.

26 Catholic Tractates, ed. T.G. Law (1901), 269-78.
are worth quoting: It is good fisching in drumlie waters (p. 16), fooles are ay faine of flitting (p. 17), like the bairns of Lasmahagow, who saw never a fairer Abbey nor their own (p. 31). For the modern reader, however, the intemperance of Baillie's language in speaking of his opponents becomes tedious. Two examples must suffice: Knox is 'a most pernicious parasite and faithles flatterer', while the devil, 'that great grandfather of Calvin and old enimie of mankind...inspired every one of those sacriligious hellshounds (the persons who 'cast down' the churches in Scotland) with his flaming sprit of malice and blasphemie' (1, 7).

The book has three parts, one exposing the errors of Protestantism, the next showing Catholicism to be true, and the third dealing with various controverted subjects. The first part takes the reformers in turn, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and finally Knox; it is the chapters on Knox and Scotland that are the most interesting in the book, not because of their theological content but because of the picture they give of Scottish Catholic attitudes, and to some extent of Scotland itself, in the seventh decade after 1560. Baillie, for instance admits the harm done to the pre-reformation church by bad pastors and worldly prelates (p. 20-21). His interest in Edinburgh is apparent, and his knowledge of the town is considerable. He laments the downcasting of Holyrood and other churches and gives a detailed description of St Giles's. He imagines Christ 'now entring in at S. Giles', seeing its state and the secular uses to which it was being put, and grieving more than when he ejected the money-lenders from the temple. Baillie also gives a paraphrase, adapted to Edinburgh, of Christ weeping over Jerusalem for its rejection of him. He tells how he himself first gazed sadly on the ruins of Arbroath abbey church, and though he does not
say so he evidently knew Edinburgh well and was not afraid to give a contemporary description of it (I, 7, 8). Surely he had seen it since leaving Scotland in or before 1612; most probably he had returned to Scotland and visited Edinburgh in 1622, less than six years before writing this book.

It might be interesting to investigate Baillie's statements about events in Scotland (I, 9), for instance the murder of Cardinal Beaton, in an attempt to discover either their accuracy or their coming into circulation. His aim here is to portray the 'impoisoned fruits' of the Reformation, in other words the lamentable events in Scotland. A few pages are on the sufferings of Queen Mary Stuart. This is evidently an important section in Baillie's view, for on the blank verso of the title-page is a note in large type telling the reader to see chapter 9 for Marie Stuart.

The second part, on the marks of the true church, shows Baillie as a shrewd controversialist with a knowledge of Scotland rather than as a divinity scholar. He has an interesting comparison between the true church and Edinburgh. Supposing some envious people have built a village nearby and claim that theirs is the true Edinburgh, what should the earnest enquirer do? He should seek the origin of each in the available chronicles, and he should learn the distinguishing marks of the true Edinburgh: the cloven ridge of land running down to the east, one of the fairest streets of Europe, the loch to the north, Arthur Seat to the east, the castle to the west, and so on. Then let him judge whether the old town or the new village fits the description of the real Edinburgh (II, 2). Baillie makes the most of the struggle of the Kirk with King James. Has the Kirk no head but Christ, as the reformers used to insist against the
papists, or is the king its head? (II, 5).

The third part fills almost half the volume and is the least interesting, though it may well have been the most useful for the Scots expatriates who desired instruction. Twenty-four short chapters deal with the chief points of doctrine on which Catholics and Protestants disagree. Only occasionally does Baillie give glimpses of the Scottish scene. It is still the custom in Scotland for heirs or executors to give a burial-feast for those who accompany the corpse to the grave, the relic (he says) of feeding the poor, who would then pray for the deceased's soul in purgatory (p. 178-79), and he supplies a cautionary tale of the man who dared to yoke his plough on yule-day itself and was punished by a mishap, as all Scotland knows (p. 209).

Baillie wrote the dedication to Abbot Ogilvie on St Mungo's day, 13th January 1628. Silvanus Mayne, deputed to act as censor as it was in a foreign language, approved it. Then on 24th May the vicar-general of Würzburg diocese gave an imprimatur to this little book in the Scottish language, as he termed it. It has, as far as one knows, no place in the history of post-reformation controversy. It was not written in reply to any book, nor did it evoke a reply. Perhaps it never circulated in Scotland. Its interest in the history of the Würzburg abbey is that it reveals how Protestant Scots came to Würzburg and were influenced by their Benedictine compatriots, and that it shows Alexander Baillie as a writer with a bent for historical work.

There was one monk who produced literary work as against scholarly or instructional writing. This was Thomas Duff, who was making his noviciate at the time of Ogilvie's election in 1615 and remained at Würzburg until
after the Swedish occupation. His medium was poetry, and classical Latin poetry at that (in other words, the metre depended on quantity, not on word accent), but he can hardly be called a humanist, for his choice of subject matter was anything but literary. The impression one gets is that he had a thorough knowledge of Latin and a great interest in its possibilities as a literary medium, but rather to serve a linguistic hobby than as a vehicle for genuine poetry. His verses are notable for ingenuity and not for literary inspiration. Even if the poems themselves did not reveal this, the amount of purely verbal juggling (acrostics, chronograms, and so on) to be found in his autograph book of verse would make one suspect it. Really the medium is everything; there is no poetic vision struggling to find expression in words.

When this has been said, however, his poems still have much to commend them. They do not fall flat, because Duff did not aim higher than he was able to reach. They convey adequately what he wants to say and they do so in language which does not jar and is at times felicitous. For instance, the poems addressed to the aged Abbot Whyte (one of them based on the Scots song 'Lowse thy pock, Laurie') successfully create the atmosphere of calm and peace when life's work is over (f. 60rv). Many of the verses were composed for some occasion, such as the feast-day of a fellow monk or the visit of a dignitary or to thank a benefactor. This is obviously versifying and not poetry. Others have a lofty subject, like the poems to St Andrew (f. 48v-49r); at the other end of the scale are scurrilous ones addressed to Abbot Algeo of Ratisbon (f. 20r-21r). Somewhere in between come such compositions as that on the Scots doctor who cured Henry VIII's toothache (f. 68r), or the one to the swarthy girl marrying the lame

27 Duff (see Abbreviations).
cobbler (f. 60v). After Macarius's body was found, Duff composed a poem asking the saint to reverse his miracle and change the water of his well to wine (the only reference we have anywhere to Macarius's well), so that the Scots can sell it and have money to repair his chapel (f. 40v). One can easily imagine not everyone being pleased by this poem. The lot of a poet could be hard: the book of poems was confiscated by the prior at one point, and there is a poem on the imprisonment he underwent (presumably in the monastery) for prophesying some disaster in 1618 (f. 65v).

As Duff's facility for versifying became known beyond the confines of the monastery, he was asked to compose poems or inscriptions in verse to mark events. Thus he provided an inscription with a chronogram for the church of the Conventual Franciscans in Würzburg restored by Julius Echter, and a poem to be recited by a student when Echter's successor was received in the Würzburg seminary (f. 58v). His compositions are thus valuable not only for the information they provide on his own career and the affairs of St James's but also for the history of religious houses and churches in Würzburg diocese at the time.28

In one matter Duff's poems are of much more than local interest. He composed five on the career and death of Alexander Montgomerie,30 one of the better-known Scots poets, who simply disappears from the records in 1597. The year 1611 has been suggested by scholars as the date of his death. Duff, however, describes Montgomerie, who was born at the latest about 1550, as being cut off in his prime; a date of death as near as

28 Printed in Gropp, I, 420. Another inscription by him is printed ibid. 425. It is not known if the various poems ibid. 420, 686, 690, 691 are by Duff.

29 As the catalogue description in Wz. UB affirms.

possible to 1597 is thus called for. The poems also tell how Montgomerie intended to become a monk at Würzburg but was prevented from doing so by his untimely death, and they suggest strongly that he did visit Würzburg at the time of its restoration in 1595. Most interesting of all, however, the poems describe the extraordinary circumstances of Montgomerie's funeral. He was refused burial in consecrated ground by the Calvinist ministers, who had shut their churches and forbidden the bells to be rung. There was general consternation at this, and after a successful appeal to the king the funeral took place under royal escort, with the bells rung after all. Most probably the king was James VI, not yet departed for London. The solution of the problem does not concern the Würzburg Scots, but it seems quite likely that Duff's poems may lead to the discovery of where and when Alexander Montgomerie was buried.

There is another connection between Duff and Montgomerie. In 1631 there was published a Latin translation in hexameters of Montgomerie's long poem, *The Cherrie and the Slae*, the translator being designated by the initials T.D.S.P.M.B.P.P. Students of Scottish literature have not understood that the place of publication, *Arctauni Francorum*, was Würzburg, and the initials have commonly been taken to represent Thomas Dempster. Almost certainly, however, they represent Thomas Duff, who was alive and in Würzburg in 1631 whereas Dempster had died in Italy in 1625. The attribution to Dempster demands that his manuscript was preserved and then published posthumously in another country yet without revealing his identity, even though another of his works was published posthumously at Bologna, where he had lived, and had his name on the title-page. Duff's authorship, on the other hand, is positively supported by his interest in

31 The arguments for Duff's authorship have been fully set out by M. Dilworth, "The Latin translator of *The Cherrie and the Slae*" to appear in *Studies in Scottish Literature* (1968).
Montgomerie, his passion for Latin versification, and two indirect testimonies: one is that Duff had poems published, yet no publication besides this is known; the other is that a Scottish religious house on the continent was responsible for the translation. We know, too, that Duff had some connection with the 1631 Würzburg translation, since it contains as an appendix two poems which can be shown to be by him. It is thus almost certain that Duff himself translated The Cherrie and the Slae into Latin. The initials on the title-page can very plausibly be taken to stand for Thomas Duff Scotus Poeta Monachus Benedictinus Professus Presbyter, that is, Thomas Duff, Scotsman and poet, a professed Benedictine monk and a priest.

One can agree with the second of the testimonies referred to above, which describes the translation as 'Latin Verses, with the same number of foot and unisons as in the Original; A stupendious work indeed! fitt for the acute witts, of that Scottish friary (beyond our Seas) which undertook it'. Duff, however, has hitherto received no credit for this 'stupendious work' from posterity. One wonders if something similar has happened with another Scots monk, Columbanus Fraser, who was described in the almost contemporary chronicle as having died during Maurus Dixon's abbacy, a native of Buchan, a poet and notable for innocence of life.32 The necrologies list him as dying in the years 1676-78 and call him a notable poet. In spite of this, not a single composition of his is known.

The field in which the Würzburg Scots produced most of their literary work was Scottish history and what they imagined to be Scottish history, namely the apocryphal early history of Scotland and the exploits of the Scotic monks. They wrote the history of their own house, as is almost

32 Chronicle.
inevitable in a Benedictine monastery, where the monks have taken a vow of stability to the house. Not only are all bound by lasting ties to the same community, but the community is of its nature bound to a particular place. Tradition, in its various senses, is inevitably strong, more so probably than in any remote Highland glen or Hebridean island. When persons or places are mentioned, everyone knows who or what is meant. In the monastery, too, the stones and the documents have, barring some accident, survived from the past, enabling any monk with an antiquarian interest to investigate his community's history.

The Würzburg Scots hardly needed to investigate (or invent) their past history. The learned Trithemius had done it for them, and they had inherited the copy of the *Compendium* written in his own hand. An inscription written by Bishop Johann Gottfried shows that it was in the possession of the Scots during his rule (1617-22). The *Compendium* had also been printed in 1604 with a supplement continuing it to 1548. What is surprising is not so much that Scots themselves continued the account into the seventeenth century as that they only did so in 1679. (If there were earlier attempts to bring Trithemius's work up to date, they have not survived). Trithemius's *Compendium* of the history of St James's began with the forged foundation deed of 1140 and the life of the first abbot, Macarius, recounting his three chief miracles and a posthumous one of a century later; then it outlined the documents surviving from Macarius's abbacy, adding a note on the ceremonies to be performed when the bishop's body was brought to St James's, and described Macarius's tombstone. The other abbots follow in chronological order, with documents cited or given in full, down to the death of the last Irish abbot in 1497. Here Trithemius sup-

33 Wz. UB, M.ch.f. 126, fol. 145r-153v.
34 Catalogue description in Wz. UB.
plies the papal document authorising the introduction of German monks and adds a note on the need there was for a reform. The narrative ends at 1509, when he himself was abbot.

In 1679 the Scots were very much interested in Macarius and were petitioning for leave to celebrate his feast liturgically. The continuation and adaptation of Trithemius's chronicle reflects this. What the Scottish editor did was as follows: he made the account of Macarius chronological by omitting mention of the documents which had survived from his abbacy and inserting the description of his tombstone before the posthumous miracle. Then at once he added the miraculous finding of the tomb, the translation of 1615, and a list of miracles down to 1679. The series of abbots then follows from 1153 to the election of Bernard Maxwell in 1679.

This compilation, entitled the *Chronicon* of the abbey, is thus really two distinct narratives: the life and cultus of Macarius, and the history of the monastery divided according to the abbots' reigns. What is taken from Trithemius is not merely repeated verbatim; for instance, the text of a twelfth-century document is inserted. Every reference in any way derogatory to the early monks, presumed to be Scots, is omitted or altered. Where Trithemius said that Macarius came from Ireland to Franconia, one now finds Scotland instead; where Trithemius justified the reform of 1497, his Scottish adapter excuses the supposed Scots and remarks on Trithemius's prejudice.

A decade later, in 1690, we have another development of Trithemius's chronicle; this time the miracles of Macarius are omitted, except for the changing of wine into water, which is relevant to the history of the monastery. The compilation is entitled *Series Abbatum*. The author has added

35 *Chronicon* (see Abbreviations).
a short prologue and the text of a very early document, and has adapted Trithemius in places. For instance, he tells how Macarius was a Benedictine monk of Iona and came to Ratisbon, then to Würzburg. He also gives his sources, usually Trithemius supplemented by some other material, such as the book of ceremonies for the bishop's funeral rites. Wherever Trithemius had criticised the early monks, this Scot corrects him vigorously. It seems clear that this work is independent of the Chronicon of ten years before, in both the early and later parts. The later, Scottish period is treated quite differently: there is, for the first time, the story of the 1595 restoration being due to Julius Echter's miraculous recovery, and where the Chronicon had merely a few bald dates, descriptions of the doings of the Scots abbots are now given.

There is also found, at the same time as this Series Abbatum, a Vita Macarii which uses the material omitted by the former. The two are found together in a volume dated 1691. The Life is in no way original, since the mediaeval stories come from Trithemius, and the events of 1614-15 and subsequent miracles were in Haim's book on Macarius (to which the Series Abbatum referred the reader) as well as in the Chronicon of 1679. In fact the Life is described by its title as excerpted from Trithemius and other sources. The authorship is not important since it is a mere scissors-and-paste compilation; for what it is worth, however, the man responsible seems to have been Alan Chisholm. This attribution, at least, is found added to a later copy, while a version in Chisholm's hand has also been preserved. It is quite likely, too, that Chisholm was responsible for the Series Abbatum, since the version of 1690 is in his hand.

Of their nature chronicles need bringing up to date, so it is no sur-

36 See Note at end of chapter for extant MSS of the two works.
37 Dennistoun, f. 337v.
prise to find additions in the manuscripts. The last miracle in the life of Macarius was in 1679, but naturally the cure of the infant Prince of Wales and other divine favours were added. Chisholm brought his autograph copy of Series Abbatum up to date as far as 1699; the version of 1691 contains an addition in another hand, seemingly that of Gregory Cheyne,\(^{38}\) recording Abbot Cook's vicissitudes; another version has details of events down to 1701. The various additions, being more or less contemporary, make the dozen years from 1688 to 1700 one of the best documented periods of the century. Probably what occasioned, or at least stimulated, this activity was the sending to the Maurists of a copy bringing the history of St James's up to date to 1690.

**NOTES**\(^{39}\)

**MSS of Series Abbatum**

1. 1690 version in the hand of Alan Chisholm, continued by him to 1699 (Wz. UB, M.ch.q. 56).

2. 1691 version in an unknown hand, continued by Gregory Cheyne (?) to 1716 (Wz. UB, M.ch.o. 23, f. 8v-36v).

   A transcript of this is in Reid, f. 74r-83r.

3. 1690 version in a scribal hand, sent to the Maurists (FL, 12,675, f. 201-18).

4. The version continued to 1701 is in the manuscript volume Index Monasteriorum, etc. in Ratisbon Ordinariat. Not at present available for examination.\(^{40}\)

   A fragment containing the additions 1688-1701, copied in the hand of

---

38 See p. 194.

39 There are several minor problems or textual variations in the MSS but none are really worth the trouble of elucidation.

40 Dilworth, "Two MSS", 29 ff.
Abbot Fleming and probably the exemplar of the foregoing, is in Dennistoun, f. 333r-335r. 41

Notes taken from the Index volume are in Dennistoun, f. 136-38.

MSS of Vita Macarii
1. 1679 version in an unknown hand (Wz. UB, M.ch.o. 23, f. 2r-8r). A transcript of this is in Reid, f. 70v-72v.
2. 1679 version in Alan Chisholm's hand (Dennistoun, f. 315-24).
3. 1679 version, copied by Abbot Fleming and with two miracles of 1688-89 added (Dennistoun, 337v-342r).

This is probably the exemplar of the version found in the Index volume. 42

Gropp prints (I, 809-10) the Vita Macarii up to 1615 from a manuscript supplied by the Würzburg Scots and says (I, xviii) he was not informed who had compiled it. In other places he prints lists of miracles after 1615 in both Latin and German.

41 ibid. 30-31.
42 ibid. 32.
Chapter 19

THE WURZBURG MONASTIC HISTORIANS


The first example of historical work on a wider canvas produced by the Würzburg Scots belongs to 1610, when a monk put together two short works and added an introduction. The lay-out of the title-page in the manuscript shows that it was intended for publication, and indeed the work would be quite purposeless otherwise. It is entitled Scotia Antiqua et Nova, Scotland old and new. The title continues:

George Thomson describes the antiquity of Christianity among the Scots Ninian Winzet deplores the novelty of Calvinism in Scotland A Scottish monk of Würzburg has edited and interpreted both Würzburg, 1610.

George Thomson is rather a mysterious person. He is obviously to be distinguished from his namesake who was a Protestant minister and wrote anti-Catholic works, and the name has been called a pseudonym of James Tyrie the Jesuit.  

We have already seen how the suffragan bishop of Würzburg drew on Thomson's treatise for his sermon at the translation of

1 Wz. UB, M.ch.q. 58.
2 P. Grosjean, "Sur quelques pièces, imprimées et manuscrites, de la controverse entre Écoisais et Irlandais au début du XVIIe siècle", in Analecta Bollandiana, lxxxi, 443-46; DNB s.v. Tyrie.
Macarius’s body. The work, though written originally to gain help for the Scots college at Douai, was considered valuable by later Scots because of its glorification of Scotland’s Catholic, heresy-free past. The Würzburg Scot in 1610 simply took the treatise word for word from Possevinus’s reprint of 1607 and added to it a Latin translation of Winzet’s *Certane Tractates*, which had been published in Scots at Edinburgh in 1562. The whole was introduced by a short preface to Bishop Echter and a longer one to the Reader, and followed by a sort of dessert consisting of a fragment written by Winzet and some funeral odes to him by his nephew James Winzet, who was a monk of Ratisbon. The fragment by Ninian Winzet, giving six reasons why the Catholic faith was eclipsed in Scotland, has not been published and seems to be quite unknown.

The Preface to the Reader treats of the origins of the Scots and Scotland from the sons of Japhet on, the derivations of the words 'Scot' and 'Gael' from Hebrew, Greek and so forth, the first Scots Christian (a disciple of St Peter!), and similar fables. The Latin is neo-classical and stylish to the point of being almost unintelligible. The only matter of interest is the story of the writer and some other monks being in the house of one Alexander Paton in Brussels three years before and hearing the evidence for some piece of history from the aged abbot of Sweetheart, Gilbert Brown, who was exiled in or shortly after 1605 and died at Paris in 1612. This also gives a little help towards determining who the author was. It must have been someone who was a monk of Würzburg (as he explicitly calls himself on the title-page) in 1607 and 1610. Only two persons are known to fit this description, William Ogilvie and John Stuart, with a possible third, William Gordon, who appears on the scene at Ratisbon in 1609.

3 Text in Hewison, I, 1-34.
4 Ibid.
This composite work was never published, and the loss occasioned thereby is negligible. At the same time one can recognise that, viewed merely as polemics, the idea was good: to contrast Catholic antiquity with Calvinist modernity, entirely in the favour of the former. George Conn was later to do this, and one wonders if he got the idea from Würzburg. Certainly this work of Conn, published in 1628, shows acquaintance with the Würzburg Scots, and his life of Mary Stuart had been printed at Würzburg four years earlier.

The chief production of Scottish historians at Würzburg is a series of inter-related works on Scots at home and abroad, written around the middle of the century. The best known of them are *Germania Christiana* by Boniface Strachan, on the conversion of the German lands to Christianity by Scots, and two volumes by James Brown on the Scottish monasteries on the continent, called *Germania Sancta* and *Indiculus*, the second an elaboration of the first. These works refer to or quote earlier historical work by Silvanus Mayne and Alexander Baillie, who (perhaps significantly) were the two monks of Würzburg that saved the Ratisbon abbey and its daughter-house at Erfurt after the Swedish occupation of those towns.

Mayne has left us no writings of his own apart from the letter in which, as administrator of Ratisbon, he appealed for help to Charles I's ambassador to the emperor. The letter reveals a historically-minded man who accepted the 'Scottish legend', because he spoke of the foundation of the Ratisbon abbey by the Scottish royal house and its contribution to Scotland's prestige for eight centuries, which takes one back almost to Charlemagne's time. As proof of the connection with the Stuarts, Mayne mentioned the letters of James V to the town senate of Ratisbon, preserved

---

5 Conn, 41.
6 *Bibliographia Aberdonensis* (Third Spalding Club, 1929), 216, 240.
in the monastery archives; he was thus at least aware of archival material.

In the Würzburg historical works which cite him, on the other hand, Mayne appears in very equivocal light. *Germania Christiana* records that he found at Fulda ancient manuscripts written in the Scottish language and giving St Boniface's birthplace as Rosemarkie in Cromarty. This is surely an invention on someone's part, since they could hardly have been in Scots and Mayne was no Celtic scholar. Mayne is also cited as the authority for considering two monasteries, at Rome and at Dieulouard in Lorraine, as originally founded for Scots. The author of *Germania Sancta* says that Mayne told him and others this, then in the *Indiculus* he gives as his authority Mayne's 'observations on his journey to Lorraine and France'. Whether these were spoken or written is not clear. Another passage describes how Mayne, *vir plus et in historiis nostris versatissimus*, told the author and others that St Columbanus and all Scottish monks wore a black habit; the author adds that he always had great faith in Mayne as a holy and trustworthy man but finds it difficult to reconcile his statement with other evidence. To the modern reader it is clear that Mayne's testimony is quite without value, but he cannot be ignored on that account. A tradition of scholarship entails personalities, and Mayne's prestige must have been of value in keeping this alive.

With Baillie we are on much firmer ground since writings by him have survived. He was made administrator of Ratisbon in 1634, abbot of Erfurt in 1636, again administrator of Ratisbon in 1640 while remaining abbot of Erfurt, and finally abbot of Ratisbon in 1646. In the latter year his German scribe began to copy documents into a large bound folio volume, whose title indicates its scope: it is a *Codex Privilegiorum et Actorum*

---

7 Dilworth, "Trilogy", 121.
8 *Germ. Sancta*, f. 10v.
9 *Indiculus*, f. 30v.
10 *Germ. Sancta*, f. 10v; Dilworth, "Trilogy", 129.
11 Baillie (see Abbreviations).
of the Ratisbon abbey, together with some of the happenings and transactions since 1640 when Baillie became administrator. The documents range from the twelfth century to Ninian Winzet's time and on to the 1620's, and every so often Baillie himself added a guarantee of the accuracy of the transcript in the manner of a notary. One has to admit that, provided the documents were genuine, there could scarcely be a better introduction to historical research for a seventeenth-century man. The significance of this will become apparent. Baillie did in one place erase a reference to Irish monks, no doubt on the grounds that he considered it to have been fraudulently inserted, but the work as a whole is accurate and trustworthy.

The volume gradually changes character. Baillie's account of the Thirty Years War and the way it impinged on Ratisbon and on himself, at first inserted in blank spaces and then filling whole pages, begins to assume greater importance. The second half of the chronicle is Baillie's narrative of the vicissitudes of the Ratisbon abbey after the Swedish invasion, interspersed with the text of relevant documents. Being a first-hand account and contemporary, it is extremely valuable although (as was seen in earlier chapters) it is shown by other surviving sources to be somewhat subjective. It continues to 1653, by which time Baillie was writing it partly in English.

Baillie, of course, was the man who had published the polemical book in 1628 with its tendency to deal with recent Scottish history rather than pure theology. He was evidently a historian by inclination. Fragments of his historical compilations have survived through being incorporated in works which themselves remained in manuscript. Brown's volumes on Scotic

12 Some are printed in Hewison, II, xvii-xxv.
13 On f. 23r. The passage is quoted in Dilworth, "Marianus", 132.
monasteries cite Baillie in evidence for the existence of four foundations. The first of these was at Aachen, \(^{14}\) for which Brown quotes verbatim a passage taken from Baillie. The passage itself, repeating as it does the legend of Charlemagne and the Scotic monks, has no interest; what is interesting is that the \textit{Indiculus} says it was among Baillie's miscellaneous writings and was taken by him from a codex in Erfurt written by one James who became abbot there in 1525 (as indeed one did).

The other three monasteries were at Mainz, Leipzig and Metz. Brown says that Baillie compiled much on the Scottish monasteries before becoming abbot of Ratisbon but his papers were scattered through some carelessness, and that Baillie's sources were chapter 12 of a manuscript \textit{Gesta Caroli Magni} and original papers preserved in the Ratisbon monastic library. \(^{15}\) Scotic monks were in fact associated with Mainz and Metz, but the alleged documents at Ratisbon can have been nothing more than some earlier fanciful compilation.

Another writer to use Baillie's compilations was Eberhard Wassenberg, who completed his seven volumes on the history of Ratisbon diocese some time in the years 1659-61. This enormous work, called \textit{Ratisbonensis dioecesis illustrata}, consists for the most part of extracts lifted bodily from other writers. The fourth volume, \textit{Ratisbona Religiosa}, takes each religious foundation in turn, including the Scots abbey, and it is here that Baillie is cited. The Scots abbot had given his account, when asked to do so, to the bishop, who passed it on to Wassenberg. Three passages are reproduced verbatim. \(^{16}\) One is on the founding of the Scotic monasteries, first Aachen and then others, including Weih-St-Peter at Ratisbon, in the time of Charlemagne. Baillie seems to have made heroic efforts to harmon-

\(^{14}\) Germ. Sancta, f. 17v; \textit{Indiculus}, f. 25r.

\(^{15}\) Germ. Sancta, f. 17rv; \textit{Indiculus}, f. 26rv, 30r.

\(^{16}\) Adv. 34.6.1, p. 41-44, 63-65, 87-89. For an account of Wassenberg and of this manuscript, wrongly attributed to Boniface Strachan, see Dilworth, "Two MSS", 24-28, 52.
ise the conflicting sources (the fantastic Irish Libellus, the more sober Vita Mariani, and the Scottish account of Duke William). Another passage of Baillie's gives the story of the founding of St James's at Ratisbon. Here he was up against the difficulty of making the fables in the Libellus agree with other authorities placing the foundation around 1100. His conclusion is that there was a second foundation at the latter date.

The third passage carries the narrative from about 1400 to Baillie's own time. He retails the story of how the Irish monks infiltrated and drove out the Scots until the rightful owners were brought back by Leo X in 1515. This was to remain the version of their history accepted by the Scottish monks as long as their monasteries lasted. Finally Baillie deals briefly with the finances of the abbey during the Scottish period. Having quoted a genuine document to show how low they were at the end of the Irish period, he tells how the Scots improved them and adds in typical fashion that in spite of the recent wars they are now improving steadily. Wassenberg concludes his section on the Scots abbey by giving a list of abbots, which is fairly accurate for the years after 1515; this he says was supplied by the monks. It was, apparently, not part of Baillie's account.

While Baillie was still alive, and probably before he wrote the account used by Wassenberg, the chief historical work of the seventeenth-century Würzburg monks had been compiled. The first intimation of it is in a letter from Boniface Strachan to Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet, director of the chancery of Scotland, written at Vienna in November 1641. The letter itself is interesting in its own right. Strachan says he is writing at the request of John Wood of Largo, of the family of the famous Andrew Wood the sea-captain. Wood carried the letter back to Scotland and

---

18 For whom see F.M. Montagu, Memorials of the family of Wood of Largo, 17-18, 30; W. Wood, The East Neuk of Fife (2nd edn. 1887), 86-89.
presumably delivered it in person to Scot, who was his fairly near neighbour in Fife, for it is endorsed: 'Procht home by John Wood'. But why did Wood ask the Scots monk whom he met in Vienna to write to Scot about the Schottenklöster and the work he was planning on them? In the absence of evidence for some particular reason, one may presume it was because of Scot's known interest in scholarship.  

The fate of the letter is also interesting. Scot took a great interest in the cartography of Scotland and helped Jan Blaeu, the celebrated cartographer in Amsterdam, with the Scottish section of his Atlas; or perhaps, with justice, one might call Scot the real author of this. In 1647 Scot sent a copy of Strachan's letter to Blaeu, telling him to print it if he wanted. Blaeu did print it, and it appeared in full (but without mention of John Wood) in several languages in the various editions of his Atlas, in the section on Scotland. There was no doubt about Strachan being in the printed literature of Europe.

Perhaps it was the hope and desire of recovering the Vienna abbey that stimulated Strachan to plan his work on the Scots in Germany. His letter about this to Scot is a lengthy document and has two parts: in the first, Strachan outlines the provinces of Germany converted to Christianity by Scottish saints, and in the second he gives a list of Scottish monasteries in Germany, among which are numbered several belonging to remote antiquity as well as those of the mediaeval Ratisbon group. He concludes by saying there are other monasteries besides, of which he will treat more fully in his forthcoming work, Germania Christiana; the first volume will be on the evangelisation of each province, the second will be on the monasteries and will contain their chronicles, lists of their abbots, and so on.

19 See DNB.
20 DNB; Nieuw Nederlandsch Biographisch Woordenboek, X (Leiden, 1937), col. 68-69.
21 For instance, in the Latin editions of 1654 and 1662, pp. 22-25.
In the next two and a half years, before June 1644, Strachan wrote the first volume. The work follows a simple plan: there is a section on Scots who preached the gospel in Germany in the first centuries of the Christian era, then subsequent sections take each region of Germany in turn and describe their Scottish apostles. There are long sections on Kilian and Boniface, the apostles of Franconia and Frisia respectively. After the opening sections one is inured to shocks, because they tell how the apostle Peter preached the gospel in Scotland and his Scottish converts in their turn at once preached it on the continent.

One can sum up by saying that Strachan follows in the footsteps of Dempster and Camerarius, whom he quotes frequently. There are pages on St Ursula and her eleven thousand companions, whom he claims for Scotland; St Columbanus comes from the Lothians, and St Gall is his nephew.

There is immense erudition in the book, in the sense that a wide range of authors is frequently cited, and a serious discussion of dates can be found side by side with some piece of fantasy. What is more interesting, however, is the occasional indication of contemporary affairs or the comparison of the Scots language and German, for Strachan was an amateur philologist. Another interesting thread is that running from the enigmatic George Thomson through the work of the Würzburg Scots: Thomson had said that St Boniface (a Devon man in reality) came from Rosemarkie in Cromarty, a Jesuit named Serarius had attacked this, and now Strachan in turn was reasserting it and counter-attacking Serarius fiercely.

To this volume of *Germania Christiana* Strachan had added a preface, called Velitatio or Skirmish against the Irish. Irish expatriates on the Continent were producing books putting forward their claims that the Scoti

---

22 For the authorship and date of each volume and their connection with each other, as well as bibliographical information and detailed references to various MSS, see Dilworth, "Trilogy" (in Appendix). References given there will not be repeated.

23 *S. Kiliani Gesta*, reprinted in Ludewig, 971.
who evangelised Europe in the early middle ages were in fact Irish. Some refutation of their claims was thus necessary. Strachen produces an impressive array of testimonies from ancient authors, both British and foreign, to back his case, then proceeds to give his own arguments and attack those of the Irish. This seems to be based on a similar procedure in Camerarius but elaborated considerably. Strachan's arguments vary very much in scope, ranging from the royal tombs in Iona to the valour of the Scots in war. He gives first place to the traditional Franco-Scottish alliance made between Charlemagne and Achaius. Once again it is on the contemporary situation that Strachan has something useful to say, when he speaks about the privileges which Scots still have in France because of the alliance, and about the influence of French on spoken Scots.

Strachan never wrote the second volume on the monasteries. Instead his fellow-monk James Brown wrote it and made the work into a trilogy by expanding the Velitatio into a volume in its own right. Two drafts, made in 1648 and 1652 respectively, have survived of this introductory volume, called Perspicilium (or optic glass) to enable one to distinguish Scots from English and Irish. This new work takes all the names for regions of the British Isles found in ancient authors and supplies means of interpreting them correctly. Thus there are sections on Albion, Britannia, Anglia, Hibernia and Scotia, followed by proofs that Scotia can only mean North Britain. Most of the Velitatio is incorporated almost as it stood, to supply these proofs. The second draft of the Perspicilium is an elaboration of the first but was left uncompleted by Brown.

The work is almost incredibly bad, a monument of misplaced erudition. The idea behind it was good: one has only to think of the similarity bet-
ween Albainn, the Gaelic name (in the genitive) for Scotland, and Albion, used of England, to see the sort of question Brown was trying to resolve. Some explanation is also needed of why Highlanders spoke a different language and were known to Lowland Scots as Erse or Irish. But if the idea was good, its execution was not. A wide range of authors ancient and modern is cited and quoted from, although this impressive erudition is found side by side with a repetition of the most ludicrous traditional fantasies on the early history of Scotland. Not only does Scotia for Brown always denote North Britain but he manages to interpret the other names so that their celebrities are invariably attributed to Scotland. As with Strachan's work the real interest comes from the glimpses it almost unconsciously affords of the contemporary scene, for example, of the Scots expatriates in Ireland.

The volume on the monasteries, now the third of the set, was also written by Brown, who changed the title either by accident or design to Germania Sancta. He wrote it, most probably, not long before 1652. The first section, on the origins of the monasteries and the past glories of Scottish monasticism, is really introductory and can be passed over quickly. The next part, on the individual monasteries, is much more interesting. First come the ten belonging to the mediaeval Ratisbon congregation, correctly given; then the two in Cologne supposed to have been founded by Duke William. A list prepared for John Lesley, bishop of Ross, about 1578 contains five names besides the foregoing, bringing the tally to seventeen. Then there are four from the papers of Alexander Baillie already mentioned, and two from Dempster. Finally a mixed bag of two in Rome and one each in Strasburg, Lorraine and Ireland brings the total to twenty-eight, though
the frontiers of Germany seem to have been considerably extended. The
third section of *Germania Sancta* is on the lives of nine holy men, two of
which come from printed books and the remainder from some Ratisbon codex.

It is abundantly clear that *Germania Sancta* is a rough draft and in
places merely an outline of what Brown intended to do. Though it is hard-
ly fair to criticise the weaknesses of what is merely an outline, one can
note the flimsiness of some of the evidence he adduces: the unsupported
statements, for instance, of Silvanus Mayne. The value of the work, on
the other hand, comes precisely from its being a mere draft; the documents
used are copied verbatim and not digested. In this way we have an origin-
al list of monasteries drawn up for John Lesley and their state at the
time, a passage from a codex preserved at Erfurt and transcribed or adapted
by Alexander Baillie, and long extracts from the codex on the monastic
saints. The last-named seems to be a mixture of the *Vita Mariani* and the
*Libellus*, but with Irish references made Scottish and Boece quoted. Brown
reveals without knowing it that historical work of a sort was done by the
sixteenth-century Scottish monks of Ratisbon.

The *Germania Sancta* was merely a draft, and the *Perspicilium* in its
final form was never completed. What seems to have happened is that Brown
abandoned the trilogy and instead, not long after 1655, compiled a rather
different work on the monasteries, entitled the *Indiculus* or short list of
Scottish Benedictine monasteries outside Scotland. This began with a pro-
logue, then dealt in turn with the monasteries in France, those founded by
Duke William, those in Belgium, Lorraine and Italy, and finally the more
recent ones in Germany. There followed a Brief Compendium on the vicissi-
tudes of the monasteries and an epilogue on the observance of the Rule.
The new work is clearly based on the middle section of Germania Sancta, for it contains the same monasteries as were found in the earlier list (and an extraordinary assortment they were!) but with three more added. This time, however, they are arranged according to region and date of foundation rather than source material, while Brown's undeclared but obvious intention is to indicate where the Scots monks can hope for help and even for the restoration of some of their monasteries.

The Indiculnus is far and away the best historical work produced by the Würzburg Scots and is outstanding even by comparison with its fore-runner, Germania Sancta. It has some of the same weaknesses, such as Brown's willingness to rely on the flimsiest of argument or authority, and it is vitiates by the bias, shared by all his fellow-monks and compatriots, which prevented him from allowing the Irish credit for anything connected with the name of Scot except some maladministration in the fifteenth century. Nevertheless its weaknesses are far outweighed by its merits, the chief of which is the division of the monasteries into ancient and more recent foundations. The former are more or less apocryphal, and Brown was unable to see that the connection with Charlemagne was merely legendary, but even here he gives his sources and acknowledges when his information is limited. As for the more recent foundations, the advance he made is revolutionary. Only the Ratisbon group of houses is included in the list; he lists them completely and correctly, so that even today only details need correction; most important of all, he ignores the legendary connection of the Ratisbon foundation with Charlemagne and places the beginnings in the eleventh century. To be sure, Aventinus, the anti-clerical Bavarian historian, had done this a century and a half before, but it still

remains an achievement for Brown, a Scottish monk and thus an interested party, to be able to do so.

The Brief Compendium outlines the vicissitudes of the Scots monasteries during a thousand years but gives two thirds of the space to the history of the Ratisbon group of houses. Its faults are glaring, chiefly because it concentrates on the vicissitudes as a lesson to the Scots monks who are to read it and so has to deal professedly with the question of the Irish and the decline of the congregation in the fifteenth century. Nevertheless there is reliance on genuine documents, while the period after 1515 is substantially accurate. James Brown, however, has never received credit for his achievements. He did not give his name, either on the title-page or in the text of any of his works. His authorship has to be worked out from autobiographical references. Boniface Strachan, on the other hand, put his name to his volume of Germania Christiana as well as to the letter to Scot of Scotstarvet and has received full credit for what he wrote, and a little more besides.²⁵

Brown's work was not limited to the foregoing. He quite often referred the reader to his other productions, and one such reference reads:

'Hinc in nostro Scoeto-Fulda deduxi argumentum, S. Bonifacium non esse Angum.'²⁶

It would certainly seem from this that he had written a work on the ancient abbey of Fulda and that he made it out to be a Scotic abbey, in which case nobody is much worse off for the loss of the work. A further volume, however, the Chronologia of the Scotic abbey in Vienna,²⁷ has survived, and every indication is that Brown was the author. The only known text is in the hand of Alan Chisholm, who was a prolific scribe and penned at least two copies of the Indiculus, brought up to date in 1687.

²⁵ For instance, he is listed in Ziegelbauer, III, 556; IV, 439, whereas Brown is omitted.
²⁶ Second draft of Perspicillum (EUL, Laing III, 201), f. 25v.
²⁷ CV (see Abbreviations). Page references to the MS will be added to the description in the following pages.
Some knowledge of the background of the work is necessary. The abbey was founded by Irish monks from Lisbon shortly after 1150 but these were replaced by Austrians in 1416; unsuccessful attempts were subsequently made by the Scots to gain possession of the abbey, notably by John Lesley and Ninian Winzet in the years after 1576. To this day it has remained in the hands of Austrian monks and is the only Schottenkloster which is still a monastery. Brown argues that it was founded for Scots (8ff.), Irish monks then supplanted the Scots and were guilty of misconduct (26ff.), which gave the Austrians an excuse to take over the abbey; but this, says Brown, was an injustice to the Scots who are the rightful owners and now are too poor to support their own monks or accept the novices who wish to enter (58). Therefore they ask for the restitution of the Vienna abbey to enable them to educate Scots who can then help their poor country (99-100). One can see that Brown's quarrel is with the Austrian monks who have been in possession since 1416, but he is also arguing the usual Scottish, anti-Irish thesis. The whole question has an air of unreality: Brown is identifying himself, quite wrongly, with one of the parties in an ancient dispute and producing historical arguments why the Scots should have a monastery which was taken away by the Austrians from the Irish two and a half centuries before.

What gives the work its interest is not the unreal arguments but Brown's method. After a short introduction outlining the benefits conferred on Austria by the ancient Scots, he announces that he is going to give verbatim the Manifesto produced by the Austrian monks in 1582-83 against the Scottish claimants (5-6), and this he does, giving alternately a section of the text and his own comments on it. We thus find preserved
a document of whose existence historians have been entirely unaware. It consists of a brief history of the abbey, showing how abuses crept in among the Soetie monks and how they refused to reform and so were replaced by Austrians who restored monastic discipline. In his interspersed comments Brown explains away a mention of Irishmen in an early document (8 ff.) but accepts later references to them, expounding that they were responsible for the scandals before 1418 in the same way as they were at Ratisbon also about that time (26 ff.).

Concerning the introduction of Austrian monks in 1418 he has much to say: monastic reform should not be effected by expulsion even if abuses are serious; the Austrians exaggerated the Irish abuses in order to justify their action; their motive was not zeal but cupidity; it was utterly unjust to take Scottish property because of the misconduct of Irishmen who were temporarily in possession (37 ff.). One has to admit that Brown the historian has renounced all objectivity in favour of undiscriminating polemics. He throws in, too, a fair amount of criticism of Irish fecklessness and barbarism (53-55, 62-63) as well as condemnations of German monks in general (44, 48, 59, 63). His commentary on the remainder of the Manifesto aims at showing that the Austrians were no improvement on the Irish (75 ff.). He then tries to continue his account for the period since 1582 but is hampered by lack of information and has to be content with taking a few swipes at the state of the Vienna abbey at the time of writing (93 ff.).

Even though Brown cites documents from the Ratisbon and Würzburg archives (13, 26-27), the value of the Chronologia comes not from anything in his arguments but from the information almost unconsciously supplied
about Scottish attempts to obtain the Vienna abbey. He gives new details about Ninian Winzet's efforts (92), with of course the text of the hitherto unknown Manifesto, and informs the reader of (likewise hitherto unknown) attempts made by the Scots in 1630 and 1641 (94). The word-for-word transcript of the Manifesto is one of the reasons for attributing authorship to Brown; it is the same procedure as he used in his Germania Sancta, where he transcribed passages from Alexander Baillie's writings, the sixteenth-century Ratisbon codex and the memorial drawn up for John Lesley. He actually refers to the memorial in the Chronologia as alibi producto (86), that is, transcribed in another work. In addition, the remarks on the Irish character and mode of life are very much in the style of Brown, who indulged in them in his Perspicilium and his Indicus.

The date of composition also fits Brown but is too early for Alan Chisholm, the scribe of the sole surviving copy. The author, in describing the contemporary state of the Vienna abbey, gives the name of its previous abbot, Anton Spindler, and says that his successor, the present abbot, is a stranger monk as the abbey was obliged to take in such through lack of novices (94-95). Spindler died in 1648, the new abbot was elected in 1649 and died in 1662. The work was thus composed between these dates. Incidentally, the new abbot, Peter Heister, was a lieutenant of Colchon,29 the Bursfeld president whose agent Abbot Asloan was, and had been prior in Prague before being succeeded there by Caramuel;30 he was probably no stranger to the affairs of the Scots. Probably, too, the work was composed after the Indicus, which makes no reference to it in the section on the Vienna abbey. Since James Brown died, as far as we know, in 1658, the Vienna Chronologia was written in the last years of his life, between 1654

28 Lindner, 15-16.
29 Colchon, passim.
30 Lindner, 17.
and 1658. His right to the title of historian, however, rests not on this work but on the section concerning the Ratisbon group of houses in his Indiculus.

It only remains to see what the Würzburg Scots did for the promotion of learning, by helping scholars and in particular by passing on their own historical compositions. Here one can leave aside the information they supplied about Macarius and his miracles, since their motive was not entirely scholarly. Bernard Maxwell's letters show him eager to supply scholars with the books or texts they needed. Francis Fabritius, the Würzburg official who was compiling genealogies of the families of Europe, had read Boece, Lesley, Buchanan and whatever else the Scots could give him, so Maxwell in June 1678 asked Fleming to lend him Dempster's History from the Ratisbon library. In June of the next two years we again find Maxwell obtaining or returning books for him, and during the whole of 1681 he was importuning Fleming on his behalf for the loan of two volumes on old English families. In August 1681 he told Fleming that the rector of the Scots College in Rome had asked him if the monks had any material for the continuation of John Lesley's History. A second edition of the original work had been brought out shortly before, in 1675, but no continuation was ever published.

Another man for whom Maxwell asked Fleming's help was Dr Christopher Irvine, who was a physician and a scholar. Maxwell had been with him in Scotland and on returning to Würzburg at the end of 1677 asked for a copy of Winzet's Velitatio against George Buchanan to be made at Ratisbon for Irvine. Fleming agreed, and a few months later Maxwell was making a further request for Irvine:

31 References to them will not be given since the text of the following pages will give approximate dates.

32 For him see DNB.
'I pray you minde to send him also the fundations of all the monasteries we have, and had formerly in Germany, for he is very desireous to have them, and did speak to me particularly concerning them, desiring they might be sent to him with the booke: which I hope your Lordship will be carefull to do, for I doubt not but that you will without greate difficultie find them all in your house'.

Evidently what was meant was the foundation deeds and so on. At the beginning of 1681 Maxwell, now abbot, wanted to get a book for Fabritius and had written to Dr Irvine about it. Then, in September 1682, the Würzburg abbot, who was worried about a forthcoming publication by Irvine, wrote to Fleming:

'Doctor Irwin is putting a piece to the Press wherein he is to treat of our Scots Monasteries here in Germanie and to vindicat them from the Irish, and will also denie that ever the Irish was in any of them, and will also put the bleame of the lost Monasteries of our Nation upon the bad and lewd lives of som of our owne Nation. Your advice is desired in this, and what you thinke best to be said in the affaire, and what excuse you think best to be inserted for the loss of the lost monasteries of our Nation, and as I was alwayes informed the bad economie of the Irish was the occasion of the loss of many of them, but whither you thinke fitt that that should (be) said your answere will signifie.'

As far as is known, the piece was never published but this may explain why Fleming had Boniface Strachan's *Germania Christiana* transcribed and wrote in it in his own hand 'Written at Ratisbone, and sent to Doctor Irvine by Ab. Fleming for a small token of affectione 1684'.

---

33 This is Adv. 33.7.20.
It was about this time that Fleming sent copies of Ratisbon documents, either handwritten or printed, to the Maurists. In June 1681 Maxwell had been asked to supply deeds and a list of abbots for the Maurists and had urged Fleming to do the same. What is interesting is that the documents eventually sent by Fleming included a *Brevis et succincta narratio* on the Scotic monasteries in Germany which is no other than an adaptation of the letter sent by Boniface Strachan to Scot of Scotstarvet in 1641, taken presumably from Blaeu's Atlas and clearly made at Ratisbon since it stresses the position of the Ratisbon abbot as superior general of the Scotic monasteries. Wassenberg, too, had inserted the letter whole from the Atlas into his account of the Ratisbon abbey. The merit of Strachan's list of monasteries is that it is short and so has only four houses besides the Ratisbon group, but its chronology is quite unsound. It is a pity that Fleming did not send James Brown's *Indiculus* to Dr Irvine and the Maurists instead of Strachan's writings, but the Ratisbon copies of Brown's works were not made until 1705. What the Würzburg monks for their part sent to the Maurists was their own *Series Abbatum* brought up to date to 1690.

The Maurist *Monasticon Benedictinum* was never published, and the material sent from Ratisbon and Würzburg remained in manuscript. In fact, apart from the life and miracles of Macarius, none of the Würzburg historical compilations have to this day been printed. This is not to say that they have never been used. They must certainly have helped to form the accepted view at Ratisbon and Würzburg (the 'myth', if one prefers) of their monastic past. The various copies which found their way to Scotland may have influenced or provided material for those who read them.

ally enough, they have been used most by writers dealing explicitly with the Scots monasteries in Germany. Wieland's account of the Würzburg abbey, which has held the field for over a century, relies greatly on the *Series Abbatum*; it could hardly be otherwise.

Probably their greatest effect was to provide material for the eighteenth-century Ratisbon historians, notably Marianus Brockie, whose work has undoubtedly been influential. Brockie forged material when it suited him to do so, with the result that all his work is rightly suspect. In the case of the Scots abbeys, however, he did not need to do so; for Würzburg an account was available in the *Series Abbatum*, while he had the Ratisbon and Erfurt archives at his disposal. He also had the guidelines for the history of the Ratisbon congregation, with the mythological material discarded, laid down for him in the *Indiculus*. Even if Brockie would have by himself produced a reasonably accurate picture of the Ratisbon group of houses, the fact remains that James Brown had done this a century before him. And lest one be inclined to condemn Brown too strongly for the anti-Irish myth so prominent in his work, one should remember that this was accepted by Scots and Germans into the twentieth century.
Chapter 20

THE SCOTS AND WÜRZBURG LIFE

Geographical facts about Würzburg - position of St James's - the cathedral prebend - donation of Jobstal - income of the Scots - legacies - bishops' funerals: body in St James's - processions to St James's - proper feasts - blessings of abbots - other ceremonial occasions - prayers for the dead - elections and visitations - church studies in Würzburg - visitors to the town - some less attractive features - the fortifications - monastic buildings - the church - appointments and furnishing - sacristy equipment - coats of arms - indulgences - employees, etc. - horarium - spiritual life - spiritual writings.

The part played by the Scots in Würzburg life was influenced greatly by two factors: their antiquity and their geographical position. To understand Würzburg one should picture the Main flowing more or less northwards through a narrow valley, meeting a steep ridge and making a sharp bend of ninety degrees to the west, then making a second turn and resuming its flow northward through an even narrower valley. Just before the river makes its first bend the valley widens; on this flat, hill-surrounded ground on the right bank is built the town of Würzburg, while the ground on the left bank opposite rises steeply from the water's edge to form an imposing hill, a natural site for a fortress. The town on the comparatively flat ground to the east of the river, the fortress-crowned hill towering above to the west of it; these are the two important geographical facts about Würzburg.
The Scots monastery was on the west of the river, on a spur of the fortress hill. It lay slightly to the north, that is, downstream, of the bridge over the Main, while the fortress lay southwards of it. The height on which the monastery was built, called Girberg, was bare and deserted before the monks came. Gradually it was brought under cultivation, and dwellings were built on the ground that was not too steep. There was a parish church on this left bank, St Burkard's; the people in the Main-quarter, as it was called, were clannish and considered themselves as apart from the Würzburg folk across the river. And there had never been a time in the memory of the people when St James's was not there.

The forged foundation charter of 1140 narrates how Bishop Embricho endowed the Scots with a prebend in the cathedral church to mark the general appreciation of Macarius's miracle in changing wine into water. The forgery could not have been done before the prebend was given, hence we know that the monks were receiving it well before the end of the twelfth century. They were still receiving it in the eighteenth century. It was paid chiefly in kind: daily measures of bread and wine, varying according to the season, with other occasional grants. The wine could be sold if the monks wished, and the price given to them instead. If the abbot attended a meeting of chapter he took precedence over dean and canons, and twice a year a monk of St James's had to sing a Mass in the cathedral.

Another donation to the monks, perhaps the earliest, was the property of Jobstal; certainly the deed of donation is the earliest genuine document extant. Bishop Embricho in 1142 donated the property to the Scoic monks who were the compatriots of the martyr Kilian. In 1581 Bishop Echter transferred it to the hospital he had founded in Würzburg; then, when

1 J.A. Oegg, Versuch einer Korographie der...Stadt Würzburg (Würzburg, 1808), 761-62; Wieland, 11.
2 Wz. SA, SB 547, f. 9r-15v; Wieland, 78-80, 88; Taschenbuch (1795), 196, 207.
3 Wendehorst, op. cit. 146 (see p. 7.).
the Scots came to St James's they were given the income but not the property itself. In 1631 and 1641 the Scots abbots appealed for their rights according to the donation made to them by Bishop Embricho, and the question was settled in 1650. The point about the cathedral prebend and the Jobstal property is that the Scots were not only looked upon as the compatriots of the mediaeval monks and thus of Macarius and Kilian; they were actually receiving revenues, considered legally theirs, in virtue of donations made half a millenium before.

The properties and incomes of the monastery, being more a matter for the local historian, lie outside the scope of this study except insofar as they affected the life of the Scots. Nevertheless a summary made by one of the monks in 1738, and no doubt in the main valid for the previous century too, gives one a useful insight into their means of support. There was the cathedral prebend, the compensation for the land swallowed up by the fortifications, grain supplied annually by the peasants in several villages, the rent for various properties, and wine from vineyards. Stipends, gifts and alms brought in about 200 reichsthalers, and the whole, in cash and kind, came to about 1200 reichsthalers or 1800 Rhenish florins. Interest on capital added a little to this. The Scots were poorer than any of the other monastic establishments. In 1613, for instance, the abbot's income was only 126 florins, less than half that of the second-poorest and a fraction of that of the richer prelates.

Probably visitors to the church were generous in the matter of small donations, while the prince-bishops could be expected to supply a princely sum when some pressing need arose. In between came the legacies left by the notables of Würzburg, usually in the form of endowments for Masses to

4 S. Zeissner, "Hofgut Jobstthal", in AU, lxx, 135-55; Wz. SA, Misc. 5793, catalogue entry; Wieland, 80, 135.
5 Sch. Akten, 322.
6 AU, xliii, 35.
be said for their souls, on their anniversary days or oftener. The seventeenth-century monastic necrology records many of these benefactors but without giving details; the later necrology records at least two such seventeenth-century endowments, and we know of other legacies left to the Scots in 1685 and 1698. By the end of the eighteenth century there were about fifty-five such endowments, and Mass was still being said weekly in virtue of a bequest made in 1167.  

When a bishop of Würzburg died the funeral arrangements took into account the antiquity and geographical position of the Scots abbey, which lay on a flank of the fortress hill, a good bit lower down and nearer the bridge than was the fortress. Bishop Embricho, the founder, had therefore ordered that his body should lie overnight in St James's, and this was done when he died in 1149. Thereafter it was the custom for the body of each bishop to be brought to the Scots church in procession in the afternoon and to be taken the next day across the river to be buried in the cathedral. Trithemius wrote an account of the procedure in his history of St James's. The body was carried down from the fortress and met by the Herren of St Burkard's, who escorted it cum cantu towards the Scots church. The abbot, vested in pontificals, went out to meet the procession. The body was placed in the church, the Herren sang Vespers of the Dead, and the abbot of St James's said the prayers at the bier. Others, including the monks, then took their turn at offices of the dead. The next morning the abbot or his deputy sang Mass, and the abbot again officiated at the bier. After Vespers, which were sung early, the Würzburg clergy came in procession to St James's, sang Vespers of the Dead and took the body to the cathedral. The candles and the precious black cloth which covered the coffin

7 VL, MS Vat. Lat. 10,100, with useful extracts in MS Vat. Lat. 11,063, f. 25-30; Sch. Akten, 320; Wieland, 58-65. References given in the chronological chapters will, in general, not be repeated.

8 Compendium.
remained with the monks as perquisites.

An account of what actually happened in 1519 has been preserved; it agrees with the foregoing and adds various details, like the little table on which the casket containing the bishop's heart was put, and the lights and coals which had to be provided for those who watched by the coffin all night. The mid-sixteenth century was an unsettled period in Würzburg but we have a record of the body being taken to St James's in 1540. Julius Echter, the reforming bishop, ruled for a long time; when he died in 1617 it was forty-four years at least since the old custom had been observed, and possibly much longer, for St James's was in a ruinous condition before his accession. Probably Echter, having restored the monastery, would have adhered to the ancient custom in any case, but several publications had brought it to public notice. Lorenz Fries's Chronicle of Würzburg in 1544 said that taking the body to the church of the Scots was customary; Sebastian Münster's Cosmography, which went through at least fifteen editions in four languages between 1544 and 1598, gave space to it; and Trithemius's Compendium was printed in 1604. Echter's body lay in the citadel for eighteen days before being brought to the Scots church, where the ancient ceremonies were carried out and a Scots monk preached a panegyric next morning.

The next bishop died at Ratisbon during a Diet and was buried in Bamberg, hence it was not until 1631 that the old custom was followed once more. The ceremonial at the funerals of these episcopal princes of the empire was growing more elaborate. The body was embalmed, the entrails buried in the citadel, and the heart put in a silver vessel. The Scots,

10 Gropp, I, 91; III, 77.
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on being told of the arrangements, procured the necessary candles and black cloths at the expense of the deceased. In the early afternoon the body was brought down the hill and escorted by the Scots abbot and other clerical dignitaries to St James's. There were the usual protracted offices, with the prince's ministers keeping watch all night. An eye-witness added an extraordinary detail, that he saw the more important ones being offered and accepting beds covered with bed-clothes so that they could get some rest. Early next morning the Scots abbot sang pontifical Mass (during which a collection was taken up for the monastery) and performed the ceremonies, but the body did not remain until the afternoon. Instead it was escorted across the river that morning, while the heart was taken by a grand cavalcade to the monastery of Ebrach. 15

Presumably this happened at the next funeral in 1642. 16 The following occasion, in 1673, was described by Abbot Dixon, who seems to have had less interest in the ceremonies than in the expense. There were some slight changes in the former: the suffragan and four mitred abbots, including Dixon, vested and went out together to meet the procession. Dixon sang a collect when the body arrived at the Scots church, but it was the suffragan who officiated after Vespers. Before the funeral, however, the Scots abbot had discussed the candles and black hangings to be supplied to his church but did not get all he wanted. He complained about the officials' parsimony and left for posterity a note to the effect that it was not worth it unless the Scots kept the hangings and received compensation for their trouble and for the fuel and food they had to supply. 17

We do not know what happened when the next bishop died only two years later while Dixon was still abbot, 18 but the following two, who died during

17 Copialbuch, f. 28-29; Wieland, 55-56; Gropp, IV, 264-69.
18 Cf. Gropp, II, 509; IV, 270.
Maxwell's short rule, were buried in the customary way. In 1698 the bishop died in the town across the river, and the body therefore did not come to St James's. To mark their traditional role, however, the Scots were invited to sing dead offices beside the coffin. They petitioned to be given the candles and hangings but received a mere hundred florins in compensation instead and were aggrieved at this ignoring of their rights dating back five and a half centuries. In the eighteenth century the magnificent baroque Residence, later described by Napoleon as the grandest presbytery in Europe, was built in Würzburg itself. Henceforth the prince-bishops lived and died there and not in the fortress, and thus ended the age-old custom of taking the bishop's body to the Scots church on its way to burial.

Another liturgical custom resulted partly from the position of the Scots church, partly from its antiquity; this was the custom of going there in processions. When the Scots were established under Echter, the people of St Burkard's used to come along the river and climb the hill to St James's on Palm Sunday, the Rogation days and Corpus Christi. In addition to these, presumably liturgical, processions, they came on each Sunday from Easter to Pentecost at a very early hour, arriving before six o'clock. On Corpus Christi and the Rogation days there also came other groups from outlying places and from the citadel. On the vigil of St James's all the canons of the various churches came in procession to the Scots church, clearly a mark of special distinction as St James was not a local patron nor does any liturgical procession belong to his feast. The procession on the vigil of the Ascension, the last of the Rogation days, was instituted in 1618, and Thomas Duff has left the text of the extempore sermon he

20 Copitalbuch, f. 29; Wieland, 56, note; Gropp, IV, 308-12.
21 Gropp, II, 209-12.
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preached on the first occasion. A list of processions drawn up at the end of the seventeenth century shows some elaboration; it was evidently a custom to visit one or more monasteries on these days of procession, and one country group had a sung Mass in the chapel of St Macarius in the Scots church.

St James’s day was a principal feast for the Scots since he was the titular of their church. They also kept the dedication of the church. The high altar had been consecrated on the feast of St Vitus, 15th June, 1499, after a thorough renovation of the church; in the time of the Scots the dedication was celebrated on the Sunday following St Vitus’s day. The dedication of the chapel was also kept in August, on the Sunday after St Laurence. In 1681 Abbot Maxwell was trying to get authorisation from Rome to keep the Scottish saints and intended to find out more about them from old Scottish breviaries, but nothing came of his plans and at the end of the century the only feasts proper to the abbey were those of St James, the dedication of the church and the chapel, and the two of St Macarius. On the vigil of St James, as we have seen, the canons came in procession to the Scots church, while on the feast itself the bishop and other dignitaries could be expected to attend the High Mass, after which they were entertained in the monastery.

It has been made clear in the narrative that the Scots were integrated into the institutional framework of the Franconian monasteries. On a more personal level, too, they were integrated into the religious life of Würzburg. This is most clearly seen in the position of their abbot, who as a mitred prelate enjoyed a clerical dignity greater than did the officials
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who regulated his affairs. Often several abbots received their abbatial blessing simultaneously; Asloan, Irvine and Cook, for instance, were blessed with other recently elected German abbots. At these functions the bishop is assisted by two other mitred prelates, among whom one sometimes finds the abbot of St James's. Thus Asloan was present at the blessing of abbots of Neustadt in 1649 and 1660, and on the second occasion he was assistant prelate. Irvine was present at the abbatial election in Neustadt in 1686. Dixon attended the blessing of the prince-abbot of Fulda in 1678, and Ogilvie the consecration of a Cistercian church in 1624. Probably the record of only a fraction of these occasions has survived.

It was the custom in Würzburg for the bishop to invite abbots to be his assistants at episcopal consecrations, and Maurus Dixon was so invited in 1675, while in 1696 Ambrose Cook was actually delegated by the bishop to carry out an abbatial blessing himself. Neither of these two functions would normally be permitted to anyone not a bishop under present law. At the bishops' funerals, at least those in the later seventeenth century, the Scots abbot went with his fellow prelates to the final ceremonies in the cathedral and performed one of the absolutions. Irvine officiated at the funeral of the abbot of Oberzell in 1688. We can be sure that the abbots of St James's were invited to the various special functions or celebrations; such was the consecration of Haug church in 1691 when Cook sang pontifical Mass, or the other occasion the same year when he sang pontifical Mass and afterwards sat next to the prince-bishop at dinner.
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Being appointed by the bishop to carry out a visitation (as Asloan and Cook were) can be regarded as something impersonal and juridical. Not so with inclusion in the necrologies of other monasteries. Asloan found a place in that of Neustadt; Dixon, Maxwell and the prior John Stuart, who died in 1614, are in that of St Stephen's; the four abbots from Asloan to Irvine are in the Schwarzach necrology. In November 1679 the monasteries of the dioceses of Würzburg and Bamberg re-established a confraternity for offering prayers for the dead: when a religious died each priest was to say Mass, each religious not a priest to say certain prayers. St James's was among the handful of monasteries represented when the agreement was made; other houses were to join later.

It was commissioners appointed by the bishop who presided over abbatial elections and carried out visitations. For an election the commissioners were received by the monks at the church porch, to the ringing of bells. One of the commissioners addressed the monks, then there followed a Mass of the Holy Spirit. After this the monks took the oath to elect the man they considered the most suitable. Each wrote the name of his choice on a slip of paper, folded it and dropped it into a chalice. The result was announced, the abbot accepted office, and he was led to the church, where the Te Deum was sung. The newly-elect then lay prostrate during the Litany of the Saints. Next he was taken to the abbot's place in choir, where he promised obedience to the bishop and was given authority in spiritualibus, and the monks kissed his hand and promised obedience. That done, the abbot was led to the grave of his predecessor and reminded that he too must soon give an account of his stewardship. After a short
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prayer for the deceased, all repaired to the abbot's quarters. There, when his monks had paid him homage once more (presumably to acknowledge his authority in temporalibus), the new abbot was given the administration of monastic property and the keys of the monastery. The result of the election was posted on the church door before it was confirmed by the bishop, and in due time the abbatial blessing was conferred. 43

At a visitation the commissioners summoned abbot and community to chapter and presented their credentials. There followed some prayers and an exhortation from one of the commissioners, after which each monk took an oath to answer truthfully the questions put to him. The answers to the comprehensive questionnaire were recorded in each case. 44 The custom of answering a prepared list of questions under oath, it can be noted, was a recognised legal procedure on the Continent, at any rate in church courts. It was also, perhaps, universal procedure for visitations, unlike modern custom, which is less formal; a historian of the Reformation in England, for example, speaks of the 'traditional routine questions' at visitations. It should be obvious, incidentally, that a balanced view of a religious community cannot be obtained from studying the answers to these questions, which do not seek a judicious assessment of the health of the body but investigate specifically the ailments from which it might be suffering. The same historian calls the study of visitation records the 'pathology' of the religious life. 45

When trying to picture life in seventeenth-century Würzburg one should remember that it was a seat of learning both because of its diocesan seminary and of the university. Presumably a clerical student could do adequate theological studies at the seminary or perhaps some other college, or else
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cover much the same ground but at a higher level at the university. Bishop Echter had wanted the Scots to teach theology, and perhaps some did, if not at the university, which was firmly in the hands of the Jesuits, then in one of the colleges. Only a few of the Scots student monks are listed in the matriculation rolls, which leads one to suppose that the others attended classes in divinity at the seminary or some religious house. Marianus Irvine, we know, taught philosophy and theology in St James's itself. The Scots may also have attended the college for Benedictines which the bishop ordered to be set up in St Stephen's in 1651.

Three abbots of St James's held the position of Rector Magnificus of the university: Ogilvie, Asloan and Cook. The Scots abbot is also said to have acted as pro-rector in 1683, but his name as given, Maurus, does not fit in with the date, and one of the two must be wrong. Scots names on the matriculation rolls appear to fall into two classes, young students and something more honorific. The former have already been discussed; the matriculation of Abbot Ogilvie before being appointed rector, and of Abbots Irvine and Cook immediately after their election, belong to the latter. Some entries, however, are less easy to evaluate. Francis Hamilton in 1596, although prior, was undoubtedly a student, but why did Robert Forbes the prior and Thomas Duff the poet matriculate in 1629, and Alan Chisholm the senior monk in 1694? It is surely no coincidence that in each case the Scots abbot was Rector at the time. Perhaps they matriculated in order to serve the Rector in some official capacity.

The city of Würzburg had importance as the residence of a prince-bishop and a seat of learning. Naturally it attracted foreign travellers. The letters of Abbot Maxwell give an indication of the number of Scots who
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visited the town and the monastery of their fellow-countrymen. This is not surprising when one considers the great number of Scots on the continent and the liaison which the monks maintained with their homeland. The Irish also came to Würzburg, at least in the middle years of the century. Some matriculated at the university,\textsuperscript{49} others were merely visitors, like the friars whom James Brown interrogated about Ireland,\textsuperscript{50} or the Vicar General of Ireland and the Bernardine abbot who passed through in 1653-54.\textsuperscript{51} During the Cromwellian persecution the Irish Franciscans who could find no accommodation in Prague wanted to establish a house in Würzburg. They were attracted by the Irish associations of St Kilian's town and by the fact that it was a centre of studies and thus suitable for their students, but in the event no Irish house was founded.\textsuperscript{52}

Some features of Würzburg life were less attractive, at least when viewed three centuries later. The Jews were subject to restrictions.\textsuperscript{53} Würzburg was a sort of theocracy inasmuch as the source of spiritual and temporal authority was the prince-bishop, which helps to explain the various enactments against swearing and unchastity in the last third of the century.\textsuperscript{54} In one matter Catholic Würzburg's reputation is very black: with Presbyterian Scotland and Puritan New England it shares the unenviable distinction of having persecuted witches most cruelly. It is listed as one of the two most notorious German states in this regard. Even if we dismiss as fantastic the figure of nine thousand put to death in the years 1627-28,\textsuperscript{55} the amount of innocent suffering involved remains appalling.

Nobody was secure: even a relative of the bishop, when he took to a dis-
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solute life, was beheaded for witchcraft.  

Since the Schottenklöster centred on Batisbon were almost all founded in the twelfth century, the history of their buildings tended to be similar. They were built very near but not in the town, then the town grew and absorbed them within its limits. The Würzburg abbey was different from the others in that it lay across the river from the town, but even so it was in the path of the new city walls, precisely the situation which occasioned the demolition of two Scotic monasteries in the sixteenth century. Originally it was outside the city wall, but was brought within it, so that in 1400 the outer wall of the monastery actually formed part of the city wall. What affected the monastery still more, however, was its proximity to the citadel as the latter's fortifications and defences became more elaborate.

During their occupation of the town and citadel in 1631-34 the Swedes drew up plans which affected St James's. A decade later work began on new fortifications, which took some of the Scots' vineyards and spoiled others for a considerable time. For this they were compensated. From 1653 to 1663 work is recorded on the Schottenschanz or Scottish redoubt, which brought the monastery within the fortifications and quite changed its surroundings. Even now, however, it was not completed, and the Scots again received compensation, in 1664 and 1667, including a reduction in their subsidium charitativum, the tax paid to the prince-bishop. Inclusion in the fortifications was to cause great inconvenience to the abbey, particularly in the eighteenth century, but it undoubtedly makes its surroundings more picturesque. Even today the visitor comes across high sheer walls and precipitous drops as he walks round the precincts of St
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James's.

Detailed investigation of the buildings occupied by the Scots is less a matter for the historian than for the local antiquarians, and indeed these have written at length on the subject. All the same, in trying to picture the life led by the Scots in the local setting, it is helpful to know something of their monastery and church. The church faced east as one would expect; the monastery, at the time of the Scots' arrival, lay north and east of the church, and the two buildings were not joined until a later date. The mediaeval monastery does not concern us here, because nothing survived of it in the seventeenth century. When German monks were introduced in 1497 the monastery was all but uninhabitable; only the renovations carried out by the bishop, some of them entailing completely new buildings, enabled monastic life to continue. The same pattern of events was repeated not much later. The monastery was in great part burnt down in the Peasants War about 1525 and by Bishop Echter's time was once again uninhabitable. Before the first three Scots could take up residence, Echter had to restore it from the ruins and rebuild it extensively. For all practical purposes, therefore, the monastic buildings dated from the sixteenth century.

This monastery consisted of one building running north and south, at some distance to the east of the church; its south end was more or less in line with the north side of the church. It seems fairly clear that little more than the necessary minimum was done before the first three monks arrived in 1595 and that more was planned. References to the buildings are confused and not easy to interpret, as Wieland, the principal

59 For the monastery buildings see Wieland, 63-77; F. Mader (ed.), Die Kunstdenkmäler von Bayern, III, 12: Stadt Würzburg (Munich, 1915), 346. Other references given are supplementary to these. The mentions in Ser. Abb. to buildings and furnishing are printed in P. Weissenberger, "Beiträge zur Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte mainfränkischer...Klöster", in Mainfränkisches Jahrbuch, iii, 203-04. A plan of the building is opposite p. 385.

60 Oegg, 358-61.
A: old wing
B: new wings
C: porter's lodge, built in 1627
D: church towers
E: west transept, removed in 1699
F: chapel of Macarius
G: wing begun in 1744
H: chapel shown on 17th-century sketch
writer on the subject admits, and the almost complete destruction of 1945 has removed most of the evidence. Nevertheless, it seems clear that in the seventeenth century new buildings were erected while extensive repairs were also carried out on the old ones. The arms of Abbots Asloan and Irvine, with the dates 1652 and 1688 respectively, in the old wing bear witness to renovations there.

On St Benedict's day, 1600, Abbot Whyte laid a foundation stone, which can hardly have been in the church or the old wing and so must denote a new building. The list of benefactors which chronicles this goes on to record donations made by Bishop Echter for the new fabric, ending with one for repairing cells in the dormitory in 1610. Whether this last refers to the new wing or the old, the dormitory of three storeys built from its foundations by Abbot Ogilvie, who succeeded to the abbacy in 1615, must surely be a completely new building. In 1631, towards the end of Ogilvie's rule, there was mention of a new monastery building, and in 1688 of the old and new monastery buildings. The chronicler states that Abbot Dixon built a fine hall on the east side (ad plagam orientalem), which presupposes that there were other sides already in existence.

Certainly by the early eighteenth century two other wings had been added to the one restored by Echter. The original wing was to the east; the two others were to the north and west, and the latter reached almost to the north-east corner of the church. The three wings formed, more or less, the three sides of a square, and one can conjecture that the cloister referred to in seventeenth-century documents completed the square and provided a covered way for the monks to enter the church from either end of the completed monastic buildings. This cloister, which bore a coat-of-
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arms with the date 1519, disappeared without trace when the square of buildings was eventually completed. Abbot Ogilvie had also added at the outside gate a small building which is still standing and bears the date 1627. The important conclusion emerges from all this that the Scots built and renovated extensively in the seventeenth century and ended by possessing premises far superior to those of a century before.

As regards the church the uncertainties are less great, for it was always repaired or rebuilt on the same site. It was a basilica in shape, with three aisles whose round apses formed a clover-leaf design. There was no transept. It was fairly large, being about 140 feet long and 55 feet wide. Inside, the impression was given of very slim proportions as the centre aisle ran the whole length of the church, had a flat ceiling over 45 feet high, but was only about 25 feet wide. On the outside, two high towers soared above the east ends of the side aisles, and on the roof of the rounded apse on the south side aisle squatted the grotesque stone figure called the Schottenmandel (dialect for 'Scots dwarf').

The church bore a striking resemblance to that of the Scotic monks in Ratisbon; both had towers over the side aisles to the east, a flat-ceilinged nave and a vaulted choir, with the same slender proportions. Both had a sort of transept with gallery at the west end of the nave. It is worth noting that the surviving church in Ratisbon dates from after that in Würzburg. The stone dwarf, too, was like a figure on the bridge over the Danube at Ratisbon.

The church was built shortly before 1156. Its basic form and a good
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64 B. Hanftmann, "Das Schottenmännchen in Würzburg und seine Sippe", in AU, lxx, 323-34.
many of its surviving features were romanesque. The choir, however, was rebuilt towards the end of the thirteenth century. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it underwent the same vicissitudes as the monastic buildings, requiring a thorough restoration when the German monks took possession and then once more falling into a ruinous condition. Shortly before the Scots arrived, Mass could not be said at the high altar, so exposed was it to the elements. The foundation deed of 1595 referred to the church as having been struck by lightning and partly burnt out; on the other hand, the suffragan who was administrator had apparently been holding ordinations there not many years before. Bishop Sang in his oration in 1615 said the church was provided with a new roof and twin towers before the Scots arrived, but even so there was constant need for renovation. The roof of the choir was rotten in 1617, and the chapel at the west end in a bad state; snow and rain came freely into the church in 1625; the church was in need of a thorough-going repair in 1640 after the Swedish occupation. Later in the century Abbot Dixon had the inside roof renewed and Abbot Maxwell built a new choir; probably this last, too, refers to interior renovation.

Although it was less magnificent than before the destruction of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the church of St James's could still be described as one of the most imposing and individualistic churches in Franconia. Its proportions have won praise from architects, and in spite of its vicissitudes it retained not only its early forms but also a wealth of romanesque and gothic ornament. There were two old chapels, one just outside the north apse, and the other in the angle formed by the south aisle and the west transept. The former, the chapel of St James where
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Macarius was buried, survived until an eighteenth-century extension of the monastery was built on its site. The latter presumably disappeared with the west transept, which was demolished in 1699 as a wall of the fortifications was pressing against it. By that time the church as a whole once more needed repair. It received this in the early eighteenth century, and thereafter remained much as it was until it was gutted in 1945. At present its exterior dimensions remain the same, the towers still stand and one still enters by the early eighteenth-century porch, but the pillars separating the aisles have gone and the nave is a simple rectangle.

In the seventeenth century, then, the Scots had a church of venerable antiquity. Its interior arrangements and furnishings were what one would expect. The eastward bays of the centre aisle formed the choir and sanctuary, elevated somewhat above the nave. The side aisles were likewise divided at much the same point, and on the eastern side of the partitions were chapels entered from the choir. The one to the south of the choir was used as the sacristy. The details recorded of the altars are confusing, but it can be mentioned that one was dedicated to St Kilian and in 1615 there were six altars in use in the church. Some were at the west end of the church.

At some point, possibly in the eighteenth century, the pillars of the church were covered over with lime or plaster, which hid the frescoes painted in 1504 and portraying saints, among them Kilian and his companions. The chapel of Macarius also had pictures, presumably frescoes, of his miracles, but these may well have been made after the finding of the body. The same is probably true of a picture of Macarius in the church. Another picture showing Bishops Embricho and Echter with Macarius and
Abbot Ogilvie clearly commemorates the finding. There was also a picture of Abbot Trithemius and at least two pictures painted later in the seventeenth century. There were statues, of various dates, of Christ and his mother; above the entrance to the choir stood a crucifixion group. Saints, notably St James, had their statues, and the group comprising the Madonna, St Benedict and St Macarius has been mentioned earlier. The surviving statue of Macarius is baroque and thus later than its two companions, but may be a replacement of an earlier statue. We know that this happened with the crucifixion group. Seventeenth-century churchmen and craftsmen had no hesitation about introducing baroque 'improvements'.

Collection boxes were placed in the chapel of Macarius and at the foot of the steps leading up to the choir. At the top of the steps stood the stone sarcophagus of Macarius, within which was the metal coffin containing his bones. The stone lid, still to be seen in the Marienkapelle, bore the figure of Macarius in Benedictine cowl and hood, of a pattern very like the English Congregation hood of today. On the sides were the arms of Bishop Echter and Abbot Ogilvie. It was the custom to bury abbots in the church and erect monuments to them; one could read the epitaphs of a fourteenth-century Irish abbot and of Trithemius and other sixteenth-century German abbots. The Scots Ogilvie and Asloan were also in their turn given burial and a monument in the church.

In the choir stood the gothic choirstalls presented by Bishop von Bibra about 1500. Ogilvie had an organ built, which was replaced by Abbot Maxwell's new one half a century later. In the south tower was a bell presented by the bishop in 1638 and later repaired by Maxwell, as well as
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two others blessed in 1657; it was recorded in 1682 that three bells were in this tower, and another in the chapel of Macarius. One can see from all this that the Scots had more than a little oratory in which to say their choir office far from home. They had a fine church five centuries old, needing constant repair, it is true, but they found the means to supply this. Its furniture and appointments betokened both its venerable past and the present glory of its own saint, Macarius. Its equipment, both the necessary and the ornamental, was being replaced and added to. The chronicle describes most of the seventeenth-century abbots as buying chalices, vestments and so on for the church. Whether this was done out of income or was the result of benefactions - the faithful visiting Macarius's tomb would no doubt express their devotion in a practical way - it seems clear that the sacristy equipment increased. Roughly a sixth of the Scots' income in 1736 came from stipends and alms. The inventory drawn up in 1688 would seem to indicate that in this Catholic city during the era of Baroque, the Scots were not unaffected by the general process of elaboration in worship. They had half a dozen chalices, at least four sets of Mass vestments of each colour, and all the paraphernalia necessary for pontifical ceremonies.

A Würzburg chalice which has found its way to Scotland is probably not one of these six, as it is a 'travelling' chalice for use by missionaries. The arms of Abbot Maxwell and the monastery are engraved on its base. This is perhaps a suitable place to comment on the custom among the monks in this regard, since the chalice is a perfect example of it. The abbot's arms consist of a saltire cross (for Maxwell), which does not necessarily mean that he was personally entitled to them. Each Scots
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abbot would assume the arms of some family of the same surname; these he would use either alone or joined to the arms of the monastery. The latter consisted of the scallop-shell of St James, the pilgrim apostle, on two pilgrim staffs crossed saltire-wise. The large seal of the monastery showed St James with pilgrim hat and staff, and scallop-shells on his cloak.  

The Scots encouraged the people of Würzburg to visit their church by obtaining papal grants of indulgences. In 1619 Paul V granted several indulgences to the church. Later in the century the Scots sought a plenary indulgence for those who visited the church on the feast of St James. A grant made in 1688 apparently arrived too late but Alan Chisholm asked for it again the following year, and the indulgence was bestowed for seven years in 1690.

Let us consider finally the life led by the monks. We know a certain amount about its externals. The monastery needed employees, and we have a list of them in 1625, but it is not easy to judge which ones were employed full-time: possibly the abbot's manservant, the organist, bailiff, cook, gardener, porter, vinedresser, or at least some of them; hardly, one would think, the washerwoman; and surely not the doctor, surgeon, slater and cooper. The habit worn by the monks was the same as that of other Benedictines in the diocese, for not only did the statutes of 1618 lay down regulations for dress but the pictures and statues which survived until recently show the similarity. The only choir books of which we know were those prescribed for use in all Benedictine houses.

The time of rising varied. In 1595 it was 3 o'clock, in 1614 mid-
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night, in 1618 3.45 and an hour earlier on feast-days; in 1665 it was 3.45, in 1692 2 o'clock. Apart from the short period during which they rose at midnight and then returned to bed after Matins, the time must be considered in relation to the habits of the townspeople, who could assemble in procession on Easter Sunday at 5 a.m. We know the horarium prescribed for the monks by Bishop Echter, while the detailed regulations for daily routine laid down by the synod of 1618 have been preserved through the diligence of the Scot; Thomas Duff, who transcribed them. Since, however, they were the result of the bishop's zeal for monastic observance and were not peculiar to the Scots, there is little point in describing them in detail. It is enough to know that the Scots followed the same observance as other monasteries in the diocese.

It is paradoxical that the aspect we know least about is the spiritual life of the monks. This is perhaps inevitable; the history of a university, for example, will say next to nothing about its success in producing the genuine fruits of education, breadth of mind and so on, in its alumni. The synod of 1618 said that priests were to go to confession once a week, and it wanted them to say Mass three times a week or even daily. In 1628 Silvanus Mayne declared that he had said Mass that morning as the custom was to celebrate almost daily. But even this tells us little about the personal spiritual lives of the monks. One has to remember that unless monastic life had broken down completely, as for example during the Swedish occupation, the monks continued to perform their common duties and choir offices and also their private devotional exercises. Day in and day out, whether the observance at the time was such as would satisfy the bishop's officials and edify the later historian or not,
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this continued. One must presume, except when there is evidence to the contrary, that the monks remained faithful to the essentials of their vows; and in order to do this, the vital spark of spiritual fervour must have been kept alive.

This is putting it at its lowest. We can get some idea of the interest of the monks in spiritual things from the writings which have survived. Even if we dismiss letters, such as those containing Abbot Maxwell's Christian sentiments, or works intended for publication, like James Brown's well-meaning hagiography, on the grounds that their purpose was to edify, the notebooks kept by monks surely indicate where their interests lay. Thomas Duff, who filled one volume with poems of his own composition, filled another with prayers, meditations and devotional passages, copied from various authors. He and another monk filled yet another notebook between them with the same sort of thing. James Hegate's scrapbook, containing items on the most diverse subjects, has spiritual topics among them.

Towards the end of the century Bernard Falconer penned a volume of spiritual doctrine and meditations. Augustine Bruce, who was professed in 1678 and elected abbot in 1713, filled two books with passages on monastic observance. A further volume that has survived is possibly later; it is in English and is called a Spiritual Testament. One could perhaps go through all these volumes in detail and examine the sources used by the monks and the works they read to nourish their spiritual life. One might even discover that some of what they wrote was their own composition.

The point here being made is simpler and more general: that they did read spiritual works assiduously and were interested in spiritual things.
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The Scottish monastery in Würzburg remained in being for another hundred years and was not dissolved until the general secularisation shortly after 1800 which put an end to almost every religious community in Germany. It underwent some vicissitudes during the period; perhaps the most serious occurred a few years after the time we have been considering, when in 1703 Abbot Cook was deposed for misconduct. Not all its superiors were successful, but on the whole the monastery prospered and recruitment appeared to present no problem. Apart from a period in the 1740s when numbers sank lower, there were always between seven and ten monks, which was probably as many as the revenues could support. At the time of the secularisation in 1803 there were seven priests resident and one missionary in Scotland. As in the previous century, the contribution to the Scottish mission was small but not negligible.

The Scots became even more dependent on local officials when the administration of their temporalities was given to the diocesan exchequer under Bishop Frederick Charles von Schönborn (1729-46). From then on, their revenues were collected for them, which may have eased their burden but also increased their dependence. In the eighteenth century, too, the diocesan officials deferred abbatial elections, so that there were periods in which the monastery was ruled by a prior. From the 1760s on there was no abbot at all. For the last forty years of its existence the ordinary, regular superior of the monastery was a prior; this arrangement meant a loss of dignity for St James's but worked admirably. Towards the end of the century the Scots enjoyed a high reputation for good living and learn-
ing, even among the somewhat anti-clerical supporters of the Enlightenment.

Close relations with Ratisbon were retained but there was no form of common organisation or union. At the time of the secularisation the Würzburg monks made no effort to act in concert with the Ratisbon community (which was not dissolved) for the continuance of Scottish monasticism. Instead, they lived privately in or near Würzburg until the last of their number died in 1839. In spite of this, one could argue that the greatest contribution made by the monks of Würzburg to the Benedictine order and the Roman Catholic church was the help they gave to the Ratisbon abbey. In the darkest days after the troubles under Abbot Algeo and the Swedish occupation of Ratisbon, it was Würzburg monks who took charge in Ratisbon and its dependency at Erfurt. It was the Würzburg abbot, Aslohan, who saved Ratisbon when the emperor and bishop were trying to expel the Scots, and it was a Würzburg monk, Baillie, who ruled at Ratisbon until 1655. Würzburg monks continued to help the Ratisbon monastery until the election of its great abbot, Flacid Fleming.

The achievements of the Ratisbon abbey in the eighteenth century were outstanding: its seminary flourished, its monks played a distinguished part in the cultural life of Bavaria and made a notable contribution to learning, as professors and writers, at Erfurt university. Alone of all the monastic houses of Germany, the Scots abbey in Ratisbon was not secularised in the early years of the nineteenth century. It was not dissolved until 1862; its last monk, having returned to Scotland, lived on to 1900; its last student was a parish priest in the West Highlands until his death in 1927. But without the salvage operations directed from Würzburg, it is extremely doubtful if the Ratisbon monastery would have survived into the second half of the seventeenth century.
APPENDIX A

Conditions for restoration accepted by the Scots, 2nd May 1595.
(Originals in Wz,SA, 50.24a, 99.223. Text taken from the former).

NOS IOANNES IACOBUS ALBUS, DEI et Apostolicae Sedis gratia Abbas Sancti Iacobi apud Scotos Ratisbonae, ordinis Divi Benedicti, et RICHARDUS IREWING Abbas Sancti Iacobi Herbipolensis eiusdem ordinis Notum facimus per praesentes.

Cum temporum iniuria, religionisque Catholicae mutatione, nec non superiorum Abbatum Monasterii Divi Iacobi Herbipolensis negligentia acciderit, Scotorum monachorum ordinis D. Benedicti residentiam in dicto Monasterio Herbipolensi plane abrogari, redditusque ita extenuari, ut nulli vel pauci saltem in eodem ali potuerint, adhaec templum dicti Monasterii caelo tactum magna ex parte conflagrarit, ita ut ob id divina officia longissimo tempore omissa, ac monasterium propemodum desolatum fuerit, adeo ut nisi beneficio atque opera Reverendissimi atque Illustriissimi Principis ac Domini, domini IULII Episcopi Herbipolensis ac Franciae orientalis Ducis restituta fuisset religio, ac restauratum templum, redditusque conservati atque aucti, de Monasterio Scotisque hac in parte actum videretur, Nos praefati Domini Principis atque Episcopi consilio atque consensu, praecedente quoque tractatu nostrorum fratrums Conventualium, eorumque voluntate huic malo praeveneri ac in posterum praecavere satagentes, constituimus atque ordinamus, quod in posterum in dicto monasterio S. Iacobi Herbipolensi praeter Abbatem alii quinque Religiosi fratres ordinis (D.) Benedicti genere Scoti resident, aut si eorum copia haberii nequeat, vel defectus
intra semestre tempus non supplatur, erit liberum praefato Domino Episcopo tanquam ordinario eiusque successoribus ex aliis monasteriis eiusdem ordinis D. Benedicti Dioecesis Herbipolensis alium vel alios Germanae nationis substituere, quo constitutus numerus senarius continuus sit atque perpetuus, ex quo in casu vacationis Abbas legitime eligetur, qui omnium erit aptissimus, sive ille demum sit Scotus sive Germanus.

Ut autem officia divina debito modo persolvantur, novitiorumque ignorantiae subveniatur, curabimus ut omnes sint in ordine Presbiterii aut aliquo ex maioribus constituti, aut intra annum ad id promovendi, qui aliis vita, moribus atque institutione praeesse ac prodesse possint, quorum unus etiam cum laude Theologiam publice atque in Universitate Herbipolensi profiteri debeat.

Adhaec liberum erit praedicto Domino Episcopo ac Principi Herbipolensi eiusque successoribus vi ordinariae Visitationis quotannis praefatum Monasterium, tam quo ad regularem Disciplinam, quam cultum divinum, atque administrationem rerum Ecclesiasticarum per se vel suos Visitatores deputatos visitare, ordinis regulas iuxta praescriptum observari curare, cultum divinum aliquo modo collapsum restituere, regulares personas in nominato Monasterio constitutas iisque coabitantes examinare, corrigere, debitisque poenis canonicis afficere, transferre ac si opus foret plane removere, ab administrationibus, oeconomis, ac praefectis annuatim pro ut in aliis R.S.C. Dioecesis Monasteriis non absque fructu atque utilitate eorundem observatum ac receptum est, rationes exigere, absque fraude et dolo.

In quorum omnium fidem ac robur has literas nostrae Abbatiae Sigillis communiri fecimus.

Et quia ut praemittitur haec consensu atque authoritate praefati
Domini Episcopi ac Principis tanquam Ordinarii, accedente quoque consensu Reverendorum Generosi ac Nobilium DD. Decani et Capituli Cathedralis Ecclesiae a nobis statuta ac in vim iuramenti stipulatione a nobis promissa sunt, hinc ad nos eius rei nomine convincendos, debita humilitate petivimus, ut S.R.C. nec non DD. Decanus ac Capitulum easdem has literas suo ac Capituli Sigillis confirmarent.

Quod nos IULIUS Episcopus Herbipolensis ac Franciae orientalis Dux, qui promissionem praedictam ratione Ecclesiae nostrae acceptavimus, ac constitutiones praedictas tanquam canonibus, ac consuetudini nostrae Diocesis conformes, ordinaria nostra potestate confirmavimus, ac per praesentes confirmamus atque acceptamus, uti praemittitur requisiti, volentes lubentesque fecimus, atque nostro Sigillo has literas communiri iussimus, Et nos Decanus et Capitulum praedictum ad maiorem huius rei corroborationem nostri Capituli Sigillum his quoque appendi fecimus.

Datas secunda Maii, Anno millesimo quingentesimo Nonagesimo quinto.
APPENDIX B

Property made over, under conditions, to the Scots, 11th September 1595.
(Copy in Wz.SA, SB 548, f. 8r-9r).

Wir Julius von Gottes gnaden Bischoff zu Wirtzburg unnd Hertzog zu Franckenn, Nachdem unser Gottshauss und Closter zu Sandt Jacob alhe zun Schotten gnant, Wie auch die darzu gehorige ligende guetter auss ublem hausshalten, fast gar in abgang kommen, haben wir, die weil sonderlich mit hilff und seegen dass Allmechtigen, unser hauptstatt Und gantzen Stifft, in der Religion widerumb in alten standt, und zu Christlicher einhelligkeit gebracht, bemelt Closter widerumb, Vermog ufgerichter sonderbarer Capitulation, mit Ordens Personen, Damit der gebuerlich Gottes Dienst der Fundation gemess verrichtet werde, besetzt unnd bestellet, Auch aber desselbigen guetter gefell unnd einkommen dem wirdigen unserm lieben Andechtigen Richardo, Itzigem desselbigen Abbt, und dem Convent dises besiglete Register, sich dessen zu einbringung der gefell haben zu gebrauchen, einantwortten und behendigen lassen, Darauf sie für sich, Und Ire Nachkommen, sich obligirt und versprochen, Das ohne unser und unserer Nachkommen vorwissen Unnd verwilligung, sie von solchen hierin specificirten guettern, Lehenschafften, zinsen, Gultten, nutzungen und einkommen sampt deren anhengig rechten, Und gerechtigkeiten, nichts vereussern, verkauffen, versetzen, verpfenden noch beschweren sonderm alles in guetten richtigen, auch die ligenden guetter in bewlichen wesen, In massen wir Inen zu guetten, sonderlich die Weingartten, widerumb zu recht haben pringen lassen, erhalten und hand haben sollen unnd wollen, Damit solch ders Gottes hauss guetter
William Ogilvie made Prefect of the Benedictine mission and given faculties, 1629.

(Copy of letter to Ogilvie in KJP, 517/1; it is not a bull. Copies of faculties in KJP, 517/1; Sch. Urk, 682; ML, Dixon, 11.11.1676. Punctuation has been altered slightly).

Copia Bullae Urbani octavi Papae Gulielmo Abbati Scotorum Herbipoli concessa pro Missione Apostolica in regnum Scotiae.


Tu igitur, rei magnitudinem et Apostolici Muneris tibi commissi gravitatem serio perpendens, inprimis cave, ne ad Haereticorum conciones aut ritus quoslibet quovis praetextu vel causa accedas: Deinde ommem adhibe curam, ut ministerium tuum digne et fideliter etiam cum sanguinis effusione ac morte ipsa, si opus fuerit, impleas, ut immarcescibilem coronam a Patre luminum recipere merearis. Datum Romae ex sacra Congregatione de propa-
ganda fide die 22. Junii MDXXIX.

Card. Ludovisius Presbyter
Franciscus Ingolus Sec.


Reconciliandi Haereticos cuiuscunque Nationis, dummodo non sint ex partibus in quibus exercetur sanctum officium Inquisitionis.

Absolvendi a casibus etiam sedi Apostolicae et in bulla Coenae Domini reservatis omnes etiam Ecclesiasticos et Regularis, inimictis iniungendis.

Dispensandi cum Ecclesiasticis super quibuscunque suspensionibus, inhabilitatibus et irregularitatis, praeterquam homicidii voluntarii et vitiorum corporis, in foro conscientiae, et in civitatibus et dioecesibus quae non habent Episcopos residentes aut Vicarios Apostolicos, vel cum eorum licentia.

Concedendi Apostolicam benedictionem cum plenaria Indulgentia iis quos Ecclesiae Catholicae reconciliaverit, ubi non sunt Episcopi vel Vicarii, et ubi sunt de eorum licentia.

Concedendi Indulgentiam plenariam quotannis in festis celebrioribus et in mortis articulo, ac si quotannis generalem suorum peccatorum confessionem fecerint, et etiam Indulgentiam quadraginta aut quinquaginta dierum ad libitum.

Tenendi ac legendi libros haereticorum et quoscunque prohibitos, ad effectum illos impugnandi, ita tamen ut libri praedicti non extrahantur
extra illam regionem.

Administrandi sacramenta omnia, excepta confirmatione et sacris ordinibus, omissis pro necessitate solemnitatis et ceremoniis solitis et consuetis, non autem necessariis, ita tamen ut Baptismus, Extrema Unctio ac Matrimonium non administratur in locis ubi Pastores inveniuntur ab Ordinariis seu Vicariis Apostoliciis instituti, absque eorumquam Pastorum seu Ordinariorum consensu.

Ubi Brevarium ferre non potest absque periculo, recitandi rosarium B. Virginis vel alias orationes et psalmos quos memoria tenet.

Benedicendi, ubi non sunt Episcopi vel Vicarii, et ubi sunt de eorum licentia, paramenta et consecranti ea quae ad cultum divinum sunt necessaria, ubi non intervenit sacra unctio, nec teneatur inquirere, an altaaria portatilia continant reliquias necne.

Celebrandi Missam quocunque loco decenti, etiam sub dio, subitus terra, tribus horis ante lucem, hyeme una hora post meridiem, bis in die, ubi necessitas postulaverit, etiam coram haereticis alisquis personis excommunicatis, dummodo Minister non sit haereticus, ac aliter celebrari non possit, et sit ieiunus.

Hostiam consecratum servandi loco decenti sine lumine et aliis ceremoniis quibus uti solet Ecclesia.

Commutandi vota simplicia, ubi non sunt Episcopi vel Vicarii Apostolici, et ubi sunt de eorum licentia, exceptis Castitatis et Religionis, in aliud opus plium, et iuramenta relaxandi iustas ob causas.

Dispensandi ob magnam necessitatem, et quando non potest haberis recursus ad Episcopos, in secundo et tertio gradu consanguinitatis seu affinitatis, etiam ante contractum Matrimonium; absque Episcoporum vero consensu,
si commode haberí potest, non dispenseetur in his aut aliis Matrimonii im-
pedimentis.

Imprimendi et edendi libros Catholicorum tacito nomine auctoris, loci
ac typographi et reliquorum, non obstante Concilio Tridentino.

Dispensandi cum Conversis ad fidem Catholicam super fructibus bonorum
Ecclesiasticorum male perceptis, facta aliqua eleemosyna in usum Religionis
illius cuius ante schisma erant bona, si ibi adsit Religio illa, sin minus
in Catholicos pauperes.

Communicandi supradictas facultates in toto vel in parte decem aliis
sacerdotibus sui ordinis sibi bene visis.

Utendi his facultatibus in Anglia, Hybernia, Scotia, Mona et aliis
locis Dominii Regis magnae Britanniae.

Feria 5°a Die 2. Augusti 1629

In generali Congregatione sancti officii habita in palatio Apostolico
Montis Quirinalis, praefatus sanctissimus D.N.D. Urbanus Papa Octavus con-
cessit suprascriptas facultates ad septennium proximum praedicto Patri
Gulielmo Ogilbaeo Scoto Ordinis S. Benedicti, designato Praefecto Missionis
Scotiae.

Jo. Garsia Cardinalis Millinus

Locus Sigilli

Joa. Antonius Thomasius Sanctae

Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis Notarius
Monks of St James's by order of profession.

The list that follows is intended to be a handy guide. The criterion for inclusion is association with the monastery for a sufficiently long period to have some significance for its history; thus not all who made profession are included. Ratisbon monks who merely lived for a time at Würzburg are not included either. Where two forenames are given, the first (except in the case of Abbot Asloan) is the baptismal name, the second that assumed with the religious habit. Where only one name is given, it can be presumed that down to James Brown it is the baptismal name, and from Maurus Dixon on it is the religious name. One notes roughly three main classes of saints' names taken in religion: those of the Benedictine saints (chiefly Benedict, Maurus, Placid, Gregory, Bernard); those of Scottish saints or Scotic missionaries in Germany; and those of the great saints of Christendom.

It is impossible in most cases to establish the dates precisely. Normally profession takes place twelve months after reception of the habit, which itself will not usually be long delayed after the arrival of the aspirant, provided he has the requisite age and education. Much of the dating depends on figures given much later at visitations or in obituaries, where the person is described as (say) 20 years professed. It is usually not clear if this means 'in the 20th year' or 'having completed 20 years'; the policy followed in this list is therefore, in general, to subtract 20, which establishes the date within a maximum of twelve months' error.
Even this, however, is dependent on the accuracy of the figure 20, and it is obvious that the figures given in visitation records are merely approximate. From 1658 onwards, on the other hand, the order of seniority is accurate (except for Hay and Mackintosh).

In the list, 'before (after) 1620' is to be interpreted as meaning 'in or before (after) 1620'; the date is a terminus. Death can be presumed to have taken place at Würzburg unless there is an indication to the contrary. For all but the later monks, a question mark has been added to the date of death where the only evidence is an unsupported entry in the necrology. Finally, most of the information is printed in Necrologies (or Necr. Suppl.) or is to be found in Reid, f. 112, 117-20, or else it relies on the body of the present work and the sources specifically related there to the monk in question. Source references will only be given if they are in addition to these.


1595 **Francis Hamilton.** From Edinburgh. Professed at Ratisbon before 1592. Abbot of Würzburg 1602-05. Died after 1617, presumably at Kirchworbis.

1595 **John Stuart.** Born near Glasgow. Professed at Ratisbon before 1595. Died in May 1614.


Before 1611 Gabriel Wallace. Was later said to have been a laybrother. Died 1616 (?).


Before 1630 Andrew Urquhart. The only information about him is his inclusion, with the title of priest, in the necrology under 23rd November 1630.

January 1623. Died in May 1631 (?); certainly after 1629 and before September 1635.


After 1624 Edward Maxwell. Born c. 1607 at Conheath, near Dumfries. Came to Würzburg May 1623. Died as prior October 1635.

Before 1631(?) William Maxwell. The only information is that he was a deacon and was in Ireland in September 1635. Not in the necrology.

After 1632 James Brown. Received the habit 13th July 1631. Not yet ordained priest in November 1636. Died in March 1658 (?); certainly after 1652 and before February 1661.


After 1647 David Placid Keith. Came to Würzburg September 1646. At
Würzburg 1654. In Poland 1662 (?). Not in necrology.


1663 Alan Chisholm. From Tweeddale.\(^1\) Born c. 1642.\(^2\) Novice 1662. Died 1703.


1667-68 James Blair or Benburn. Died 1st October 1702 at Monte Cassino.\(^3\)

1667-68 Columbanus Fraser. From Buchan. Died 1677 (?); certainly before 1679.

1668-69 James Marianus Irvine. Of Belty or Drum (?). Abbot 1685-88. Died 22nd November 1688.


---

1 ML, Chisholm, May 1700.
2 ML, Bruce, 13.4.1698, implies a rather earlier date.
3 ML, Holgher, 2.10.1702.
Before 1670  **Michael Mackintosh.**  The only information about him is his inclusion, with the title of priest, in the necrology under 29th December 1670. Not in lists of resident community 1661-68.

Before 1673 (?) **Benedict Hay.** Of Dalgety. Is mentioned in no Würzburg document before his transfer to Ratisbon c. 1673 (?)

1677  **Gregory Seaton.**  Born 1658. Died before ordination at Ratisbon 13th February 1685.

1678-79  **Kilian Harris.**  Born 1663. Died 30th March 1683.


1680  **Patrick John Alexander.**  From Aberdeen. Born 1658. Received the habit December 1679. Died 25th May 1682.

1682  **John Ambrose Cook.**  Born at Preston c. 1660. Received the habit July 1681. Ordained priest c. 1685. Abbot 1689-1703. Died at Düsseldorf 1727.

1685  **Thomas Joseph Ogilvie.**  Received habit as laybrother in May 1684. Still in Würzburg community 1698. Not in necrology.

25th July 1689  **Isidore Ogilvie.**  Born 1670. Ordained priest 1694.

---

4 ML, Fleming, 12.1.1700.
Died April 1701.

c. 1689  Flacid Crichton. Of Auchingoul.  Died 1730.
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It was an accident of history that gave counter-Reformation bases on the Continent to Scottish Benedictines. In this respect, indeed, the history of the Scottish and English Benedictine Congregations could hardly have been more different. The English Congregation was re-founded on the Continent early in the seventeenth century, with houses within fairly easy distance of the Channel and England, and having as its primary aim the re-conversion of the homeland to Catholicism. Scottish Benedictines, on the other hand, had acquired their abbeys in Central Europe when Luther was just embarking on his career as a reformer, and fully forty years before the reformed religion was established by law in Scotland.

In origin these abbeys were not Scottish at all, but Irish. Of all the Benedictine congregations and confederations which have come and gone or are still with us, the congregation centred on the abbey of St James in Ratisbon had perhaps the strangest history. To understand its origins one must go back to the first centuries of Irish Christianity when it was the custom for monks to go into voluntary exile and preach the Gospel as they went. The Irish Church was organised on a monastic basis, a fact which greatly influenced their missionary work. Besides evangelising the neigh-

1 For a survey and bibliography of various aspects down to the sixteenth century the following can be consulted: D. A. Binchy, 'The Irish Benedictine Congregation in medieval Germany' (Studies, Vol. XVIII, 194-210); A. Gwynn, 'Some notes on the history of Irish and Scottish Benedictine monasteries in Germany' (The Innes Review, Vol. V, 5-25); L. Hammermayer, 'Deutsche Schottenklöster, schottische Reformation, etc.' (Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte, Band XXVI, 131-76); G. A. Renz, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Schottenabtei St. Jakob und des Priorates Weiβ St. Peter in Regensburg, (Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner und dem Cistercienser-Orden, Band XVI, 64-84, and also subsequent issues which contain a calendar of documents down to 1500); M. Dilworth, 'The Schottenklöster at the Reformation' in Essays on the Scottish Reformation 1513-1625, ed. D. McRoberts (Glasgow, 1962), 241-44; idem, 'Marianus Scotus: scribe and monastic founder' (Scottish Gaelic Studies, Vol. X, 125-43). There is unfortunately no full-length account.
bouring island of Britain they preached and settled in France, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Switzerland and Italy; to this day the memory of their missionary zeal persists in many parts of Central Europe.

About the middle of the seventh century the first monasteries for Irish monks exclusively were founded. It is not certain how long they survived or remained Irish: perhaps a matter of a generation, in some cases perhaps for a period running into centuries. Nor is it clear what rule they followed: no doubt a Celtic rule to begin with, then either the Benedictine rule or some mixture of the two. But the stream of monks leaving Ireland for their peregrinatio, or voluntary exile, *pro Dei amore*, although it may have slackened at times, never dried up. By the middle of the eleventh century the chief scene of their activities was what we now call Germany; and here, at Ratisbon on the Danube, was founded the Irish monastery of Weih-Sankt-Peter in 1075-76.

Its founder, Muiredach MacRobartaig, usually known as Marianus Scotus, had received the Benedictine habit at St Michael’s in Bamberg shortly before. After his death the monastery founded by him flourished to such an extent that a larger monastery, St James’s, was built in Ratisbon about 1110. Then, in quick succession, seven other houses of Irish Benedictine monks were founded from Ratisbon in the twelfth century. When the Lateran Council in 1215 ordered monasteries to group themselves into congregations and gather for general chapters according to regional divisions, a special arrangement was made for these Irish houses. Wherever they were, they were formed into a closely-knit congregation under the jurisdiction of the abbot of St James’s in Ratisbon.3

In the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a decline set in and gathered momentum. Some houses went out of existence,

---

2 A survey of exclusively Irish monasteries is given by J. P. Fuhrmann: *Irish medieval monasteries on the Continent* (Washington, 1927). This work has not received the notice it deserves from Irish scholars; one would like them to discuss in particular the author’s thesis that these monasteries observed the Benedictine rule from a very early date.

3 See U. Berlière, ‘Les Chapitres généraux de l’Ordre de St Benoît. V: Les Ecossais d’Allemagne’ (*Revue Benedictine*, Vol. XIX, 68-75). The important houses were in Germany but we know for certain of one at Rosscarbery in Co. Cork. Probably also a priory at Cashel was subject to Ratisbon (Gwynn, *op. cit.*, 14-15; Renz, *op. cit.*, ad 1248, 1456, 1479).
some were handed over to German monks. The rest remained exclusively Irish, even though the stream of novices from Ireland had all but dried up completely. By the early years of the sixteenth century St James’s at Ratisbon was the only house with a community; the others had merely an abbot or prior elected out of this community. And now it was that the accident of history removed these monasteries from Irish hands. The Irish were known as Scotti up to the eleventh century; so too were the Irish settlers in Argyll. After that time Ireland and the Irish became known as Hibernia and Hiberni, while Scotia came to denote that part of Britain north of the Forth and Clyde, and eventually what is now called Scotland. The Irish monasteries in Germany, however, had retained the original name and continued to be known as the monasteries of the Scots, or Schottenklöster. Accordingly, when a dispute involving the abbot in Ratisbon broke out in 1514 and the various parties appealed to the Pope, a Scottish secular priest resident in Rome was appointed abbot.\footnote{There is a detailed account of the affair in K. T. Gemeiner: \textit{Regensburger Chronik} (Regensburg, 1824), 1514-20. This work takes the form of a year-to-year chronicle.}

The foregoing is essential for the understanding of the Scottish monasteries in Germany. It is strange enough that the most important group of Irish Benedictine houses was not in Ireland (where Black Benedictinism had never flourished), stranger still that the meaning of their name should change so that they could in good faith be handed over to monks of another nation. The canonical position of the abbot of Ratisbon gave the new Scottish abbot control \textit{de jure} over the whole congregation; the lack of any community in the other houses meant that there was no opposition to his assuming this control \textit{de facto}. One of the things which strikes the student of these monasteries most forcibly is the way in which these Scotsmen, coming in from outside, assumed the mantle of the Irish so efficiently. One gains the impression that they must have studied their deeds and charters in order to know their assets and their rights, while the Germans were quite indifferent as to which particular island in the Atlantic was the homeland of the Scotic monks. For four centuries these monks from the west had followed the Benedictine rule in their own separate monasteries; for centuries previous to that they had lived as monks or missionaries on German
soil. The Schottenklöster formed part of the structure of pre-Reformation Germany, and into this the Scottish monks merged, with little thought for their homeland.

It was not until 1520 that the Scottish monks were in complete and undisputed possession of the four surviving Schottenklöster. For a number of years the Scottish community at Ratisbon flourished, but the new congregation thereafter fell on evil days. Two of the four houses were destroyed by war, leaving only the abbeys in Ratisbon and Erfurt, both called St James's. The former of these was in great measure destroyed by fire, the latter was without any Scots monk for many years. When the reformed religion was approved in Scotland by act of parliament in 1560, the Scottish Benedictine Congregation in Germany was all but extinct, and various interested parties endeavoured to obtain possession of the Ratisbon abbey.

In 1577 came a second dawn. Rome decided the matter by appointing Ninian Winzet, who had been John Knox's most formidable opponent, as abbot of Ratisbon. Once again it is clear that a secular priest appointed by Rome realised the traditional position of the abbot of St James's in Ratisbon, for he and John Lesley, Bishop of Ross, set out to recover the monasteries that were under Winzet's jurisdiction by right. They obtained Erfurt easily enough, and Winzet built up a community and established some sort of college at Ratisbon, but that was the limit of his success. It is interesting to examine the letters and petitions drawn up during their campaign and in particular to see the eleven reasons adduced by Winzet in 1583 in his efforts to persuade the Emperor to restore to the Scots the Vienna Schottenkloster, which had been occupied by Austrian monks since 1418. They are largely concerned with the benefits conferred by the Scoti (presumed by Winzet to have been Scotsmen)

5 For the period after 1560 see Dr L. Hammermayer's recent and detailed article: op. cit., 176-246. The most formidable competitors of the Scots were the Jesuits, who wished to found a college in the town (ibid., 190 ff, 231-36; J. Brodrick: Saint Peter Canisius (London, 1963), 742.

in the past and the persecution undergone in Scotland by the petitioners. Of the help the monastery might be to Scotland there is not a hint; in fact he speaks of the benefit to Austria since the monks would occupy themselves 'in reaedificandis muris Jerusalem in Austria'. Speaking of their exile from Scotland he adds: 'Deo ad tempus permittente'. And yet Winzet, more than anyone else, might have been expected to have the interests of his church in Scotland at heart. The success of the Scottish Reformation was not yet seen to be permanent. Winzet was still thinking in terms of the old order.7

In 1595, three years after Winzet's death, the abbey of St James in Würzburg was handed over to the Scots monks. It had been Irish until 1497, when it was given to German monks, but they too had died out by 1566.8 The prince-bishop, Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn, was a commanding figure and one of the greatest bishops of Würzburg. It is recorded that he restored the monastery out of thanksgiving for his recovery from an illness; perhaps he intended to benefit the Scots and considered it fitting that the ancient Scotic monastery should be occupied by them once more. More likely still, he had in mind the benefit to religion in his own diocese, where he was repairing the ravages of the reformation period. But certainly the benefit to the harassed church in Scotland does not seem to have been in his thoughts. The point is of some importance, for monasteries in his diocese were subject to a considerable amount of control.

When did the Scottish monks first turn their thoughts to missionary work in Scotland? The Ratisbon necrology has four references to it in its sixteenth-century names,9 but it was not compiled until 1722. The first is Robert Paterson 'in missione Scotiae' in 1536. Both the date and the fact that he was not a monk make the reference valueless. Of the three others, the first is James Gordon in 1590, 'diu Mission-

---

7 Other documents written on behalf of Winzet fail to mention any hoped-for benefit to Scotland. Dr Hammermayer (op. cit., 211, 221) speaks of Lesley's plans for a chain of Scottish counter-Reformation centres but there is no mention of the form of activity to be undertaken.


9 M. Dilworth, 'Two necrologies of Scottish Benedictine abbeys in Germany' (The Innes Review, Vol. IX, 180, 812, 183. This will be quoted hereafter as Necrologies.) There are no references to the mission under entries in the first decades of the seventeenth century.
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arius, deinde Prior noster'. The name is found in no extant document, and we know that another man was prior after 1584. He too can be safely ignored. The next is James Winzet, nephew of Ninian, ‘Missionarius, deinde Prior noster’. The name is found in no extant document, and we know that another man was prior after 1584. He too can be safely ignored. The next is James Winzet, nephew of Ninian, ‘Missionarius, deinde Prior noster’, listed under 1595. He was undoubtedly prior, but this is the one item of information which is accurate, for we know that he was at Ratisbon in 1595, was prior in 1596, was elected abbot of Erfurt in 1603 and died there in 1611. Our confidence is further undermined by the rough draft, in which ‘Missionarius deinde’ was a later addition and 1593 was the date of death. The last is David Craig under 1596, ‘Prior noster, primus ex nostris qui opus Missionis inter Sectarios in Scotia adivit’. Craig was a Carmelite friar, who entered Ratisbon in 1578.10 He may have been prior before 1584, when we find John James Whyte in office, but it is doubtful if he was ever a missionary, especially as the rough draft of the necrology gave 1579 as the date of his missionary activities, and 1594 as date of death. Thus all three are described as missionary and prior, enough in itself to arouse our scepticism.

The one we know to have been prior held that office after his reported date of death; it looks very much like a lucky shot in the dark on the part of the compiler. The other two share the possibility of having been prior in the very early years before 1584,11 but we know of no record that either did so. Until some evidence comes to light, we must consider their missionary careers with the same scepticism.

The first genuine references to interest shown by monks in the Scottish mission belong to 1623, just one year after the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide had been founded to delineate the world and arrange its conversion or re-conversion to Catholicism. The question at once arose of who was to re-convert Scotland, which was not clearly seen as a separate nation after the union of the crowns. In

10 Hammermayer, op. cit., 207. His papal licence to enter Ratisbon is printed in Hewison, op. cit., Vol. II, xv, where 1587 is a misprint for 1578. For his earlier history see Accounts of the Collectors of Thirds of Benefices 1561-1572, ed. G. Donaldson (Scottish History Society, 1949), 97, 154, 219; The Innes Review, Vol. V, 26. It is stated in The Ampleforth Journal, April 1901, 258, that Fr David Gray worked in Scotland from 1597 to 1622, but no reference is given nor is the source of the statement known to the present writer. For the confusion between Craig and Gray see Necrologies, 183.

11 Even this possibility is made remote by the fact that John Hamilton, who is said to have been, and may very well have been, a former monk of Paisley, was prior of Ratisbon when he was elected abbot of Erfurt on 19th January 1582 (Necrologies, 183, with correction of date of election).
or about 1623 there was one Benedictine on the Scottish mission.\textsuperscript{12} We know neither who he was nor from what monastery. In the same year, however, we have documents of the greatest importance. They are not originals but are to be found in a Copiale, or book containing copies of documents considered important, which belonged to the abbey in Würzburg.\textsuperscript{13} They consist of three letters or documents addressed by officials of the English Congregation to the Scottish monks, and two official documents in reply. Because of their importance to the history of missionary work in Scotland (not merely that done by Benedictines) as well as of their comparative inaccessibility, they will be given in full in the original Latin in the Appendices. Our knowledge of Catholic missionary work in Scotland at this period is very sketchy, but some attempt should be made to assess the significance of these negotiations between the English Benedictine Congregation and the Scots abbeys.

* * *

The first three documents are dated Douai, 16th January 1623. The first and longest is an open letter from Fr Rudesind Barlow, President of the E.B.C., to all the Scots monks. He says that Frs Adam MacCall and Sylvanus Mayne\textsuperscript{14} have been staying at Douai on their way to Scotland, and he is therefore writing to urge the setting up of a mission in Scotland as he knows the Scots have men suitable as missioners if they can be replaced in their monasteries. In the Scots College at Douai, he says, there are many excellent young men who wish to be monks; thus there is no obstacle to the taking up of apostolic work. For this, however, one needs faculties and privileges from the Holy See, but at the present time, because of opposition, both open and secret, they are not granted easily to regulars.\textsuperscript{15} He therefore offers facilities to the Scots since the E.B.C. already has a mission set up for the whole of Great Britain with all

\textsuperscript{12} Irish Franciscan Mission to Scotland 1619-1646: Documents from Roman Archives, ed. C. Giblin (Dublin, 1964), viii. See also note \# infra.
\textsuperscript{13} Now in Würzburg Staatsarchiv and catalogued as Standbuch No. 545 (formerly No. 195). The documents in question are on ff 149r-151r.
\textsuperscript{14} See Necrologies, 184 and 197 respectively. The English monks will of course be found in the fully indexed compilations of Weldon and Birt.
\textsuperscript{15} The first decades of the seventeenth century were marked by strife between seculars and regulars engaged on the English mission. See, for instance, Vol. V of Dodd's \textit{Church History of England}, edited by Tierney (1843) or P. Hughes, \textit{Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England}, 312 ff.
necessary faculties. Suitable men sent to Scotland with means of support and credentials will be given faculties and help. The only condition imposed is that they should be subject to the rules and superiors of the E.B.C. while on the mission, which will not prevent them from doing any business entrusted to them or being recalled to their monasteries. They will be eligible for appointment to offices in the E.B.C. and attendance at its chapter with power to vote if the office includes this, and they will have all the help on the mission that they would have if they were incorporated in the E.B.C. No burden will be placed on the Scottish monasteries, nor will they be asked to take in English monks, and no share in any rights of the Scots will be sought. The only aim of the English is the glory of God, the restitution of their order in Britain and the renewal of their monastic forebears’ fame. The co-operation, it is hoped, will be useful to the Scots and enable them to find and train suitable recruits to perpetuate both monastic life and their missionary work. If any English monk happens to be in the neighbourhood of the Scots, which is unlikely, given the distance, only a few days’ hospitality and the benefit of their knowledge of local conditions will be asked for. As for spiritual benefits, no doubt the Scots will reciprocate what the English willingly and sincerely offer.

The second document is a less formal letter from the prior of St Gregory’s in Douai to William Ogilvie, abbot of Würzburg. Fr Silvanus Mayne is returning to Würzburg with some students from Douai who wish to take the habit, and he will be able to tell of the desire of the English monks to have a mission to the whole of Britain, as expressed in the open letter. The prior has great hopes of success for the Catholic faith and the Benedictine order in the British Isles, and he begs Ogilvie to give earnest consideration to what the President has written and Mayne will explain. Both correspondence and personal visits from the Scots will be welcome at Douai.

The third is a formal document, signed by the President and his secretary and with the President’s official seal attached; it is addressed to the three Scots abbots by name and their monks. It begins, after

16 Monks of the Cassinese Congregation were likewise received under some such arrangement (E.B.C. Constitutions, Chap. i, Section 8—seventeenth century MS. in Cathedral House, Oban).
what one might term solemn formulas, by mentioning the visit of the two Scots monks. The close relationship of nationality and religion, and the hope of being mutually united in heaven, have inspired the English monks to desire close co-operation in this world. Therefore they are sending this Charter of Confraternity admitting the Scots to communication in all their spiritual goods and asking for the same favour in return. Any Scots monk with letters of credence will be welcomed in all English houses, and given all fraternal help, for as long as he wishes to stay.

Taken together, the three documents are most impressive. There is the official letter making concrete proposals for close co-operation in missionary work; the friendly, more informal, letter assuring one abbot of the genuine desire for such co-operation; the deed drawn up with solemn formalities and conferring full fellowship and the benefits of full spiritual union. One cannot doubt the writers' sincerity and genuine desire for a close and fruitful partnership. Apart from the business-like proposals for working together on the mission, the only note of caution is the insistence that each Scot seeking hospitality should have some letter of credence, a condition that is readily understood. They could hardly make an offer of welcome and refuge to any monk who might be out of favour with his superiors.

In the transcriptions which follow, contractions have for the most part been expanded. Capitals and punctuation have been left unaltered as far as possible, but it was often difficult to distinguish the latter in the microfilm used for the transcription. In cases of doubt the punctuation most helpful to the sense was adopted, and in a few cases where the apparent punctuation was clearly wrong or misleading it was changed. In two cases a syllable added for the sake of sense has been enclosed in brackets.
COPIA LITERARUM R. PATRIS RVDESINDI

Barlo, Praesidis Congregationis Anglicanae Ordinis S. Benedicti ad Conuentus Abbatiarum Scotorum Per Superiorem Germaniam de negocio Missionis Apostolicae in Patriam.

Admodum Reuerendi in Christo Patres & Domini.

Cum iam coenobiorum vestrorum Sanctaetque in ijsdem disciplinæ notitiam aliquam per Reverendos Patres filios vestros P. Adamum Mackall & P. Siluanum Maynum adepti simus, quos nimirum in Scotiam proficiscentes pro ratione paupertatis nostræ hospitio excipimus; visum est nobis opera precium si paucis ad Reverendas Dominaciones Vestras scriberemus, et instanter hortaremur, ut missionem monachorum vestrorum in Scotiam institueritis pro prædicandæ fidei Catholicae causa, sacramentæque et sacrificia pro Catholicoorum regionis illius solatio et instructione administrandi. Videmus non deesse vobis doctos et graues Monachos, qui tarn sanctum opus suscipiant, modo adessent vobis alii qui illorum loco in Monasterij onera disciplinæ religiosæ sustinerent: & ad simile quoque missionis institutum suscipliendum suo tempore paulatim erudirentur. Videmus etiam eum in finem apertam esse latissimam fenestram, cum iam multorum adolescentum [sic] optimorum animi praesertim in Seminario nationis vestrae, quod hic est Duaci inflammati sint & accensi amore ac desiderio Sancti habitus vestri: Quare nihil deesse vobis video, quo minus in vos hoc nobile munus Apostolicae functionis assumatis. Ductis fortasse ad hoc opus esse auctoritate Apostolici, qua diversas vobis facultates ac privilegia ad missionem illam bene instituendam impertiatur. Verum quidem id est, sed eam auctoritatem, si pro vestris peculiariter monasterijs & monachis velletis Romae petere, ea sunt nunc tempora, tam inuito animo conceduntur ista regularibus, tam multi sunt, qui clam et palam se petitionibus vestris opponerent, ut revera, aut non omnino possetis hanc impetrare, aut non nisi post multam temporis, laboris et impensarum. Quare, quia eiusdem ordinis sumus, eiusdem Magni Patriarchæ filij, eiusdem insulae Clives et indigenæ, ac proinde arctissimis tam naturæ quam Charitatis vinculis asträngi debemus, offerimus vobis securom huius rei sine laboris molestia aut impensarum sollicitudine aut temporis mora compendium. Habemus enim missionem iam pridem in Congregatione nostra erectam, pro tota insula Regnisque Britanniae, missionem cum omnibus facultatibus et privilegiis necessarijs, ad eum finem instructam, quæ possumus quibus-cunque Monachis ordinis nostri pro ijsdem Angliae Regnis prout expedire iudicauerimus subdelegare. Igitur si placebit Reverendis Dominacionibus Vestris aliquot ex Fratribus vestris aetate, doctrina, moribus ac pietate conspicuos ad opus missionis pro Scotia mittere, tantum viatico mediocris literisque ac licentijs vestris munitos: nos eos necessarijs facultatibus ac privilegijs instruemus. Et omni consilio dirigemus, omnique auxilio nostrorum Fratrum qui iam in missione versantur consolabimur.
Ea tantum conditione ut quos hunc in finem nunc & deinceps mittere velitis, ij durante hoc misero patriae nostrae schismate, tantispe rum dum in missione laborare debeat nostrae Congregationis legibus ac Superioribus subjiciantur & gubernentur. Idque in literis missionis ipsorum exprimatur; Ita tamen ut vestra etiam negotia illis commissa, sine impedimento possint agere, & a Vobis quandocunque volueritis ad vestra monasteria revocari. Quibus nos vicissim communicabimus congregationis nostrae praerogatiuas, aut deinceps haberemus aut haberemus in Germania sive quae eis habetis, aut habere debetis aut habetis in Scotia, nobis fieri ualuentes cupimus aut petemus; sed solum, ob honorem Dei & ordinis nostri in patrijs restitutionem, et gloriam antiquorum Patrum nostrorum suscitandum, hanc vobiscum coniunctionem cupimus. Quam etiam speramus vos forem unum vssum, cum inde possint selectissima ingenia praeparari, & adduci ad Monasteria vestra implenda, & disciplinam in ijs perpetuandam et missionis huius seriei usque ad conversionem patriae (vel si etiam Deus voluerit) usque ad finem mundi pro Catholicis in ea conservandis continuandam.

Quod si contingent aliquos e nostris in illas partes venire, praeter paucissimorum dierum hospitium nihil aliud a vobis postulabunt, quam vt vestris consiliis et commendationibus prout inuenerint necessariam apud magnates illarum prouinciarum vobis notos adiuentur, quaquam ob locorum intercapedinem maximam vix putemus aliquos nostrum eo destinandos: Tandem quia potest sese occasio offerre illud solum uis officij & fraternitatis sine vestro onere aut incommodo postulabimus. In spiritualibus uero non dubitamus quin vestra nobis sitis communicetur, sicut nos nostra quanta possimus animorum nostrorum lubentia et synceritate communicamus. Responsum a Pietate vestra expectabimus, magis tamen per aliquos Fratres vestros ad opus missionis destinandos, quos libentissime amplectabimur, quam per solas litteras, quas tamen cum omni reuerentia suciemus. & Deo optimo Maximo interea Reuerendas Dominationes vestras humilibus commendabimus votis. Duaci in Belgio ex Conuentu et Collegio nostro S. Gregorij 16 Januarij 1623.

Reverendarum Paternitatum Vestrarum servus in Christo Jesu
F Rudisindus Barlo Praeses
Benedictinorum Congregationis Anglicae.
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II

Copia literarum Reverendi P. Leandri di S. Martino, Prioris ad S. Gregorium Anglorum Duaci (Vnde supra).


Reverendae Dominationis Vestrae Sérus in Christo

III

CHARTA ANGLORUM PRO DICTAE Missionis Apostolicae Confraternitate


Bonus odor coenobiorum vestrorum, quem nobis afflauit duorum ex Patribus vestris inter nos aliquamdiu convernantium pietas atque deuotion; praesertim, cum eiusdem ordinis nationisque quasi quaedam spiritualis consanguinitas accedat; effect vt vobiscum arctissima fraternitas legi coniungi cupiamus, decet enim nos, qui sub codem Patre Benedicto militamus Christo Vero Regi nostro, & speramus aliquando nos inuicem
in coelesti regno charitate nunquam cessatura complecti: hic etiam in terris quasi tyrocinium quoddam eiusdem charitatis exercere, ut tanto magis de mutua felicitate gaudeamus in caelo, quanto diligentius studuerimus in hac vita religiose amoris officij inservire. IDCIRCO dignum duximus hanc Fraternitatis chartam vobis dirigere, per quam in Christi Dei ac Domini Nostri benignitate confisi, omnia spiritualia Congregationis nostrae bona ac merita, suffragia, Vigilias, caeteraque pietatis regularis opera Vobis & omnibus Fratribus Monasteriorum vestrorum Com-monachis nostris communia esse volumus: Eandem spiritualem communicationem operum ac meritorum vestrorum instantissime a vobis deposcentes. Insuper significamus vobis quia si quando aliquis vestrum ad loca nostra cum literis commendatitijs vestris accederit, Confidenter ad eadem loca tanquam vestra accedat quia per Dei gratiam, honorifice & amanter ibidem tractabitur; et omnia solatia necessaria a nobis eidem sicut uni ex nostris fraterne administrabuntur, quamdui nobiscum ipsum commorari contigerit, aut quamdui ipse necessarium aut desiderabile duxerit. IN CVIVS nostrae dilectionis communicationis ac Fraternitatis testimonium, has Charitatis literas ad Reverendas Dominationes Vestrarum deferendas dedimus dilectissimo Fratri nostro Patri Siluano Mayno Herbipolensis Monasterij Vestri Monacho; & per eum humiliter orationum vestrarum suffragia postulamus. Datum Duaci in Conuentu nostro Sancti Gregorij XVI Januarij Anno MDCXXIII

Locus Reverendarum Dominationum Vestrarum Servus in Xto Sigilli

F Rudisindus Barlo Praeses Benedictinorum Congregationis Anglicanae

Ex mandato Reverendi Admodum Praesidis Nostri F. Clemens Reyner Secretarius.

[The two Scottish documents sent in reply will be printed in an Appendix to the second part of the article, which will appear in April. — ED.]
THE FIRST BENEDICTINE MISSION TO SCOTLAND—PART II

by

DOM MARK DILWORTH

[In the Appendix to the first part of this article were printed three letters addressed by officials of the English Benedictine Congregation to the Scottish monks in 1623. In the Appendix to this second part are printed the replies of the Scottish monks.—ED.]

Both Scottish documents are signed by the three abbots and have almost identical dating. They were evidently signed and dated at Ratisbon towards the end of June 1623, then taken to Würzburg for the remaining signature(s) to be added towards the end of July. The abbot of Erfurt was at either Ratisbon or Würzburg. The first document is a reply to the first English letter. Fr Silvanus has returned some months ago, and the disinterested charity borne to the Scots, whom the English did not yet know, is evident. The Scots cannot but accede to the English requests. Suitable men will be sent to Scotland as soon as their places can be filled; they will be subject to the laws and superiors of the English congregation, with the reservation that the abbots can use them for any special business if so desired. The English monks not only gave hospitality to Frs Silvanus and Adam but willingly bore the inconveniences attendant on their business and perhaps caused by the envy of certain parties.17 For this and for helping the two fathers and others in the matter of expenses the Scots are grateful and will

17 It is legitimate to suppose that the Jesuit superiors of the Scots College in Douai did not take kindly to the loss of three students and the prospect of losing more (see p. 162, infra), since at this period their Society was the chief beneficiary of the Scots Colleges.
try to repay in part. Hence all English monks visiting their neigh-
bourhood will be helped in every way. What was given to the two
monks is accepted as a gift, but in future monks will not set out
without sufficient money for expenses; what was given, or will
in the future be given, to other Scots wishing to take the habit
will be refunded in full, but this service should only be rendered
to those who are authorised to receive it. The desired letter pro-
longing Fr Adam’s stay for two years has been sent.\textsuperscript{18}

The second document is a ‘charter’ in reply to the English one;
it bears the seals of the three abbots and is addressed to all the
English monks. The Scots feel impelled to satisfy the English
requests. They themselves desire the same things, quite apart from
the benefits they will reap; it would be both wrong and imprudent
to refuse, as the English do not desire to acquire anything but to
share with others what they already possess. To the common bonds
of nature, country and language, as well as of faith and religious
order, the English wish to add those of brotherhood and spiritual
benefits and so foreshadow on earth their union in heaven, for one
cannot proceed alone through the difficulties of this life, and one’s
course will be run more safely and happily with mutual support.
Therefore the Scots likewise grant a share in all their spiritual goods,
and will receive as a brother any English monk furnished with a
letter of credence.

The same favourable impression is made by the Scottish docu-
ments: a clear and business-like letter in reply to the English pro-
posals, and a sincere acknowledgement of the spirit in which the
English acted. The Scots know how to accept a favour gracefully
and they realise that the union will be of more benefit to them-
selves than to the English.

* * * * *

It would be very gratifying if monastic history were always such
as is mirrored in this correspondence. There is no reason to doubt
the sincerity of the writers. One might say that the letters embody
the ideals of monastic life, while human frailty will always cause
the monks themselves to fall short of those ideals. A word needs
therefore to be said of the condition of the three Scottish abbeys

\textsuperscript{18} He may, therefore, be the Benedictine who was in Scotland at this time.
at this time. Würzburg was refounded by monks of Ratisbon. Its first two abbots ruled for short periods only before they resigned: Richard Irving from 1595 to 1598, and Francis Hamilton from 1602 to 1608. The third abbot, William Ogilvie, was elected in 1615 and remained in office until his death twenty years later; with him Würzburg entered on a period of prosperity.\textsuperscript{19}

The case was quite otherwise at Ratisbon.\textsuperscript{20} After each resignation at Würzburg Abbot Whyte undertook the administration of that abbey as well as his own, and naturally was not wholly successful. In 1608 he appointed an administrator at Ratisbon, the Adam MacCall mentioned in the letters of 1623; three years later a coadjutor abbot was appointed, Fr Benedict Algeo. There was trouble over his canonical status, as his election was not confirmed by the Holy See; apparently this was necessary since St James at Ratisbon was a ‘consistorial’ abbey. Even when the tangle was sorted out and he was blessed seven years later, his personal rule seems to have been disastrous. There was a papal visitation in 1623, the year in which Abbot Whyte finally left Ratisbon; possibly the two events were not unconnected. Four years later Algeo gave up his position, but did not place his resignation in the hands of the Holy See. The result was that a new abbot could not be elected, and Ratisbon was given administrators. When both Whyte and Algeo died in the early 1630’s, the Swedish invasions effectively prevented any return to normal status. Not until 1646 did Ratisbon once more have an abbot, and he was a Würzburg monk who had been administrator.\textsuperscript{21}

There is no need to say much about Erfurt. It had an abbot, but no community or noviciate; the abbot was elected by the Ratisbon community and to a certain extent was under the jurisdiction of the abbot of Ratisbon. In the years before 1623 two abbots of Erfurt had been prior at Würzburg: William Ogilvie from 1613 to 1615, and Hugh Wallace for some years after 1615. Later, in 1626, Wallace had been absent for so long that the diocese took over the administration of the Erfurt abbey.\textsuperscript{22} As far as missionary work is concerned, Erfurt can be left out of consideration.

\textsuperscript{19} Necrologies, 196, where detailed references are given.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 184.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 198.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 196, 184; J. Scholle: \textit{Das Erfurter Schottenkloster} (Düsseldorf, 1932), 39.
THE DOWNSIDE REVIEW

With Ratisbon suffering from grave internal troubles and Würzburg flourishing under an effective abbot who was twenty years in office, the leadership among the Scottish monks was exercised by Würzburg. Ogilvie was an important figure in Franconia: in 1626-28 he was administrator of the abbey of Münster-Schwarzach, and when the Swedes occupied Würzburg he was the man chosen to make terms with Gustavus Adolphus. His tombstone bore the words: ‘Bonus fuit oeconomus et de Franconia bene meritus’. Fr Silvanus Mayne, a monk of Würzburg, was also an outstanding man. As a layman he had been closely associated with John Ogilvie the martyr and had been imprisoned with him in Scotland. Discussion of the importance of the dealings with the E.B.C. in 1623 centres round Mayne and William Ogilvie.

To take the matter of the Douai seminarists first, it is evidently Mayne and not MacCall who was the chief figure. The Douai register under 1620 has the following: ‘Jacobus Scott . . . ivit inunte Januario 1623 cum Jacobo Hegato et Richardo Todeo ad monasterium Scotorum Herbipolense’. Thus all three went to Würzburg, Mayne’s monastery; the latter two are in the Würzburg necrology, and one can deduce from the omission of Scott that he did not persevere. Moreover, Hegat was already known to Mayne, having been associated with him when Mayne and John Ogilvie were in prison in Scotland. Both Mayne and Hegat were to be important witnesses when proceedings for the beatification of John Ogilvie were instituted at Würzburg in 1628. Tod had also been associated with the martyr. Two further entries in the Douai register record that Edward Maxwell and Robert Maclean set out for Würzburg on 2nd May 1623; both are in the Würzburg necrology. Maxwell, one entry runs, said he had procured admission to Würzburg ‘cum D. Magnus hac transisset’. Clearly, by

23 Ibid., 196; Robert Monro: Expedition with the Scots Regiment (London, 1637. See Short Title Catalogue, no. 18022), Part II, 79.
24 Necrologies, 197; W. E. Brown: John Ogilvie (London, 1925), passim.
26 Loc. cit., 196.
28 Ibid., 305.
29 Douai Register, 17, 18; Necrologies, 197, 198.
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'Magnus' is meant 'Mayne'. An interesting document in the same Copiale as contained the E.B.C. correspondence says that in 1625 Abbot Ogilvie ordered seven more breviaries as the number of monks had doubled from six to twelve.

The increase in numbers allowed Würzburg to send men as missionaries. But first something must be said about the state of the Scottish mission. In the first decades of the seventeenth century there were never more than seventeen or eighteen priests in the whole of Scotland. In 1623 there were fifteen, belonging to five religious orders; not one was a secular priest, although there had been some seculars on the mission. There was no co-ordinated mission, and no general superior or ordinary in Scotland. The first two English Vicars-Apostolic, when they were appointed, were nominally ordinaries of Scotland too, an arrangement that was virtually a dead letter from the start. Fr Giblin has recently published documents concerning the mission, in the years after 1619, of the Irish Franciscans to the Gaelic-speaking half of Scotland (see note 12). To begin with, it was controlled from Louvain. This, evidently, was the pattern of missionary work in Scotland at the time: small groups of religious, working independently of each other, each subject to superiors on the Continent. But it must be emphasized that our knowledge of the Scottish mission in 1623 is fragmentary.

The correspondence between English and Scottish Benedictines is thus a valuable contribution to the subject. It is, unfortunately, not so easy to evaluate its practical results. One can only state the facts as far as they are known. The establishment of the Congregation of Propaganda in 1622 undoubtedly gave a considerable stimulus to efforts on behalf of the Scottish mission. The first English letter quoted above mentions Mayne and MacCall as 'in Scotiam proficiscentes' but the precise significance of this is not apparent. It would certainly seem that the initiative for the English proposal came from the E.B.C. authorities in Douai, if one can

30 Douai Register, 17. Probably 'Magnus' is a misreading of 'Maynus'.
32 Giblin, op. cit., viii.
judge from such phrases as 'visum est nobis operae precium si . . . scriberemus et instanter hortaremur' (in the first English letter) and the Scots' reference to themselves as 'adieu vobis ignotos' in their reply.

The Scots, as we have seen, agreed to the English proposals but apparently soon decided that they could improve on them. In April 1624 the new Congregation of Propaganda was considering a petition from the three Scottish abbeys that a Benedictine mission to Scotland should be established, with Silvanus Mayne at its head.33 The nuncio in Germany was accordingly instructed to send the names of suitable monks and a report on Mayne's fitness for the post. The following December Mayne, 'benemerito della fede cattolica', was declared superior of a mission of seven monks.34 In the interval Mayne had appeared before the Emperor with a petition for the restitution of the Vienna Schottenkloster to the Scots. He was the emissary of the Scottish abbots and was backed by the bishop of Würzburg and Cardinal Barberini, Protector of Scotland and a member of the Congregation of Propaganda.35

We can deduce from this that Abbot Ogilvie took a leading part and that the affair was not unconnected with the mission project. The petition, however, was not granted.

In April 1625 a bull was sent to Mayne giving faculties for the mission to him and eight others,36 but he had not set out by January 1627, for he was then refused leave to add another three monks and to send missioners to Scottish expatriates in Germany and Poland.37 His request for a visitation of the Scots abbeys (no doubt Ratisbon was in his mind) was referred to the nuncios. That same spring Propaganda gave sympathetic consideration to his request to have the limiting clause 'de consenso ordinarii' removed from his faculties, and to his appeal for financial help.38 In May 1628, at the Würzburg process for the beatification of John Ogilvie, Mayne

34 Acta, 44.
36 Copy in Würzburg Copiale, loc. cit., ff. 151v-152v.
37 Acta, 46.
38 Ibid., 47. The ordinary in question was Bishop Smith, the English Vicar-Apostolic, and Mayne was not alone in making his request (Hughes, op. cit., 341-2).
stated that he was ‘just in the act of travelling to Scotland’. The following month the Congregation declared that being prefect of the mission did not exempt him from obedience to his regular superiors, and it ordered Mayne to set off for Scotland as soon as possible with the monks chosen by the abbot. Exactly twelve months later he was removed from the office and Abbot Ogilvie was appointed in his place. By a bull of 2nd August 1629 Ogilvie was given faculties for seven years with power to communicate them to ten priests of his order.

It is clear from the context of events that Ogilvie was made prefect of the Benedictines only, and not of the Scottish mission in its entirety as some writers seem to suppose. We know nothing of the reasons for the three (and possibly four) years’ delay after the issue of the 1625 bull, nor of any clash of interests or personalities which may have led to the change of prefect, but it does not need much imagination to see the difficulties of Mayne’s position.

No further accurate information about this Benedictine mission to Scotland has yet come to light. The Scritture Riferite of meetings of Propaganda in the following years contain no reference to it. Ogilvie may of course have been quietly exercising his faculties. Nevertheless, it is curious that the only certain reference to Scottish monks on the mission should be in the proceedings of the English Benedictine chapter in 1633. The two monks concerned may have been working in Scotland according to the terms of the 1623 agreement. The Würzburg necrology for this period does not mention mission work, even in the cases where we know of it from other sources, and therefore no argument can be based on its silence. The Ratisbon necrology attributes mission work to several monks,

---

40 Acta, 47.
41 Ibid., 48.
42 There is a copy of the bull in the Schottenarchiv (in Bischofliches Ordinariats-archiv, Ratisbon), Urkunden, Fach 31, no. 682.
43 The note in the English Catholic Directory heading the section on the Scottish Vicars-Apostolic needs correction regarding Ogilvie’s position and date of death, while the information about his successors refers only to the Irish Franciscan mission to the Gaelic-speaking districts.
44 Cf. THE DOWNSIDE REVIEW, Vol. LXXXII, 236, where the possibility of work in Scotland under E.B.C. auspices should have been considered.
some of whom certainly existed, but there is no corroboration from other sources. We cannot say if Ogilvie gave them faculties or not.45 Ogilvie himself died in 1635, shortly after the Swedish invasion had scattered his community. Mayne was at Erfurt in 1630 and in charge of the house when the Swedes occupied Erfurt a few years later. He was forced to flee to Rome but was appointed administrator of Ratisbon in 1636 by Cardinal Barberini and died in office three years later.46 All three abbeys suffered in the Swedish wars, and there is no record of anyone succeeding to Ogilvie as prefect. The Benedictine mission to Scotland can fairly be said to have ended. Nevertheless, in any future assessment of the Scottish mission field in the first half of the seventeenth century, the offer made by the English Benedictines in 1623 will have to be taken into consideration. Even if it accomplished nothing else, it undoubtedly stimulated the Scots of Würzburg to efforts on behalf of Scotland, and it was to lead to the Union between Würzburg and the E.B.C. in 1660. And finally, even if it would be over-cynical to regard the episode merely as an incident in the campaign which would decide who was to have charge of the Scottish mission, whether under the aegis of Propaganda or not, one must still consider the desire of the English monks to extend their mission against the background of the tensions among the Catholic émigrés, and one would like to know why the Scots accepted the English offer so gratefully and then a year later were planning something quite different.

APPENDIX II

I

COPIA LITERARUM COMMUNIUM Abbatum Ratisbonensis Herbigolensis Erfurdiensis ad Praesidem & Congregationem Patrum Anglorum pro Confraternitate missioneque Apostolica Fratrum nostrorum in Patriam.

Redijt ad nos ante aliquot menses Frater noster P. Siluanus ex cuius et omnium consona relatione, qui inde a vobis ad nos venerunt probe

45 It is almost invariably stated by writers that Benedictines worked in Scotland in the first half of the seventeenth century, and it may well have been so although precise information is difficult to find. Fr Thomas Innes, the well-known historian, asserts it (The Innes Review, Vol. VII, 121), and he was a careful scholar writing early in the eighteenth century. Any precise references would be welcome.

46 Necrologies, 196, 197.
Perspectum habemus, quanta nos (adhuc vobis ignotos) charitate complectamini; vnde & Vestrae dilectiosis integritas a solo Divinae gloriae intuitu, & nostri ordinis honore venientis liquido comprobatis; et nos ad piam aliquam Vestris officij & beneficijs aemulationem prouocamus: quibus cum pro merito respondere nullatenus possimus, quam a nobis compensationem petitis, eadem nos omni studio reddere laboramus, Ideoque desiderio vestro eatenus satisfieri annuente Domino curabimus Fratresque nostros ad missionem in Scotia idoneos quum primum illorum partes supervenientes alij explere possint eo destinabimus, quos dum in missione nobis permittentibus versantur, Vestrae directioni & congregacionis Vestrae legibus ac Superioribus subijcimus, & nunc quasi tunc subijcimus, reseruata nobis interim ea libertate ut eorum opera in pecuniaribus quibusdam negotijs nostris, si quae tunc forte occurrant, non obstante quous alio imperio nobis vti liceat, rebus tamen sic com temperatis, vt & nobis et vobis per omnia obtemperare possint: Illos vero vestrae charitati commendare superuacaneum ducimus quae Fratres nostros, Patrem Adamum & Siluanum non solum hospitio suscepit & quamdui illis placuit humanissime habuit sed etiam molestias illas ex eorum negotijs, cum aliquorum forte inuidia vobis ingentis libertissime sustinuit. Iuuistis itidem pecunia non illos modo, sed & alios huc ad nos venientes, qui non tantum grato recolemus animo sed cum liberum fuerit reipsa paribus officij aliqVe ex parte aedaequare conabimus. Quare si vobis quandocumque visum fuerit aliquot ex vestris in has Germaniae provincias mittere, quibus possumus modis vestris & eorum coeptis auxiliabimus, tuguriola nostra tanquam propriaboni consulant plurimum rogamus. Consilio quoque & directione, qui mores harum partium diuturniore experimentia edoeti sumus, ipsis adesse & si res postulaverit, apud quos valemus gratia intercedere parati erimus; Et in omnibus quibus indiguerint, pro modulo nostro, eorum defectum supplebimus: quod autem Fratribus nostris dedistis hoc gratuiti muneris loco habemus, qui tamen sine sufficienti viatico hinc abire non permittentur, quidquid vero alij populares, nostri habitus desiderio accensi, a vobis vel acceperunt vel postea accipient, hoc integre refundemus, Rogatos tamen volumus vt illis duntaxat hanc gratiam faciatis, qui re nobiscum communicat litteras nostras accipient de itinere hue ad nos instituendo. Misimus simul pro prorogatione ad biennium temporis & morae Fratris nostri Patris Adami, quas desiderastis a nobis literas. Interim dum nova expectatur scribendi occasio Reverendas Paternitates Vestras Deo optimo Maximo Omnibus nostris votis commendamus & commendabimus. E. Monasterio S. Jacobi Scotorum Ratisbonae 4 Calend. Julij anno 1623. Herbipoli ad S. Iacobum Scotorum 4 Calend. Aug. Anno quo supra.

Fr Gulielmus Ad S. Jacobum Scotorum Herbipoli Abbas
Fr Benedictus ad S. Jacobum Scotorum Ratisbonae Abbas

F. Hugo Monasterij S. Jacobi Scotorum Erfordiae Abbas
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II

CHARTA ABBATVM RATISBONENSIS HERBIPOLENSIS ET ERFVRDENSIS CONgregationis Scotorum in Germania Superiori & Fratrum eorumdem Monasteriorum ad Congregationem Anglicanam Duaci & in Belgio de Confraternitate & Missione Apostolica in Patriam &c.


Vestram vere Christianam charitatem et sinceram dilectionem tot argumentis & rationibus adeo compertam habemus; vt omnibus vestris votis & postulationibus annuere, mutui in vos amoris nostri pondus satis impellat. Verum cum non alia desideretis, quam quae nos omni studio appetamus, praeterquam quod in nostrum non mediocrem redundent utilitatem, Vobis non satisfacere non modo iniquum sed & extreme imprudentiae esse videretur: cum non aliena colligere, sed pro more omnia nobis beneigne diuidere cupiatis.

Postulatis vt ad omnia illa naturae, nationis, idiomatis vincula, nec non religionis, ordinis, instituti, & accederet indissolubilis confraternitatis nexus, & spiritualium bonorum, quae vere bona sunt communicatio; vt hic in terris positi vitae illum, quam expectamus, aliquomodo adumbremus, dum ea quae singulis sunt quasi propria, omnibus sunt communia. & qui per tot ac tantas huius aerumnosae vitae difficulties ad patriam nobis promissam soli sine ruina procedere non valemus datis manibus & collatis viribus securius & felicius cursum nostrum consummemus. IDecoque & vobis hanc nostrae Confraternitatis CHARTAM transmitti curauimus vt qui a vobis ad vestrorum bonorum participationem vocati sumus, per hanc nos tanquam infirma corporis Christi membra (quorum est quae accipientes in alterutrum subministrare) omnia nostra & nostrorum conuentuum bona spiritualia, preces, suffragia & regularis obseruantiae merita vobis omnibus & singulis vestrae Congregationis Fratibus in Domino communicamus. & in indiuiduum fructuum eorum consortium & societatem assumimus. AD HAEC si forte contingat aliquem ex vobis vestris litteris munitum in has nostras partes venire ad nos tanquam confriter, & loca nostra tanquam propria accedere non grauabitur. Cui pro viribus nostris omnia quibus indiguerit solatia suppediterate (quo tempore apud nos permanerit) non cessabimus. In cuius nostrae Confraternitatis, sodalitij, & dilectionis fidem & testimonium has nostras debite a nobis subscriptas & sigillis nostris consuetis munitas ad vos remissimis. E Monasterio S. Iacobi Scotorum Ratisbonae IV Calendas Julij Anno 1623. Herbipoli 5 Calendas Augusti Anno eodem.

Locus sigilli
abattialis
Ratisbonae
Fr Benedictus Abbas

Locus sigilli
Abbatiae
Herbipolensis
F Gulielmus Abbass

Locus sigilli
Abbatiae
Erfurdiae
Herbipoli

Fr Hugo Abbass
Erfurdensis
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One of the most tantalising things about the history of the Scottish Benedictines in Würzburg is the way in which isolated documents have survived, in a vacuum, as it were, and out of context. Though they are clearly of some importance, their significance is difficult to evaluate since the background to them is unknown. Industrious research, including much physical searching in Germany and Rome, can undoubtedly yield some results, but the total destruction of the Würzburg episcopal archives in 1945 means that many of the questions which spring to one’s mind will probably never now be answered.

A typical case is the agreement drawn up in 1660 between the monks of the Scots monastery of St James in Würzburg and the authorities of the English Benedictine Congregation. Four extant copies are known to the present writer, preserved in the following places: (a) in a folio volume into which the Würzburg monks copied documents they considered important1 (b) in the archives of the diocese of Ratisbon2 (c) in a collection made by a Scottish antiquarian, James Dennistoun, in the nineteenth century3 (d) in the archives of the present Douai Abbey at Woolhampton.4 Although none of them is an original, the first and second have preserved the signatures and approbations of the parties to the agreement.

1 Würzburg Staatsarchiv, Standbuch 545, fol. 147r-148v.
2 Ratisbon Ordinariatsarchiv, Akt Schottenkloster St Jakob, ohne Fol. I owe my knowledge of this copy and a partial transcript to the kindness of Dr Ludwig Hammermayer, Munich.
4 Dom Gregory Freeman informed me of this and very kindly provided a photostat.
But in spite of having such a rich documentation of the agreement itself, we know practically nothing about what led up to it. Most probably the initiative came from the Scots, since it was they who stood to gain more immediately from it. This paper will attempt to fill in some of the gap by sketching the background in Würzburg and pointing out what seem the most likely motives behind the Scots’ desire for union.5

Any consideration of the Scotic group of monasteries in Germany must go back to 1215, when the Lateran Council decreed that Benedictine houses were to unite into congregations on a regional basis and hold general chapters every three years. A special arrangement was made for the Scotic monasteries, at that time Irish, which were to be grouped according to nationality and not locality. The head of the congregation was the abbot of the mother-house, St James’s in Ratisbon, who had considerable disciplinary powers. His abbey was exempt from all spiritual and temporal rulers except the pope and emperor; the other houses were, in theory and to a large extent in practice, subject to the Ratisbon abbot. On the whole, this arrangement held good until the dawn of the Reformation although the fortunes of the congregation declined greatly, but the various daughter houses naturally fell to some degree under the domination of the local bishops. This was perhaps nowhere more so than in Würzburg, where the prince-bishop was also the temporal ruler and resided in a fortress a few hundred yards away from the abbey. From 1268 on, it was he and not the Ratisbon abbot who carried out visitations there, while the oath taken by Würzburg abbots after election entailed comprehensive submission to him. The bishop was largely instrumental in introducing German monks into the abbey in 1497, and it was by his authority that the abbey, now entirely German, was joined to the Bursfeld Congregation in 1514.

The monasteries which remained in Irish hands were taken over by the Scots in 1515, but only two houses survived the Reformation, namely the abbeys in Ratisbon and Erfurt. The post-Reformation Scottish monks in Ratisbon made efforts to recover the houses

5 Detailed references will not be given as I am preparing a larger study on the history of the Würzburg monks in the seventeenth century. Some general works are listed in The Downside Review, Vol. LXXXIII, (1965) pp. 60 ff.
which they considered theirs by right; one of these was Würzburg. At this time the see of Würzburg was held by the great reforming prince-bishop, Julius Echter, who ruled his territory for forty-four years, from 1573 to 1617, and restored many churches and religious houses. It was therefore consistent with his policy that Echter should restore St James’s and hand it over to Scottish monks from Ratisbon in 1595, but it was similarly consistent that the arrangement was made on his terms. He laid down the horarium to be followed, his officials had the right of visitation, and certain conditions were insisted on, the most notable of these being that there should always be six Scots in residence, or else the number would have to be made up with monks from elsewhere.

For some years the foundation languished and there was much coming and going between Würzburg and Ratisbon until Bishop Echter lost patience and commanded the Würzburg monks to hold an election without reference to Ratisbon. William Ogilvie was accordingly elected abbot in January 1615, and with him the monastery entered on a period of growth and achievement in complete independence of the mother-house. The Thirty Years War, and in particular the Swedish invasion of Franconia, wrecked the economy and everything that Ogilvie had built up. When Audomarus John Asloan became abbot in 1638 the monastery was poor, the community a tiny handful. Ratisbon, however, had suffered even more and was governed by administrators who were monks of Würzburg. In the winter of 1639-40 Asloan was postulated abbot of Ratisbon but continued to live at Würzburg while Alexander Baillie, who was a monk of Würzburg and abbot of Erfurt, acted as administrator of Ratisbon on his behalf.

St James’s was thus subject to the bishop of Würzburg, yet it retained close but unofficial links with the Scots abbey in Ratisbon. One must also say something about the movement in seventeenth-century Germany towards the forming of monastic congregations. Although the century before the Reformation had seen something of this, it was really a reform movement rather than a territorial grouping. With militant zeal, the monasteries which had accepted a reformed observance would seek to introduce it into other uncommitted monasteries. Such a congregation was the Bursfeld Union, which did much to raise the level of German monasticism
before the Reformation. When Germany settled into comparative stability after the Reformation decades, the movement gathered strength, the motive behind it being now twofold: besides zeal for spreading strict observance, there was the desire for union as a means of resisting aggression.

This last was considerably strengthened by the action of the Jesuits in south Germany, who in 1627 decided that Benedictine monachism had had its day and the monasteries should be made over to serve some useful purpose such as providing Jesuit colleges. The monks reacted with sufficient vigour to show that they were not entirely moribund. In particular the Bursfeld Union set out to draw all monasteries in Germany into its ranks. It failed in its ultimate object, more than anything because certain autocratic bishops refused to allow monasteries in their dioceses to be controlled by the Bursfeld General Chapter.

Würzburg diocese was a case in point, and Audomarus Asloam, the Scots abbot, played an important part in the negotiations between the Bursfeld Congregation and the prince-bishop. In 1618 Bishop Echter’s successor convoked a synod of the abbots in his diocese, the aim and result of which was the adoption of uniform observance in all monasteries. The Scots, too, were placed on the same footing as the German monks. In 1630 the Bursfeld Congregation made an unsuccessful attempt to establish itself in Würzburg, and in 1641 common constitutions for all monasteries in the diocese were once more agreed on. In fact, these monasteries formed what was in reality, if not in name, a diocesan congregation. In 1642 the Bursfeld President made persistent appeals to the bishop of Würzburg to allow the abbots in his diocese to attend the Bursfeld chapters and accept Bursfeld observance. Abbot Asloan was his agent and presented the petitions, although himself reacting strongly against the proposal that St James’s should have its tenuous link with the Ratisbon Scots broken and be forced to join a purely German congregation. The appeals were not successful and the Würzburg monasteries continued as before.

The bull Plantata was issued to the English Congregation in 1633, promulgated at the conventual chapter in St Gregory’s the following year, and ‘authenticated’, as Weldon terms it, in the
General Chapter of 1639. Weldon describes the bull as ‘a thing of that consequence to the Congregation as nothing can be more, which gives it all its grandeur and decorum and puts it on equal terms with all the religious Congregations that ever were or will be’. This acquisition by the English stimulated the Scots monks to petition Rome for a Scottish Congregation to be formed after the English model, with its own mission to the homeland, and no doubt the Bursfeld President’s colonising zeal provided them with an additional motive. But the petition achieved nothing, which is not surprising when one considers that there were almost certainly less than a dozen monks in the three Scottish abbeys at this time.

The mention of mission work points to one great attraction of the English Congregation in the eyes of the Scots: it had a well-established and organised mission to the homeland. The Würzburg Scots had in 1623 entered into an agreement whereby they could serve the Scottish mission under the auspices of the E.B.C. It is true that they almost at once set about establishing their own mission, and in 1629 Abbot Ogilvie was granted faculties for eight monks for seven years, but the English General Chapter of 1633 reported that two Scottish monks were working as missioners under English superiors. We know of two monks of Würzburg and one of Ratisbon who were missioners at this time; presumably two of the three had faculties granted both by Ogilvie and the English Congregation. In 1650 Abbot Asloan, who had been one of those three, asked Rome for the renewal of the faculties granted to Ogilvie as they had long since expired. It is at least doubtful whether the request was granted, and this leads one to ask who provided the faculties for Scots monks after 1636, when the faculties granted to Ogilvie expired. The possibility must be kept in mind that Scots monks continued intermittently to use the E.B.C. faculties.

To a certain extent the whole relation of Scottish monks to English was influenced by what one might call ‘British’ patriotism. The factors making for union with England, in sentiment as well as in the political sphere, had been growing since the early sixteenth century. Henry VII’s daughter had married the Scottish king in

---

6 Weldon’s Chronological Notes, 179-80.
7 The documents were edited with a commentary in The Downside Review, Vol. LXXXIII, (1965) pp. 60-72, 159-68.
1503, with the result that the sovereigns in the two countries were henceforth closely related, and James VI of Scotland succeeded to the English throne when Elizabeth died childless. Already in 1521 the Scottish historian John Major (or Mair) had written his *Historia Majoris Britanniae tam Angliae quam Scotiae*. The Reformation movement in Scotland was closely bound up with the pro-English, anti-French faction, and the common break with Rome and Catholicism forged a strong link between the two countries. The Civil War was the culmination of a growing division within the two countries, according to ideological and not national or regional considerations.

The Benedictines in exile were presumably as susceptible to these unifying influences as their fellow-countrymen. If Protestants in the two countries tended to unite according to their religious outlook, so did Catholics. The 1623 agreement between the monks spoke of the bonds of nature, country and language linking English and Scots, to which were added those forged by professing the same faith and religious life. Abbot Asloan of Würzburg apparently worked in Newcastle, at least during part of his time on the mission. He was a son of the laird of Garroch, very near Dumfries, and thus a native of the border lands. His brother, who was a secular priest in Scotland, worked on both sides of the border and petitioned Propaganda for faculties covering both realms. Later he too became a monk at Würzburg. Abbot Ogilvie’s faculties in 1629 were valid for ‘England, Ireland, Scotland, Man and other places of the dominion of the king of Great Britain’.

Such then was the background to the precariously existing Scottish abbeys in Germany a decade before the agreement with the E.B.C. was signed. In that decade the Ratisbon abbey underwent a further crisis, with the Würzburg monks and the English abbot of Lambspring hovering, so to speak, in the wings. The episode has elements of the ludicrous in it from beginning to end. Abbot Baillie of Ratisbon was anxious to get more monks and was in touch with the extraordinary character, Caramuel, the *princeps laxistarum* who figures in our moral theology manuals. At this

---

8 His name is Scots and is nowadays written Sloan.
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stage of his career Caramuel was a Benedictine abbot ruling communities in Prague and Vienna, and he offered Baillie some Irish monks on condition that one of them, Columbanus Duffy, was made coadjutor abbot of Ratisbon. Naturally Baillie refused the offer; instead he turned to Fr Placid Gascoigne, the President General of the E.B.C. This was in 1651, the year in which Gascoigne became abbot of Lambspring. Gascoigne promised to help and to put the matter to his congregation, but when nothing more was heard of it Baillie concluded the matter was shelved.

The following year Baillie accepted Caramuel’s proposal, giving as one reason that he was in his grand climacteric (that is, his sixty-third year) and therefore likely to die soon since he had recently been unwell. In November 1652 he made Duffy his coadjutor on condition that he and Caramuel kept it a secret. Of course it was invalid, for the Ratisbon monks, who had the right to elect their abbot, did not know of it. The news leaked out, Caramuel tried to uphold the validity of the pact while Baillie himself declared it invalid, and there was a great deal of trouble which embroiled the Emperor and many of the dignitaries who had come to Ratisbon for the 1653 Diet. Baillie was rather lucky to emerge unscathed from the affair; Rome decided in his favour, and some Würzburg monks replaced the Irishmen and helped to meet the extra needs while the Diet lasted.

The following year Duffy returned to the attack, calling himself Prior of St John’s, Waterford and claiming that Ratisbon was an Irish monastery unjustly taken from his countrymen in Elizabeth’s reign. In actual fact it had been so taken in 1515. The Scots refuted his claims and incidentally pointed out what seems to be factually accurate as a point of medieval history, that Duffy had no right to his title since the Waterford priory was subject to the Benedictines of Bath Cathedral. Once more the decision was given in favour of the Scots. The English monks are mentioned here and there in the proceedings. In 1653 Baillie told the bishop of Ratisbon that he could get some English monks quite easily, and in 1654 he declared that the English had more right to the Scots abbeys than the Irish had. He was still willing to accept some Englishmen but these had the drawback that, unlike the Irish, they would bring no means of support with them. The bishop of Ratisbon was
claiming rights over the Scots abbey in spite of its exempt status and was therefore opposed to the Irish claims. He communicated with the Scottish abbots in Würzburg and Erfurt over the affair, and in the late spring of 1654 Abbot Gascoigne, no longer President General, carried a letter from him to Asloan in Würzburg. One should note that these two abbots, Asloan and Gascoigne, were to be the chief parties in the 1660 pact between English and Scottish monks.

We can now consider the documents, which are not what one would expect in the case of a mutual agreement. Instead of a pact signed by both parties, they consist of the Articles of Union signed by the Scots and followed by approbations signed by various English officials. The dates of the documents afford some help in determining what happened. The first in time was signed and sealed by Abbot Gascoigne at Lambspring on 7th September 1660 in his capacity of Procurator General of the congregation per totam Germaniam appointed with full powers by the General Chapter of 1653. The post of Procurator in Germany is not included as one of the offices found in the various congregation lists, nor is it mentioned in the obit note on Gascoigne himself. One can only presume that the chapter had deputed him to undertake negotiations with the Scottish abbots in Germany; as superior of Lambspring he was the fittest man for the task, being the only abbot in the Congregation and the superior of the only English house in Germany. As a corollary of this, one can only presume that the request emanating from Ratisbon in 1651 for some form of union had not been forgotten, as Abbot Baillie thought, but had been deferred until the General Chapter of 1653; or perhaps Abbot Asloan of Würzburg had also requested something similar. Certainly it gives added significance to Gascoigne's visit to Würzburg in 1654.

There is no heading to Gascoigne's acceptance and approbation of the Articles of Union as there is to the other English approbations, at least in the Würzburg copy. It begins 'I, the undersigned ...' and mentions 'the aforesaid conditions, articles, etc.' and it follows on the actual Articles, which leads one to suspect that in the original it was an appendix forming part of the document containing the

---

8 Printed in full in Appendix I.
THE WÜRZBURG SCOTS

Articles. The Articles themselves are written in the first person and signed by the Scots, and one paragraph concerns a purely Scottish affair, but Asloane's signature is dated 15th October 1660, five weeks after Gascoigne signed. It seems clear enough that the Würzburg Scots drew up the Articles; the approbation was then added and signed by Gascoigne at Lambspring; then they were taken to Würzburg and signed by Asloane and two of his monks.

A year later the English General Chapter at Douai confirmed the union. Six fathers appointed by chapter to consider the matter declared themselves in favour of it on 1st September 1661. They were, incidentally, the same six as had been deputed to revise the Statutes of the Congregation for that chapter. Two days later, when the Articles had been read in a plenary session of the Chapter and formally approved, the President General and the Secretary of Chapter signed an official declaration to this effect and added the great seal of the Congregation. The approbation of the six chapter fathers is a merely formal statement, but the documents signed by Abbot Gascoigne and the President General are much more. Both speak of the glory of God, the growth of the Benedictine order and the advantage to the homeland which they earnestly hope will be furthered by the union. Gascoigne in addition expresses his most willing consent and says that the agreement can easily be modified by mutual consent in the future if circumstances call for it.

In the Articles themselves there are variations in wording in the four copies, which fall naturally into two pairs. The Würzburg and Ratisbon copies are practically identical and so are the other two, but between the two pairs there are some significant variations. Though it does not seem profitable to speculate why this is so, one can note that the first pair omit reference to the internal Scottish matter mentioned above, the election of a coadjutor abbot; they also have a clause which might tend to endanger the requirement that the Würzburg abbot must always be a Scot and they omit a clause which safeguards this. But any conclusion as to why the versions preserved at Würzburg and Ratisbon show this tendency is rendered quite uncertain by the fact that in theory the references apply equally to Scots and English superiors, and in any case one
of the other copies was almost certainly collected by Dennistoun at Ratisbon or Würzburg.

The Articles drawn up by the Scots are comprehensive. It is no mere arrangement for missionary work, coupled with a general affirmation of confraternity and spiritual union as in 1623. In fact it is termed 'union and incorporation'. The first article does indeed re-affirm the mission arrangement: any Scot sent by his abbot to the mission will have the same privileges and faculties as English monks and will be subject to English authority for the duration of his missionary work. But at once more fundamental points are dealt with; the next article concerns superiors. Only a Scot is to be abbot of Würzburg, and only an English monk is to be superior in an English monastery. To this article two of the copies add a clause declaring one of the signatories, Fr Maurus Dixon, to be elected coadjutor abbot to Asloan with right of succession. The insistence on a Scot 'always and infallibly' being abbot of Würzburg is considerably weakened by the limiting clause 'provided he is suitable' found in the Ratisbon and Würzburg copies, and the infallibility is further called in question by an article (5) requiring any English monk appointed abbot there to see that Scottish novices are brought into the house.

A fair number of the articles legislate for what is to happen when monks live in a monastery of the other nation. When monks travel from one monastery to another, payment of travelling expenses is to be arranged between the superiors of the respective houses (3). Monks are to wear the habit and follow the customs of the monastery where they are residing at the time (6). They have the same voting rights as other monks in the monastery where they reside, but, as two copies declare, the article regarding the nationality of the superior to be elected must be respected (4).

It goes without saying that the English Congregation had facilities and organisation lacking to the Scots. The latter are to be free to attend the English General Chapter or not (8). The financial levies laid from time to time on the English houses are not to be obligatory for the Scots, who will instead use their discretion as to whether they contribute or not (9). If the English procurator in Rome or elsewhere transacts business for the Scots, he is to have expenses refunded as well as receiving a fee for his services (10).
Throughout one can see the care taken to safeguard the rights of the bishop of Würzburg over the Scots abbey. The preamble to the agreement mentions his approval as well as that of the Holy See, and the conclusion insists that the pact must not prejudice his rights in any way. The longest article states that the Würzburg abbey will not be bound by the English statutes in the same way as the English monasteries are, because St James’s, like all Benedictine monasteries in those parts, is immediately subject to the bishop and it would be too great a burden to be subject both to him and to the English President General. The Scots, however, are willing to accept an unofficial visitation by the latter once every four years (his term of office) but at the expense of the English with possibly some financial contribution of their own (II).

The clause concerning Maurus Dixon’s election as coadjutor likewise mentions the Ordinary’s consent. Those who read the Latin text carefully will notice that when the consent of the bishop hoc et nunc is mentioned, for instance for the agreement itself or this election, he is called the Most Eminent Archbishop. The reason is that in 1661 the bishop of Würzburg also held the see of Mainz and was thus an Elector and one of the most important officials of the Empire. Yet another article brings in the Ordinary: it is declared that abbots of monasteries in Germany, whether English or Scots, hold office for life unless the Ordinary of the diocese removes them for grave canonical reasons (7). The terms used show that this refers to all monasteries in Germany, including Lambspring, and not merely to Würzburg. Certainly the German environment and pressures at Lambspring showed resemblances to those at Würzburg.10

If one is struck by the insistence on the rights of the bishop of Würzburg, the references to the lack of men and money in the Scots abbey are equally revealing. The possibility is envisaged of an English monk becoming abbot of Würzburg ex defectu Scotorum (5), no financial contribution will be levied from the Scots by General Chapter, any visitation by the English President will be at his expense. In connection with this last, the Scots’ slender means

---

10 Cf. Weldon, op. cit. 233, 235. The general chapter of 1693 decreed that an election should be held speedily if Lambspring became vacant, to avoid desolatio (Würzburg University Library, M.ch.q.52, fol. 76v).
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(tenuitas nostra) are explicitly referred to. The final article in the agreement arranges for English monks to help, should they be required, with the instruction of novices at Würzburg and in any other pressing need arising later. A clause making this a reciprocal arrangement is added at the end, but it is going to be shown that English fathers were at once required at Würzburg and at least one was already there.

Several questions at once suggest themselves. Why was the agreement made? Why was it made by Würzburg monks when it was Ratisbon monks who had first suggested it? Why was it made in 1660, several years after the 1653 General Chapter allowed negotiations to proceed? Two reasons can be suggested why the Ratisbon monks did not continue with the plan for union with the English. The first is that the bishop of Ratisbon, who was claiming rights over the monastery, did not like the idea. The suggestion, although plausible enough, must in the absence of evidence remain a mere supposition. A much more likely reason is the character of the abbot, for Abbot Baillie, who had requested some form of union, died in 1655 and his successor was quite unequal to his office. When, after letting things slide for some years, he eventually departed for Italy, the Würzburg abbot, the Maurus Dixon elected coadjutor in 1660, administered the Ratisbon abbey. Thus, at the time of the union, the Ratisbon Scots lacked any sort of firm direction.¹¹

The year 1660 suggests that the Restoration had something to do with the pact. Cromwell had made Scotland subject to English enactments and stimulated the desire in Scotland for union with England. Both countries welcomed Charles II back in the early summer of 1660; no doubt Scots and English recusants abroad were even more pleased than their Protestant compatriots at home. Both English and Scots monks would naturally look forward to the new opportunities given them to help their homeland, and they had perhaps never before been so united in aims and sentiment. Abbot Gascoigne’s approbation expresses the hope that the union will provide solace for ‘our common fatherland Great Britain’,

¹¹ The Scots abbey at Erfurt can be ignored. This Ratisbon abbot also ruled Erfurt, where there was no community at this time.
and the President General also speaks of ‘our fatherland Great Britain’. But the Scots do not mention this aspect, when there was no reason why those who drew up the Articles should not have expressed what they had in mind.

There is, however, one positive reason for the monks of Würzburg wanting to use the resources of their more affluent English brethren in 1660. The key is provided by a list of the resident community in Würzburg at the time of the episcopal visitation made on 4th February 1661. Abbot Asloan died towards the end of January 1661, three months after signing the Articles and long before the General Chapter finally approved them. The only Scottish priests left in residence were Frs Maurus Dixon and Placid Baillie, the two who had signed the Articles with Asloan; there were also two Scots novices and two English monks.

The six resident monks in February 1661 were Maurus Dixon, aged 43 and professed 23 years; Placid Baillie, aged 28; Anselm Touchet of St Gregory’s, Douai, professed in November 1643; Placid Shaftoe of Lambspring, professed in December 1655; Macarius Brown, aged 22, professed 1st November 1660; and William Dunn, aged 17, professed the same day. It is not clear whether, for instance, aet. 17 means aged 17 or in his 17th year, and it is at least possible that by profession the list really means reception of the habit. Shaftoe is described as having been professed ante 7 annos when it was actually five years and two months before, Touchet as having been professed ante 20 annos when it was seventeen years and three months before. If this is so, then Brown and Dunn were merely received into the noviciate in November 1660, which indeed seems more in keeping with Dunn’s age.

The community in Würzburg was of necessity small, for the revenues had been reduced by the wars and could not support many monks. One monk died in 1656, another in 1658. One father is recorded as being in Poland in 1662, possibly working among expatriate Scots, while another, Boniface Strachan, who is said to have died in 1664, was possibly in Scotland as he had taken the mission oath before going to Würzburg. In September 1658 Placid Baillie had arrived from the Scots College in Rome, while four youths were expected from Scotland; it seems reasonable to

12 See Appendix II.
assume that the latter included Brown and Dunn. It was about this time, too, that Fr Placid Shaftoe came to live in Würzburg, for the visitation list of February 1661 says explicitly that he had been there two years. It says nothing of how long Touchet had been there. In October 1660, therefore, the three men who signed the Articles constituted the sum of the professed resident Scots, and of these one had been professed a year at the most and another was to die within three months.

The most likely explanation of the agreement is that Asloan, having seen his resident professed monks dwindle to three (including himself) and realising that his own end was not far off, was trying to provide for the future. Hence the election of Dixon as coadjutor with right of succession, although this was not ratified until after Asloan’s death, and hence the insistence that Würzburg was to be preserved for the Scots even if an English abbot were elected through lack of Scots. The final article calling for help with the training of novices is easily explained if two were awaiting their clothing at the time; or it may have been confirming what was already happening in practice. Whether the two young Scots began their novitiate in November 1659 or November 1660, Shaftoe at least had been in Würzburg before it began. Not only did the Englishmen bring the resident community up to the required number of six, but it would certainly seem that one of them was novice-master, for Dixon was cellarer and Baillie was himself a recent recruit. Twenty-one years later, on receiving an obituary notice of Shaftoe from Lambspring, the Würzburg abbot wrote that he was a good man who did the Scots a service and lived in Würzburg for some years when priests were scarce.

It only remains now to see what permanent effects the union with the E.B.C. had on the Würzburg monastery. The conclusion must be that they were nothing very striking. It does not seem, for instance, that any Würzburg abbot attended the English General Chapter. By 1665 three more young Scots had been professed in Würzburg, and by 1668 a further two; no Englishman is recorded at the visitations in these years, although Fr Bernard Sanderson of Lambspring died at Würzburg in June 1669. In fact the new abbot of St James’s was able to get help from another source.
Asloan had been of considerable assistance to the abbot of the neighbouring abbey of Schwarzach in the difficult post-war period, and this prelate was present at Dixon’s election on 25th February 1661. Dixon asked for and obtained, *propter defectum personarum*, the loan of one of his monks, who lived with the Scots and was cellarer for almost two years. The following year a Scot made his novitiate in Schwarzach and a German laybrother lived in St James’s. In 1663 another Schwarzach monk was teaching philosophy in the Scots abbey, and when he printed his *Theses* on logic, Brown and Dunn were the exponents.

The most significant result of the union was undoubtedly in mission work. At this point the question must be asked whether some unwritten agreement was made between Scots and English, something like: You help us by providing a novice-master and another priest at once, and we will provide men as soon as possible for your mission stations. Certainly this happened in practice, and Abbot Dixon was later to say that the English solicited the union in order to get priests to supply their mission stations. Brown left Würzburg in 1663 and spent thirty-four years on the English mission. Baillie left before the end of 1665 and worked in Scotland and England; in 1679 he seems to have been in England, for letters to him from Würzburg were sent via Lambspring. Dunn left for England between 1669 and 1671 and worked there until his death. These are three of whom we have certain information; there may have been others who worked in England for shorter periods.

Any Würzburg monks who worked in Scotland did so with E.B.C. faculties. Dixon did not like the arrangement and from 1669 onwards petitioned Rome for powers to supply his own monks with faculties. Receiving no satisfaction, however, he had no option but to continue asking the English President General for faculties for each monk. But soon the arrangement began to break down. Abbot Gascoigne wrote to Rome from Lambspring in February 1675 advocating a Scottish Benedictine mission for the monks of Ratisbon and Würzburg which would be independent of the English President; and two years later Dixon was complaining about the English monks in a letter to Rome and accusing them of saying untruthfully that Propaganda had forbidden them to supply his monks with faculties for England, and this in spite of the incorpora-
tion of the Würzburg Scots into the English Congregation and their right to the faculties tanguam unius corporis membra. Fr James Blair of Würzburg arrived in Scotland in 1678 with faculties from the English President General. The Prefect of the Scottish mission approved them but it happened that at this time a visitation of the Scottish mission was made; and, as the Visitator put it, Blair’s arrival with these faculties caused un gran fracasso since the Scots refuse to recognise English jurisdiction. A great deal could be said about mission work and faculties, but even without going into detail one can see the difficulties of the Würzburg monks: Propaganda would not give the abbot the power to grant faculties himself, the E.B.C. was no longer willing to grant them for England, and the Scots objected to E.B.C. faculties being given for Scotland.

In 1679 the celebrated Cardinal Francesco Barberini died and was succeeded as Protector of Scotland by Cardinal Howard. Propaganda produced a decree that year whereby faculties would be given to the Scottish monks by the Prefect of the mission, but there was delay in its being put into effect. Dixon’s successor as abbot, Bernard Maxwell, was in November 1681 explaining the agreement with the English Congregation to the powerful agent of the Scottish clergy in Rome, Will Leslie, and he added, ‘This union is also almost now decayed, only as yet have our faculties from them ever untill we can have them elsewhere’. The following August he told his fellow Scots abbot in Ratisbon: ‘It seemes before several years they (the E.B.C.) are tyred of us, and desire our companie no longer, for they make difficultie to give us faculties any more’. The question seems to have been resolved in practice by Howard himself giving faculties to monks going to Scotland, then after the flight of the Stuart king by the appointment of the first Catholic bishop in Scotland, Thomas Nicholson, in 1695. Many years later, in 1716, the abbot of Ratisbon asserted that the English monks had had the agreement with Würzburg revoked by Cardinal Howard’s authority.

For all that, relations between English and Scottish monks did not cease entirely when the arrangement over mission faculties

---

13 One can expect some odd English from these Scots in Germany. For instance, ‘before several years’ looks like the German idiom for ‘several years ago’.
14 I owe this reference to an unpublished paper of Dr Hammermayer and am grateful to the Revd William James Anderson, M.A., keeper of the Scottish Catholic Archives, for making this and other originals available.
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broke down. The situation among the Scots had changed radically when Fr Placid Fleming was elected abbot of Ratisbon in 1672. For the next forty-eight years Ratisbon had a gifted and vigorous abbot who insisted on his exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, built up his community and founded a seminary for boys from Scotland attached to his abbey. When the Bavarian Congregation was finally established in 1684, pressure was put on Fleming to join it; probably as a reaction against this he set out to refound the Scottish Congregation and include the Würzburg abbey in it.

This no doubt explains the transcription of E.B.C. material which could serve as a model for the establishing of a Scottish Congregation. Thus in 1684-85 James Blair, a Würzburg monk, copied out for Abbot Fleming the E.B.C. Statutes and the Acts and Definitions of the General Chapter of 1639, together with the draft petitions for the formation of a Scottish Congregation about 1640. Towards the end of the century another Würzburg monk transcribed the revised E.B.C. Statutes of 1661 and the bull Plantata as well as some more recent material. As long as the English Congregation and its mission existed, the less numerous Scots were likely to keep them in view and hope to imitate them. Abbot Maxwell of Würzburg (1679-85) corresponded with Lambspring and received news from England and obituary notices. Scots and English continued to meet. In 1690, for instance, the former prior of Lambspring visited Würzburg on his way from Rome, and seven years later James Blair set off for the Scottish mission in the company of some Englishmen who had spent a few days in the Würzburg monastery. No Scottish Congregation was ever formed, however, and we can attribute this to the position of all monasteries in the diocese of Würzburg, a homogeneous group subject to their bishop. Effective union with any monastery outside the diocese was not really possible. But the short-lived union of St James’s with the English Benedictine Congregation accomplished two useful results: it helped to tide the Scots over their man-power crisis in 1660, and it provided them with faculties for missionary work in Scotland and England during the next two decades. Perhaps, too, it gave some useful assistance to understaffed English mission stations at a time when it was needed.

15 This seems to be Maurus Knightly, who was Prior at Lambspring after 1688, was Procurator in Rome 1692 and was later abbot of Lambspring (Birt, 70).
Copia Articulorum sive punctorum Unionis et Incorporationis inter Monasteria Anglica et Congregationis et Monasterium Scotorum Herbipoli.

Nos Abbas et Conventus Monasterii S. Jacobi Scotorum Herbipoli, praeentes et futuri, Dei imprimis gloriae et sacri ordinis incrementum simulatque nationis Anglica et Scoticae emolumentum penitius attendentes, communis consilio et consensu Unionem et Incorporationem cum Congregatione Anglica inire desideramus, quam accedente approbatione Sedis Apostolicae atque Eminentissimi Archiepiscopi Ordinarii ipso facto compromittimus, sub his expressis reservatis clausulis.

1. Qui ex nostris cum licentia Abbatis sui Ordinarii ad Missionem Apostolicam mittentur, eisdem cum Congregationis Anglicanae Patribus privilegiis et facultatibus Apostolicae gaudere debebunt, tamquam membra Unionis, ac insuper legibus et imperiis Anglorum subesse, quamdiu in Missione inter ipsos manserint.

2. Pro regimine dicti Monasterii Scotorum Herbipoli religiosus ordinis de natione Scotica, modo idoneus, semper et infallibiliter praeferatur praelaturae, intuitu primaevae fundationis, quae facta est pro solis et puris Scotis; et converso idem fiet quoad praelaturas vel regimen in Monasteriis Anglicarum, qui in propriis Monasteriis sine contradictione aut oppositione semper praeficiatur superioritate supremo officio.

Et quia Pater Maurus Dixon natione Scotus ob experientiam rem domesticam administrandi aliasque labores pro bono nativi sui Monasterii ac Ordinis susceps meretur promoveri, accedente approbatione Eminentissimi Ordinarii ipsum Coadjutorem cum pleno jure successionis adoptamus, designamus et denominamus.

3. Quia in omni vera unione propter diversas considerationes et circumstantias requiritur interdum permutatio personarum, adeoque ad quodcumque Monasterium sive Anglicum sive Scoticum cum praeclaria et obedientia Superiorem destinabuntur Religiosi Conventuales, si ille quocumque personam conferre tenebunt, expensis integris vel dimidiatis ejus Monasterii a quo vel ad quod mittuntur, prout Superiores conveniunt.

4. Patres Angli qui vivunt in praefato Monasterio Scotorum Herbipoli et similiter Patres Scoti quando sunt conventuales in Monasteriis Anglicarum, illaesa et servata secunda clausula, habebunt aequale jus suffragii tam in electione Superiorum quam in cunctis aliis quae Monasterio illud quocunque modo concernunt.

5. Si contingat Patres Anglos praeferci praetalture ex defectu Scotorum, juxta fundationem conabuntur idem procurare personas ex Scotia natione oriundas illasque praes aliis ad habitum et professionem admittere.

6. Quoad habitum aliasque regulares vivendi modos Religiosi se accommodabunt et conformabunt laudabili consuetudini loci ad quem mittuntur et in quo pro tempore resident.

7. Praefati Monasteriorum in Germany, seu Angli seu Scoti, sint sicut hactenus semper fuerunt perpetui superiores et nullo modo amovibles,
nisi grave aliquod scandalum aut vitae infamia demonstrari et probari queat, quo casu Episcopus tanquam ordinarius talem Praelatum juxta Canones Ecclesiasticos et regulae Benedictinae prae scriptum amovere poterit.

8. Patribus Scotis sit liberum accedere vel non accedere Capitulum Generale Patrum Anglorum, singulis quadriennii celebrari solitum in loco ab ipsis designando.

9. Ad communes contributiones propter emergentes causas in Generali Capitulo interdum imponi solitas non urgebitur Scotorum Abbas, sed eius relinquetur discretioni an et quid velit suppeditare.

10. Pater Agens sive Anglica Congregationis procurator Romae vel alibi residenti, pro expediendis negotiis Scotorum Monasterii Herbipolensis, secretariis aliisque officialibus quascumque pecunias dederit eidem integre refunduntur, ac insuper pro eius habitu labore transmittetur honesta recompensatio.

11. Legibus et statuis Capituli et Praesidentis non aeque adstringetur Monasterium Scotorum Herbipolense ac alia Monasteria et residenzae ad Patres Anglos proprie et directe spectantia. Ratio, quia dictum Scotense Monasterium jurisdictioni Episcopi ordinarii immediate cum sit subjectum, uti alia omnia Benedictinorum Monasteria in hisce partibus existentia, si porro subire deberet visitationem et ordinationem Praesidentis Anglorum aliasque institutiones eidem Congregationi annexas, duplici cique gravi succumberet oneri. Ad firmandam tamen et stabilendam inter nos veram et formalem unionem et incorporationem, minime recusamus fraternam et amicam visitationem semel in quadriennio, modo instituat propriis Anglorum expensis, quibus ad melius et commodius conficiendum iter, si tenuitas nostra possit aliquid superaddere, officio debitae fraternae charitatis haud deerrimus.

12. Unione et incorporatione inter nos facta et conclusa, Patres Angli si curn opera requiratur praesto sint in auxilium saepe dicto Monasterio Scotorum, tam in initio pro instructione novitiorum, quam etiam postea quacunque emergent occassione et necessitate; et e contra Patres Scoti Anglis.

Advertendum praedictam unionem et incorporationem praefatii Monasterii Scotorum cum Congregatione Anglicana nullo modo posse aut debere praeficicare juri Dioecesani, quod utrinque in suo vigore fixum et stabile esse decernimus et declaramus. Unde prae habito Eminentissimi et Reverendissimi Ordinarii aliorumque quorum interest consensu et approbatione, sub praedictis conditionibus et expressis reservatis clausulis, in eandem unionem et incorporationem ego infra scriptus Scotorum Herbipoli Abbas libere consentio, proque majore fide et confirmatione usuale sigillum appono.

Herbipoli 15. Octobris Anno 1660
Fr: Audomarus Ioannes Abbas
Fr: Maurus Dixonus Senior et Cellerarius
Fr: Placidus Baylie Sacerdos professus
Ego infrascriptus Congregationis Anglicane Ordinis S. Benedicti Abbas Lambspringensis eiudemque Congregationis per totam Germaniam Procurator Generalis, ab ipso nostro Capitulo Generali Parisiis anno 1653 celebrato cum plena potestate constitutus, huic etiam unioni atque incorporationi, sub praedictis conditionibus, articolis, punctis et reservatis clausulis libenter subscribo; sperans fore ut in Dei honorem et sacri ordinis incrementum, Patriaeque communis Magnae Brittaniiæ solutium singular, haec unio faeliciter cedat. Si quae vero in posterum rebus id exigentibus, hisce articulis vel addenda vel quoquo modo mutanda videbuntur, utriusque partis consensu fieri id facile potest. Et in huius sententiae meae liberrimique consensum testimonium, nomen et sigillum meum apposui. Actum in Monasterio Lambspringensi Die 7. Septembris 1660.

F. Placidus Abbas et Procurator

Locus Sigilli

Copia Approbationis Patrum Deputatorum a Capitulo Generali ad confirmandum Unionem.

Cum absque ullo nostro incommodo promoveri possit opus tam pium, Ordini Patriaæque utile, nobisque etiam haud dubie honorificum, Infrascripti a Capitulo Generali ad id deputati censemus hanc cum Patribus Scotis nostri Ordinis in Germania factam Unioinem atque incorporationem merito a nobis amplectendam, Capitulique nostri Generalis autoritate confirmandam esse et corroborandam.

Datum die primo Septembris anni 1661 in Collegio S. Gregorii Duaci sedente Capitulo Generali.

Fr Placidus Abbas Lambspringensis.
Fr Anselmus Crowderus Provincialis et Prior Cantuariensis17.
Fr Faustus18 Vincentius Prior Cathedralis Cestrensis deffinitor 2.
Fr Iosephus Frere prior Cathedralis Coventriensis.
Fr Benedictus Stapiltonus deffinitor 3 et prior S. Gregorii.
Fr Augustinus Latham deffinitor provinciae Cantuariensis.

Copia Approbationis Admodum Reverendi Patris Praesidis (?) Congregationis Anglicane

Cum Articuli et puncta praememoratae unionis et Incorporationis inter Monasteria Congregationis Anglicane et Monasterium Scotorum eiusdem Ordinis nostri Benedictini Herbipoli, in Capitulo nostro Generali huius anni 1661 in pleno consessu et praesentia omnium Patrum Capitularem fuerint praelecta, ipsaque unio et Incorporatio facta ab Admodum R. P. Praeside et Regimine Congregationis nostrae sit approbata, Nos quibus nihil magis cordi est quam ut Dei honorem, Sacri Ordinis propagandaem, salutem animarum et patriae nostrae Magnae Brittaniiæ conversionem modis omnibus pro virili nostro promoveamus, unionem et incorporationem praedictam sub insertis conditionibus et clausulis reservatis auctoritate nostra Capitulari libenter confirmamus, eandemque
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F. Cuthbertus Horsleyus Congregationis Anglicanae Ordinis S. Benedicti Praeses Generalis

Locus Sigilli
De mandato Capituli Generalis
F. Bernardus Millington Secretarius

NOTES TO APPENDIX I

1 The transcript is taken from the Würzburg copy, with some additions and variations from the other copies. Significant variations between the versions are noted. All the versions are careless copies to some extent, so in this transcript the most suitable punctuation has been selected, some obvious scribal errors corrected, and so on; contractions have also been expanded. The four copies are referred to respectively as Wz, Rat, Denn, Douai.
2 Denn, Douai: incrementum.
3 Denn, Douai: cum consilio.
4 Wz, Rat have the same careless error Sedis Anglicae.
5 Only Wz, Rat have this word.
6 Wz, Rat omit these two words.
7 Only Wz, Rat have these two words.
8 Only Wz, Rat have this word.
9 Only Wz, Rat omit this paragraph.
10 Wz, Rat omit these five words.
11 Denn: tenebuntur. Douai: tenebuntur, with conabuntur in margin.
12 Only Wz, Rat have this word.
13 Rat: constitutiones.
14 Only Wz, Rat have remainder of paragraph.
15 Only Wz, Rat have these two words.
16 Rat omits praesto . . . Scotorum, which deprives the paragraph of sense.
17 Contractions have been expanded in conformity with the forms found in other acts of this chapter signed by the same six (Würzburg University Library, M.ch.q.52, fol. 67r).
18 The scribe began to write Faustus but changed it to Paulus. The signature in the volume mentioned in the foregoing note adds the surname Sadler, which makes identification certain and shows Faustus to be correct. This also provides proof that Sadler was cathedral prior of Chester in 1661, so the question mark in Birt's Obit-book, p. 350, can be removed.
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APPENDIX II

THREE SCOTTISH BENEDICTINES

The Downside Review, Vol. LXXXII (1964), pp. 233-45, contained an article by the present writer on the three monks of Würzburg listed in the E.B.C. necrology. One of the principal sources for the history of St James's was the Würzburg diocesan archives, which were completely destroyed in the last war. They had been used just over a century ago by a German writer, Michael Wieland, whose lengthy compilation on the abbey thus became indispensable. Unfortunately, Wieland's use of the archives, particularly in the references to individual monks, was not entirely satisfactory, with the result that one could often only guess what these references meant precisely. Recently, however, other notes and transcripts taken from the diocesan archives before their destruction have come to light. They are in the collection made by Alexander Reid, a Scottish secular priest, in 1877. Reid was subsidised for part of his work by the third Marquess of Bute, who was a man of many parts, and the volumes are now in the library of Mount Stuart. Grateful thanks are due to the present Marquess and the librarian at Mount Stuart, Miss C. Armet, by whose kindness the volumes were made available for consultation. The following notes are corrections and additions to the information about the three Scots monks given in the above-mentioned article. All are taken from the Reid Collections, Vol. II, fol. 112r, 117v-119v, unless otherwise stated.

Fr William Gordon

An even clearer testimony to his family background is found in the Memoirs of Richard Augustine Hay, compiled at the end of the seventeenth century. In a list of the children of the 5th Earl of Huntly (died 1576) occurs the following: 'William Earle George his (=George's) third sone became a Relligous Monke in Germany'.

In a list of the community drawn up on 18th September 1635 he is described as 'in Scotia professus'. Since the purpose of the list was to establish where the monks were, because of the coming abbatical election, we can understand a comma and translate as 'in Scotland, a professed monk'. It is thus confirmed that Gordon was on the mission at this time.

Fr William Dunn

The questions asked as to why he was listed with two English monks in 1661 have been answered in the foregoing article on the Union of 1660. Dunn was professed (or clothed?) on All Saints day, 1660, with the consent of his parents, being aged only 17 the following February. At the visitation of December 1665 he was aged 21 and had been four years in the order; at that of November 1668 he had been eight years professed. One can see
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that mathematical precision was not aimed at in these statements, which were probably the answers given by the monk himself to the formal queries put to him when summoned before the visitators.

He was not present at the visitation of January 1672, so we can conclude that he went on the mission between November 1668 and that date. He was not listed among the monks present or absent at the time of the abbatial election in 1679, which fits in with the date of his death, given as 1675. Throughout he is termed William, which is clearly his religious name.

Fr MACARIUS BROWN

He was professed (or clothed?) on All Saints Day, 1660 and was aged 22 the following February. The Würzburg necrology saying that he was thirty-four years on the mission is corroborated by a letter of Abbot Fleming,2 who makes an explicit statement to this effect. It also harmonises with the visitation lists: Brown was not present in December 1665 or at any subsequent visitation. At the election of 1679 he was listed as being absent in Scotland, and was termed a missionary in a list of December 1682. The omission of his name at the 1689 election in some versions of the chronicle has probably no significance except that the scribes considered him remote from the affairs of the monastery.

Brown thus went on the English mission in 1663 and remained there until his death. In January 1680 he was in prison, and still imprisoned in November; fears for his life were expressed but by June 1681 he was apparently free, or at least able to correspond with Würzburg.3

A fellow-monk of Würzburg called him explicitly Alexander Brown,4 which makes it even more probable that the Dom Alexander Brown among the unauthenticated names in Birt (p. 296) is a ghost, or rather is none other than Fr Macarius Brown. The other draft of the Würzburg necrology (that is, the one not quoted above) says he died in his 63rd year, which disagrees by about four years with his age as given in the 1661 list. On general principles one should accept the latter in preference to the necrology drafts, which at times are mere guess-work. He was thus born about 1639.

NOTES TO APPENDIX II

3 Letters of Abbot Maxwell, 4th February 1680, 3rd March 1680, 6th November 1680, 22nd June 1681, in Ratisbon Ordinariatsarchiv, Schottenarchiv, Akten 319-20.
4 Scottish Catholic Archives, Mission Letters, Chisholm, 10th March 1698.