“Your Best and Maist Faithfull
Subjects”: Andrew and James
Melville as James VI and I's
“Loyal Opposition”

STEPHEN
KING

Résumé : *Bien que moins connue des chercheurs que celle de 1604, la conférence qui eut lieu en 1606 à Hampton Court entre le roi James et ses ecclésiastiques anglais et écossais proéminents produisit néanmoins un effet immédiat sur la pratique monarchique de James Stuart en Angleterre. À la conférence de 1606, et pendant les six mois suivants, James puisa dans son éducation précédente et son expérience comme roi d'Écosse pour s'engager activement dans des débats avec les pasteurs presbytériens Andrew et James Melville. Au moyen de cet engagement soutenu avec son « opposition loyale », il se définît pour ses sujets anglais en tant qu'un monarque puissant mais résolument voué au dialogue, à la tolérance et à la recherche du moyen terme.*

What means did James Stuart, as a foreigner, use to define his style of rule and articulate it to his new subjects in the early years of his English reign? At least part of the answer lies in what might be termed the “Second Hampton Court Conference,” a meeting between James and his preeminent Scottish and English ecclesiastics in September 1606, whose immediate result was a series of sporadic meetings that took place at various locations until April 1607.¹ In recent years, several scholars have identified factors that contributed to James's development of a public rhetoric and policy in both Scotland and England: Mark Fortier argues for the centrality of legal discourse to James's practice of rule; Sandra Bell examines the role of poetic discourse; and William Brown Patterson argues that James defined his rule in terms of his publicly expressed desire for pan-European religious reconciliation.²

Nevertheless, since Thomas McCrie wrote his two-volume *Life of Andrew Melville* in the early nineteenth century, few have considered the

cultural and historical significance of James's interaction with the Scottish ministers and academics Andrew and James Melville, and even fewer have examined James's engagement with the two Melvilles during and after the "Second Hampton Court Conference" of 1606.³ In their 1985 article, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I," Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake fill this gap to some degree. They begin their article with a description of the textual result of the 1606 conference — the four published sermons by bishops Barlow, Buckeridge, Andrewes, and King.⁴ Subsequently, they characterise James's style of rule as firmly rooted in "personal contact" and an adherence to the *via media*. They also argue that James was a "subtle manipulator of men," who incorporated opposing points of view into his own conception of rule but tended to "overestimate the impact of his personality and arguments" on others.⁵

Despite these judgements, Fincham and Lake fail to examine James's practice of kingship in light of its clearest manifestation: the 1606 Hampton Court Conference itself. They devote six pages to an analysis of the 1604 Hampton Court Conference,⁶ but do not return to that of 1606. In what is perhaps their most serious oversight, they fail to mention the Melvilles by name, but simply include them at the beginning of their article as part of the "unwilling audience of Scottish Presbyterians" who listened to the four bishops' sermons. When examining James's practice of rule in England and in Scotland, however, one must not overlook the Melvilles, who constituted a principled opposition to James's public policy but were certainly not an "unwilling audience." Their dialogue with James was a longstanding one. As early as the 1570s, the two ministers had actively functioned in Scotland almost as texts for James — texts to address, interpret, expound or repudiate, and even suppress. The "Second Hampton Court Conference" provided James with another opportunity to engage with the Melvilles as texts. At this conference, James defined himself for his English subjects as a mediating, authoritative, and tolerant divine-right monarch committed to upholding the *via media*. In doing so, he relied heavily upon his Scottish experience, and more specifically, upon his longstanding dialogue with a fierce but loyal opposition represented by Andrew Melville and his nephew James.

As Presbyterian ministers, Andrew and James Melville represented oppositional otherness in nearly every category of public discourse, as James defined his political and religious monarchical theory in Scotland. Born in 1545, Andrew Melville was orphaned as a child and subsequently raised in the Baldovy household of his older brother Richard. After attending grammar school at Montrose and studying at the University of St. Andrews, in 1569 Melville began a five-year tenure teaching at the Academy of Geneva and studying under Jean Calvin's successor, the professor of divinity Theo-

dore Beza. In 1574, at the urging of a number of figures concerned with the state of the Kirk in Scotland, Melville returned to Scotland in order to become Principal of the College of Glasgow.⁷ He carried with him a letter of introduction to the General Assembly from Beza himself, which stated that the act of depriving itself of Melville by returning him to Scotland to enrich his Presbyterian colleagues was "the graittest taken of affection the Kirk of Genev could schaw to Scotland."⁸ Beza's high esteem proved justified, for Gordon Donaldson argues that, because of his continued and vocal personal defence of the Kirk against James's monarchical authority, Andrew Melville, although lesser-known than John Knox, "is to be remembered as the real founder of Scottish Presbyterianism."⁹

In November of 1574, Melville brought his brother Richard's son James — to that point a student following in his uncle's footsteps at Montrose, then at the University of St. Andrews — with him when he became Principal of the College of Glasgow. By 1575, under the supervision of his uncle, the nineteen-year-old James Melville began studying Hebrew and theology and teaching Greek grammar, as well as courses — taught in Greek — in geometry, arithmetic, logic, and rhetoric. In 1580, when Andrew left Glasgow to assume the position of Principal of the New College at St. Andrews, his nephew again followed him and became Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages at St. Andrews, a position which he held until 1586.¹⁰ After the completion of his tenure at St. Andrews, James Melville became minister of the parish of Anstruther-Wester in 1586, and in 1590 minister of the parish of Kilrenny, where he served until 1607.¹¹ The Melvilles occupied a strong academic and ecclesiastical position from which to shape both Kirk policy and public opinion, and they shared a fervent devotion to Presbyterianism. That devotion led them to a sort of martyrdom. After decades of heated debate with James, both died as still-virulent opponents of monarchical involvement in the Kirk — James under house arrest at Berwick in 1614, and Andrew in exile at Sedan, France, in 1622.

Episcopalianist in temperament, James detested the Melvilles' fervent brand of Presbyterianism, yet his childhood education under George Buchanan had given him a reverence for the *via media* and a love of academic dialogue that allowed him to consider principled intellectual opposition as politically helpful to a discerning monarch. Before he was appointed James's principal tutor, Buchanan had stated, in a poem addressed to his English friend Sir Thomas Randolph, that, were he ever in a position to mould a king, he would teach that monarch to "lay aside his hate" for his enemies and be lenient with his opponents "if it is consistent with the welfare of his people."¹² In Peter Hume Brown's words, after he became James's tutor, Buchanan "lost no opportunity of impressing on James this ideal of his future

duties”¹³ and, by exposing the young king to a variety of printed texts, taught him to engage constructively with oppositional authorities. Subject to such an education, James from his youth was a monarchical paradox, for he was both a born king, and, thanks to his education at the hands of Buchanan, a king who had been constructed to a greater degree than had been any of his recent predecessors. As infant ruler of Scotland and heir presumptive of England, he had always been a king, and in *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* he would later argue that “Monarchie is the trew paterne of Diuinitie,”¹⁴ a form of secular and ecclesiastical office divinely bestowed on a ruler at birth. His childhood experience did not demonstrate to him simply that he had always been king, however; his text-based education at the hands of Buchanan — one of Scotland’s, and indeed Europe’s most competent and renowned humanist scholars — showed him also that he was always a king-in-process, a monarchical construct continually reliant upon his intellectual interaction with others. In short, through his education, James became the embodiment of a contradiction, in that he represented a tenuous balance between the opposing forces of divinely ordained hereditary succession and temporally constructed kingship. Moreover, another contradiction was fashioned that would be evident throughout James’s life and manifest itself at Hampton Court in 1606: his paradoxical dual identity as both a “subtle manipulator of men”¹⁵ and a sincere product of his humanist training.

From Buchanan, James received a rigorous linguistic, political, and textual education that was unique among contemporary monarchs and gave him a lifelong respect, if not love, for academic learning, opinion, and debate.¹⁶ But he did not just have a respect *for* academics; he also had the respect *of* academics, most notably Andrew and James Melville, who, after visiting the eight-year-old at Stirling in 1574, called him “the sweitest sight in Europe that day, for strange and extraordinar gifts of ingyne, judgment, memory, and langage.”¹⁷ Although in later years James would not be so sweet a sight for the Presbyterian Melvilles, given his episcopal policy, a mutual intellectual respect and understanding did exist between the king and his two most contentious ecclesiastical subjects. On James’s part, this respect grew out of his being an amateur scholar in the truest sense of “amateur,” and Andrew Melville, having been himself instructed in classical languages by Buchanan,¹⁸ and having studied at the University of Paris as well as at Geneva, was the sort of professional scholar whose opinion the young king had been trained to respect, even if it did not entirely agree with his own. As a university instructor in Classics, James Melville was in the same category, and he likewise shared with James a grudging mutual respect and an understanding of the process of Socratic dialogue. As both outspoken Presbyterian ministers and professional scholars, the two Melvilles thus

represented a powerfully negative but also formative opposition for the king; they were both religious and political "others," as well as academic and dialogical fellows, with whose opinion James actively engaged.

From the late 1570s to the early 1600s, James and the Melvilles had a series of defining confrontations over religious and political issues in Scotland. As they debated the legitimacy of the 1578 *Presbyterian Second Book of Discipline*, which Andrew Melville had supervised, the two sides set out their positions regarding the monarch's authority over the Kirk. In May 1584, faced with the threat of imprisonment for their opposition to James's "Black Acts," which repudiated the *Second Book of Discipline*, the Melvilles began a self-imposed exile in England and registered their criticism from a distance. Although they returned to Scotland with James's permission within two years and James Melville served briefly as a Privy Councillor in the early 1590s, by the end of the decade the Melvilles were again at odds with the king, this time over the monarch's role in the Kirk as outlined in James's 1599 *Basilicon Doron*. Such confrontations allowed James to define himself as an assertive but tolerant ruler of both Kirk and State. Indeed, his 1596 meeting with the Melvilles at Falkland Palace set a seal upon his Scottish kingship more firmly than did any other engagement: it solidified the Melvilles' status as "constructive critics" who walked the fine line between traitor and patriot; it defined his own Scottish authority; and it even foreshadowed the means by which he would define himself at and immediately after the "Second Hampton Court Conference."

The telling confrontation between James and the Melvilles at Falkland Palace occurred as follows. Near the end of August 1596, James called a convention of the Estates at Falkland and, in the spirit of mediation, included in the invitation the Catholic Earls of Angus, Huntly, and Arroll, whom the 1593 Edinburgh Provincial Assembly of the Kirk had excommunicated at the Melvilles' urging. Although he had not been invited, Andrew Melville considered himself both a loyal member of the Kirk and a loyal subject of the king, and as such "cam in [to Falkland Palace] with the formaist" members of the Estates, intending to warn James of the perceived Catholic danger. Upon seeing Melville, James angrily questioned "him that came ther uncallit" as to the purpose of his bold and unsolicited arrival. Melville responded "with plane speitche and mightie force of zeall" that those of the Estates present were traitors to God, Kirk, and country through their betrayal of the nation and religion to Spain. As for himself, he argued that he did not require royal sanction to attend but was rather authorised to be there "be Chryst Jesus the King, and his Kirk, . . . against quhilks directlie the Conventioun is mett." Showing a degree of restraint that was characteristic of him where the Melvilles were concerned, James merely ordered them to

leave. "Thanking God that they haid knawin his mynd, and [that he had] gottin his message dischargit," Andrew Melville complied and allowed the convention of the Estates to continue uninterrupted.¹⁹

The subsequent decision by the Estates to consider removing the sentence of excommunication upon the Catholic earls, however, caused the elder Melville to return to Falkland with his nephew. Meeting with the king, the ministers questioned him regarding his motives. Understanding the king's desire for reasoned and moderate discourse, James Melville began to question him "in a myld and smothe maner, quhilk the King lyked best of." Nonetheless, James "crabbotlie" answered that the ministers had acted seditiously by questioning the king's will, and in fact by coming uninvited to the convention of the Estates in the first place. Andrew Melville angrily replied that the members of the Assembly had come to Falkland according to God's will, and since James was but "God's sillie vassal," or simple servant, they did not require his sanction in order to meet or participate in matters of state which impinged upon the Kirk. Then, he insolently took James by the sleeve and admonished him by stating that as a temporal monarch, he had no jurisdiction over the Kirk, but must instead do God's bidding:

Sir, as divers tymes before, sa now again, I mon tell yow, thair is twa Kings and twa Kingdomes in Scotland. Thair is Chryst Jesus the King, and his kingdome the Kirk, whase subject King James the Saxt is, and of whase kingdome nocht a king, nor a lord, nor a heid, bot a member!²⁰

He then argued that the Presbyterian ministers who deferred to the king in temporal matters but to God in ecclesiastical ones were "Chryst's servants, and [James's] best and maist faithfull subjects." Convinced of the Melvilles' sincerity, James responded to their virulent but loyal criticism in a characteristically conciliatory manner: he "dimitted [the ministers] pleasandlie," with the promise that the Catholic earls "sould gett na grace at his hand till they satisfeid the Kirk."²¹

This engagement at Falkland was arguably the defining moment of James's Scottish rule for several reasons. For one thing, it solidified the Melvilles' credentials as the embodiment of a term that did not then exist but is now a well-known paradox: "His Majesty's loyal opposition." James did not view the Melvilles simply as threatening forces that he had to eliminate in order to consolidate his kingship; instead, he saw them as constructive critics — a type of figure incomprehensible to Henry VIII and even Elizabeth I — whose viewpoints he grudgingly but necessarily took into consideration as he sought to establish his practical monarchical authority. Though the Melvilles might virulently oppose James regarding the relationship between Kirk and State, their belief in their duty to the monarch allowed them to

assert that they were his "best and maist faithfull subjects." James's humanist education allowed him to consider both sides of the argument and, ultimately, to believe their protestation of loyalty. And although he was firmly opposed to the Melvilles' potentially treasonous interference, because he believed in their principled opposition, he incorporated their ideas into his own mediating political theory and practice and was able to fulfill what he later would express as his desire to "meete [opposition] in the mid-way."²² The solution which James negotiated — the dependence of the earls' reinstatement on consultation with the General Assembly — allowed him to define himself as a mediator able to keep the peace in Scotland. And having defined himself at Falkland as a forgiving and mediating authority by engaging with the Melvilles in front of an audience of his most important nobles and churchmen, James had set a strong precedent for his early rule in England.

In January 1604, less than a year after ascending to the English throne, James held the "First Hampton Court Conference" in an effort to demonstrate his conciliatory nature in matters of religion. But since the conference's most tangible result and strongest statement of the king's political and religious authority — the King James Bible — was still years from completion, and since the November 1605 Gunpowder Plot had revealed him as potentially vulnerable on his new throne, by 1606 James required an emphatic means of portraying himself as a mediating but authoritative monarch. Exercising a "go with what you know" form of policy, he commanded that Andrew and James Melville come to Hampton Court with six other ministers on 15 September 1606 to answer charges of subversion within the Scottish Kirk. Surprisingly, however, in his letter summoning the Melvilles he called them his "trustie and weilbelovit" subjects, and expressed a desire to draw upon their "guid lairning and experience" in a structured dialogue regarding the extent of his ecclesiastical authority.²³ At this September 1606 "Second Hampton Court Conference" and over the next six months, James began to incorporate his Scottish experience into the development of his English authority. By affirming his supremacy over the Scottish Kirk and its ministers, he demonstrated to an audience of his most eminent new subjects that he wielded the same sort of mediating but nonetheless absolute power over the English Church and State.

From the start of the conference, James took pains to portray himself to his ecclesiastical and noble English audience as "Great Britain's Solomon," a mediator who could reconcile ecclesiastical and even national differences. For example, although his Presbyterian guests arrived for their meeting with the king at Hampton Court five days late — on 20 September 1606 — James nonetheless greeted them civilly, and then officially began a program of combined indoctrination and reconciliation by bringing the

ministers together with his most powerful ecclesiastical instruments: his English bishops. Between 20 and 30 September, James introduced his implacably anti-episcopal Scottish ministers to the preaching and personal persuasions of four of his most learned English ecclesiastics: William Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln; John Buckeridge, Bishop of Rochester; Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Chichester; and John King, Bishop of London. And on 23 September, at a banquet in his chambers, he introduced the ministers to the most powerful churchman in England, the recently appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Bancroft, as well as to several of his primary English nobles. According to James Melville, at this banquet the king and his Scottish and English subjects “maid guid cheir” with each other.²⁴ By breaking bread with, and encouraging a constructive dialogue between, his divided subjects in the most intimate of personal spaces — his chambers — James succeeded, not just in articulating his ecclesiastical authority over his Scottish and English subjects, but also in presenting himself to them as a monarch able to negotiate between contrary opinions in order to define his authority in terms of a mediated consensus.²⁵

This ability was put to the test immediately after the meal in the king's chambers. Taking up James's invitation to defend the actions of the July 1605 Aberdeen Assembly that had convened contrary to royal order,²⁶ Andrew Melville “talkit all his mynd in his awin maner, roundly, soundly, fully, friely, and fervently, [for] almaist the space of ane hour,” arguing that the Assembly had taken place according to God's dictum, whether or not it had followed that of the king.²⁷ He then denied James's ecclesiastical authority by asking the question, “Quis me constituit judicem?” — that is, “who makes me a judge?”²⁸ Thomas McCrie reports that “the English nobility, who had not been accustomed to see the King addressed with such freedom, could not refrain from expressing their admiration at the boldness with which Melville and his associates delivered their sentiments before such an audience.”²⁹ Through this heated exchange with the Melvilles, then, James demonstrated to some of his most powerful English subjects that, in the name of humanist dialogue, he was willing to entertain staunch but principled criticism from his most learned subjects.

Even when the Melvilles' extreme behaviour at Hampton Court did not allow him to play the mediating role of the modern-day Solomon, James still profited politically by delivering a clear warning to his new subjects: that when they crossed the bounds of acceptable reasoned discourse, he would restrict the dialogical freedom that he had afforded them and thereby uphold both the *via media* and his monarchical authority. When on 29 September Andrew and James Melville accused the Scottish Privy Council of being traitors to Presbyterianism, James sequestered Andrew in the personal

custody of Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, and James in the custody of William James, Bishop of Durham.³⁰ The "Second Hampton Court Conference" had come to an end.

But if the physical grounds of discussion had shifted, the ideological ones had not. After allowing the two ministers to engage in a two-month ecclesiastical dialogue with their episcopal chaperones, James again called them before him on 30 November, this time to answer charges of having composed a verse satirising the Anglican liturgy.³¹ Andrew Melville readily admitted that he had composed the verse out of indignation at a service he had witnessed at the King's Chapel on 29 September, but when Archbishop Bancroft began to remonstrate against him, Melville interrupted him "to tell him all his mynd, quhilk burst out as inclossit fyre in watter." In a gesture reminiscent of his 1596 altercation with James at Falkland, Melville shook Bancroft's sleeve, called his vestments "Romish rags," and blamed him for much of the corruption he saw in the Church. He called Bancroft the enemy of all reformed churches in Europe for having profaned the sabbath, restrained preachers, and originated and propagated abuses and regressions in the Church. He closed by declaring Bancroft his own sworn enemy until "the effusioun of the last droppe of all the blood in his bodie."³²

Having in the words of John Spottiswoode "behaved himself insolently, and more like a madman, then Divine,"³³ Melville provided James with the opportunity to demonstrate his moderate yet unquestionable authority. The king temporarily set the less vocal James Melville free in England, albeit with "a gentill wairneing to tak heid to [his] actiounes, speiches, and wryttingis too." He reserved for Andrew Melville more than a mere warning; he sentenced him to house arrest in the custody of the Dean of St. Paul's, ordering him to receive ecclesiastical instruction until further notice.³⁴ Melville remained recalcitrant, however, and so in March 1607 James commanded that he be placed in the care of the Bishop of Winchester, and that his nephew once more be placed in the custody of the Bishop of Durham. Both ministers refused to obey James,³⁵ and this blunt defiance of his direct order potentially undermined the king's power to rule even his secular subjects. In order to demonstrate his authority over both his civil and ecclesiastical subjects, James ordered a final punishment of the Melvilles which silenced and repudiated their extreme opposition. On 26 April 1607, he charged Andrew with treason and had him conveyed immediately to the Tower of London,³⁶ and within two weeks, on 10 May 1607, he imprisoned James Melville as well, ordering him to take up lodgings in Newcastle and remain within a two mile radius of them "under the paine of rebellioun."³⁷ Characteristically, however, James treated the prisoners with a fair degree of leniency. He allowed James Melville to return to his home at Anstruther

upon the death of his wife in 1609, and thereafter placed him under loose house arrest in Berwick — so loose, in fact, that Melville was able to remarry in 1612.³⁸ While he stripped Andrew Melville of his principalship of the New College,³⁹ the king allowed Andrew to have some intellectual interaction with others, for he granted the imprisoned minister “several interviews” with fellow prisoner Sir Walter Raleigh.⁴⁰ Andrew Melville was also allowed some family visitation, for he was able to tutor one of his own great-nephews while in the Tower.⁴¹ James even let Melville spend time in the country for health reasons before, in 1611, permitting him to continue his academic career in exile at the Protestant college at Sedan.⁴²

James's imprisonment of the Melvilles after his meeting with them at Hampton Court helped to define and solidify his monarchical position in both Scotland and England for a number of reasons. For one thing, his very punishment of two clerics for defiance at once of his secular and his ecclesiastical authority consolidated the position which he had sought to define for himself in Scotland for almost three decades: ruler of both Kirk and State. When he imprisoned the two Melvilles, on a practical level James enforced his authority in Scotland by disenfranchising and disempowering his most fervent Scottish opposition. He thereby also launched a pre-emptive strike against potential English opposition by demonstrating his God-like power as monarch to create or destroy — and thus control — both his ecclesiastical and secular subjects in his new kingdom.

Yet by moderating his punishment of his erstwhile “loyal opposition,” James continued to portray himself as committed to the *via media* in his dispensing of justice, as in religion. By consulting with the Melvilles as members of his “loyal opposition,” by repudiating their extremism in favour of the *via media*, and finally by inflicting a relatively light punishment upon them, James defined himself for both his Scottish and English subjects as a mediating king who necessarily engaged with but neither bowed to nor took extreme measures against men of extreme action or opinion. Having defined his moderate ecclesiastical position in late 1606 and early 1607, James would throughout his English reign demonstrate such leniency in his dealings with churchmen who represented the differing strains of Protestantism in England. He saw it as necessary to tolerate and even exploit a broad spectrum of religious belief within the Church of England:

Seeing real advantage in patronising rival groups of churchmen, James demanded minimal conformity from Puritans, attempted to contain disputes between Calvinists and anti-Calvinists, offered favour to churchmen while avoiding excessive provocation to laymen, and urged those looking for advancement to defend the royal supremacy and episcopacy as divine and complementary institutions. The strength of his Church lay in the incorporation of diverse and competitive threads in English Protestantism.⁴³

In sum, at a time when he had not yet clearly articulated his kingly authority in England as he had done in Scotland, James consulted the "texts" of his youth and found in the Melvilles a personal link to his monarchical apprenticeship — a link which enabled him to define his new role both for himself and for his subjects. At Hampton Court in late 1606, he once again sought out and engaged with the criticism of the two "best and maist faithfull subjects" who had previously helped him to establish his monarchical position in Scotland. By colluding as much as colliding with the Melvilles at this meeting, James theoretically outlined and practically demonstrated his function as a king committed to dialogue, mediation, adjudication, discipline, and mercy. As he had in Scotland, James again *contained* the Melvilles in both senses of the term, for his political style and practice were to a large degree based both on neutralising their extremism and on incorporating their constructive criticism regarding the relationship between the Presbyterian and Anglican churches, which in fact remained separate entities. Keeping in mind the means by which he had developed and consolidated his rule in Scotland, at the "Second Hampton Court Conference" James gave his English kingship a foundation built upon the techniques of dialogue and mediation which he had learned in his youth.

University of Alberta

Notes

1. What is traditionally known as the Hampton Court Conference — and what for reasons of convenience I call the "First Hampton Court Conference" — took place from 14–16 January 1604. For a contemporary description of the event, see William Barlow, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference, which it pleased his Excellent Maiestie to haue with the Lords, Bishops and other of his Clergie at Hampton Court* (1604; rpt. Gainesville, Fla.: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1965). A number of contemporary sources describe the Melvilles' dealings with James both before and during the "Second Hampton Court Conference": James Melville, *The Autobiography and Diary of Mr James Melvill*, ed. Robert Pitcairn (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842); John Spottiswoode, *The History of the Church of Scotland* (Menston: Scholar Press, 1972); and David Calderwood, *The True History of the Church of Scotland* (Menston: Scholar Press, 1971). More recent accounts of this conference are few. See Thomas McCrie, *The Life of Andrew Melville: Containing Illustrations of the Ecclesiastical and Literary History of Scotland, during the Latter Part of the Sixteenth and Beginning of the Seventeenth Century*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1824). See also pp. 169–70 of Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I," *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985): 169–207.
2. See Mark Fortier, "Equity and Ideas: Coke, Ellesmere, and James I," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 1255–81; Sandra Bell, "Writing the Monarch: King James VI and *Lepanto*," in *Other Voices, Other Views: Expanding the Canon in English Renaissance Studies*, ed. Helen Ostovich *et al.* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), pp. 193–208; and

William Brown Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

3. Indeed, John and Julia Keay make a common but telling mistake on p. 692 of the *Collins Encyclopaedia of Scotland* (London: HarperCollins, 1994). They erroneously list Melville as a participant in the 1604 Hampton Court Conference, out of which came the resolution to translate the Bible. Actually, Melville and his nephew were not present at the 1604 Hampton Court Conference, but instead attended the "Second Hampton Court Conference," which took place in September 1606.
4. Fincham and Lake, p. 169.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 170–71 and 206.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 171–76.
7. The most notable of these figures was Alexander Campbell, Bishop of Brechin, who had visited Melville in Geneva and determined that his reforming zeal could be put to best use in his native land. This is recorded in Melville, p. 42.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 42–43.
9. Gordon Donaldson, "The Scottish Church 1567–1625," in *The Reign of James VI and I*, ed. Alan G. R. Smith (London: Macmillan, 1973), p. 44.
10. Melville, pp. 53–55.
11. Robert Pitcairn, "Prefatory Notice," in Melville, p. xiii.
12. Peter Hume Brown, *George Buchanan: Humanist and Reformer* (Edinburgh: D. Douglas, 1890), p. 254.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 254–55.
14. James VI and I, *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*, in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 64.
15. Fincham and Lake, p. 206.
16. For information on James's childhood education and reading, two sources are especially helpful: George F. Warner, ed., "The Library of James VI, 1573–1583: From a Manuscript in the Hand of Peter Young, his Tutor," in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, 8 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1893), 1: ix–lxxv, and "The Library of Queen Mary and of King James VI," in *Miscellany of the Maitland Club Consisting of Original Papers and Other Documents Illustrative of the History and Literature of Scotland*, 4 vols. (Glasgow: Maitland Club, 1834–47), 1: 2–23.
17. Melville, p. 48.
18. McCrie, 1: 15.
19. I am citing the detailed account given by Melville, pp. 368–69.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 369–70.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 371.
22. James VI and I, *A Speach, as it Was Delivered in the Vpper Hovse of the Parliament to the Lords Spiritvall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses There Assembled, on Mynday the XIX. Day of March 1603*, in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, p. 140.
23. Melville, pp. 634–36.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 658–59.
25. James employed a similar tactic at St. Andrews in 1587, when, after a day of disputations, he shared a banquet with the two Melvilles and the visiting scholar and poet Guillaume de Salluste, Seigneur du Bartas (Melville, pp. 256–57).
26. James had affirmed before leaving Scotland for England that the next General Assembly of the Kirk would take place as scheduled in July 1604. He decided to prorogue the Assembly to July 1605, however, and eventually postponed it indefinitely. His failure to hold the Assembly contravened the 1592 "Golden Acts," which had guaranteed yearly meetings of the primary churchmen in Scotland, and a group of ministers — the Melvilles included — disregarded James's postponement and held the meeting at Aberdeen in July 1605.
27. Melville, pp. 658–59.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 661; see also Spottiswoode, p. 498.
29. McCrie, 2: 147–48.
30. Calderwood, p. 548.
31. By 1606, Andrew Melville was well known for his satirical attacks on the Church of England. In 1604, he had composed the *Anti-Tami-Cami-Categoria*, Latin verses that criticised the ceremony of the Anglican Church. This text was widely circulated in manuscript form, but was not published until 1620. It is reproduced in F. E. Hutchinson, ed., *The Works of George Herbert* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), pp. 609–14. Melville's 1606 Hampton Court libel, which takes a similar position to the *Anti-Tami-Cami-Categoria*, reads as follows:

On Kinglie Chappell aultar standis
 Blind candelstickis, and closit buikis,
 Dry silver basines, tuo of each:
 Quhairfor, saith he, quho luikis,
 The mynd and worschipe of the Lord
 Does England so keipe closse?
 Blind in hir sycht, and buried in
 Hir filthines and drosse:
 And quhill with Roman ritis schoe does
 Hir kingly altar dress,
 Religiously a purple quhoore
 To tame sche does professe! (Melville, pp. 682–83)
32. Melville, p. 679.
33. Spottiswoode, p. 500.
34. Melville, p. 681.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 691–94.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 706–8.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 709–10.
38. Pitcairn, p. xv.
39. McCrie, 2: 188–89.
40. *Ibid.*, 2: 263.
41. Pitcairn, p. xxxvii.

42. McCrie, 2: 273.

43. Kenneth Fincham, Introduction, in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), p. 12.