

Reading King James VI and I in the Civil War

Joseph Marshall

PhD English Literature

The University of Edinburgh

1999



Abstract

This is a provisional account of the reception of the writings of King James VI of Scotland and I of England between 1584 and 1689, focusing on the period 1637-1660, in which a remarkable number of new editions of James's works appeared for partisan political ends. Although he is popularly remembered today as a proponent of absolute monarchy, it has not been recognised that in the seventeenth century James's texts were very frequently exploited by those sympathetic to reforming the church and strengthening the position of Parliament. King James was strongly aware of the presence of his readers, and when writing as a private man he endeavoured to give them space and responsibility. However, James did not appreciate the extent to which this was empowering already strong reading communities based on religious opinions he was increasingly inclined to reject. The combination of a king with too much confidence in the communicability of the authorial meaning, and reading subjects with a fervent belief in the validity of their own interpretations of this secular Scripture, greatly contributed to the political tension of the 1620s, as one version of the royal will was invoked against another. King Charles's distrust of the works which had transferred so much authority to the subject only exacerbated his conflict with Puritan readers upholding their interpretation of King James.

The early Civil War controversies saw an overwhelming victory for the pamphleteers using James's words for the Parliamentary cause; the royalist pamphleteers could not or would not wield the king's words as weapons with any degree of success. However, the outcome of the pamphlet war in 1642 was to transform approaches to James and his writings. The aura of royal authority was dispelled by the use of his words in cheap tracts, and the failure of the royalists to make James speak for King Charles drew attention to the way in which his words were bound by historical and literary context. The loss of faith in the tradition of using James's words to articulate contemporary positions coincided with the fall of the monarchy; the attempt to redirect the king through reinterpreting his works was abandoned, and James, Charles and their words were rejected. The burst of anti-Stuart writing in the early 1650s saw James's works treated as memorials of failed conspiracies, and the documentary collections that followed reduced James's words to illustrations for a polemical historical narrative. However, after the Restoration the Puritan communities once again found themselves seeking legitimisation in James's texts, and after the Revolution they proceeded to celebrate the works of the king whose house they had expelled. Empowered by King James to fight and win the pamphlet battles of the 1640s, his readers were still seeking to recapture something of that sense of transferred authority and reworkable meaning fifty years later.

Declaration of Originality

I declare that I have composed this thesis myself, and that it is all my own work.

Joseph Marshall

Acknowledgements

This thesis was supported by a three-year British Academy studentship. Particular thanks are also due to Dr. Richard Maber, Dr. Jonathan Gibson, Dr. Frances Dow, Professor Alastair Fowler, Dr. Joseph Black, Dr. Jenny Wormald, Professor John Morrill, Professor J. P. Sommerville, Dr. Kenneth Fincham, Professor R. D. S. Jack, Professor Jon Usher, Dr. Daniel Fischlin, Dr. Julian Goodare, Dr. Jennifer Richards, Emma Barreiro, Simone Testa and Martin Moonie. Thanks are also due to the staff of the libraries of Edinburgh University, Edinburgh New College, Durham University, Durham Cathedral, Lambeth Palace, Emmanuel College (Cambridge), Corpus Christi College (Oxford), the British Library and the National Library of Scotland. Special thanks go to Dr. Jonquil Bevan, whose constant encouragement made this thesis a pleasure to write, and to Mary who has listened to the words of King James for four years with remarkable patience.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Declaration of Originality	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Note on Citations and Endnotes	vii
Abbreviations Used	ix
Introduction: Reading King James today	1
Chapter 1: King James and his Readers, 1584-1617	
I. The Scholar-King, 1584-1603: James's theory and practice of authorship	17
II. Writing as King, 1604-1614: the influence of art on the royal voice	28
III. Writing as Scholar, 1608-1617: art and authority	36
Chapter Two: Challenging the King's Words, 1618-24	
I. The breakdown in the relationship between James and his readers, 1618-1621	49
II. The Parliament of 1621: communication in crisis	55
III. The <u>Letter and Directions touching Preaching and Preachers</u> (1622)	63
IV. 'A king but in a playe': the triumph of James's militant Protestant readers, 1623-4	81

Chapter Three: Rereading King James under Charles I, 1625-40

I. Rival traditions: King Charles and King James as a Calvinist poet 102

II. James's writings and opposition religious politics 1625-9: a prophetic legacy 109

III. King Charles and the attempt to reclaim James, 1630-7: Psalms and Sports 120

IV. A revolution empowered by reading King James? 1638-1640 134

Chapter Four: Reading King James in the pamphlet war of 1642

I. King James his Letter and Directions: the 1642 versions 159

II. A royalist response? The Trve Law of Free Monarchy and A Puritane Set Forth in his Lively Colours 171

III. King James His Judgement 179

IV. The Ghost of King James and the Trial of King Charles 190

Chapter Five: Reinterpreting King James 1643-1649 - wider contexts and diminishing authors

I. Discontinuous readings: ecclesiastical policies and the rise of the text, 1643-5 206

II. Political controversy, Anglo-Scottish relations and literary history, 1643-6 220

III. King Charles and the future of the monarchy 1646-49: textual theory in crisis? 232

Conclusion: Reading King James from the Republic to the Revolution

I. The destruction of James's literary reputation under the republic 247

II. Reading King James after 1660: a Restoration? 255

Bibliography of Printed Books Cited

I. Works printed before 1700	268
II. Works printed in or after 1700	280

Appendix One: Annotated checklist of printed works of James VI & I, in chronological order of first publication

I. Introduction	294
II. Annotated Checklist	296

Appendix Two: The Answere to the Libell called the Comons teares. The wiper of the peoples teares / The dryer vp of doubts and feares.	301
--	-----

Appendix Three: King James and the political historians, 1650-1659

I. Sir Anthony Weldon and the rewriting of Jacobean history	305
II. Documenting the Republic: Reprints and Historical Collections	319
III. Royalist counter-propaganda, and the failure to rehabilitate King James	328

Appendix Four: Alternative Traditions

I. Continuing Traditions 1643-1715: King James's 'table talk'	339
II. King James on Tobacco: literary entertainment and social comment, 1644-1676	351

Note on Citations and Endnotes

I have endeavoured to retain original spelling and punctuation, although I have replaced 'j', 'v' and 'vv' with 'i', 'u' and 'w' in accordance with modern conventions, unless these letters occur in a work's title and are needed for bibliographical reasons. Equally, I have replaced long 's' with the modern letter, and ß with 'ss'. I have modernised italicisation and capitalisation, and expanded contractions. I have sometimes reparagraphed lengthy citations. Endnotes are to be found at the end of each chapter. In bibliographical notes, if no place of publication is mentioned, it can be assumed to be London. In imprints, I have used the standard abbreviations 'b.' = printed by, 'f.' = printed for, 's. b.' = 'to be sold by', "n. p." = no place of publication given, "n. d." = no date given.

I have always given reference numbers for works listed in Wing, STC, and for works found in the Thomason Tracts in the British Library. I have used the Chadwyck-Healey microfilm edition of the archives of the Stationers' Company, and when I refer to entries of copies I give the date and a reference to the original, e.g. 12 August 1635, Liber D, p. 319. When dealing with sixteenth and seventeenth-century books published between 1 January and 25 March, I have followed standard procedure for giving the year (e.g. James VI & I, Workes, 1616/7). Dates are Old Style unless otherwise stated. When I have given one of Thomason's manuscript dates on the title-pages of the tracts he collected, I have not given it in the original form, but have regularised it. So, when Thomason wrote 'feb. 14', and crossed out the last digit of the printed year '1648', writing in '7', I describe his dating as '14 February 1647/8'. For a discussion of some of the peculiarities of Thomason's dating system, and its subsequent handling by G. K. Fortescue in his catalogue of the Thomason Collection, see Lois Spencer, 'The

Professional and Literary Connexions of George Thomason', (Library (5th series) 13 (1958), [102]-118).

Abbreviations Used

ANQ = American Notes and Queries

BLC = British Library Author Catalogue

CJ = Journals of the House of Commons

CRSS = Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies (Toronto)

CSPD = Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, ed. M. A. E. Green

CSPV = Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, ed. Allen B. Hinds

CUP = Cambridge University Press

DNB = Dictionary of National Biography

ELR = English Literary Renaissance

JBS = Journal of British Studies

HLQ = Huntington Library Quarterly

N&Q = Notes and Queries

OUP = Oxford University Press

PRO = Public Record Office

RPCS = The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, ed. David Masson

SHR = Scottish Historical Review

STC = A.W.Pollard & G.R.Redgrave, A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland - And of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640, (2nd edition, W.A.Jackson, F.J.Ferguson, K.F.Pantzer), 3 vols., Bibliographical Society, 1976-91

STS = Scottish Text Society

X

Wing = Donald Wing, Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries 1641-1700, 2nd edition, New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1994

Introduction: Reading King James today

The story of the reception of the works of King James VI of Scotland and I of England is exceptionally complex, and I have restricted this study to readings of and responses to his writings between 1584 and 1689, my focus being on printed versions of his texts published in the period 1637-1660. However, as this study is partly inspired by the current revival of critical, even popular interest in James's texts, it seems appropriate to give some account of the way his books are being read today.¹ Over the last century, scholars from different academic disciplines have attempted reassessments of James's life, policies and achievements. Previously, as Jenny Wormald notes, it was standard practice to dismiss James, on the basis of the anti-Stuart and republican histories of the 1650s, as a vain and foolish man, a weak and corrupt king, and a pedantic writer.² Many illogical assumptions seem to have been widely accepted, including the strange belief that King James forgot how to rule as soon as he ascended the English throne.³ Different portions of the myth have now been challenged, but as yet no coherent model for James's life and works as a whole has been substituted. This thesis is intended as a contribution to the debates currently taking place in literary, historical and political studies, and to suggest possible explanations for the origins of these debates. It is, equally, hoped that this history of reception will make connections between the new ideas about James's psychology, James's use of language, and James's relationship with his subjects, in the belief that it is possible to sustain a more integrated and less distorted reading of the king and his words than has been the case in the past.

In literary studies, James's works have always been given some curiosity value, but the lack of accessible texts has done much to impair critical judgement. By the early nineteenth century, many scholars apparently knew virtually nothing about James's activities as a poet, although he had published two volumes of verse, and had his poem on the Battle of Lepanto translated into several European languages. William Harris's An Historical and Critical Account of the Lives and Writings of James I. and Charles I. notes that James is believed to have translated some of the Psalms, and adds that one of the leading authorities on King James, Thomas Birch, has heard that he wrote other poems:

there is extant in James's name, another [work] intituled, "His Majesty's Lepanto, or Heroical Story, being part of his poetical exercises at vacant hours, London, 1603. in 4to." A sight of this, perhaps, might afford some diversion. This book being burnt among those of the honourable Charles York, Esq. at Lincoln's Inn in the late fire there, Mr. Birch could give no further account of it.⁴

In view of this background of critical scorn and bibliographical confusion, it is not surprising that the rehabilitation of James's poetry has been slow. A reprint of James's collection of 1591, His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres, was published in 1818, and in 1869 Edward Arber arranged the reprinting of The Essayes of a Prentise.⁵ Robert S. Rait enlarged the canon by publishing several of James's poems which had hitherto remained in manuscript, in Lusus Regius (1901), and more poems again were added by Allan F. Westcott in his New Poems by James I (1911).⁶

James Craigie's two volumes of more than a hundred poems, including those printed during James's lifetime and those discovered in manuscript, were published

by the Scottish Text Society in 1955 and 1958.⁷ Unfortunately, Craigie's evaluation of James's verse relies heavily on Romanticist assumptions, leading him to denigrate the craftsmanship and self-awareness that make the poems remarkable. There have been several positive general reassessments of the poetry, including G. P. V. Akrigg's 'The Literary Achievement of King James I' (1974-5), and Derrick McClure's "'O Phoenix Escossois": James VI as Poet' (1990).⁸ The revival of interest in the culture of early modern Scotland has led to appreciative accounts of James's poetry and poetic theory, from R. D. S. Jack and Helena Mennie Shire in particular.⁹ King James's poems are increasingly selected for anthologies of Renaissance verse, but a full modern critical edition is eagerly awaited.

James's prose writings were rediscovered almost single-handedly by James Craigie, through a series of excellent editions for the Scottish Text Society. Craigie's critical edition of Basilicon Doron, which appeared in two volumes (1944 and 1950), was particularly influential in stimulating research into James's works.¹⁰ Somewhat confusing in layout, but still highly informative, is the Scottish Text Society's edition of Daemonologie, The True Law of Free Monarchies, A Counterblaste to Tobacco and the Declaration of Sports, which appeared under the title Minor Prose Works of King James VI and I in 1982.¹¹ Building on Craigie's work, Stanley Rypins and Akihiro Yamada have explored the complexities of the editing and printing of Basilicon Doron and The True Law.¹² Unfortunately, the quality of the Scottish Text Society editions was not matched by G. P. V. Akrigg's Letters of King James VI & I (1984), which gives unreliable and inconsistently modernised texts of a selection of letters.¹³ A complete, original spelling edition of the letters would be a major undertaking, but would be of great utility. A modern spelling version of The True

Law of Free Monarchies and Basilikon Doron was published in 1996, edited by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, but the most useful readily available collection of James's prose works is that edited by J. P. Sommerville, King James VI and I: Political Writings (1994), which includes both The True Law and Basilicon Doron, and has an excellent index.¹⁴ Sommerville's edition largely supersedes that edited by Charles Howard McIlwain, The Political Works of James I: reprinted from the edition of 1616 (1918), which was formerly the main source for historians wishing to read James's writings.¹⁵

Having decided that James's writings are worth reading, critics have begun to study them in depth, applying various modern interpretive theories to James's works, including deconstructive and psychoanalytic approaches. Jonathan Goldberg's James I and the Politics of Literature (1983), although more concerned with developing the theory that power expresses itself through contradiction and ambiguity than with James's actual words, has nonetheless been highly influential.¹⁶ Daniel Fischlin's article "'The Candie-Souldier', Venice, and James VI (I)'s advice on monarchic dress in *Basilicon Doron*' (1995) explores James's ambiguous literary allusions.¹⁷ In "'Counterfeiting God": James VI (I) and the Politics of *Daemonologie*' (1996), Fischlin argues that James's textual strategies reveal deep anxiety about the legitimacy of his authority.¹⁸ It is expected that the forthcoming volume of essays on James's writings, edited by Mark Fortier and Daniel Fischlin, will show that James's poems also can repay close reading and sophisticated critical evaluation.¹⁹ It should

be interesting to see James's speeches to Parliament, many of which have been overlooked because they are not in his Workes of 1617, read in the light of modern performance theory, or his love poetry in the light of modern understanding of the complexities of Renaissance gender politics.²⁰

Studies of the culture of the Stuart court have increasingly emphasised James's role as an active patron and participant in the creative process. Graham Parry's The Golden Age Restor'd (1981) paid much attention to the way in which James constructed a personal mythology, both in his own writings and through the artistic works of others.²¹ In the same year, William Germano's thesis 'The Literary Icon of James I' argued that James's attempts to impose a fixed image of his authority gave his son, King Charles I, only a limited space in which to present and develop his own iconography.²² The significance of the king's entrance into print culture is further discussed in Richard Helgerson's 'Milton Reads the King's Book: Print, Performance, and the Making of a Bourgeois Idol' (1987).²³ The importance of James in the dialogue between court patrons and artistic creativity is discussed in Alvin Kernan's Shakespeare, the King's Playwright (1995).²⁴ Much work has been done on the way the Jacobean drama reflects and reworks the thoughts, actions and writings of the king.²⁵ There is, equally, a growing awareness that James was perfectly capable of responding in kind (see for example James H. Forse, 'An Echo of *Henry IV, Part 2*, in a Work by King James I?', 1995).²⁶ James Doelman, 'The Accession of King James I and English Religious Poetry' (1994), and Richard A. McCabe, 'The Masks of Duessa: Spenser, Mary Queen of Scots, and James VI' (1987) both present James as a dynamic force in the field of literature.²⁷

In historical and political studies, parallel but independent developments have been taking place. James's reputation as a man has, at times, been even lower than his reputation as a man of letters, and its rehabilitation has been slow. While Craigie was showing the world that James could write well-structured prose, the main historian of James's reign was David Harris Willson, whose dislike of James makes his biography, King James VI and I (1956), an entertaining but untrustworthy account.²⁸ It is depressing to have to confront the fact that writers like Willson have frequently made negative judgements about James's character on the basis of his supposed homosexuality. A. W. Beasley's article 'The Disability of James VI & I' (1995), which argues that James's reliance on strong young men was actually a consequence of his cerebral palsy, has started to unsettle some of these prejudices.²⁹ Roger Lockyer's short positive reassessment, James VI and I (1998) has to some extent replaced Willson's biography.³⁰

The tendency to attack James's standards of personal morality has had most unfortunate consequences for studies of James as an author. D. H. Willson's article 'James I and His Literary Assistants' (1944-5) is a highly speculative attempt to prove that many of the texts James claimed to have written were actually ghost-written, which anticipates the partial criticism of the later biography.³¹ This theory does not stand up well to the findings of modern research into James's involvement in all stages of the production of his works, as represented by James Craigie's work on the Semple transcript of Basilicon Doron (1950), Rhodes Dunlap's article 'King James

and some Witches: the Date and Text of the Daemonologie' (1975), and the writings of T. A. Birrell.³² Craigie, in fact, has suggested that James may be responsible for more works than he acknowledged during his lifetime, such as the excellent and much-overlooked play Philotus.³³ There is evidence that James wrote, or participated in the writing, of other works which cannot now be traced, perhaps because they have been attributed to others.³⁴ In a period where James's personality does not excite repulsion and disbelief, scholars have been more inclined to give credit to his statements about his own learning and scholarship.³⁵

Studies of particular aspects of James's administration have shown that there is considerable scope for more research. Marc L. Schwarz, Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake have made the case that James's ecclesiastical policy was a successful model of compromise and inclusivity.³⁶ W. B. Patterson's King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom (1997) is an excellent study of James's involvement in international religious politics which argues that in the light of the modern ecumenical movement the old reasons for criticising James's reconciliatory policies can be challenged.³⁷ J. H. M. Salmon has also shed light on the international dimension to James's theological and constitutional ideas.³⁸ However, James's domestic religious policies have not been assessed fully in relation to his own place in theological writing, and the complexity of his own religious opinions has yet to be fully unravelled. James's Scottish reign has been particularly well served by the revisionist historians, and Maurice Lee has noted that the rehabilitation of James's historical reputation was originated by Scottish historians like Jenny Wormald and Gordon Donaldson.³⁹ Jenny Wormald's critical biography is expected to bring the different strands of the revisionist argument together, and to supersede Willson at

last. It is to be expected that the political changes in Scotland over the next few years will stimulate new interest into James's union of the crowns which maintained a separate Scottish Parliament.

Although Whig and Tory histories are widely supposed to have been consigned to oblivion, studies of the events of James's reign are still dominated by the debate over the causes of the Civil War, which shows no sign of concluding.⁴⁰ Revisionists like Kevin Sharpe, Conrad Russell, and Glenn Burgess have criticised the nineteenth-century Whig narrative in which the Civil War is explained as an inevitable result of the Stuart kings' attempts to increase their authority at the expense of the privileges of Parliament, following King James's theory of divine right.⁴¹ The revisionists tend to argue that James's reign was a period of consensus politics, and that Charles undid his father's work. This claim is vigorously opposed by, among others, J. P. Sommerville and Thomas Cogswell, who draw attention to the signs of tension already present under James.⁴² The 'revisionist' approach has developed since the 1970s to examine many assumptions about conflict and continuity in the early seventeenth century, particularly in church history.⁴³ It seems likely that the traditional narrative will not survive the revisionist attack, but it also seems likely that its place will be taken by a more complex understanding of the way in which James's life and actions influenced the way in which the political situation broke down in the 1640s. It is certainly possible to question the way in which the 'revisionists' stress continuities between James's Scottish and English reigns, but

emphasise discontinuities between the reign of James and that of King Charles. It is hoped that a forthcoming book of essays edited by Michael Lynch and Julian Goodare will show how the debate can move beyond the conflicts over 'revisionism'.⁴⁴

One way of reapproaching the vexed question of 'continuity' or 'discontinuity' is to study the transmission and transformation of ideas, beliefs and modes of discourse. The history of the reception of James's writings could be told in relation to any of the disciplines mentioned above, but so far only Jenny Wormald and James Doelman have given this matter serious consideration. Wormald's pioneering analysis of the English reception of Basilicon Doron and The True Law of Free Monarchies suggests that James's texts did not easily transfer from a Scottish context of playful scholarly debate to an English one in which political utterances were taken too seriously.⁴⁵ Doelman, in his article "'A King of Thine Own Heart": The English Reception of King James VI and I's Basilikon Doron' (1994), has made the first detailed study of actual readings of the king's words.⁴⁶ Doelman examines the consequences of James's decision to have his book on the nature and duties of kingship, first printed in an edition of seven copies in Edinburgh in 1599 and reprinted there in a public edition in 1603, republished in London just before his accession to the English throne. James's work on the nature and duties of kingship was read with great excitement, in the belief that the text would reveal the authoritative wishes and intentions of the ruler they had never seen.

James advertised the book as an accurate self-portrait, 'the trew image of my very minde, and forme of the rule, which I have prescribed to my selfe and mine'.⁴⁷ However, his confidence in the ability of language to convey the royal will, expressed

in such visual imagery, was perhaps misplaced. As Doelman remarks, 'readers generally used Basilikon Doron as a mirror, to reflect their own beliefs and desires'.⁴⁸ James had emphasised that it was vital for his subjects to understand the meaning contained in his words, and had equally emphasised the accessibility of this meaning. However, this seems to have made readers eager to find meanings agreeable to their own preconceived beliefs and expectations, and confident enough to publish their own readings of the king's book: if James's authorial intention was so transparent, how could they misconstrue it? Neither James nor his readers seems to have considered the possibility that a text could not fulfil such expectations.

Doelman shows how, in 1603 and 1604, James's words were quoted in defence of all kinds of different religious and political opinions. Just as every writer extracted phrases from the Bible to support their arguments, in the belief that the inspired word could still function out of context, so 'James's word had become detached from its royal origins, and was being freely used and misused by his readers'.⁴⁹ And there were no traditions of reading to check the king's readers, no body of royal theologians to produce definitive interpretations. Before his accession to the English throne James maintained ambiguous positions on many vital questions, such as the status of Catholics and the reform of the liturgy, in order to secure support from every quarter. Readers found in every passing reference in Basilikon Doron a confirmation of their beliefs that James would suppress the prelates, preserve the Elizabethan settlement, or restore the faith of his mother. James found

his subjects quoting his own words back at him, trying to make their king conform to their disparate interpretations of his words. As Doelman says:

James gave to the people of England a king that they could hold in their hands. In the end, the well-thumbed pages of *Basilikon Doron* did little to increase James's majesty in England. His pageantry of the written word raised expectations, but ultimately it gave over to his subjects the power to interpret and direct their own king.⁵⁰

The implications of all this for studies of James's life and works are considerable. There are clearly profound connections between James's personal beliefs about language and communication, the ambiguities and tensions in his texts, and the growing fondness of his reader-subjects for talking back to their king. The potential for more studies of the history of the reception of James's writings is great: indeed, the forthcoming book of essays on James's writings edited by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier will contain new work by James Doelman on the reception of the translation of the Psalms attributed to James. Future research will hopefully be able to discuss James's texts and their reception using a variety of modern theoretical tools and critical approaches. This study, however, seeks to depict the literary theory and practice of James and his readers rather than to theorise those practices from a twentieth-century perspective, although such work will eventually need to be done. This thesis focuses on what happened to King James's words in the decades after his death. It has long been known that a surprising number of works by and about James were printed during the Civil War, and the work of Craigie and Sommerville has provided vital basic information about them. Texts that had a turbulent reception history even during the author's lifetime, still bearing the aura of divinely-established authority, were freely accessible to readers, editors and publishers during the years in

which the Stuart monarchy was displaced. New versions and new interpretations of King James's words, circulating without the restrictions of censorship, could indicate much about the nature of James's texts, the opportunities they offered readers, and the role they played in transforming the way people imagined, saw and read the king.

¹For more bibliographic details of modern works on James, see Susanne Collier, 'Recent Studies in James VI and I', ELR 23 (1993), 509-519.

²See Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I: Two Kings or One?' (1977), reprinted History 68 (1983), 187-209, 190-2. There is a good summary account of the anti-Stuart histories of the 1650s in Royce MacGillivray, Restoration Historians and the English Civil War, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974, 28-9.

³Wormald (1983).

⁴William Harris, An Historical and Critical Account of the Lives and Writings of James I. and Charles I., New edition, 5 vols., f. F. C. & J. Rivington *et al.*, 1814, (Vol. 1, 164). The reference is to James's epic poem 'Lepanto', written in the mid-1580s and first printed in His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres, Edinburgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, 1591, STC 14379, (entered 7 August 1589, Liber B, f. 247^r), sig. [G3^r-L4^v]. 'Lepanto' was republished as an independent work on his accession to the English throne in 1603 as His Maiesties Lepanto, London: b. Simon Stafford & Henry Hooke, STC 14379.3, (entered 12 April 1603, Liber C, f. 94^v).

⁵His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres, [Anonymously edited, Edinburgh: 1818]; Edward Arber (ed.), James VI of Scotland, I of England. The Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie. Edinburgh. 1585. A Counterblaste to Tobacco. London. 1604., English Reprints, 1869

⁶Robert S. Rait (ed.), Lusus Regius - being poems and other pieces by King James the first, Archibald Constable & Co., 1901; Allan F. Westcott (ed.), New Poems by James I of England - from a hitherto unpublished manuscript (Add. 24195) in the British Museum, New York: Columbia University Press, 1911

⁷James Craigie (ed.), The Poems of James VI. of Scotland, STS, 2 vols., 1955, 1958

⁸G. P. V. Akrigg, 'The Literary Achievement of King James I', University of Toronto Quarterly 44 (1974-5), 115-129; J. Derrick McClure, "'O Phoenix Escossois": James VI as Poet', in Alisoun Gardner-Medwin & Janet Hadley-Williams (eds.), A Day Estivall - Essays on the Music, Poetry and History of Scotland and England & Poems Previously Unpublished - in honour of Helena Mennie Shire, Aberdeen University Press, 1990, 96-111

⁹R. D. S. Jack (ed.), The History of Scottish Literature - Vol. 1 - Origins to 1660 (Mediæval and Renaissance), Aberdeen University Press, 1988; Helena Mennie Shire, Song, Dance and Poetry of the Court of Scotland under King James VI, Cambridge: CUP, 1969

¹⁰James Craigie (ed.), The Basilicon Doron of King James VI., STS, 2 vols., 1944, 1950

¹¹James Craigie (ed.), Minor Prose Works of King James VI and I, STS, 1982 (this was prepared for the press by Alexander Law, as James Craigie died while working on the edition).

¹²Stanley Rypins, 'The Printing of *Basilicòn Dôron*, 1603', Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America 64 (1970), 393-417; Akihiro Yamada, 'The Printing of King James I's *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* with special reference to the 1603 editions', Poetica 23 (1986), 74-80

¹³G. P. V. Akrigg (ed.), Letters of King James VI & I, University of California Press, 1984

¹⁴Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (eds.), The True Law of Free Monarchies and Basilicon Doron, Toronto: CRRS, 1996; J. P. Sommerville (ed.), King James VI and I: Political Writings, Cambridge: CUP, 1994

¹⁵Charles Howard McIlwain (ed.), The Political Works of James I: reprinted from the edition of 1616, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1918

¹⁶Jonathan Goldberg, James I and the Politics of Literature - Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983

¹⁷Daniel Fischlin, "'The Candie-Souldier'", Venice, and James VI (I)'s advice on Monarchic Dress in *Basilicon Doron*', N&Q 240 (1995), 357-361

¹⁸Daniel Fischlin, "'Counterfeiting God": James VI (I) and the Politics of *Daemonologie* (1597)', Journal of Narrative Technique 26 (1996), 1-29

¹⁹Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (eds.), Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I, (Wayne State University Press, forthcoming)

²⁰All James's major speeches can be found in [William] Cobbett, Parliamentary History of England, b. T. Curson Hansard f. R. Bagshaw *et al*, 1806

²¹Graham Parry, The Golden Age restor'd - The culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42, Manchester University Press, 1981

²²William P. Germano, 'The Literary Icon of James I', PhD thesis, Indiana University, 1981

²³Richard Helgerson, 'Milton Reads the King's Book: Print, Performance, and the Making of a Bourgeois Idol', Criticism 29 (1987) 1-25

²⁴Alvin Kernan, Shakespeare, the King's Playwright - Theater in the Stuart Court 1603-1613, Yale University Press, 1995

²⁵See for example Emrys Jones, "'Othello", "Lepanto" and the Cyprus Wars', Shakespeare Survey 21 (1968), 47-52.

²⁶James H. Forse, 'An Echo of *Henry VI, Part 2*, in a Work by King James I?', ANQ 8 (Spring 1995), 3-6

²⁷James Doelman, 'The Accession of King James I and English Religious Poetry', Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 34 (1994), 19-40; Richard A. McCabe, 'The Masks of Duessa: Spenser, Mary Queen of Scots, and James VI', ELR 17 (1987), 224-42

²⁸David Harris Willson, King James VI and I, Jonathan Cape, 1956

²⁹A. W. Beasley, 'The Disability of James VI & I', The Seventeenth Century 10 (1995), 151-162

³⁰Roger Lockyer, James VI and I, Longman, 1998

³¹David Harris Willson, 'James I and His Literary Assistants', HLQ 8 (1944-5), 35-57

³²James Craigie, 'The *Basilicon Doron*: Semple's Transcript of James VI's Treatise', Scotsman, 4/3/1950; Rhodes Dunlap, 'King James and some Witches: the Date and Text of the *Daemonologie*', Philological Quarterly 54 (1975), 40-6; T. A. Birrell, English Monarchs and their books: from Henry VII to Charles II, (Panizzi Lectures 1986), British Library, 1987; T. A. Birrell, 'Some Rare Scottish Books in the Old Royal Library', in A. A. MacDonald, Michael Lynch & Ian B. Cowan (eds.), The

Renaissance in Scotland - Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture offered to John Durkan, New York: E. J. Brill, 1994, 404-16

³³James Craigie, 'Philotus: A Late Middle Scots Comedy', Scottish Literary Journal 6 (1979), 19-33. See Philotus. Ane verie excellent and delectabill Treatise intitultit, Edinburgh: b. Robert Charteris, 1603, STC 19888. Philotus has been reproduced by the Bannatyne Club, in Philotus; a Comedy, reprinted from the edition of Robert Charteris, Edinburgh: Ballantyne & Co., 1835. There is also a version edited by A. J. Mill in the Miscellany Volume of the Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh: STS, 1933), [81]-158. The Bannatyne Club also prints the play's probable source text, while the version published by the STS includes a useful glossary. Both have useful introductions. There is also a modern facsimile, Philotvs: Edinburgh, 1603, Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1969.

³⁴See Akrigg (1984), 258-60

³⁵For another interesting reassessment of James as a genuine scholar, see Mark H. Curtis, 'The Alienated Intellectuals of Early Stuart England', 1962, reprinted in Trevor Aston (ed.), Crisis in Europe 1560-1660 - Essays from Past and Present, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965, 295-316.

³⁶Marc L. Schwarz, 'James I and the Historians: Toward a Reconsideration', JBS 13 (1973-4), 114-134; Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', JBS 24 (1985), 169-207; Kenneth Fincham (ed.), The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642, Macmillan, 1993

³⁷W. B. Patterson, King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom, Cambridge: CUP, 1997

³⁸J. H. M. Salmon, 'James I, the Oath of Allegiance, the Venetian Interdict, and the reappearance of French Ultramontanism', in J. H. Burns & Mark Goldie (eds.), The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1430-1700, Cambridge: CUP, 1991, 247-53

³⁹Maurice Lee, Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms, Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990, xiv; see also Maurice Lee, Government by Pen: Scotland under James VI and I, University of Illinois Press, 1980; see Jennifer M. Brown [Jenny Wormald], 'Scottish Politics 1567-1625', in Alan G. R. Smith (ed.), The Reign of James VI and I, Macmillan, 1973, 22-39; Gordon Donaldson, Scotland - James V to James VII, Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1965

⁴⁰For a good overview of the current state of debate, see John Morrill, The Nature of the English Revolution, Longman, 1993.

⁴¹Kevin Sharpe (ed.), Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History, OUP, 1978 [new edition, Methuen, 1985]; Sharpe, The Personal Rule of Charles I, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1992; Conrad Russell, The Causes of the English Civil War, (Ford Lectures 1987-8), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990; Russell, The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637-1642, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991; Russell, 'Divine Right in the Early Seventeenth Century', in John Morrill, Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf (eds.), Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England - Essays presented to G. E. Aylmer, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, 101-120; Glenn Burgess, The Politics of the Ancient Constitution - An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603-1642, Macmillan, 1992. A good analysis of

nineteenth-century constructions of Stuart history is Timothy Lang, The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage: Interpretations of a Discordant Past, CUP, 1995.

⁴²J. P. Sommerville, Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640, Longman, 1986; J. P. Sommerville, 'James I and the Divine Right of Kings: English Politics and Continental Theory', in Linda Levy Peck (ed.), The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, Cambridge: CUP, 1991, 55-70; Thomas Cogswell, The Blessed Revolution - English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624, Cambridge: CUP, 1989; Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish Match', in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (eds.), Conflict in Early Stuart England - Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642, London & New York: Longman, 1989, 107-33

⁴³Cynthia Herrup, 'Revisionism: What's in a Name?' (JBS 35 (1996), 135-8) is a good introduction, and accompanies two anti-revisionist articles, Nicholas Tyacke, 'Anglican Attitudes: Some Recent Writings on English Religious History, from the Reformation to the Civil War', JBS 35 (1996), 139-67, and J. P. Sommerville, 'English and European Political Ideas in the Early Seventeenth Century: Revisionism and the Case of Absolutism', JBS 35 (1996), 168-194. While I am in general agreement with both Tyacke and Sommerville, I am unable to sympathise with the manner in which Dr. Tyacke disposes of his adversaries' publications.

⁴⁴Michael Lynch and Julian Goodare (eds.), The Reign of James VI, forthcoming

⁴⁵Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I, Basilikon Doron and The Trew Law of Free Monarchies: the Scottish context and the English translation', in Peck (1991), 36-54

⁴⁶James Doelman, "'A King of Thine Own Heart": The English Reception of King James VI and I's Basilikon Doron', The Seventeenth Century 9 (1994), 1-9

⁴⁷Doelman, 'Reception', (1994), 2

⁴⁸Doelman, 'Reception', (1994), 3

⁴⁹Doelman, 'Reception', (1994), 5

⁵⁰Doelman, 'Reception', (1994), 7

Chapter One: King James and his Readers, 1584-1617

I. The Scholar-King, 1584-1603: James's theory and practice of authorship

A king who is highly intelligent, thoroughly educated in classical and modern letters, and eager to make intellectual contributions of his own as well as sponsoring those of others, is likely to find himself reflecting on his rather unusual position. James VI and I, in particular, has few royal rivals in terms of creative output; he wrote extensively on politics, theology and contemporary culture, published volumes of poetry (leaving more in manuscript), and helped to translate and edit major sacred and profane texts.¹ His closest counterpart is perhaps the thirteenth-century Spanish ruler Alfonso the Wise, whose hymns, histories and tables of laws seem to mark the birth of a new era of literature just as James's promotion of the arts helped to transform intellectual life in Scotland, England and beyond.²

James wrote as a European Renaissance ruler, and although he wrote about his own kingdom and its circumstances, his works are by no means inward-looking or dedicated to immediate political needs, but they explore constitutional, religious and cultural issues, and were directed to an international audience. Craigie is not entirely accurate when he claims that Basilicon Doron was 'the first prose work in the vernacular of Great Britain which could be read by Frenchmen who knew no language but their own', but it was certainly a ground-breaking publication.³ As Jenny Wormald writes:

The very fact that this first British king since Alfred to write books about the nature of his office was doing so not to harangue his subjects but to contribute to the great European debate was itself a matter of pride.⁴

It may have been a matter of pride, but it also led to intricate problems for James and his subjects.

It was unusual for a monarch to make literary compositions, but for a ruler to publish his writings in print before his subjects was almost unprecedented. James's ancestor James I of Scotland had probably written The Kingis Quair, but there was no tradition in Scotland of a ruler writing with the intention of having his words fixed in print and exposed to a wide public audience.⁵ James VI's mother, Queen Mary, had lost much reputation after the publication of the famous 'casket' letters and sonnets, which her opponents presented as evidence for her betrayal of her husband Darnley: hardly an example to encourage further royal publications.⁶ Elizabeth I of England had abilities comparable to those of James, but preferred to reserve her literary talents for private occasions and to offer her subjects the visible image of authority, with the occasional 'golden speech'.⁷ James, however, from the appearance of his first volume of poetry in 1584 to his last speeches to Parliament in 1624, continually submitted his words to a mass audience. He knew that he had entered into a unique relationship, and in his writings he repeatedly tries to explain and justify his literary practice.

Nineteenth and twentieth-century scholars have tended to hold that all James's literary productions were essentially declarations of royal power, to which readers were simply expected to submit. Robert Ashton writes:

the rôles of scholar and king did not mingle altogether happily in his person. Scholarship was too often viewed by him as something which was to be pressed into the service of the assertion of kingly authority rather than into that of the search for truth as an end in itself, while those who disagreed with

James's conclusions as a scholar were all too likely to incur his displeasure as a king.⁸

In fact, it can be argued that the reverse is true, and that the popular assumption that James was vain and egotistical has obscured the extent to which his theory and practice of writing is reader-orientated rather than self-centred. The title of James's very first printed work, The Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie, suggests quite a different attitude to that suggested by Ashton. There is little that is arrogant or imposing about this anonymous volume: James tries his hand at writing sonnets, translating French epic verse, and a version of Psalm 104, with varying degrees of success.⁹ The text displays a great awareness of the reader and his expectations, and the first twelve sonnets are an extended prayer to the gods that the verse which follows will stimulate readers to imaginatively recreate the scenes and events described.¹⁰ James's treatise on Scottish poetry 'Ane Schort Treatise, conteining some Reulis and Caultelis to be observit and eschewit in Scottis Poesie' emphasises the need for the author to be humble before his readers and to allow them space for different interpretations.¹¹ James's poems are explorative, open and non-confrontational - not even the deeply personal allegory 'Phoenix', which relates to the ousting of his friend and counsellor Esmé Stuart by hardline Presbyterians, is a vehicle for any political threats or denunciations.

It is true that at this stage James had, in practical terms, limited authority as a king: however, he never addressed his subjects as if he were an apprentice in the art of kingship. In defining himself as a poet he seems to be trying to make a distinction between James Stuart the writer and King James of Scotland. The king has power over his subjects, even if this is qualified by circumstances; the writer must always

acknowledge the rights of his readers, even if as a king he had the opportunity to make his texts vehicles for conveying his authority. Perhaps James had assimilated George Buchanan's theories about the king as a servant of his people into his model of creative activity, even if he sought to out-grow those theories in his practical administration of the country.¹² There is a considerable body of work on theories of kingship in which the king is credited with two 'bodies', mortal and mystical; although this distinction does not correspond exactly to James's attempts to distinguish between king and poet here, it is worth recalling that James felt that in many spheres of life he had to be different things to different people.¹³ As a scholarly writer, he should not domineer over the readers he ruled as subjects.

This distinction between scholar and king is made explicit in ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΟΩΝ (Basilicon Doron, 'the kingly gift'), which James wrote in 1598 to give his infant son Prince Henry some advice about the nature and duties of kingship, in case an early death prevented James from being able to instruct him in person. Basilicon Doron is one of the richest sources for James's thoughts and beliefs, and was quoted by James in many of his later writings. In the third book, he writes:

Remember also, to put a difference betwixt your forme of language in reasoning, and your pronouncing of sentences, or declaratour of your wil in judgement, or anie other waies in the points of your office. For in the former case, ye must reason pleasantlie and pacientlie, not like a king, but like a priuate man and a scholer: otherwaies, your impacience of contradiction will be interpreted to be for lacke of reason on your parte. Where in the pointes of your office, ye should ripelie aduise indeede, before ye giue forth your sentence: but fra it be giuen forth, the suffering of any contradiction, diminisheth the Majestie of your authoritie, and maketh the processes endlesse.¹⁴

The scholar is making a contribution to a continuing debate, which did not begin with

him and which will survive after him: the opinion of a private man is no final judgement. James argues that in his capacity as a king, he should use words quite differently.¹⁵ A scholar's argument belongs to the world of words, and will be contradicted and elaborated: the voice of a king comes from the source of legitimate power, and should produce action, not more discussion on the part of his hearers. However, James recognises that it is not easy to sustain this kind of control over language, and discusses the implications of failing to fulfil the expectations of the audience, and of failing to make clear what sort of words are being uttered. If his audience is expecting a scholarly argument, they will be scornful if the king tries to win the argument by wielding his royal authority; if, on the other hand, the king's official pronouncements are received as the words of a private man, his authority will be in jeopardy. Language is potentially very dangerous for a king, and the effect on its recipients must always be considered.

James goes on to discuss written texts in similar terms:

Nowe as to your writing, whiche is nothing else, but a forme of en-registrate speeche; use a plaine, shorte, but statelie stile, both in your Proclamations and missives, especiaillie to forraine Princes. And if your engine spurre you to write any workes, eyther in verse or in prose; I cannot but allowe you to practise it: but take no longsome workes in hande, for distracting you from your calling.¹⁶

Just as when speaking, a king has to distinguish between royal commands and private observations, so when writing, there is a difference between the ruler's state letters and declarations, and 'workes' created when off-duty.¹⁷ One is reminded of the title of James's second collection of poetry, His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres (1591). Again James recognises the danger that the two kinds of writing will

become confused - suppose the private man's enthusiasm for his art interferes with his official 'calling'? However, a serious theoretical problem is raised by James's assertion that writing is just speech fixed on the page. This suggests that he was either unaware of or unwilling to confront the fact that speech, which can be easily misconstrued itself, can communicate the speaker's expectations of the audience much more clearly than can written text, which tends to give greater scope for interpretation.

James goes on to speak in terms that suggest he felt a love for art that he knew could undermine his kingly status:

Flatter not your selfe in your laboures, but before they be set forth, let them first be privilie censured by some of the best skilled men in that craft, that in these workes ye medle with. And because your writes will remaine as true pictures of your minde, to all posterities; let them be free of all un-comelinesse and un-honestie...

If ye would write worthelie, choose subjectes worthie of you, that be not full of vanitie, but of vertue; eschewing obscuritie, and delighting ever to be plaine and sensible. And if ye write in verse, remember that it is not the principall parte of a poëme to rime right, and flowe well with many prettie wordes: but the chiefe commendation of a poëme is, that when the verse shall be shaken sundrie in prose, it shall be founde so riche in quick inventions, & poëticke floures, and in faire and pertinent comparisions; as it shall retaine the lustre of a poëme, although in prose. And I would also advise you to write in your owne language: for there is no thing left to be saide in Greeke and Latine alreadie; and ynewe of poore schollers would matche you in these languages; and besides that, it best becommeth a King to purifie and make famous his owne tongue; wherein he may goe before all his subjectes; as it setteth him well to doe in all honest & lawfull things.¹⁸

The last lines suggest that in his enthusiasm James has blurred the distinction he established only pages before. He describes the private poet submitting his work to the judgement of other artists, and acknowledging that his poems will pass into the control of others; he warns against trivial verses and mere rhyme-making. However, he then argues that to write poetry in the vernacular is an act of patriotism: in fact, it

is the king's job to tap the resources of the native tongue. He concludes by suggesting that in doing so the king is leading his people, but it sounds strangely as though the king were making himself a servant of the art that would ultimately belong to his subjects.

James's own account of the early history of the writing and reception of Basilicon Doron reveals the difficulty he had found in separating the two kinds of discourse.¹⁹ Was Basilicon Doron itself a kingly or a scholarly text? In his preface to the text as it appeared in the first public edition of 1603, printed in Edinburgh, James remarked that he had originally written the work 'for exercise of my owne ingyne', which had never been meant to be published. But Basilicon Doron is more than a private, scholarly text; it is deeply personal, not in the sense in which the Essayes of a Prentise are personal responses to situations, but because it is about the kingship which James believed was intimately bound up with his person. Despite believing that it was possible and important to distinguish between the king and the private man, James equally believed that in some respects the two were inseparable. Basilicon Doron assumes the hereditary and divinely-appointed nature of monarchy, and it is not surprising that James hesitates to exclude either the king or the private man from a narrative depicting them working as one. It is perhaps best to see Basilicon Doron as a kingly text, informing Prince Henry how he should govern after James, rather than a scholarly contribution to the long-running debate on the duties of governors. However, it is still a witty, anecdotal, familiar piece, and would clearly contradict James's advice about distinguishing between the two forms of writing if it were not the case that it was addressed to the one reader who could receive the author's work both as royal injunction and as friendly advice.²⁰

The fact that Basilicon Doron escaped from this limited intended audience made it difficult for James to maintain control over a text that was already genre-problematic. James had seven copies printed in 1599, for the use of his family and leading courtiers, but accounts of the work began to circulate more widely through word of mouth and hurriedly copied notes, and it became the subject of intense discussion.²¹ Reports of James's derogatory references to the 'Puritans' provoked a furious reaction from some members of the Kirk, particularly from those in the circle associated with the Melvills. In his diary, James Melvill listed the positions the king was said to hold, and remarked, 'The righteous Chryst knowes what wrang he and his servands gettes heir'.²² In the public edition of 1603, James commented on the way in which these readers had transformed his text:

In-deede I am little beholden to the curiositie of some, who thinking it too large already (as appears) for lack of leasure to copie it, drewe some notes out of it, for speeds sake; putting in the one halfe of the purpose, and leaving out the other... And of these notes, making a little pamphlet (lacking both my methode and halfe of my mater) entituled it, forsooth, the Kings Testament: as if I had eiked a third Testament of my owne, to the two that are in the holy Scriptures.²³

Unfortunately no copy of The Kings Testament appears to have survived, but it is clear that James was deeply vexed by the way in which a confused reworking of his private words was being ascribed such 'scriptural' importance.²⁴ He felt that only a full publication of the text, with explanatory notes, could limit the damage, but knew that it would be difficult to reconceive the work in a manner that would discourage readers from producing unwelcome interpretations:

since contrarie to my intention and exspectation, as I have alreadie said, this booke is nowe vented, and set forth to the publicke viewe of the worlde, and consequentlie, subject to every mans censure, as the current of his affection leades him; I am nowe forced, aswell for resisting to the malice of the children of envy, who like waspes, suckes venome out of every wholsome

hearbe; as for the satisfaction of the godly honest sorte, in any thing that they may mistake therein; both to publishe and spred the true copies thereof, for defacing of the false copies that are alreadie spred, as I am informed: as likeweyes, by this preface, to cleare suche parts thereof, as in respect of the concised shortnesse of my style, may be mis-interpreted therein.²⁵

James revised the text, removing passages containing advice for Prince Henry which seemed a little Machiavellian, and explaining and elaborating upon his arguments.²⁶ He seems to have become enthusiastic about the way in which these problems offered an opportunity for communicating his vision and ideals to his subjects. Yet the resulting work displays an ambiguous attitude to the readers it intends to reach. James was unable to distance himself from the work sufficiently to make it a scholarly text, and he could not change a letter to Prince Henry into a set of royal commands for a whole nation of readers. Clearly James did not want people arguing about and contradicting his opinions on the nature of monarchy, but the result is far too discursive and personal to be placed in the class of proclamations and official letters. His numerous attempts to explain exactly what he meant by his references to the Puritans, for example, seemed to suggest both that the text was communicating an authoritative judgement, and that the matter was still open to debate. Consequently, readers were to produce all kinds of interpretations of James's own explanations, while claiming that they were simply reproducing the king's own meaning.

James concluded his preface with some remarks which suggest that he could feel his control of the text and its readers slipping away. He appeals to the charitable reader:

to interprete favourably this birth of mine, according to the integritie of the authour, and not looking for perfection in the worke it selfe.

This almost sounds like an attempt to discourage people from reading further: they should believe in the good intentions of James whether they found them in the text or not. But James remarks on the same page:

since it was first written in secret, and is now published, not of ambition, but of a kinde of necessity; it must be taken of all men, for the true image of my very minde, and forme of the rule, which I have præscribed to my selfe and mine.²⁷

How can an imperfect text be the true image of the author's mind? James is ordering - or appealing to - readers to believe that the book represents something important and non-textual. But does it represent the will of the king or of the mind of James Stuart, and are readers supposed to submit to the authority of the word, or the presence behind it? In attempting to persuade readers to perform the right reading, James seems increasingly unsure about what he actually means. Jenny Wormald has shown how James's love for theorising and rhetoric confused his English subjects: here he seems to have confused himself.²⁸

It is this combination of intellectual confusion and enthusiasm for conveying a message of enormous importance, in part, which makes Basilicon Doron, particularly in the version revised for full publication, so appealing: however, as James Doelman has shown, it also encouraged and permitted readers to produce a host of divergent interpretations of the work. In 1603, Basilicon Doron introduced the new king to his English subjects as one engaged in a complex debate with his subjects and readers.²⁹ It is fascinating to compare the reception of Basilicon Doron with that of The True Lawe of Free Monarchies, which had appeared anonymously in 1598, the year before Basilicon Doron. James's first essay on the origins and theory of kingship was clearly conceived as a scholarly work, rather than a handbook for

practical government. It was published anonymously, although it seems likely that its authorship was an open secret, and the central intellectual thesis, that monarchy is divinely instituted, is developed without dragging in the ambiguities of personal motives and contemporary politics. Although the ideas developed in The True Lawe are extreme in many ways, it does not seem to have attracted any significant criticism, unlike the more accommodating and practical Basilicon Doron. Indeed, it is exceedingly difficult to find any record of contemporary responses to The True Lawe, although it was republished in 1603 like Basilicon Doron.³⁰ In that work, James seems to have succeeded in fulfilling his intention; in Basilicon Doron, where there was a gap between intention and realisation, his readers intervened to fill the void in their own way.

II. Writing as King, 1604-1614: the influence of art on the royal voice

It is perhaps a little surprising that James continued to have his 'kingly' writings and speeches published after the unwelcome reception of Basilicon Doron, but it seems that he could not repress the urge to express himself in words, even at the risk of seeing his authority passing into the hands of his readers. On 19 March 1603/4 James concluded his first speech to the English Parliament, which was to be printed, by explaining his lack of verbal flourish:

it becommeth a King, in my opinion, to use no other Eloquence then plainnesse and sincerity. By plainnesse I meane, that his Speeches should bee so cleere and voyde of all ambiguitie, that they may not be throwne, nor rent a sunder in contrarie sences like the olde Oracles of the Pagan gods. And by sinceritie, I understand that uprightnesse and honestie which ought to bee in a Kings whole Speeches and actions: That as farre as a King is in Honor erected above any of his Subjects, so far should he strive in sinceritie to be above them all, and that his tongue should be ever the true Messenger of his heart: and this sort of Eloquence may you ever assuredly looke for at my hands.³¹

James's fear that his words would be 'rent asunder in contrary sences' was not misplaced: the débâcle of Basilicon Doron had shown the danger of a kingly text not being received as such by its readers. He seems to have made a special effort in this speech to ensure that his expressions were clear and unambiguous, in order to minimise the danger of his audience producing interpretations of the royal will that differed from those the king had attempted to communicate. But despite James's strictures against 'ambiguitie', this speech still contains passages in which the author's love for metaphor apparently carries him away from the main subject. At one point, James reflects on the union between England and Scotland which has been achieved in his person:

What God hath conjoynd then, let no man separate. I am the Husband, and

all the whole Isle is my lawfull Wife; I am the Head, and it is my Body; I am the Shepherd, and it is my Flocke: I hope therefore no man will be so unreasonable as to thinke that I that am a Christian King under the Gospel, should be a Polygamist & Husband to two Wives; that I being the Head, should have a divided and monstrous Body...³²

This remarkable imagery rather distracts from the issue of how a change of monarch should actually transform national identity - perhaps that was, to some extent, James's intention.³³ At any rate, there is clearly a gap between James's own description of and instructions for reading his texts, and the words themselves.

In fact, King James's public orations and declarations are continually disrupted by what might be an artistic penchant for stylistic experimentation and intellectual speculation, or deliberate obfuscation. Particularly in his orally delivered speeches, where one might expect the self-indulgences inevitable in private writing to be suppressed, there is often a surprising use of metaphor, self-quotation and meditative hypothesising, which seems to open the text to multiple interpretations. The prime example of this is James's use of the metaphor of a glass in his speeches to impress the conviction that his words really do reveal the royal will.³⁴ There is no space here to trace the development of the metaphor in his writings, but it is worth looking at his most extended treatment of it, in his speech to Parliament on 21 March 1609/10, which tells the audience how the power of the king relates to the authority of the law.³⁵ The mirror metaphor frames the speech, the second paragraph of which opens:

As ye made me a faire Present indeed in presenting your thanks and louing duties unto mee; So have I now called you here, to recompence you againe with a great and a rare Present, which is a faire and a Christall Mirror; Not such a Mirror wherein you may see your owne faces, or shadowes; but such a Mirror, or Christall, as through the transparantnesse thereof, you may see the heart of your King.³⁶

The conclusion, while purporting to close the speech, develops the metaphor and its interesting implications still further:

Thus have I now performed my promise, in presenting unto you the Christall of your Kings Heart. Yee know that principally by three wayes ye may wrong a Mirrour. First, I pray you, looke not upon my Mirror with a false light: which ye doe, if ye mistake, or mis-understand my Speach, and so alter the sence thereof. But secondly, I pray you beware to soile it with a foule breath, and uncleane hands: I meane, that ye pervert not my words by any corrupt affections, turning them to an ill meaning, like one, who when hee heares the tolling of a Bell, fancies to himselfe, that it speakes those words which are most in his minde. And lastly (which is worst of all) beware to let it fall or breake; (for glasse is brittle) which ye doe, if ye lightly esteeme it, and by contemning it, conforme not your selues to my perswasions.³⁷

Whether James perceived the irony in using complex imagery to insist on the transparency of his words is open to debate; it may well have been a deliberate comment on his irritation at having to reply to grievances and worries which he felt to be groundless. At any rate, this sparkling display of wit allows the audience to be distracted from the process of absorbing and accepting the substance of the speech, and to consider the nature of the language, power and meaning in the same self-conscious manner as James. By explaining the numerous subtle ways in which listeners could manipulate his words, and suggesting the difficulty of preserving any pure communication of authorial intention, James is almost authorising the subversion of his apparent intention. All this is far removed from Erasmus' suggestion that 'speech is the least deceptive mirror of the mind'.³⁸ It seems more likely that James has in mind St.Paul ('For now we see through a glass, darkly') and Shakespeare's Richard II ('O flattering glass! / Like to my followers in prosperity, / Thou dost beguile me... A brittle glory shineth in this face, / As brittle as the glory is the face'), allusions which could encourage James's more thoughtful readers to speculate about his meaning.³⁹ Could not misunderstandings be the fault of the

'mirror', or text, rather than the fault of the reader or listener? How was this image of authority carried through words?⁴⁰

It has not been recognised that, additionally, James is apparently inverting Francis Bacon's advice for kings in the second book of The Advancement of Learning (1605):

Concerning Government, it is a part of knowledge secret and retired, in both these respects in which things are deemed secret; for some things are secret because they are hard to know, and some because they are not fit to utter. We see all governments are obscure and invisible... But contrariwise in the governors toward the governed all things ought, as far as the frailty of man permitteth, to be manifest and revealed. For so it is expressed in the Scriptures touching the government of God, that this globe, which seemeth to us a dark and shady body, is in the view of God as crystal... So unto princes and states, especially towards wise senates and councils, the natures and dispositions of the people, their conditions and necessities, their factions and combinations, their animosities and discontents, ought to be, in regard of the variety of their intelligences, the wisdom of their observations, and the height of their station where they keep sentinel, in great part clear and transparent. Wherefore, considering that I write to a king that is a master of this science, and is so well assisted, I think it decent to pass over this part in silence...⁴¹

Bacon offers James a vision of a hidden prince looking at his people through a glass, but James suggests that he is overturning this model and subjecting himself to the inspection of his audience. James had stated earlier in the speech that 'The State of Monarchie is the supremest thing upon earth', but his allusion to Bacon seems to imply that the king's readers are in a higher position still.⁴²

There was considerable interest in James's speech, as will be shown; surprisingly, however, there is no evidence that James's readers picked up on these linguistic obscurities and discontinuities in a way that modern deconstructionists would like. A modern politician who employed mirror-rhetoric like that used by James in 1610 would have his metaphors subjected to every kind of scrutiny. Yet there do not seem to be any records of contemporary interest in the 1610 speech's

imagery. It is possible that some of the more elaborate and polished metaphors were added for the printed version, and it is true that the manuscript versions of what James actually said do omit or shorten the mirror analogy.⁴³ However, James himself seems to have anticipated that his audience would not pay much attention to the language of his speech. At one point, he interrupted his speech to remark:

because I see many writing and noting, I will crave your pardons, to holde you a little longer by speaking the more distinctly, for feare of mistaking.⁴⁴

James was aware that his hearers were more concerned to understand what he meant than with what he was actually saying. The belief that meaning was hidden behind language seems to have led James's audience to neglect the king's words.

One record of a possible comment on a specific phrase of James in this speech is John More's letter to Ralph Winwood, in which he says that:

the most strictly religious could have wished that his Highness would have been more spareing in using the Name of God, and comparing the Deity with Princes Sovereignty.⁴⁵

This may refer to the passage in which James distinguishes between the original and ideal nature of monarchy, and its current realisation in a society with established laws: in relation to the former, James invokes Psalm 82: 6, remarking that 'Kings are justly called Gods, for that they exercise a manner or resemblance of Divine power upon earth'.⁴⁶ It could, equally, be a reflection on the way people understood the general import of what James was saying. People seem to have been too busy trying to discover the meaning that lay behind the text to pay much attention to the structure of the text itself. This was, indeed, in line with James's own expressed theory in Basilicon Doron and this very speech: the words of the king were only important because they revealed the mind of the king. And yet James knew as an artist and

compulsive communicator that words were extremely important in their own right: one wonders whether James's verbal artistry in this speech, coupled with his remarks to the note-takers, was an attempt to get people to notice his words.

James's speeches display an increasing vexation at the fact that they were not being interpreted in the way he wanted; the problem was that his theory of speaking and writing as a king was flawed. He spoke of his words as transparent, and claimed that it was as easy for his audience to perceive the royal meaning correctly as it was important for them to do so. Akrigg is right to say that James 'counted too much upon language'.⁴⁷ Readers seem to have accepted James's theory, but with the result that they placed great confidence in the various readings and misreadings they produced in accordance with their own conditions and expectations. James's speech of 21 March 1610 was intended to soothe fears and enforce a definitive understanding of the place of the king in Parliament, but it seems to have stimulated debate as different people claimed that James meant one thing or another. His remarks on the difference between a king and a tyrant, in particular, were appropriated for the most surprising purposes, as will be seen.⁴⁸

As the Parliament of 1610 progressed, James became increasingly irritated by Parliament's tendency to discuss their rights and grievances rather than the financial reform he desired, and on 21 May delivered a much less conciliatory speech, in which he described the nature of kingly authority in more detail, telling Parliament that 'If the king will be a tyrant and ill, you cannot restrain him as long as God gives him time to reign over you'.⁴⁹ James was dropping a huge hint that they were not to discuss matters relating to the prerogative any further, unless they wanted a crushing rejoinder. Yet this speech provoked yet more discussion, as people sought to

discover what lay behind these alarming words.⁵⁰ John Chamberlain gives an extended account of the reception of this speech:

the 21th of this present he made another speach to both the houses, but so litle to theyre satisfaction, that I heare yt bred generally much discomfort; to see our monarchicall powre and regall prerogative strained so high and made so transcendent every way, that yf the practise shold follow the positions, we are not like to leave to our successors that freedome we received from our forefathers, nor make account of any thing we have longer then they list that govern. Many bold passages have ben since in the lower house, and among the rest a wish that this speach might never come in print: but what yssue this business now in hand will come unto, God knowes...⁵¹

Chamberlain's concern is not with the linguistic technicalities which we tend to privilege nowadays, but with the relationship between James's real meaning and the critical interpretations being placed upon it. He is more interested in the 'practise' rather than the 'positions' advanced in the speech - what will James actually *do*? In Basilicon Doron, James had warned Prince Henry that the words of a king must achieve silence and action on the part of their hearers, or the debate would be endless: through a misconception of language, endless debate had indeed been started. Chamberlain's wish that this speech should not be printed seems to have been granted, but James was becoming increasingly irate as his intentions became the subject of furious disputes, and his hearers were becoming alarmed that their interpretations of his speeches were rejected as ill-intentioned.

It seems probable that the increasingly rich artifice of the discourse in James's speeches is not a cause, but a symptom of these misreadings. James seems to have resorted to art: if he could not control his subjects by speaking as a king, he would persuade them as readers of scholarly works. James may have felt that since his kingly texts were being subjected to the same amount of discussion as literary or academic productions, he might as well write them as such. After the failure of the

Great Contract in 1610, four years passed before the next Parliament. On 5 April 1614, James addressed his Parliament again, recalling his previous speech:

It is the sayeing of the wyseste king that evere was, 'That the harte of kings weare inscrutable;' but in the laste parleamente, I muste calle to your remembrance the comparisone I used, whearin I presented myselfe unto you as a mirrore, whearin you mighte cleerelye see the integretye of my purpos for our lengtheninge that parleamente for the generall good and benefyte of the commonwelthe; but as I then sayd of the nature of a mirrore, that it mighte be deffyled by the eyes of the behouderes, so did some of the lowere house looke uppon me with poluted eyes, and as I may saye, deffyled my mirrore; I canne saye no more nowe then I did then, but to offere you the same mirrore, to [looke to] protestyng as I shall answeere it to Almyghty God, that my integretye is like the whitnes of my roabe, my purety like the mettle of golde in my crowne, my firmnes and clearnes like the precious stones I weare, and my affectyones naturalle like the rednes of my harte.⁵²

This is considerably less authoritarian than his earlier speeches, and even more colourful. He tells Parliament that he can only offer them the same mirror of his heart, but he does not sound particularly confident that they will treat it any better this time. The sudden reminder in the last line of his real, fleshly heart suggests the conflict between the metaphors of communication and clarity, and the reality of the situation. The recognition of failure as a kingly speaker and writer is played out in a joyful display of literary rhetoric. James's flawed understanding of language had resulted in an audience which treated him as a writer rather than a king, and increasingly James allowed himself to enjoy the artistic role for which he was most naturally suited.

III. Writing as Scholar, 1608-1617: art and authority

James also persisted in writing as a private man after his accession to the English throne, but in doing so encountered new problems. In 1603, he had new editions of Daemonologie and his early scriptural meditations printed in London, and in 1604 his A Counter-Blaste to Tobacco appeared anonymously.⁵³ These works, like his earlier collections of verse, do not appear to have had the general impact of Basilicon Doron, and were presumably read by people with specific interests, as was probably James's intention. However, in 1608 James found that scholarly works could have an unwelcome mass interest, caused once again by his failure to fully control the text and its implied readers. After the Gunpowder Plot, a new form of the Oath of Allegiance was drafted, which was intended to distinguish those Catholics who were prepared to reject the Pope's temporal authority, and those whose religious zeal was greater than their national loyalty. When some of the secular clergy submitted to the oath, the Pope and leading Jesuits wrote in protest to the seculars' leader, Archpriest George Blackwell. James prepared a defence of the new oath, containing a rebuttal of the accusations in the letters of Pope Paul V and Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, and issued it anonymously, apparently hoping that his powers of reasoning would alone be sufficient to convince the Catholics.⁵⁴

Triplici Nodo, Triplex Cuneus. Or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance appeared in early 1608.⁵⁵ James seems not to have minded when the work's origin became common knowledge, and the subject of considerable discussion and comment in its own right. However, a number of publications then appeared, by both

English and continental authors, which attacked James's work in forthright terms. When Bellarmine's Responsio appeared against the king's book, James decided to acknowledge his authorship in a new edition. The British Library preserves James's personally annotated copy of the anonymous first edition, in which he changed the pronouns from third to first person, and made other alterations.⁵⁶ The revised version was prefaced by an essay addressed to other leading European rulers entitled A Premonition of his Maiesties to all most mightie Monarches.⁵⁷

In A Premonition, James explained to his fellow-monarchs why he had originally published Triplici Nodo anonymously:

first because of the matter.... it being a Treatise, which I was to write, containing reasons & discourses in Divinity for the defence of the Oath of Allegiance, and refutation of the condemners therof; I thought it not comely for one of my place, to put my name to bookes concerning scholastick Disputations; whose calling is to set forth Decrees in the Imperative moode.⁵⁸

However, James had been unable to contain his personal and kingly rage when Bellarmine demolished the arguments of Triplici Nodo, pretending not to know that it had a royal author. Bellarmine, in fact, issued his Responsio under his chaplain's name, apparently as a satirical comment on James's use of anonymous publishing.⁵⁹

In A Premonition, James devotes a great deal of space and scornful language to condemning Bellarmine for this insolent behaviour:

For though hee confesseth this Master Tortus to bee an obscure man; yet being the Cardinals Chapleine, he is sufficient enough forsooth to answere an English booke, that lacketh the name of an Authour; as if a personated obscure name for Authour of a Cardinals booke, were a meete match for answering a KINGS Booke, that lacketh the name of an Authour.⁶⁰

James was particularly aroused by the way in which Bellarmine repeatedly referred to James and his heresies in the third person:

And in case this [Bellarmine's abusive criticism] might onely seeme to touch

the unknowen Authour of the Booke, whome notwithstanding he knew well enough, as I shew before; hee spareth not my Person with my owne name: sometimes saying, that Pope Clement *thought mee to bee inclined to their Religion...* And in another place, after that hee hath compared and ranked mee with Julian the Apostate, hee concludeth, *Cum Catholicus non sit, neque Christianus est.* If this now bee mannerly dealing with a King, I leave it to you to judge, who cannot but resent such indignities done to one of your qualitie.⁶¹

Once again, James had failed to preserve the distinction between his work as a scholar and his life as a king. This injection of royal and personal outrage into what was originally one of many works of reasonably academic political and religious controversy generated one of the greatest pamphlet wars of the century. Although the revised combination of A Premonition and Triplici Nodo is clearly a work by a king addressed to kings, it is still a highly complex work of literature, with erudite speculations and innumerable points of possible contention. It is one of his best works, extremely witty and dangerously provocative: the fact that he had invested it with his royal authority made readers even more eager to study and reply to it. Dudley Carleton remarked that James was simply giving the Papists something to write about, and that A Premonition 'would better become a private man'.⁶² James went far beyond a justification of the points in Triplici Nodo which had been attacked by Bellarmine, and discussed the nature of orthodox doctrine, the history of his own religious opinions, the date of the coming of Antichrist, and the crimes of the Jesuits in England: this was not exactly conducive to the peace the oath of allegiance had been revised to safeguard. Continental writers and theologians generally sympathetic to James's opposition to the monarchical papacy, like Paolo Sarpi, expressed their wishes that James would turn to practical action and abandon such inflammatory writing.⁶³

James's text was seized on by theologians and political writers of all hues, and he found himself bombarded by dozens of volumes mocking or reinterpreting his words from around Europe. James Gretser wrote a reply satirically entitled Basilicon Doron, which was printed at Ingolstadt, and personal abuse of James became increasingly common.⁶⁴ In James's defence appeared volumes of slavish flattery which also distorted James's words; one such writer, George Marcelline, produced a justification of A Premonition which announced:

in despite of the Pope, of Anabaptists, of al haire-brain'd, mutinous, opinotive, and frantique Preachers (whome his Majesty calleth and understandeth to bee Puritanes onely) hee is an absolute Monarch, as well of the Spirituall, as of the Temporall⁶⁵

The oath of allegiance had been intended to divide the English Catholics; the controversy over James's writings on the oath seemed likely to divide the Church of England as well. Over-confident readers were introducing their own theological opinions as readings of or deductions from James's texts. A recent convert to Roman Catholicism, the former royal chaplain Benjamin Carier, was not particularly dismayed by James's attacks on papal supremacy. After all, it was 'but an Hypotheticall proposition' to say that the Pope was Antichrist. Writing to James, he suggested that 'your Majestie may encrease your honor by altering your booke from less good to much better'.⁶⁶ Instead of merely entering a debate on the extent of Papal jurisdiction, James found himself the helpless subject of a highly-charged dispute about the authority of kings and the validity of their commands.⁶⁷

James's made a last attempt to impose his royal will on the debate, in A Remonstrance...for the Right of Kings. The debate over the oath had been transformed by the assassination of Henry IV of France by a Catholic extremist in

1610: the issue of whether the Pope had the power to depose the king was clearly not a matter of theory. When the Estates-General met in 1614-5 (their last meeting before 1789), the Third Estate had drawn up a declaration stating that it was impious and unlawful to overthrow the reigning monarch. Cardinal Du Perron's speech against this declaration, which was eventually suppressed, struck James as yet another threat to his authority, and he used it as the starting point for his latest, and longest essay. It is an extraordinary work; like Basilicon Doron, it is too deeply concerned with the personal nature of monarchy to be either detached and scholarly or official and kingly. At times it appears almost wilful in its rhetorical strategies.⁶⁸

At one point James attacks the literary quality of Du Perron's work:

I have no purpose to touch many prettie toyes which the ridges of his whole booke are sowed withall. Such are his allegations of Pericles, Agesilaus, Aristotle, Minos, the Druides, the French Ladies, Hannibal, Pindarus, and Poeticall fables. All resembling the red and blew flowers that pester the corne when it standeth in the fields, where they are more noysome to the growing croppe, then beautifull to the beholding eye.⁶⁹

James's metaphors are surely a digression as much as Du Perron's French Ladies. Throughout this work one is reminded of James's later Parliamentary speeches: the free play of verbal creativity seems to be taking over. In 1607 James had set out to write the text of a private scholar; by 1615 he found himself involved in a furious paper war with his royal authority fully engaged. Repeatedly humiliated by his readers and yet unwilling to renounce the pleasures of writing, it is understandable that James again found an outlet in wordplay and fantasy that would not be so easily be misused by his audience. At one point James makes a witty riposte to the theory advanced by some Catholics that the Pope's power to depose kings did not necessarily endanger their lives, a riposte which could easily be read as a comment

on the humiliation endured by a king reduced to the level of a pamphleteer:

Let a cat be throwne from a high rooffe to the bottome of a cellour or vault, she lighteth on her feete, and runneth away without taking any harme. A King is not like a cat, howsoever a cat may looke vpon a King: he cannot fall from the loftie pinnacle of Royaltie, to light on his feet vpon the hard pauement of a priuate state, without crushing all his bones in peices.⁷⁰

As in James's speech to Parliament of 1614, one feels that the pleasures of language compensate for the author's ill-treatment.

In early 1617, James's collected prose Workes were published in folio, following the sensational publication of Ben Jonson's Workes the year before.⁷¹ Explaining his decision to issue such an extensive collection, despite the problems his publications had caused when printed separately, James told the Stationers' Company that it was designed to counteract the effect of error-strewn unofficial editions of his texts, in which the 'royall meaneinge may be misinterpreted'.⁷² Although in James's case this excuse for publishing may be more than mere convention, it is difficult to believe that he really expected the Workes to have this corrective effect, having unsuccessfully attempted the same strategy with Basilicon Doron.⁷³ It seems more likely that James had decided that since both his kingly and his scholarly writings had escaped from his control into the hands of over-enthusiastic readers, he might as well continue to enjoy the satisfaction of seeing his words in print.⁷⁴

When James Montagu, the editor of the Workes, came to write the preface, he felt it necessary to reply to the arguments of those who felt that the king was subjecting himself to undesirable criticism. He remarked:

But while I am collecting workes one way, I heare others scattering wordes as fast an other way, affirming, it had beene better his Maiestie had neuer written any Bookes at all; and being written, better they had perished with the

present, like Proclamations, then haue remayned to Posterity: For say these Men, Little it befits the Maiesty of a King to turne Clerke, and to make a warre with the penne, that were fitter to be fought with the Pike... For a King, say they, to enter a Controuersie with a Scholler, is, as if he should fight a Combate with a Kerne; he doth no more descend from his Honour in the one, then he bringes vpon himselfe Disgrace by the other. And since that Booke-writing is growen into a Trade; It is as dishonorable for a King to write bookes; as it is for him to be a Practitioner in a Profession. If a King will needs write; Let him write like a King, euery Lyne a Law, euery Word a Precept, euery Letter a Mandate.⁷⁵

Montagu himself seems to have felt rather uneasy about the way in which James has given readers the opportunity to criticise the king; his rebuttal of these charges is feeble, arguing that the example of God writing the Law justifies James's literary activities. He admits, in fact, that:

so long as there are diuersity of Opinions, there will neuer want matter for Confutations: And in these Replications the person of a King is more exposed and lyes more open, then the person of a poore Scholler can doe; for as he is a farre greater marke, so he may farre more easily be hit.⁷⁶

Montagu is ultimately forced to recognise that the king's excursions into controversial writing were jeopardising his royal authority.⁷⁷

¹For a chronological overview of James's literary activities, see Appendix One.

²John Esten Keller, Alfonso X, El Sabio, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967

³Craigie (1950), [1]; see Arthur H. Williamson, Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI: The Apocalypse, the Union and the Shaping of Scotland's Public Culture, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1979, 40.

⁴Jenny Wormald, Court, Kirk, and Community: Scotland 1470-1625, Edward Arnold, 1981, 150

⁵Sir Philip Sidney praises 'King James of Scotland' as a modern poet in An Apologie for Poetrie, London: f. Henry Olney, 1595, STC 22534, sig. I2^v; this may well be James I rather than James VI - see Westcott (1911), lv.

⁶See M. H. Armstrong Davison, The Casket Letters: A Solution to the Mystery of Mary Queen of Scots and the Murder of Lord Darnley, Vision Press Ltd., 1965, and Gordon Donaldson, Mary Queen of Scots, English Universities Press Ltd., 1974, 112-15. More of Mary's writings, including her 'Essay on Adversity', and information about a lost book of advice she compiled for her son, can be found in Mrs P. Stewart-MacKenzie Arbuthnot (ed.), Queen Mary's Book: A Collection of Poems and Essays by Mary Queen of Scots, London: George Bell & Sons, 1907. A good modern edition of the poems is Robin Bell (transl. & ed.), Bittersweet Within my Heart: The Collected Poems of Mary, Queen of Scots, Pavilion Books, 1992.

⁷See Leicester Bradner (ed.), The Poems of Queen Elizabeth I, Providence: Brown University Press, 1964; G. B. Harrison, (ed.), The Letters of Queen Elizabeth, Cassell & Co., 1935.

⁸Ashton (1969), 140

⁹On the anonymity of the work, see Craigie (1955), xxv.

¹⁰[James VI & I], The Essayes of a Prentise, Edinburgh [*sic*]: b. Thomas Vautroullier, 1584, STC 14373, sig. A3^v-C1^r

¹¹Essayes (1584), sig. M2^v

¹²For a reassessment of Buchanan's humanist theories of kingship, see Roger A. Mason, 'Rex Stoicus: George Buchanan, James VI and the Scottish Polity', in John Dwyer, Roger A. Mason and Alexander Murdoch (eds.), New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland, Edinburgh: John Donald, n.d., 9-33. Jenny Wormald suggests that James's 'absolutist' theories were developed in opposition to the hardline Presbyterians rather than against Buchanan's philosophy; see Brown [Wormald], 1973, pp. 24+

¹³See Ernst H. Kantorowicz, The King's Two Bodies: a study in Mediæval Political Theology, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957; also Kevin Sharpe's interesting but rather unhistorical essay 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of James VI and I', in John Morrill, Paul Slack & Daniel Woolf (eds.), Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England - Essays presented to G.E.Aylmer, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, 77-100; also Sommerville (1996), 183.

¹⁴James VI & I, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΟΞΟΝ, Edinburgh: b. Robert Waldegrave, 1603, STC 14349, sig. K3^r; also in Craigie (1944), 183, where the texts of British Library MS. Royal 18.B.xv and Waldegrave's 1599 edition (STC 14348) are printed in juxtaposition with the text of STC 14349.

¹⁵There is a rather different discussion of James's attempts to distinguish between kingly and private writing in my 'Gender and Textual Discourse in the Works of King James VI and I', M.A. dissertation, University of Durham, 1996, 23-6.

¹⁶sig. K3^{r-v}; Craigie (1944), 183-5

¹⁷Dr Julian Goodare suggests that there are *three* modes of discourse relevant to this disussion, writing as a private scholar, writing as a king who wishes to make a position publicly known, and issuing royal *commands* which must be obeyed without question. It could be said that in the passage from Basilicon Doron in which James is discussing the king's spoken words, he is contrasting scholarly utterances with *commands*, whereas in the passage dealing with the written word, he is contrasting private writing with texts in the second category. However, it is not at all clear that James makes the distinction between hypothetical categories two and three clear in Basilicon Doron, although his letters suggest that in practice he did observe it. This may be another blind spot in Basilicon Doron's theorising.

¹⁸sig. K3^v-K4^v; Craigie (1944), 185-7. James's ideas about reading and writing in these passages appear to be derived, in part, from the first book of Baldassare Castiglione's The Courtier (see Thomas Hoby's translation, ed. Walter Raleigh, publ. David Nutt, 1900, 64-6). James is known to have owned copies of The Courtier; see Craigie (1950), 83.

¹⁹For the history of the writing and printing of Basilicon Doron, see Craigie (1950), 1-38.

²⁰See Goldberg (1983 [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989]), 119.

²¹James VI & I, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΟΞΟΝ, Edinburgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, 1599, STC 14348

²²The Diary of Mr. James Melvill, 1556-1601, Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1829, 294-5

²³sig. bb2^r; Craigie (1944), 20

²⁴There are several extant copies of unauthorised printings of Basilicon Doron, including one printed by Edward Alde, who incurred the wrath of the Court of Star Chamber (Craigie, 1950, 23-26, 149). More recently, an entirely new printing was discovered in the 1970s; the copy in the National Library of Scotland at shelfmark RB.s.516 is the only copy of Basilicon Doron which claims to have been printed at 'Edenbvrgh' by 'Henry Charteris' in 1603. The text is accurately transcribed from the official edition, but the printing is poor, and a strong case has been made for the work having been printed abroad by a printer who did not usually produce English books (see note inside this copy). STC records this new edition as STC 14349.5.

²⁵sig. B2^v-B3^r; Craigie (1944), 13

²⁶Craigie (1950), 105-110

²⁷sig. bb3^v; Craigie (1944), 22

²⁸See Wormald (1991).

²⁹James VI & I, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΟΞΟΝ, London: b. Felix Kyngston f. John Norton, 1603, STC 14350, (entered 28 March 1603, Liber C, f. 93^v)

³⁰[James VI & I], The Trve Lawe of free Monarchies, Edinbvrgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, 1598, STC 14409; [James VI & I], The Trve Lawe of Free Monarchies, London: b. T. C[reede], 1603, STC 14410, (entered 3 April 1603, Liber C, f. 94^f). See Wormald (1991), 51-2. One example is William Willymat's A Loyal Svbiects Looking-Glasse, London: b. G. Elde f. Robert Boulton, 1604, STC 25760, (entered 27 June 1604, Liber C, f. 111^f), which draws heavily on The True Lawe, which had been republished in London on James's accession to the throne. Willymat, who had also put Basilicon Doron into verse (see Chapter Four), argues for the need for subjects to submit to the king, citing and paraphrasing James's work to support his arguments.

³¹James VI & I, The Kings Maiesties Speach, London: b. Robert Barker, 1604, STC 14390.3, sig. D2^v-[D3^f]; also in The Workes, London: b. Robert Barker & John Bill, 1616/7, STC 14344, sig. Tt3^r; also in Sommerville (1994), 146; see Doelman, 'Reception', (1994), 5.

³²sig. B2^v; Sommerville (1994), 136. There are many possible sources for this imagery, including a poem by Thomas More, whose Latin title translates as 'On the Good King and His People', in which the king is described as a head, his subjects as a body (Richard S. Sylvester (ed.), St. Thomas More: The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1976, 141).

³³For the background to this speech, James's attempts to introduce the name of Great Britain into official terminology, see S. T. Bindoff, 'The Stuarts and their Style', English Historical Review 60 (1945), 192-216.

³⁴See Goldberg (1983 [1989]), 113-63. Goldberg makes much of James's references to glass and mirrors, as part of his attempt to prove that James's language reveals the contradictions of absolutism. There is some truth in this, but Goldberg pays no attention to James's relationship with his real readers, or to the development of James's language during his reigns.

³⁵For the Parliament of 1610, see Wallace Notestein, The House of Commons 1604-1610, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971

³⁶James VI & I, The Kings Maiesties Speach, London: Robert Barker, 1609/10, STC 14396, sig. A2^{r-v}; also in Sommerville (1994), 179

³⁷sig. II^{r-v}; also in Sommerville (1994), 203

³⁸Desiderius Erasmus, transl. Betty Radice, Praise of Folly and Letter to Martin Dorp, 1515, Penguin, 1971, 67

³⁹1 Corinthians 13:12; Act IV, Scene I

⁴⁰For the metaphor of the mirror in Jacobean drama, see Stephen Orgel, The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975, 59-60.

⁴¹James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, Douglas Denon Heath (eds.), The Works of Francis Bacon, new edition, Vol. 3, London: Longmans & Co. et al, 1870, 473-4

⁴²Sommerville (1994), 181

⁴³Elizabeth Read Foster (ed.), Proceedings in Parliament 1610, New Haven: Yale University Press, Vol. 1, 1966, 44-52; Vol. 2, 1966, 59-63; see note on 59.

⁴⁴Sommerville (1994), 190

⁴⁵Edmund Sawyer (ed.), Memorials of State... from the original papers of... Sir Ralph Winwood, Vol. 3, London: b. W. B. f. T. Ward, 1725, sig. 201^r

⁴⁶Sommerville (1994), 181

⁴⁷Akrigg (1974-5), 128

⁴⁸See Chapter Three.

⁴⁹Foster (1966), Vol. 1, 88

⁵⁰For a traditional Marxist summary of James's failure to work with the English Parliament, and the consequent isolation of the monarchy from English society, see Perry Anderson, Lineages of the Absolutist State, London: NLB, 1974, 137-8.

⁵¹Writing to Sir Ralph Winwood, from London, 24 May 1610, in Norman Egbert McClure (ed.), The Letters of John Chamberlain, Vol. 1, Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939, 301.

⁵²Cobbett (1806), 1149-1150; another version is in Maija Jansson, Proceedings in Parliament 1614 (House of Commons), Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988, 13-19

⁵³James VI & I, Daemonologie, London: [b. R. Bradock] f. William Aspley & W. Cotton, 1603, STC 14365, (entered 17 March 1597/8, Liber C, f. 31^v, and 3 April 1603, Liber C, f. 94^r); A Fruitefull Meditation... laying open of the 7. 8. 9. and 10. verses of the 20. chap. of the Revelation, [London: b. R. Read] f. John Harrison, 1603, STC 14377; A Meditation upon the xxv. xxvi. xxvii. xxviii. and xxix. verses of the xv. Chapter of the first Booke of the Chronicles, London: f. Felix Norton, 1603, STC 14381; A Covnter-Blaste to Tobacco, London: b. R[obert]. B[arker]., 1604, STC 14363

⁵⁴The best modern collection of James's writings on the oath of allegiance is in McIlwain (1918). McIlwain's analysis of the background to the controversy on xv-cxi is excellent, as is that in J. H. M. Salmon, The French Religious Wars in English Political Thought, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, 69-79.

⁵⁵James VI & I, Triplici Nodo, Triplex Cuneus. Or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, London: b. Robert Barker, 1607/8, STC 14400; in Sommerville (1994), 85-131; McIlwain (1918), 71-109.

⁵⁶The British Library copy is at shelfmark C.45.d.23(1); see Birrell (1987), 27. Birrell describes the alterations as 'purely mechanical', which is not entirely accurate; see sig. A3^r, C1^v, K1^r, M1^v.

⁵⁷James VI & I, A Premonition of his Maiesties to all most mightie Monarches, London: b. Robert Barker, 1609, STC 14401-14402

⁵⁸STC 14402, sig. a4^v; in McIlwain (1918), 111

⁵⁹Bellarmino seems to have known how to needle James, and his revelation that James had written a letter to the Pope in 1599 touched a most sensitive point; see James's letter to the Council of 17 October 1608, in Akrigg (1984), 301-4.

⁶⁰McIlwain (1918), 115

⁶¹McIlwain (1918), 116

⁶²[Thomas Birch] (ed.), The Court and Times of James the First, Vol. 1, f. Henry Colburn, 1849, 91

⁶³See John L. Lievsay, 'Paolo Sarpi's Appraisal of James I', in Heinz Bluhm (ed.), Essays in History and Literature: Presented by Fellows of the Newberry Library to Stanley Pargellis, Chicago: Newberry Library, 1965, 109-117. For James's difficulties in getting even the usually enthusiastic Venetians to welcome A Premonition, see Akrigg (1984), 312-3.

⁶⁴James Gretser, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ, sive Commentarius Exegeticus, Ingolstadtii: 1610; see Craigie (1950), 181. For an abusive work, see Is. Casaboni Corona Regia, [abroad], 1615, STC 4744.7, probably by Cornelius Breda; see Willson, 1956, reprinted 1962, 238-9; Sommerville (1991), 59-60.

⁶⁵[George Marcelline], The Triumphs of King James, [London: b. W. Jaggard] f. John Budge, 1610, STC 17309, (entered 11 June 1610, Liber C, f. 196^v), sig. [E4^r]

⁶⁶[Benjamin] Carier, A Treatise, n. p., [English Secret Press], 1614, STC 4623.5, sig. F1^v

⁶⁷For the extraordinary scale of this and related controversies, see the works listed in Peter Milward, Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age, London: Scolar Press, 1978, 89-136. See also Thomas H. Clancy, Papist Pamphleteers: the Allen-Persons Party and the Political Thought of the Counter-Reformation in England, 1572-1615, Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1964, 79-106; John Bossy, 'The English Catholic Community 1603-1625', in Smith (1973), 91-105; Johann Peter Sommerville, 'Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance', PhD thesis, Cambridge, 1981.

⁶⁸The work was originally published in French in 1615, and a note in the French editions states that the French Protestant Pierre du Moulin had complied with James's request 'de donner quelque polisseure au langage François' [to give some polish to the French language] (James VI & I, Declaration du Serenissime Roy, Londres: par Iehan Bill, 1615, STC 14367, sig. [Q4^r]); see Sommerville (1994), xxxiv-xxxv. (For the claim that du Moulin's contribution to the work was more substantial, see Lucien Rimbault, Pierre du Moulin 1568-1658 - Un Pasteur Classique à l'âge Classique: Étude de Théologie Pastorale sur des documents inédits, Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1966, 76-7). This was then translated into English by Richard Betts; see Milward (1978), 128-31, & STC. The involvement of so many writers may have something to do with the unusual literary features it displays; for once Willson (1944) is right in saying that James made extensive use of other authors, but James did not attempt to conceal this, and the result is in many ways a triumph of collaborative activity. I discuss this work in more detail in Marshall (1996), 24-5.

⁶⁹James VI & I, A Remonstrance...for the Right of Kings, Cambridge: b. Cantrell Legge, 1616, STC 14369, (entered 10 June 1616, Liber C, f. 272^v), sig. C1^v.

⁷⁰sig. Gg1^r. This passage is among those praised by C. J. Sisson as an example of James's imagery at its finest, in 'King James the First of England as Poet and Political Writer', Seventeenth Century Studies presented to Sir Herbert Grierson, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938, 47-63. But it may have more to do with Richard

Betts: in the French version, the relevant passage is much shorter: 'Les Rois ne sont pas comme les chats qui jettés d'un lieu haut tombent tousjours sur leurs pieds' [Kings are not like cats, who when thrown from a high place always fall on their feet] (STC 14367, sig. N2^r). It would be useful to know if Betts's translation into English was based on an earlier version made by James.

⁷¹Ben Jonson, Workes, London: b. Will Stansby, 1616, STC 14751

⁷²Letter of 25 June 1616, in William A. Jackson (ed.), Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1602 to 1640, Bibliographical Society, 1957, 356.

⁷³The authorial convention of justifying publication by referring to the need to correct unauthorised editions is discussed by H. S. Bennett, in English Books & Readers 1558 to 1603: being a study in the history of the book trade in the reign of Elizabeth I, Cambridge: CUP, 1965, 19-26, and in English Books & Readers 1603 to 1640: being a study in the history of the book trade in the reigns of James I and Charles I, Cambridge: CUP, 1970, 10-12.

⁷⁴Gordon Donaldson argues, perhaps with some exaggeration, that in his later years James 'was too secure to feel much need either to issue propaganda or to curb that of his critics' (1965, 216).

⁷⁵Workes, (1616/7), sig. b2^v

⁷⁶sig. d1^v

⁷⁷The possibility that James's use of words to uphold his authority created the conditions for its subversion is considered in Kevin Sharpe's excellent essay, 'The King's Writ: Royal Authors and Royal Authority in Early Modern England', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds.), Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England, Macmillan, 1994, 117-138. Sharpe discusses Montagu's defence of the Workes on pp. 124-5.

Chapter Two: Challenging the King's Words, 1618-24¹

I. The breakdown in the relationship between James and his readers, 1618-1621

Soon after the publication of the 1617 Workes, James's writings begin to reflect a new awareness that something was wrong in his relationship with his readers, displaying a surprising distrust of literary activity, and talking of bringing his career as an author to a close. His A Meditation upon the 27. 28. 29. verses of the xxvii. chapter of Saint Matthew, subtitled 'A Paterne for a Kings Inauguration', was written in 1619 as a kind of new Basilicon Doron, for Prince Charles. Charles had become James's heir after the death in 1612 of Prince Henry, the original intended recipient of Basilicon Doron, and James seems to have felt it necessary to produce a new guide to kingship for the very different personality of Charles. Henry had never lived up to the expectations expressed in Basilicon Doron that a prince should be a good scholar as much as a man of action, but his loss had still been widely lamented, partly because he espoused the anti-Spanish, militarist policies which James was so disinclined to follow.² One wonders whether James wrote this new work in an attempt to give the new heir a new start, and to prevent people from continuing to make comparisons between Charles and his dead brother. Unlike Basilicon Doron, however, it is not an optimistic or encouraging work.

Basilicon Doron was apparently written while James was sick and anticipating death, but in the more sombre Meditation James dwells even more seriously on his son's imminent accession, and on the ambiguous legacy Charles is to

receive, including his father's books:

To your brother, now with God, I dedicated my ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ, wherein I gave him my advice anent the government of Scotland in particular. This is but a short preparative for a Kings inauguration, and a little forewarning of his great and heavy burthen: it is soone read and easily caried, make it therefore your vade mecum, to prepare you, and put you in a habit for that day, which I dare sweare, you will never wish for...³

The description of the relationship between the ruler and his subjects which follows is quite different to that in the more relaxed Basilicon Doron. James explicates the sufferings of Christ in the hands of Pilate in relation to the responsibilities which kings must endure, finding parallels between the ironic manner in which the Roman soldiers had honoured Christ, and the way in which the splendours of monarchy entail personal suffering.

In several instances, the analogy seems strained, even blasphemous, particularly when James speaks of the succession in language that recalls the resurrection. Speaking of the popularity a good king can expect to enjoy, James writes:

And then he shal never need to doubt of that happy and willing acclamation of his people, with an Ave Cæsar, or haile King, (which was mentioned in this paterne) not only to beginne at his entrie to the croune, but even to accompanie him all the dayes of his life thereafter: and when they have bedewed and washed his grave with their teares, his posteritie to bee well-comed by them, as a bright and sunne-shining morning after a darke and gloomie night.⁴

James does not make this analogy more explicit, as he has done with other features of the crucifixion story, perhaps out of religious sensitivity, perhaps because he was dimly aware that Charles would not find it so easy to win the liking of his people. It is a curious fact that on the morning of King Charles's execution, the prescribed lesson for morning prayer was, to Charles's surprise and pleasure, Matthew 27.⁵ In

any case, the dark night, almost prophetically, ends James's testament to the future King Charles I.

James had the work printed in 1620, with a brief address to the public reader; again, there is something strange in the tone:

I have made this as a short forewarning to my Sonne, that hee may in time prepare himself for the bargaine and study his craft; that if it shall please God by course of nature to bring him to it, (which I pray God he may) he may not make his entrie in it like a raw Spanish Bisogno: but rather like an old souldier of a trayned band, that needes no prompting nor direction to teach him how to use his armes. So as mine end in this, is rather a warning then an instruction unto him. And so farewell.⁶

James leaves his readers with the assurance that Charles has been fore-warned, and fore-armed, about what he can expect from them. This bitter note is quite unusual in James's texts; even when writing as a king, giving orders through proclamations or official letters, he rarely displays such an attitude of suspicion towards his readers. Basilicon Doron, though apparently written as a private testament to Prince Henry, is highly accessible and can easily be read as if it had been written with a wider audience in mind. It is significant that this new royal gift seems designed to shut out the public; even the short note to the reader cited above is focused on Charles, glancing obliquely at his future subjects.

The new mood of distrust is probably linked to a wider political crisis than that caused by the death of Prince Henry, although there does seem to have been a popular feeling that Henry might have been of great use in checking what were perceived to be James's foolish policies.⁷ Until recently, research tended to treat the crisis of 1618-24 as a preface to the breakdown in 1637-1642, but now there are a number of excellent accounts of the period which can be consulted for a more



detailed narrative.⁸ The outbreak of war in Germany, and the spectacular gains being made by Catholic Spanish and Austrian armies, was of special concern in England as the leader of the Protestant princes was married to King James's beloved daughter Elizabeth. It was popularly expected that England would intervene, particularly in view of the fact that her historic enemy, Spain, was one of the main combatants.⁹ Even before his accession to the English throne, James had vigorously promoted the apocalyptic myth of England's mission to uphold the reformed faith. James had written (and published) a sonnet in celebration of the defeat of the Armada in 1588.¹⁰ Indeed, many of the texts collected in the Workes were strongly anti-Catholic, and at times they referred to the prophecies in Revelation which James interpreted to mean that the Church of Rome would be overthrown by a coalition of Christian princes.

However, in practice James was determined to uphold his motto 'Beati Pacifici'. In 1618, to commemorate James's fiftieth year as a king, a work entitled The Peace-Maker: Or, Great Brittaines Blessing had appeared, probably written in part by Thomas Middleton, but showing clear signs of James's active involvement.¹¹ The work opens with an address 'To all Our true-loving and Peace-embracing subjects', and proceeds to advocate the advantages of peace, in both domestic and foreign affairs. There is a strong awareness of the growing threat to peace, and of the popular enthusiasm for a war, which this work tries to counter by fulsomely describing the blessings of peace and the curse of war. This work seems to have been designed to prepare James's readers for the stance he was about to adopt. When war actually came about, James tried to avoid getting involved. Not only did he refuse to send more than a token contingent of soldiers to Germany, but he opened

negotiations with Catholic Spain in the hope that a diplomatic solution could be arranged, probably involving the marriage of Prince Charles to the Spanish Infanta. To many, James appeared to be proposing to negotiate with Antichrist: it was rumoured that he had converted to Roman Catholicism.

This was certainly unfair; in earlier texts, produced in different circumstances, James had been happy to explore the idea that the Pope was Antichrist, as the theory seemed a good explanation of the divisions between the churches, and made his readers enthusiastic about the established church over which he was supreme governor.¹² In the volatile international situation of the 1620s, the rhetoric of Knox did not seem to him so appropriate.¹³ Anthony Milton describes how James tried to reinterpret his own anti-papal works in the interests of international diplomacy.¹⁴ However, by fixing his words in print, and enshrining them in the Workes, James had given readers the opportunity to judge his actions against his writings. James's texts had been widely interpreted to mean that he seriously believed that the Church of Rome should be destroyed, and unfortunately James had never discouraged this interpretation. Surely the king could no more change his mind expressed in his words than God could repudiate the Bible? The agonised language of Thomas Scott's Vox Regis, which seems to have appeared in 1624, is representative of many pamphlets printed between 1618 and 1624.¹⁵ Scott tries to convince himself that the words and works of kings must always be consonant, even if appearances are against them:

And if their words & works seem to differ, it is to those who ought to be held in suspence. But to their own, their words & works speake one language, and they strive to resemble him whose substitutes they are, *Who spake & it was done*:... Whereas therefore his most excellent Majesty hath referd us, his poore

subjects, to the reading of his bookes for the sincerity of his heart in point of Religion; because some actions of his, either did (as he heard) or might (as he thought) give occasion of suspicion and jealousie to some, who looked as it were asquint, or with purblind eies upon them. I doe assure my selfe it can be no presumption in me for my owne and other mens resolution, to observe his words, and to reade his writings, therby to learn to know him perfectly & to expect without doubt the accomplishment of his promises. For his words and writings are published to this end and called his *Works*, because they should be turned into workes. For as it implyes weaknesse to haue workes resolved into words: so it expresseth strength to haue words sublimated into works, as the words of potent Princes use to be, or ought to be.¹⁶

Scott goes on to quote James's Remonstrance...for the Right of Kings (1615), in which James had commented on the danger of kings making unworthy contracts.¹⁷ Was the Spanish match not such a contract, and did not the people have the right to remind James of what he had said? As has been shown, this was not the first time that readers had tried to make the king conform to their interpretations of his words, but this was the first time that there had been such a clear contradiction between James's actions and the popular understanding of his intentions as contained in his printed works. Readers like Scott had certainly misinterpreted James's texts, in line with the tendency to take his rhetoric too literally, discussed by Jenny Wormald.¹⁸ However, it seems that a significant number of James's English readers agreed with these mis-readings, and they would not accept a different James to the one they imagined was contained in his Workes. It becomes a little easier to understand James's interest in the sufferings of Christ at the hands of the Jews in the Meditation: the king's people eagerly awaited his actions, but when the king appeared he was not what they expected. Refusing to abandon their reading of the texts which they understood to promise a military redeemer, they were prepared to persecute their king as a rebel against his own word.¹⁹

II. The Parliament of 1621: communication in crisis

When Parliament assembled in 1621, it was widely hoped that James would announce a change of policy, and the burden of expectations placed on his opening speech must have been considerable.²⁰ Instead, however, James confronted directly the fact that people were interpreting his past words in a way that hampered his actions. In the past, James had tried to check unwanted readings by reiterating what he had said, but now he seems to have felt that he could only regain his authority by denigrating the royal words which his audience had used to such advantage. With considerable rhetorical flourish, James repudiated a lifetime of trying to wield power through the pen:

In multi loquio non deest peccatum said the wisest king and man that ever was, Solomon; and the experience of this have I found in my own person upon occasion in this same place, for it is true that in many sessions of divers parliaments before this I have made many long discourses, especially to the gentlemen of the House of Commons, and to them have I delivered, as I myself have said, a true mirror of my mind and free thoughts of my heart. → But as no man's actions, be he never so good, are free from sin, being a mortal, sinful creature, so some through a spice of envy have made all my speech heretofore turn like spittle against the wind upon mine own face and contrary to my expectation, so that I may truly say with our Saviour, I have often piped unto you and you have not danced, I have mourned and you have not lamented. This hath made me more fully to resolve that for these few days, if God grant me more, I never mean to weary myself nor you, with such tedious discourses as I have done heretofore.²¹

James recognised that the way his words were being quoted against the Spanish match was a development from the misreadings and misuse of his speeches and declarations in previous years. Previously, James had felt that the advantages of communicating with his subjects, and the pleasures of artistic creativity, outweighed

the disadvantages of these misinterpretations. This time, however, the balance had clearly tipped too far.²² In the crisis over the Spanish match, James had for the first time experienced a mass refusal to cooperate with his words, and found that there was little he could do about it. Whether James's heart was in this recantation is doubtful, but he had to give his audience the impression that the king was not interested in hearing his own words thrown back at him, and that the royal word was no longer to be misused like secular Scripture.

The fact that it would be difficult for James to change his practice of kingship, in which the written and spoken word was so important, is suggested by the fact that he still needed a speech to announce that he would make no more such speeches. John Chamberlain displays an amused awareness of the paradoxical situation in which James found himself:

His speach lasted above an howre though he commended brevitie very much, but he had so many heads to passe thorough that he could not be short. We expect yt in print, though (by that I have heard) there are divers passages in yt that perswade the contrarie, or at least are like to be omitted.²³

However, it does not in fact appear to have been printed. Whether James was moved by the considerations suggested by Chamberlain or not, it does seem that the king's new-found distrust of his own words was not entirely feigned. It is worth recalling, as well, that he never issued another edition of his Workes after 1620, and that a volume of poems apparently dealing with events up to 1616 (British Library MS. Add. 24195), which James seems to have been preparing for publication, was ultimately left in manuscript until this century.²⁴

James seems to have thought deeply about the nature of power, and the language of power, during the first session of Parliament in 1621. In a political

climate transformed by the resurgence of Catholic imperialism, Parliament turned out to be fiercely critical and suspicious of any apparent weakness in the king's policies. In February 1621, Parliament demanded more proclamations against priests, and more action to enforce obedience to proclamations, implying that up till now James's words had been inadequate. James replied by asserting that he had done everything in his power to suppress Catholicism, but pointed out that there were limitations on the power of the king, namely, the way the king's will was read when put into words. He described his involvement in the production of proclamations: 'Most of them myselfe doth dictate every word. Never any Proclamacion of State and wayght which I did not direct'. He had invested his words with as much authority as possible. Nevertheless, he could not invest them with any inherent compulsive power. 'If I make Proclamacions, I cannot exact an accompt of them as I may of those Ministers whome I employ'.²⁵ This is a reversal of the theory advanced in Basilicon Doron that a kingly text can act as the substitute for its author. In the preface to Prince Henry, James had introduced Basilicon Doron as 'a faithfull Præceptour and counsellor unto you: whiche, because my affaires will not permit me ever to be present with you, I ordaine to be a resident faithfull admonisher of you'.²⁶ Now, however, James suggests that this metaphor is inappropriate: words are not faithful servants, but simply a means of communication which could only work if the recipients were prepared to cooperate.

James went on to argue that if the king's words did not convince the hearer the first time, there was little point in wasting more breath: 'To make any publicacion against masses is to degrade the lawe [i.e. the law against the Mass

already in existence]. To what purpose should I publish that I am Kinge of England [?]. This last remark is of the utmost importance, as King Charles was to insist on his royal authority in proclamation after proclamation. His father recognises here that to repeat a declaration of absolute power is to weaken it, and to draw attention to the vulnerability of the royal word. As James had said in the Meditation upon...Matthew, speaking of the reed placed into Christ's hand by the Roman soldiers:

But this scepter put in the hand of Christ was a reede... thereby teaching Christian Kings that their scepters, which represent their authoritie, should not be too much used nor stretched, but where necessitie requires it. For many hard blowes given with a reede would make it quickly breake (as I have said) and wise Kings would be loth to put their prerogative upon the tenter-hooks, except a great necessity should require it.²⁷

Certainly, this is partly rhetoric; James is trying to make use of his sudden awareness of powerlessness by telling the Parliamentary critics of his pro-Spanish policies, who were eager to use James's words against him and to get him to produce more anti-Spanish declarations, that the king's words were not as efficacious as everyone had thought. However, it does seem that James had a genuine and uncomfortable suspicion that his literary practice in past years had been based on flawed theory.

Even so, as the speeches mentioned above suggest, James was still very much in love with language. As he became increasingly optimistic that Parliament would settle down and produce satisfactory legislation, he began to revert to more familiar modes of speaking. In a speech of 26 March 1621, James dealt with several grievances raised by Parliament, expressing his concern at reports of corruption in many parts of the administration. His arguments are conciliatory, even humble; but they are expressed in confident and striking metaphors:

And now I confesse, that when I looked before upon the face of the government, I thought (as every man would have done) that the people were never so happie as in my time. For even as at divers times I have looked upon many of my Coppices, riding about them, and they appeared on the outside very thicke and well growen unto me: but when I entered into the midst of them, I found them all bitter within, and full of plaines and bare spots, like an apple or peare, faire and smoothe without, but when ye cleave it asunder, yee finde it rotten at the heart: even so this Kingdome²⁸

James is clearly trying to speak as if he shared the popular mood of outrage at what appeared to be astonishing discoveries about the weaknesses in the English state which made it unfit for war against Spain. Having come to realise that his audience, whether of the House of Commons or of the reading public at large, was more important than he had previously imagined, James attempted to speak as if he were collaborating with his hearers. But although James has not yet returned to his former mode of kingly speaking, he is clearly not living up to his announcement in January that he was renouncing lengthy speeches.

In April, James obliged Parliament to listen to the following:

I have called you hither that I may make a recantation, not that I mean to recall or deny what I have spoken, but *recantare* to sing over the same to you again. I remember in my first speech I told you how I had a constant resolution not to trouble you with long speeches except at extraordinary times, as at the first coming to the parliament or last going from the same; and I shewed the reasons. But now I confess to my comfort and the comfort of all my good subjects that when I spake formerly it was with apprehension of fear how my speech would be taken. But now such hath been your behavior as that henceforth I shall speak with my heart.²⁹

This is a most perplexing speech, which points to the heart of James's dilemma: he still feels the need to assert the authority of the royal word, but he has realised that that authority is dependent on the compliance of his readers. Now that his audience in Parliament is apparently disposed to interpret his intentions favourably, James declares that both he and they can have confidence in his speeches once again.

However, this is again an admission of weakness and contradiction. The suggestion that James's words would only be an honest representation of his intentions when his readers were predisposed to submit to them can hardly have helped to persuade his audience to accept his words without trying to read behind them.

It was, furthermore, unwise to tantalise readers with visions of a desirable but hidden meaning at the time when the delicate negotiations over the Spanish match were requiring the government to make some very equivocal pronouncements about the future of the Protestant church.³⁰ If James had been able to restrain himself more fully, in line with his own revised understanding of language and communication, the Parliament might have felt able to discuss practical matters of finance and security rather than words and interpretations. As it was, Parliament spent more and more time discussing James's intentions, and in January 1622 James felt impelled to dissolve it.³¹ He then published his version of the breakdown, which dwelt on Parliament's wilful misreadings of his words in some detail.³² The break with Parliament, at a moment of such political crisis, caused great anxiety and rumour. During 1622, a number of pamphlets discussing or 'explaining' the king's real intentions, especially with regard to the Spanish match and the future of the Protestant church, began to circulate.

The situation cannot have been helped by the appearance of a work entitled Ragionamento fatto dal Re dèlla Gran Bertagna [sic] al Parlamento, supposedly an Italian version of a speech made by James to Parliament on 15 February 1622 (even allowing for dating according to the Gregorian calendar, the dissolution had already taken place).³³ In this subversive text, James is made to harangue Parliament in the

most arrogant fashion:

Signori, se ci fossimo proposti d'usar termini d'Oratore, potria essere, che adornaressimo questo Discorso di concetti e fiori; però come non pretendiamo di guadagnare fama d'eloquente, procureremo guadagnarla di magnanimo; non essendo altra la nostra intentione, se non monstrarci restauratori, protettori, e distendori de' nostri Regni, Dominii, e Signorie, e del nostro Popolo, cercando Noi di comunicar la nostra intentione, e volontà, non perche ci diate consiglio, ma perche vi regolate conforme quella, si che nessuno sia ardito di contradirci sotto pena della nostra disgratia, e d'esser dichiarato per ribelle, e complice di crimen læsa Majestatis, e così in virtù della nostra autorità, e potere, dichiariamo, e comandiamo quel che segue.³⁴

[Gentlemen, if we had intended to use the language of an orator, we would have embellished this discourse with conceits and flowers; however, as we do not desire to win a reputation for eloquence, we will seek to win a reputation for greatness. Our intention is no other than to show ourselves to be restorers, protectors and enlargers of our kingdoms, dominions, and seignories, and of our people; seeking to communicate our intention and our will, and not seeking your advice, but desiring rather that you should behave in conformity with our wishes. And let no-one dare contradict us, on pain of our disfavour, and of being declared a rebel and guilty of *lese-majesty*. So therefore in virtue of our authority and power, we declare and command that which follows.]

This is obviously not genuine, but the emphasis on communicating the royal will suggests that the writer was familiar with James's speeches, and it may have convinced some people that this really was by the king. James continues to announce that he has known all along that the Roman Catholic Church is true, and that Parliament is to proceed with emancipation of the Catholics. A neat touch is a comment, supposedly by an editor, which remarks:

Questa dichiarazione dichiarata per bocea propria del Rè, è porsa di dura digestione à quelli del Parlamento, però nello vo cuore hanno dissimulato, temendo incorrere nella disgratia del Rè.³⁵

[This declaration from the king's own mouth seemed to be swallowed by

Parliament with some difficulty, but they concealed their true feelings, fearing to incur the displeasure of the king.]

The work ends with an imprimatur which suggests that the compilers of the work intended its readers to believe that it was a foreign Catholic publication. Nevertheless, the claims of the title-page that the work was printed in Bologna for Nicolò Tebaldini are dubious. The work purports to be a translation from a Spanish version of the English text of the speech, originally printed 'in Londra per Hercule Francese'. Francese is otherwise unknown, and such a complex publishing history seems improbable. There are several possible explanations for the existence of this work: it could have been printed in London by a Catholic printer, perhaps at the instigation of the Spanish embassy, in order to create unrest in England which would make it more difficult for James to order military intervention on the continent. However, it is also possible that it was actually published by the pro-war, Puritan party, to encourage anger at the way in which foreign Papists were taking advantage of the king. At any rate, it can hardly have been welcome to James.³⁶ It was not simply that the king's words were being turned against him, but the various meanings his readers conceived him to have were being fleshed out in new texts. James's refusal to heed his own warnings had allowed for a whole generation of texts claiming the true possession of the royal meaning.

III. The Letter and Directions touching Preaching and Preachers (1622)

Only one more major work was published by James between 1621 and his death in 1625, and this is the Letter and Directions touching Preaching and Preachers of 1622. The fact that the main subject of this work is the problem of people criticising the king's words makes it an interesting conclusion to a long and difficult relationship between the royal author and his readers, as well as an immediate response to a critical political situation. The work has always been known to scholars, but a reliance on corrupt texts printed late in the seventeenth century has obscured the extent to which the early printed and manuscript versions reveal a complex series of exchanges between the royal author and his readers.³⁷ For like James's earlier works, this text's attempt to regain control of wayward readings of the king's words only succeeded in generating more undesirable interpretations and misinterpretations.

After the dissolution of Parliament in January 1622, James made it clear that he intended to continue negotiations with the Catholic powers, even though Protestant strongholds, frequently defended by English volunteers, were in grave danger. Opposition to his policies was increasingly voiced in public, despite proclamations in 1620 and 1621 warning people against such criticism.³⁸ It was perhaps unfortunate for James that 1620 had seen the birth of the English newspaper, which brought the latest details of Spanish advances to the attention of an excited and horrified reading public.³⁹ In 1622, the famous series of newsbooks published by Nathaniel Butter and Nicholas Bourne was to commence.⁴⁰ The most dangerous criticism, however, came from the established church.⁴¹ Many of the ministers (or

'lecturers') with special responsibility for preaching outside normal church services were inclined to the so-called Puritan wing of the church, which emphasised the need for political and social life to be infused with Christian values, and which was bitterly opposed to any compromise with 'Roman' doctrine or ceremony.⁴² They defied repeated warnings against bringing politics into their sermons, and spoke darkly of the horrors of apostasy.⁴³ With leading figures like John Preston involved in organising opposition to the court policies from within the church, the position of the Puritans was stronger than it had been since James's accession to the English throne.⁴⁴

In April, a furore was caused by a sermon preached in Oxford by one John Knight, who discussed the question of whether subjects might, in certain circumstances, take up arms against their sovereign, and unwisely concluded in the affirmative. When questioned, Knight argued that James's support for the Huguenots endorsed resistance theory, a dangerous position which would later be articulated by William Prynne.⁴⁵ Knight was imprisoned, and the universities were ordered to suppress the sermon and the works of Pareus on which it had supposedly been based.⁴⁶ The government was making every effort to promote sympathetic preachers, but as the sermon of one such preacher, Walter Curll, admitted, books which 'spare not, to spit their poyson in the face of Princes' were becoming increasingly common.⁴⁷ Just as the preachers felt James had betrayed the Protestant cause, so James felt that his church was rebelling against its supreme governor.

King James seems to have been particularly angered by the circumstances in which Marco Antonio de Dominis, the former Catholic Archbishop of Spalatro who

had defected to the Church of England, decided to return to Rome in early 1622. Spalatro's motives may have been more financial than theological, but his explanation that he could not believe the Church of England to be Catholic while Puritan preachers held such sway clearly touched a nerve with James.⁴⁸ In May 1622, James organised a conference with the leading Jesuit, John Fisher, known as Percy, in which the king explained his main objections to the Church of Rome.⁴⁹ This kind of ecumenism was a long way from the days of his writings during the Oath of Allegiance controversy. The proceedings of the conference, which had its immediate origin as a response to the attempts to convert Buckingham and his family to Catholicism, were meant to be kept secret, but one suspects that it contributed to the atmosphere of estrangement between king and people which developed in the summer of 1622. It was widely felt that the future of the church was in real jeopardy. News was awaited of the fate of the Protestant stronghold Heidelberg, and of the terms the Spanish would demand if the marriage was to proceed: further religious discontent could come at a dangerous moment.⁵⁰

On 2 August 1622, on James's instructions, the Lord Keeper, John Williams, wrote to the Circuit Judges to order the suspension of the recusancy laws, completing a process of gradual relaxation which had been underway ever since the marriage negotiations started.⁵¹ James's reign had seen periods in which Roman Catholics had been less rigorously treated, such as shortly after his accession to the English throne, but never before had England seen anything so close to religious toleration.⁵² From the point of view of the marriage negotiators, it was a necessary move, as the Pope would only permit a Catholic princess to marry a heretic if she and her servants could

attend Mass freely on English soil. Furthermore, James could hardly appeal to Catholic Spain to preserve Protestant rights in Germany while English law criminalised the practice of the Roman faith. However, James knew that an explosion of protest would follow. On 4 August, James wrote to George Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury, enclosing some new instructions for regulating preaching which Abbot was to transmit to all the bishops.⁵³ Although it has been suggested that William Laud or John Williams had a hand in writing the directions, the work displays the tensions and contradictions which characterised James's attempts to control the House of Commons in 1621.⁵⁴

The strategies in this work suggest a keen awareness of the importance to ensure its positive reception. However, James was hampered from the start by his consciousness of the fact that in this text it would not do to make his intentions crystal-clear; readers would not accept that he was more committed to international peace than to militant Protestantism. He had to persuade people that he was restricting the preachers in order to protect the reformed religion. James takes great pains to make it appear that these directions are nothing new, and that they have nothing whatsoever to do with the current political crisis. His letter begins by invoking a tradition of state control of preaching, stating that:

the abuses and extravagancies of preachers in the pulpit have beene in all times repressed in this Realme by some acte of Councill or State with the Advice and resolution of grave and learned prelates

James is trying to prepare the reader to accept his measures by suggesting that they are merely the latest in a long series of interventions by the state to regulate clerical activities. The idea that these interventions take place with the backing of the clergy

is designed to win support from the very people who were potentially his most dangerous critics. In a sense, it was true that the directions were not particularly innovative; it was the context of a divided church and the king's possible rapprochement with Rome which made them appear so new and threatening.⁵⁵ James goes on to explain specifically why preachers need regulation at this time. He states:

at this present divers yonge students by readinge of late Writers and ungrounded devines, doe broache many times unprofitable, unsound, seditious, and daungerous doctrines to the Scandall of this Church and disquietinge of the State and present government

James is trying to attack those who have criticised his innovative policies by arguing that they, in fact, are the ones introducing new and dangerous ideas.⁵⁶

The six new directions for preachers which follow display the same uneasy combination of conciliatory rhetoric and explosively confrontational argument. The first direction imposes limits on the way preachers expound on their text of scripture; they are not to use any 'set discourse or common place' illustration which is not found in the Thirty-Nine Articles or the Books of Homilies. This essentially bans preachers from commenting on political affairs. The second direction imposes even stricter limitations on the afternoon lectures, which were a focus for so-called Puritans. Preachers are restricted to preaching on the catechism, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed or the Ten Commandments, and strongly encouraged not to preach at all, but to examine children in the catechism instead. The third direction orders that no preacher of lower rank than a dean should

presume to preache in any populary auditory the deepe poynts of *Predestinacion Election Reprobacion* or of the *universality Efficacy Resistabillity or Irresistabillity of gods grace*; but leave these theames to be handled by learned men, and that moderately and modestly by way of use and

applicacion, rather then by way of positive doctrine as beinge fitter for the Schooles and universities then for simple auditories.

This is taking a huge swipe at the intellectualism of the Puritan preachers (it is difficult to imagine how anyone could be expected to discuss the *shallow* points of predestination). James was trying to stop preachers discussing controversial theological issues, as these would inevitably be used to attack the Church of Rome and, by implication, James's policies. The manuscript in the Public Record Office cited here, which appears to be a very early draft, suggests that James paid particular attention to this sensitive section. The words italicised above seem to be in a different hand, possibly that of the king himself.

The fourth direction touches on an issue even closer to James's heart.

Preachers are forbidden to discuss:

the power prerogative Jurisdiction Authoritie or Duty of Sovereigne princes, or otherwise meddle with these matters of State, and the references betweene princes and their people, then as they are instructed and presided in the Homily of Obedience, and in the rest of the homilies set forth as before is mencioned by public Authoritie but rather confine themselues wholly to those 2 heads of Faith and ~~obediencie~~ and good leife, which are all the subject of the auncient sermons and homilies.

Again, the manuscript suggests that James was unhappy about this section; the deleted word 'obediencie' probably sounded too overbearing. James was clearly very concerned to ensure that his readers did not think that his secular need for public order was at the root of the directions, and that they proceeded from purely religious motives. However, this passage fails to conceal the fact that James's dislike of public opposition was greater than his desire for preachers to stick to strictly theological subjects. One wonders, in fact, whether James might have done better to have stated openly that the directions were a response to the popular dislike of the Spanish

match. His secular motives were not fully concealed by the pious rhetoric, and the evident duplicity of the text would feed the rumours about James's conversion to Rome.

The directions become increasingly threatening. In the fifth direction, James orders:

That noe preacher of what title or denominacion soever shall causlesly and without invitation from the Text, fall into bitter Invectives and undecent raylinge speeches against the persons of either Papists or Puritanes, but modestly and gravely when they are occasioned thereunto by the Text of Scripture, free both the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England from the aspersiones of either adversary especially where the auditorie is suspected to be tainted with the one or the other infection.

Everyone knew that the critics of the Spanish marriage, against which the fourth direction is clearly aimed, were the Puritan party. In this direction, therefore, when James warns against preaching against 'either Papists or Puritans', he is really targeting anti-Catholic preaching. The reference to the Puritans is merely a token mention, an attempt to preserve the illusion that the directions are a traditional means of checking extremists on both sides of the church. As David Calderwood was to write later in the century, 'the Puritane is joyned with the Papist for a colour onlie'.⁵⁷ The sixth direction confirms that the conciliatory language of the letter and the earlier directions is essentially window-dressing. James explains that all ministers who wish to preach must have a licence. They must be recommended by their bishop, and this recommendation must be supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury and confirmed by the Great Seal of England. Only then might their application be considered in the Court of Faculties. If these directions were as strictly enforced as James commanded,

the preachers who had been delivering Sunday afternoon lectures for years would be silenced.

George Abbot was then given the unpleasant task of officially communicating and explaining these instructions to various leading figures, including the bishops, who were to transmit them to the rest of clergy. It was a neat move to make Abbot responsible for repressing the government's critics, as he was known to be deeply unhappy with the Spanish match, and considerably more sympathetic to the 'Puritan' lecturers than rising stars like William Laud.⁵⁸ Abbot's status within the establishment had been greatly reduced by his unfashionable political stance, coupled with his notorious accidental shooting of a man while out hunting in 1621: he was an opponent of James's policies, but a weak opponent, and one whom James believed could be dragooned into promoting the new directions.⁵⁹ However, his response to the text was to set a precedent for careful but critical readings. Abbot seems to have initially introduced the king's orders with a short letter, in which he states that the directions are designed to improve the quality of preaching, and to ensure that sermons take 'a religious forme, and not that every younge man, shall take unto himself an exorbitant libertie to teach what he listeth'.⁶⁰ This deflects attention from James's evident intentions to suppress the afternoon lectures altogether, and no doubt the king was reasonably satisfied.

However, as the new directions became known during the middle of August 1622, it became clear that many were neither satisfied with the king's text nor with Abbot's explanation. John Chamberlain, writing on 10 August, was one of many to connect the new directions with the suspension of the recusancy laws two days

earlier: the king spoke of the need to defend the reformed religion, while he was releasing Roman priests from prison.⁶¹ James had tried to conceal the political reasons for the directions under pious rhetoric: unfortunately people seem to have suspected that it was Roman piety speaking. On 26 August the Venetian Ambassador described an extraordinary situation, in rather prophetic terms:

From the enclosed copy your Serenity will see the manner in which his Majesty orders the release of the Catholics, of which I wrote before. It was also ordained, although this has not yet been executed, that the archbishop of Canterbury should forbid the preachers here to attack the Roman faith or enlarge upon any disputes and disagreements with the Catholic church. I hear that they also propose to confine to Sundays only the preaching which is now so frequent through the week. Although all these things afford great joy to the Catholics and seem to promise the marriage, they incense the others to a remarkable degree and may possibly sow the seeds of a civil war⁶²

A more sophisticated justification of the directions was needed; again Abbot was called on to write the bishops a more lengthy letter, which appeared in early September.⁶³ I have not found a holograph of this letter, and the circumstances of its composition are unclear. However, the work has several peculiarities that suggest it is a genuine work by Abbot, written under protest.⁶⁴

The writer says of the directions:

no godly or discreet man cann otherwise then acknowledge that they doe much tend to edificacion if he do not take then uppe upon report, but doe punctually consider the tenor of the words as they lye and do not give an ill construccion to that which may receive a faire interpretation

It is *possible* to give the directions a fair interpretation, but the writer cannot conceal the fact that reports of the directions were causing an uproar. He continues:

some few Churchmen and manie of the people have sinisterly conceiued, as wee here find, that those instruccions do tend to the restraints of the exercise of preachinge and doe in some sorte abate the number of Sermons and so consequentlie by degrees, do make a breach to let in ignorance and superstition.

Perhaps Abbot is trying to suppress the reading that he himself had made. He then gives a lengthy explanation for James's actions, which is quite different from that given in James's own part of the text:

his Majestie being much trouble [*sic*] and greved at the heart to heare every day of so many defections from our Religion both to poperie and Anabaptisme, or other points of separacion in some parts of this Kingdome and considering with much admiracion what might be the cause thereof especially in the reigne of such a Kinge, who doeth so constantly professe himselfe an open adversarie to the superstition of the one and madnesse of the other, his princely wisdome could fall uppon noe one greater probabilitie, than the lightenes, affectedfnes [*sic*] and unprofitableness of that kind of preachinge which hath bin of late yeares to much taken up in Court Universitie Citie and Countrey.

This is much more reasonable and convincing than James's alternate appeals to traditional devotion and warnings against political sedition. The aware reader, moreover, would have noticed an ironic subtext. By describing James as a king 'who doeth so constantly professe himselfe an open adversarie to the superstition of the one', meaning Popery, Abbot may be getting a small revenge for James's attempt to make it seem that Abbot was on his side. In fact, James's open hostility towards Catholicism was currently in doubt as much as Abbot's sympathy for the Spanish marriage.

The writer continues the 'explanation' by describing the main faults in contemporary preachers:

The usuall scope of verie many preachers is noted to be a soaringe up in points of Divinity to deepe for the Capacitie of the people or a mustring up of much reading or displayinge of their owne witt or an ignorant meddling with Civill matters, aswell in the private of seavrall [*sic*] parishes and Corporacions as in the publique of the Kingdome or a venting of their owne distastes or a smoothing uppe of those idle fancies which in this blessed time of so longe a peace doe boyle in the braines of unadvised people.

The reference to 'this blessed time of so longe a peace' is potentially highly satirical, as Abbot and many others felt that the time was not blessed, but cursed by James's refusal to consider military intervention on the Continent.⁶⁵ The speaker in an important anonymous complaint against James's pusillanimous foreign policy, Tom Tell Troath, which seems to have been circulating in 1621-2, remarks 'I feare wee have too much cause to complaine of your Majesties unlimited Peace'.⁶⁶ Many felt that James's enthusiasm for peace had made the English, who had been frequently at war under Elizabeth, soft and decadent, and resented King James's reluctance to imitate his virgin warrior predecessor.⁶⁷ The writer of the letter is replying to James's argument that preachers were discussing matters that did not directly contribute to the salvation of their flocks by suggesting that it is James's cowardly policies that had given people leisure to think about forbidden things. The vigour of the language, in fact, makes one wonder whether he has James's directions in mind when he criticises those who tackle matters they do not fully understand.

The writer then takes James's second direction, which clearly intended the suppression of afternoon lectures, and reads it to imply something quite different. He writes:

And so farre are these direccions from abating; that his Maiestie doth expect att our hands, that it should increase the number of sermons by renewinge uppon every Sunday in the afternoone in all parishes throughout the Kingdome that primitive and most profitable exposition of the Catechisme

The writer claims that the restrictions on preachers' subject-matter will actually result in more sermons, in order to communicate the catechism. It looks as though Abbot was trying to save the lectures, using his task of defending the directions by producing an interpretation of them which severely restricted James's actions. In

view of this, it is possible to read Abbot's first letter, in which he claimed that James wanted to improve preaching, not simply as rhetoric designed to mask the king's purpose, but as a strategy for making James submit to the reading of his work which he had asked Abbot to perform.

Certainly, Abbot's letters do not seem to have made it any easier for James to impose the directions. Joseph Mead, writing on 14 September, describes how Abbot's second letter had in fact made people more aware of the lack of support for the Spanish match at court:

There is another letter from the archbishop to all the bishops, concerning both a complaint of the misunderstanding of the former directions for preaching, and an explication and further declaration, both of the occasion and his majesty's intendment by them. It should seem by it, that there had been great talk and strange construction somewhere. Dr. Donne preaches at Paul's tomorrow, either to that purpose, to give satisfaction, or, as the Londoners talk, to teach men how to preach there hereafter; because the two last, Mr. Clayton, of Fulham, and Dr. Sheldon, went beyond the usual limit, as was thought; for which Clayton is in prison, but Sheldon was only checked. Clayton told a tale of a great murrain of sheep in Edward the Sixth's days (I think); the reason whereof was, as he said, the coming of scabbed sheep out of Spain...⁶⁸

The directions, guided by Abbot's interpretation, were having the effect of turning open criticism of James's policies into the more insidious ironic mockery which Mead records here.

It was in this climate that John Donne was reluctantly dragged into the limelight to defend the king's policies at St. Paul's Cross.⁶⁹ On 15 September, taking a rather obscure text from the Song of Deborah, Judges 5: 20, 'The stars in their courses fought against Sisera', Donne proceeded to give a defence of the need for the church to engage in spiritual warfare by means of *orderly* preaching.⁷⁰ However, his continual references to conflict, the need for an unambiguous defence of the truth,

and the foolishness of trying to reconcile good and evil suggested that he was not altogether happy with the directions. Indeed, writing to Sir Thomas Roe in December with a copy of the sermon, Donne was to describe his unease at the pro-Catholic policy that had caused the unrest which had made the directions necessary:

many men, measuring public actions with private affections, have been scandalised, and have admitted suspicions of a tepidness in very high places. Some Civil Acts, in favour of the Papists, have been with some precipitation over-dangerously misapplied too.⁷¹

In his sermon Donne explicitly insisted that the new orders proceeded, as James had said, from religious motives alone, yet he seems to have tried to communicate his actual distrust of the directions. He quoted Abbot's letter, stating explicitly that it contained James's intentions, in order to argue that there would be no reduction in the number of sermons.⁷² He could not resist a few ironic quips, remarking that the spirit of preaching should not be quenched:

Saint Chrysostome took his example from the lampe that burnt by him, when he was preaching; (It seemes therefore hee did preach in the afternoone)⁷³

A joke to relax his audience, or a witty reminder that the tradition of lectures outside normal morning services was well-established?

Donne concluded his defence of James's good intentions with an appeal to James's earlier writings:

And when his works shall stand in the Libraries of our Posteritie, amongst the Fathers, euen these Papers, these Directions, & these Reasons shalbe pregnant evidences for his constant zeale to Gods truth, and in the meane time, as arrowes shot in their eyes, that imagine so vaine a thing, as a defection in him, to their superstition.⁷⁴

This praise of James was also a warning that the king should be wary of acting in a way that conflicted with the zealously Protestant interpretations which had been

given traditionally to his works, and which Donne and Abbot were now trying to apply to the directions for preachers. Appealing to the royal meaning to restrict James's actions was a strategy James could hardly condemn, especially when the appeal was made in what was superficially a defence of his policy. Yet Donne's sermon seems to have done still more damage to James's plans. Writing on 25 September, John Chamberlain commented:

On the 15th of this present the Dean of Paules preached at the Crosse to certifie the Kings goode intention in the late orders concerning preachers and preaching, and of his constancie in the true reformed religion, which the people (as shold seeme) began to suspect; his text was the 20th verse of the 5th chapter of the booke of Judges, somewhat a straunge text for such a busines, and how he made yt hold together I know not, but he gave no great satisfaction, or as some say, spake as yf himself were not so well satisfied.⁷⁵

In view of the fact that on 30 September James was to write to Pope Gregory XV to ask for his cooperation in securing a European peace, this doubt and suspicion was at least partially understandable.⁷⁶ Donne's audience were clearly complicit in his subversion of the king's text.⁷⁷ James, presumably feeling that any defence was better than none, ordered the work to be printed.⁷⁸ One suspects that even the printers shared Donne's desire to prevent people from taking the defence at face value; the title-page of the first two issues announced not a sermon on Judges 5: 20, but on Judges 20: 15, which describes the outbreak of civil war in Israel following an attack on a priest.⁷⁹

James might have done well to have dropped the matter at this stage: however, he was determined to make one final effort to enforce a positive reception of his work. He seems to have returned to his old theory that it was rumours and corrupt texts that caused people to interpret his works in an unsatisfactory way, and

that the solution was to ensure maximum distribution of his writings. Although he had seen this theory fail in practice on numerous occasions, at least it offered him a course of action. In his second letter, Abbot had told the bishops to ensure:

that both the former direccions and these reasons of the same be fairely written in every Registers office to the end that every preacher of what denomination soever may if he be pleased take out Coppies of either of them with his owne hand gratis.⁸⁰

Judging by the number of copies of the letter and directions which survive, many copies were made, and these copies were copied themselves. The networks of Jacobean letter-writers were at their most active during this period, when printers and preachers were being heavily censored. The British Library alone has more than a dozen contemporary copies of the letter and directions, or of parts of the work. It was also decided to spread the work further by printing James's letter and directions, with Abbot's letters of support. This appears to have been done in Oxford, with the support of Bishop John Howson, who had once been chastised by Abbot for his opposition to doctrinal Calvinism, and who was probably delighted to see Abbot apparently enforcing the repressive policies he had formerly resisted.⁸¹ The work that eventually appeared in print seems to have consisted of two parts. The Coppie of a Letter sent from my Lords Grace of Canterburie shewing the grave and weighty reasons which induced the Kings Maiestie to prescribe those former directions for Preachers contained Abbot's second letter, as received by Howson.⁸² The other part, headed To the Minister Church-Wardens, contains a letter from Howson introducing the work, James's letter to Abbot, Abbot's first letter, the directions themselves, and Howson's conclusions ordering the transmission and enforcement of the directions.⁸³ The fact that Howson's conclusions are dated 'the last of August' may indicate that

Church-Wardens was printed first, and that Coppie was issued as a supplement when Abbot's second letter became known. There are three surviving copies of Coppie, which are all bound with a copy of Church-Wardens; the fact that one of the four surviving copies of Church-Wardens exists separately may confirm that it was originally printed as an independent text.⁸⁴

The decision to transmit the work by print, however, seems to have inspired the most dangerous subversion of James's words yet.⁸⁵ We possess two surviving copies of an early edition or editions of the letter and directions which are very different to the official edition printed at Oxford. The copies of The Kings Maiesties Letter to the Lords Grace of Canterbury, touching Preaching, and Preachers now in Durham University Library (shelfmark SR.4.C.11/7, bound with other 1620s tracts) and Emmanuel College, Cambridge (shelfmark S14.3.10/1) are set differently from each other, and have a number of important textual differences.⁸⁶ However, they both re-arrange the texts found in The Coppie of a Letter and To the Minister Church-Wardens, so that the new editions contain James's letter to Abbot, the directions, and Abbot's second letter. Abbot's more unambiguous first letter of support, and the explanatory notes by Bishop Howson, are omitted altogether; as the title suggests, unlike the other editions, this publication places the emphasis firmly on the intentions of King James rather than on the wishes of his prelates.

Most importantly, the text in both the Durham and Emmanuel copies changes the words of James's letter to Abbot to make the text seem less provocative and less anti-Puritan. The Durham copy has been annotated by a contemporary reader, who appears to be noting places where it differs from a corrupt manuscript copy of the

official version in circulation.⁸⁷ Where the official text talks of the English 'Realme', the unauthorised edition has the more neutral, less kingly word 'Land'. Where the official text states that preaching has traditionally been regulated with the advise of 'Grave and learned Prelates', the unauthorised edition suggests, ironically, that it is in fact 'Grave and Reverend Preachers' who have been given the job of regulating preaching.

The most significant change was the omission of a phrase in the first direction. James's text had originally stated that the restrictions on preachers' subject matter were designed 'not only for a helpe for the non-preaching but withall for a patterne & a boundary as it were for the preachinge ministers', and this was followed in the official edition.⁸⁸ In the unauthorised edition represented by the Durham copy (although not in the Emmanuel copy), the reference to the non-preaching ministry was not printed. This is highly significant. James's reference to the importance of assisting the non-preaching ministry would have been highly controversial in 1622. The Puritan party believed that the main function of a minister of the God was to preach God's word. The concept of ministers who did not preach, but whose duties were prayer and the administration of the sacraments, was associated by many with Roman Catholicism. The editor of the unauthorised edition, therefore, seems to be changing James's words to make it seem that James was not really an enemy of the Puritans, and thereby to prevent the directions from taking full effect. Like Donne and Abbot, the editor knew it would be futile to attack the directions openly, and probably hoped that the rumours about James's apostasy were false: the editor hoped

that by twisting James's words he could make it more difficult for James's actions to confirm people's worst fears.⁸⁹

However, the fact that one version of James's words could be quoted against another may well have weakened the authority of the royal word more than the editor of the unauthorised edition intended. It is interesting to speculate on what the reader who made these annotations was thinking. The fact that a royal declaration existed in different forms must have caused considerable suspicion, especially if the reader was not sure which version represented the official text. By comparing the different texts, the reader's attention would have been drawn to the more extreme passages which had been revised by the editor of the unofficial edition. An atmosphere of growing distrust between royal author and subject readers was not going to be improved by a debate about what James had actually said and meant.

IV. 'A king but in a playe': the triumph of James's militant Protestant readers, 1623-4

Faced with ever more outspoken criticism of his behaviour, in early 1623 James took the extraordinary step of resorting to writing satirical verses against his critics, as if he were a discontented citizen rather than the absolute king.⁹⁰ 'The Wiper of the Peoples Teares' seems to have been a direct reply to a vanished document called 'The Comons Teares', presumably a work complaining about James's policies. It must have contained some pointed remarks, for James's response is incandescent, and one of his best poems.⁹¹ Although there is no surviving holograph, it seems very unlikely that it could have been written by anyone other than the king.⁹² Whereas the Meditation... on Matthew showed James increasingly distrustful of the public reader, in this text he roundly berates the people who have misinterpreted him and his words:

O stay your teares you who complaine
 and saye as babes doe all in vaine:
 Purblinde people why doe you prate
 too shallowe for the depth of State.
 You cannot judge whats truely myne 5
 who see noe further then the rine [*Rhine*].
 Kings walke the milkye heavenly way
 But you by bye pathes gad astray.

The emphasis on the king's power of *seeing* is interesting in the light of his speech to Parliament of March 1610 discussed earlier, in which James had invited his audience to see his heart through a crystal. Now, James perceives his subjects as blindly groping for his lofty meaning, and ending up in the ditch. The gap between author and reader has widened so as to be unbridgeable: James will no longer bother trying

to communicate and explain his intentions, and tells his public that kings are, by nature, incomprehensible.

One suspects that 'The Comons Teares' expressed a desire to understand James's actions, perhaps like that in the following passage from Tom Tell Troath, which James may have been thinking of as well:

The great Spectatours of your Majesties Wisdome, whose dayly exercise is to multiply the Object in the artificiall glasses of fraude, and flattery, are so distracted with the infinite faces of the counterfayts, as they cannot discerne the blemishes of the true. But wee that knowe neither the use nor the benefitt of such Court perspectives, and have no other way to understand your Majestie, then by your workes, doe, to our great greife, perceive a number of defects that cover the glory of your Raigne, as in a cloude⁹³

The speaker's claim that as a common man he is not distracted by the various images of majesty created for James in the centre of power, and that he is therefore able to judge the king fairly on the basis of his works, poses a direct challenge to James's attempts to justify his actions. If 'The Comons Teares' had contained similar sentiments, it is not surprising that James should have responded by withdrawing his long-standing offer to communicate with his subjects: if they accuse his mirror of being blemished, he will reject them as 'purblinde people'.

James is modifying his literary theory in the light of changing circumstances. In 1621 he had begun to recognise that he could not guarantee that his works would be interpreted as he wished, even if he wrote clearly, guided the reader by identifying the text as a 'kingly' or a 'scholarly' production, and ensured that unauthorised printings were suppressed. The nature of language, and of the printed book, meant that the reader's response to the text was an active, constructive process, and one which the king's authority could do little to control without the cooperation of his

readers. Now, however, James is apparently on the verge of giving up on this relationship altogether. His careful strategies in the Letter and Directions had been turned to his disadvantage, and now James seems to have chosen to use words as a weapon against his rebellious subjects. This is precisely the kind of degrading misuse of power which he had warned Prince Charles about: the word of a king has been dragged down into a battle in the gutter.

James goes on to warn his readers:

yet hold your peace least you repent 20
 And be corrected for your pride
 that kings designes dare thus deride
 by raylinge rymes and vauntinge verse
 which your kings breast should never peirce
 Religion is the right of kings 25
 and they knowe best what good it brings
 Whereto you must submitt your deeds
 or be puld up like stinkinge weeds.

James's insistence on his ability to judge wisely in matters of religion makes it quite clear that he *had* been pierced by the libel, which had presumably repeated the familiar demand that the Protestant faith should be safeguarded by military action against Spain, and called into question the motives behind James's secretive diplomacy. The insistence on the king's strength and authority points to the fact that this authority had been called into question as never before.

James proceeds to answer specific points in the libel, which appear to be demands for the dismissal of certain royal servants, and the summoning of Parliament. He remarks:

O what a callinge were a kinge
 if hee might give or take nothings
 but such as you shall to him bringe
 Such were a king but in a playe

if hee might beare noe greater swaye 45

James knew that kingship could be seen as a performative act, having said in Basilicon Doron that 'a King is as one set on a stage, whose smallest actions and gestures, all the people gazingly doe behold'.⁹⁴ However, James did not wish people to see his performance as being illusory as that of the actors in the public theatres, and had prohibited representations of living monarchs on the stage.⁹⁵ One wonders whether James had any particular plays in mind in these lines. As mentioned in Chapter One, in his speech of 21 March 1610 the language suggests an awareness of Shakespeare's Richard II. In Act 5 Scene 2, York describes the helplessness of the deposed monarch:

As in a theatre, the eyes of men
After a well-grac'd actor leaves the stage,
Are idly bent on him that enters next,
Thinking his prattle to be tedious;
Even so, or with much more contempt, men's eyes
Did scowl on Richard

James certainly seems to feel that he is being treated rather like King Richard; probably he knew that Queen Elizabeth, too, had felt that Richard II said much about the condition of an insecure ruler.⁹⁶ Although he insists that he will not be directed by his subjects, in replying to their complaints in this way James is simultaneously revealing that his critics *are* influencing his actions.

James's threats, for all their hyperbole, contain a real sense of uncertainty. In the following lines, he represents himself as a schoolmaster, a prisoner at the bar, and only lastly as a ruler, who insists he is not afraid:

where if you speake as wisemen should,
if not by me you shalbe schoold. 65
was ever kinge calld to account,

or ever mynde soe high did mount,
 as for to knowe the cause and reason
 and to appoint the meanes and season⁹⁷
 when kings should aske there subjects ayde 70
 kings cannott soe be made afrayde

The collapse in the relationship between author and reader, king and subject, seems to have shaken the identity of the king's poetic persona; again, Richard II springs to mind.

James goes on to appeal to his readers to change their attitude in a manner which implies that conflict is a real danger:

I doe desire noe more of you
 but to knowe me as I knowe you.
 Soe shall I love and you obey 100
 and you love me in a right way
 O make me not, unwillinge still
 whome I would save unwilling kill.
 Examples in extremity
 are never the best remedy. 105
 Thus have I pleasd my selfe not you
 and what I say you shall find true.

The language is breaking down under the strain; the speaker talks of loving and killing almost in the same breath. Although James is presumably referring to the popular demand for the execution of Catholic priests, the way in which this consideration of the advantages of violent repression in lines 102-7 follows his insistence that his subjects obey suggests that he may be meditating using force against his Puritan critics as well. Underlying the confusing language of subject and object, however, seems to be a struggle to work out a better theory of authorship and authority. The speaker considers the possibilities of open conflict and rejection, and self-gratifying courses of action involving violence and suppression. However, in the end these are put on hold as dubious 'examples in extremity': Charles might raise his

standard at Nottingham, but James could never bring himself to do more than look at the brink. Despite the earlier repudiations, in these lines the speaker is returning to the idea of making the king's mind known to the readers, and to the need to somehow achieve a mutual understanding.

Although the poem starts with a tirade against the subjects who have misread James's words and written against his actions, it ends by the speaker considering the nature of kingship and the identity of the king. In this poem, at least, James recognises that the problems embodied in the reception of the Letter and Directions are to do with him and his understanding of the world, as much as they are to do with the insubordination of the common people. These are some of the most personal lines James ever wrote:

were [*we're*] knowne to them that knowes us not 130
 yet you that knowe me all soe well
 why doe you push me downe to hell
 by makeinge me an Infidell
 Tis true I am a cradle kinge
 yet doe remember every thinge 135
 That I have heretofore put out
 and yet begin not for to doubt.
 O how grosse is your device
 change to impute to kings as vice
 The wise may change, yet free from fault 140
 though change to worse is ever nought.

James seems to be replying to specific accusations or insinuations that he has apostasised, that he has been king for so long that he has forgotten his initial anti-Spanish fervour, and that he appears to have changed the opinions he recorded in his books. James looks back over his life, acknowledging that his coronation in 1567 was a long time ago, and perhaps acknowledging the mental restrictions imposed by the fact that his whole conscious life had been lived as a king. He recalls all the

books he 'put out' over the years, and refuses to 'doubt', as Thomas Scott and others were doubting, that his past words preclude his current political strategy. James has finally realised the extent to which his readers have exalted the printed word: they have come to believe that a king should be like his texts, fixed and immutable. The absurdity of saying that a king should never change his mind is clear once James articulates it, but as an unspoken assumption it had been extremely damaging. There is a moment of recognition here, resulting from the speaker's decision to inspect his own identity, which disrupts the movement of the poem towards breakdown and violence. Both James and his readers have been at fault for getting angry at the charges made by the other, without looking at the assumptions about language and meaning out of which those charges had arisen.

The poem continues to be strident in its criticisms of the libel, but there are a growing number of indications that the situation can be resolved, as it is not simply a matter of two incompatible attitudes to religion and politics, but a dispute caused by mutual misunderstanding. The assurances in lines 148-51 that James will be forgiving rather than harsh, although expressed in language that is still turbulent, serve to undo the menace of lines 100-107 in which violence seemed a real possibility. The speaker goes on to address the readers as 'freinds', and to suggest that he may call on them for advice after all. The gap between king and subject is still there, but the poem has shown that it is not yet unbridgeable. The poem ends on a subdued note:

If proclamacons [*sic*] will not serve
 I must doe more peace to preserve. 175
 To keep all in obedience
 to drive such busie bodies hence.

The last line could be read as a threat to banish the authors of the libel, but the fact that James does not make the identity of the 'busie bodies' explicit suggests that he intended to issue a general warning. In admitting that his proclamations of 1620 and 1621 against such libels have failed, James seems to be recognising more clearly that he could not govern by the pen alone.

Despite his personal feelings of rage at the criticism he was receiving, the king has to take responsibility for it. In the end, the reader is rebuked, but it is James who promises to rethink his theory of government and communication. The violence which the poem had threatened is expelled with the 'busie bodies'. Chamberlain records that all kinds of verses were circulating in early 1623, some criticising the king, some purporting to be by him.⁹⁸ James Craigie shows that a great number of manuscript copies of this text survive, much like the Letter and Directions, and it seems probable that James permitted such copies to be made.⁹⁹ James had certainly degraded the royal word, but he had done so to re-forge contact with readers who were becoming increasingly alienated from their king. It is interesting to speculate about what might have happened if the Spanish match had proceeded much further. When King Charles found that his words had lost their authority in 1642, he resorted to military force: in 1623, James seems to have been preparing to deal with a comparable situation in a completely different way. James seems to have deliberately jeopardised the aura of sanctity surrounding the royal word in order to show that the situation was less catastrophic than popular rhetoric suggested, whereas King Charles would cling on to the image at the expense of the reality. It seems possible that if the voices of the opposition had grown any more strident in 1623,

James might have been led to rethink not just his relationship with his readers, but the workings of the political constitution itself.

As it was, the journey of Prince Charles and Buckingham to Madrid in February 1623 suspended the impending conflict; the negotiations there became protracted and eventually failed completely, and the disappointed wooers returned in October eager to change James's pacific stance and to go to war with Spain. Appeasement and ecumenism had failed; a Parliament was summoned, and it was made clear to James that he would have to re-impose the recusancy laws and give preachers a free rein to attack Papists and Spaniards.¹⁰⁰ Without the support of his son and his best friend, James no longer had the heart to uphold the policies which the Letter and Directions had been issued to defend. At the opening of the Parliament on 19 February 1624, James made a remark which suggests how far he was aware of the fact that his policies had been wrecked by interpretations of his words:

remembering many misunderstandings between me and you before, I am now brought hither with an earnest desire to do my duty that God hath called me unto, by declaring unto you the verity of this, that God hath put in my heart, and to manifest my actions to be true by my words.¹⁰¹

It would be rather more normal to speak of proving one's words by one's deeds; as Thomas Scott argues above, people had been expecting James's literary works to be turned into action. James's ironic inversion here points at the way in which his words, and particular readings of his words, had come to be exalted over the king and his actions. James tries to erase the memory of the Letter and Directions by giving his audience words which conform to their interpretations of his earlier writings, and which justify his actions:

One particular I must remember you of, because it hath been much talked of in the country, that I should be slack in my care of religion for other occasions. My Lords, and you Gentlemen all, I pray you judge me charitably, as you would have me to judge you; for I never made public nor private treaties but I always made a direct reservation for the weal public and [the] cause of religion, for the glory of God [and] the good of my subjects. I only thought good sometimes to wink and connive at the execution of some penal statutes, and not to go on so rigorously as at other times, but to dispense with any, to forbid or alter any that concern religion, I never promised or yielded; I never did think it with my heart, nor speak it with my mouth...¹⁰²

But despite James's recantation, the Letter and Directions remained, in many different versions, both printed and manuscript, as a testimony to the fact that the king had written a work which he had abandoned under pressure from his readers. The fact that only six printed copies of the work or parts of the work dating from 1622 seem to have survived may suggest that the authorities made a belated attempt to prevent its distribution.¹⁰³ Yet it was not forgotten; like the Armada, or the Gunpowder Plot, the wavering of King James in 1622 was inscribed into the national myth of God's intervention to save England's Protestant mission.¹⁰⁴ Thomas Scott, in Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost (1624) illustrated the situation with Elizabeth I's poem against the bull of Pius V, and James VI's own sonnet, mentioned earlier, 'The Nations banded 'gainst the Lord of might', in which God laughs at the destruction of the Spanish fleet of 1588.¹⁰⁵ James had unsuccessfully tried to stand against the designs of providence, of which his own earlier writings had been part.

John Reynolds, in his Vox Coeli, a work addressed to the Parliament of 1624 to encourage them to back a holy war with Spain, presented a dramatic debate between various deceased English monarchs on King James's policies. Reynolds' work may be related to Middleton's A Game at Chesse, which celebrates the failure

of the dark forces of Spain in a thinly-disguised allegory of white kings and black pawns, and which held the stage in 1624 for an unprecedented run of nine days.¹⁰⁶ In Reynolds' work, Queen Elizabeth described how James had been influenced by the Spanish into repressing his people, so that

no cinsere [*sic*] advise, honest Letter, Religious Sermon, or true picture can point at the King of Spaine, but they are called in; and their Authours imprisoned¹⁰⁷

Henry VIII reminded her that in such cases the English people would overrule James's mistaken orders:

For (for the good of England) if one pen, or tongue bee commanded to silence, they will occasion and set tenne at libertie to write and speake; as Grasse or Cammell, which the more it is depressed, the thicker it will spread and grow.¹⁰⁸

The word of the king had become a tool of the Catholics, but God was behind the words of the king's readers.¹⁰⁹

Despite Reynolds' invocation of the good actions of previous Protestant monarchs, 1622 had seen a transformation of the myth of the godly ruler so vigorously promoted by both Elizabeth and James. In some way, it seems that the myth, with its popular readings of texts and histories, had outgrown the king in whose writings it had grown famous, with major consequences for his works. The earlier misinterpretations of James's writings had weakened the authority of the king's word, but because they were largely individualistic responses, the damage had been limited. The Letter and Directions, however, was understood according to the universally accepted readings of James's other works, which it appeared to contradict. A whole reading community had risen up in protest.

In 1623 and 1624, a letter purporting to be by Archbishop Abbot was circulating in manuscript. This letter was addressed to King James, beginning, 'I have beene too long silent, and I am afraid, by my silence I have neglected the duty of the place it hath pleased God to call me unto'. The text goes on to attack James's policies:

Your Majesty hath propounded a tolleration of religion. I beseech You Sir, take into Your consideration what Your act is, what the consequence may be: By Your act You labour to set up that most damnable and hereticall doctrine of the Church of Rome, that whore of Babylon. How hatefull will it be to God, and grievous to Your good Subjects, (the true Professors of the Gospell) that Your Majesty, who hath often disputed and learnedly written against those wicked heresies, should now shew Your selfe a Patron of those doctrines, which Your Pen hath told the world, and Your conscience tels Your Selfe, are superstitious, idolatrous and detestable?¹¹⁰

This letter is probably not by Abbot, but probably reflects his real discontent with James's proceedings; Richard Cust remarks that Abbot 'seems to have recognised that there was much to be gained from allowing its circulation in his name'.¹¹¹ All the normal ingredients of the 'godly ruler' myth are present; the pure religion of England, the presence of the Antichrist over the sea, and the Word of God, supported by the Word of King James. However, now it is James's subjects who are described as 'the true Professors of the Gospell', and James himself is being put quite firmly in his place. As will be seen, the memory of the reception of the Letter and Directions allowed it to retain its political potency well into the Civil War and after. James had lost his final battle with his readers, and in the years to come both royalist and parliamentary pamphlets would show a constant awareness of the precedent that had been set.¹¹²

¹A version of this chapter will appear in Fischlin and Fortier (forthcoming), with the title 'Reading and mis-reading King James 1622-1642: responses to the Letter and Directions touching Preaching and Preachers'.

²See Roy Strong, Henry, Prince of Wales, and England's Lost Renaissance, Thames & Hudson, 1986, esp. p. 74.

³James VI & I, A Meditation vpon the 27, 28, 29, verses of the XXVII Chapter of St. Matthew, London: b. Iohn Bill, 1620, STC 14382, sig. [¶11^v-12^v]; also in Sommerville (1994), 230.

⁴sig. G3v-[G4r]; Sommerville (1994), 249

⁵Mentioned in the life of Charles prefixed to later editions of Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ - I am using the edition purportedly printed at 'Hague: b. Sam: Browne' [i.e. London: f. R. Royston, 1658?], Wing C2070, sig. [F7^r]. See Steven N. Zwicker, Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689, Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1993, 40-1.

⁶sig. [A12^{r-v}]; Sommerville (1994), 232

⁷See Strong (1986), 71-85.

⁸See for example Cogswell, Blessed Revolution, (1989), and 'England and the Spanish Match', (1989); Patterson (1997), esp. 293-338. Samuel R. Gardiner's History of England is still useful (Vol. 4, Longmans, Green & Co., 1886), as is Charles Howard Carter's The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625, New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1964.

⁹For a readable general overview of English attitudes to foreigners and foreign culture at this time, see Marvin Arthur Breslow, A Mirror of England: English Puritan Views of Foreign Nations, 1618-1640, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970.

¹⁰In Ane Meditatiou vpon the xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxviii, and xxix verses of the xv Chapt. of the first buke of the Chronicles, Edinburgh: b. Henrie Charteris, 1589, STC 14380, sig. Biv^v. See Craigie (1958), 164, 250; see Williamson (1979), 39-41.

¹¹The Peace-Maker: Or, Great-Brittain's Blessing, London: b. Thomas Purfoot, 1618, STC 14387. There were several more editions of this work. For the attribution to Thomas Middleton (not the dramatist), see W. W. Greg. (ed.), A Companion to Arber - being a calendar of documents in Edward Arber's Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967, 163.

¹²For the development of readings of Revelation, particularly in creation with the new imperial British state, see Arthur H. Williamson, 'Scotland, Antichrist and the Invention of Great Britain', in Dwyer *et al* (eds.), New Perspectives, 34-58.

¹³James's shift in opinion is noted in Simon Adams' excellent essay, 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', in Sharpe (1978[1985]), 139-71, esp. p.148.

¹⁴Anthony Milton, Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640, CUP, 1995, 108.

¹⁵There were at least three Thomas Scotts active in left-wing politics and religion in the 1620s, and it is rather difficult to know which works were by which Scott. See Margot Heinemann, Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts, Cambridge: CUP, 1980, n. 157, 276, and Peter Clark, 'Thomas Scott and the Growth of Urban Opposition to the Early Stuart Regime', Historical Journal 21 (1978), 1-26, esp. p. 1 (n.); see also Joseph Black, 'Pamphlet Wars: The Marprelate Tracts and 'Martinism', 1588-1688', PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1996, esp. Chapter Four.

¹⁶Thomas Scott, The Workes, Utrick, 1624 (STC 22064), reprinted Amsterdam & New York: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1973, sig. p2^{r-v}

¹⁷Scott (1973), sig. B2^v. The relevant passage in the Remonstrance is in McIlwain (1918), 261.

¹⁸Wormald (1991), esp. 54

¹⁹On Thomas Scott and the attempt to remind James of his own words, see P. G. Lake, 'Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match', Historical Journal 25 (1982), 805-825, esp. 815-8. Lake's account is an interesting attempt to set the opposition to the Spanish match within the revisionist understanding of consensus politics, and he makes useful connections between the 'oppositional' pamphlets and the anti-Spanish members of the Privy Council. However, I suspect he is conflating two separate Thomas Scotts.

²⁰For the Parliament, see Robert Zaller, The Parliament of 1621 - A Study in Constitutional Conflict, Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971

²¹30 January 1621, in Wallace Notestein, Frances Helen Relf & Hartley Simpson (eds.), Commons Debates 1621, Vol. 2, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935, 2

²²Jenny Wormald interprets this speech rather differently, arguing that James had never felt at home with the formal rhetoric of a speech to the English Parliament, and that he would have preferred a closer, more informal relationship with his advisers, as in Scotland. His retraction reflected that disenchantment (Wormald, 1983, 205).

²³McClure (1939), Vol. 2, 338

²⁴Craigie (1958), xxii-xxiii

²⁵Speech of 17 February 1621, in Notestein (1935), Vol. 4, 71-3

²⁶In Craigie (1944), 9

²⁷sig. [D6r-D7r]; Sommerville (1994), 240

²⁸James VI & I, His Maiesties Speach in the Vpper House, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, 1621, STC 14399, sig. B3^r-[B4^r]

²⁹Speech of 20 April 1621, in Notestein (1935), Vol. 2, 303

³⁰See Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish Match' (1989)

³¹The Scottish Parliament, also in session in 1621, seems to have been similarly tense, although the court party succeeded in getting their legislation passed; see Julian Goodare, 'The Scottish Parliament of 1621', Historical Journal 38 (1995),

29-51. I am indebted to Dr. Goodare for information about Scottish politics during this period.

³²James VI & I, His Maiesties Declaration, Touching his Proceedings, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, 1621/2, STC 9241. Also in Sommerville (1994), 250-267.

³³I am using the copy in Durham University library, shelfmark Routh Tracts III.3. My thanks go to Professor Jon Usher of the Department of Italian at the University of Edinburgh for his assistance with this text, on which I am planning an article.

³⁴sig. A2^r

³⁵sig. [A4^v]

³⁶CSPD, 1619-23, 345

³⁷The best modern edition of the text is in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church, Vol. 1, Church of England Record Society, 1994, 211-5, based on the text in Abbot's Register (Lambeth Palace Library) ii, fos. 199^r-200^v. An incomplete text is to be found in J. P. Kenyon, The Stuart Constitution 1603-1688, Cambridge: CUP, 1966, 145-6.

³⁸James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (eds.), Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973, 495-6, 519-21

³⁹See Folke Dahl, A Bibliography of English Corantos and Periodical Newsbooks 1620-1642, Bibliographical Society, 1952; the theory that politics was polarised by the increase in the volume of news in circulation is discussed by Richard Cust, 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England', Past and Present 112 (1986), 60-90.

⁴⁰See Bennett (1970), 186-7. For the way in which the newsbooks usurped the place of the dramatists, see D. F. McKenzie, 'Poetry, Politics and the Press', Sandars Lecture 1, 1976, circulated in typescript as The London Book Trade in the later Seventeenth Century, 5-7.

⁴¹See Godfrey Davies, 'English Political Sermons, 1603-1640', HLQ 3 (1939), 1-22, esp. 9. Bennett (1970), pp. 108-9 argues that Davies underestimates the number of sermons. For the parallel situation in the Netherlands, where Calvinist preachers skilfully exploited written and oral modes of communication, see Craig E. Harline, Pamphlets, Printing, and Political Culture in the Early Dutch Republic, Dordrecht, Boston & Lancaster: Martinus Nijhoff, 1987, 134-54.

⁴²See Paul S. Seaver, The Puritan Lectureships - The Politics of Religious Dissent 1560-1662, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970.

⁴³For a traditional account of the growth of Puritan opposition to King James, see John Dykstra Eusden, Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958. Eusden presents a polarised view of an absolutist king suppressing revolutionary preachers, but at least he acknowledges the importance of the Letter and Directions (pp. 76-8).

⁴⁴See Irvonwy Morgan, Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain, George Allen & Unwin, 1957, 11+, 51+, 192-3.

⁴⁵See Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), The History of the University of Oxford: Vol. 4 - Seventeenth-Century Oxford, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997, 583; William Prynne, The Sovereigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdomes, London: f. Michael Sparke, 1643, Wing P4087A, part 3, sig. T2^r. Prynne's appeal to James's authority is mentioned in Francis Oakley, 'On the Road from Constance to 1688: The Political Thought of John Major and George Buchanan', JBS 1, no. 2 (1962), 1-31, pp. 8-9. There is an excellent account of Prynne's controversial writing, William M. Lamont, Marginal Prynne 1600-1669, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963.

⁴⁶See CSPD, 1619-23, 379, 380, 396, 404-5, 418, 426-7

⁴⁷Walter Curll, A Sermon... 28. of April, London: b. John Bill, 1622, STC 6132, sig. C2^r

⁴⁸For Spalatro, see W. B. Patterson, 'The Peregrinations of Marco Antonio de Dominis 1616-24', in Derek Baker (ed.), Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian, Oxford: Basil Blackwell f. Ecclesiastical History Society, 1978, 241-57; see also Fincham and Lake (1985), pp. 203-4.

⁴⁹See The Answere vnto the Nine Points of Controuersy, proposed by our late Soueraygne, [St.Omer: English College Press, 1625], STC 10911; also Timothy H. Wadkins, 'King James I meets John Percy S.J.... An unpublished manuscript', Recusant History 19 (1988), 146-54; Milward (1978), 224+.

⁵⁰See Willson (1956, reprinted 1962), 429

⁵¹PRO SP 14/132/84

⁵²The issue of how far the recusancy laws were enforced at different times is complex; for a recent claim that James tried to win the support of Catholics through patronage, instead of penalising them financially, see John J. La Rocca, 'James I and his Catholic Subjects, 1606-1612: Some Financial Implications', Recusant History 18 (1987), 251-62

⁵³PRO SP 14/132/85, from which subsequent citations are taken.

⁵⁴See P[eter] Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus, London: f. A. Seile, 1668, Wing H1699, sig. O1^r-2^r; John Hacket, Scrinia Reserata, [London]: b. Edw. Jones f. Samuel Lowndes, 1693, Wing H171, sig. N1^r. Both biographers, especially Heylyn, are likely to be exaggerating the role of their subject in the crisis of 1622.

⁵⁵Peter White seems to take at face value James's presentation of the Directions as a traditional and moderate document, but he does not really analyse the specific context which made its implications so radically disturbing; see Peter White, Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War Cambridge: CUP, 1992, pp. 210-14.

⁵⁶There was some basis for James's argument, in view of the controversies resulting from the Synod of Dort (see Patterson, 1997, 281-2, and Christopher Grayson, 'James I and the Religious Crisis in the United Provinces 1613-19', in Derek Baker (ed.), Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-c1750, Oxford: Basil Blackwell f. Ecclesiastical History Society, 1979, 195-219), but the directions were clearly a response to immediate political events.

⁵⁷Thomas Thomson (ed.), The History of the Kirk of Scotland, by Mr. David Calderwood, Vol. 7, Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1845, 562.

⁵⁸Abbot's friendship with leading Puritans such as Pembroke is described by Adams (1978[1985]), 143+, and Lake (1982), 813-4. Heinemann (1980) also notes Abbot's defence of Puritan preachers (nn. on pp. 157, 272).

⁵⁹The standard biography of Abbot is Paul A. Welsby, George Abbot - the Unwanted Archbishop 1562-1633, SPCK, 1962; his role in this crisis is briefly discussed on pp. 107-9. Welsby's account needs to be read in conjunction with Kenneth Fincham's 'Prelacy and Politics: Archbishop Abbot's Defence of Protestant Orthodoxy', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 61 (1988), 36-41, which uses new evidence that reveals more clearly Abbot's sympathy for doctrinal Calvinist preachers, and his belief in popish conspiracies.

⁶⁰PRO SP 14/132/93. CSPD, 1619-23, 440, suggests that this was written on 12 August.

⁶¹McClure (1939), Vol. 2, 449; see Cogswell, The Blessed Revolution (1989), 32-3.

⁶²CSPV, 1621-1623, 397

⁶³In many early versions, like British Library MSS. Add. 3694 f.23-4, the letter is dated 4 September, but in Lambeth Palace MSS. Tenison 669/108 which I am using here to indicate the diversity of the versions which survive in different locations, and from which subsequent citations are taken, it is dated 5 September.

⁶⁴Abbot's second letter contains many arguments similar to those used by King James in his letter to the Scottish Privy Council of 31 October 1622, in which he insisted that the Directions would not lead to a toleration of Popery; see RPCS, Vol. 13, 79-81.

⁶⁵Kenneth Fincham notes that 'Abbot quickly learned to humour the king's eirenic views, and on one occasion warned Trumbull to moderate his anti-papal language when writing to James I' (Fincham, 1988, note p. 46). I agree that Abbot is using this strategy in the passage quoted above, but the exaggerated praise of James's military inactivity is surely intended to encourage the wider reading audience to see through the flattery. Fincham describes Abbot's determination to invoke national traditions of popular Protestantism, and his 'sense of acting on the public stage' (p. 57).

⁶⁶Tom Tell Troath, n.p., n.d., STC 23868, sig. [A4^r]. See CSPD, 1619-23, 332.

⁶⁷For the claim that James encouraged William Camden to write his Annales in order to reconstruct Elizabeth as a moderate ruler rather than the Protestant crusader invoked by the pro-war party, see D. R. Woolf, The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War, Toronto, Buffalo & London: University of Toronto Press, 1990, 123-4.

⁶⁸In Birch (1849), Vol. 2, 329-30

⁶⁹See Jeanne Shami, "'The Stars in their Order Fought Against Sisera": John Donne and the Pulpit Crisis of 1622', John Donne Journal 14 (1995), 1-58, and Jillian

Kearney, 'Donne's Devotions in the Context of his Early Sermons', D.Phil thesis, Oxford, 1995, 74-100. For an interesting general assessment of Donne's attitude to King James, see Annabel Patterson, 'John Donne, Kingsman?', in Peck (1991), 251-72.

⁷⁰John Donne, A Sermon, London: f. Thomas Jones, 1622, STC 7054, (entered 31 October 1622, Liber D, p. 46); also in George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson (eds.), The Sermons of John Donne, Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959, Vol. 4, 178-209. For a good discussion of this episode, see R. C. Bald, John Donne: A Life, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970, reprinted with corrections 1986, 433-47. Bald argues that Donne was broadly sympathetic to the Directions.

⁷¹Edmund Gosse, The Life and Letters of John Donne, William Heinemann, 1899, Vol. 2, 174; for Donne's later thought on the Letter and Directions, see Jeanne Shami, 'Donne's 1622 Sermon on the Gunpowder Plot: His Original Presentation Manuscript Discovered', English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700 5 (1995): 63-86.

⁷²sig. [I4^{r-v}]

⁷³sig. F2^v

⁷⁴sig. K1^r

⁷⁵McClure (1939), Vol. 2, 451

⁷⁶Akrigg (1984), 383-385, using Bodleian Tanner MSS. 73, f. 236

⁷⁷See Annabel Patterson, Censorship and Interpretation, University of Wisconsin Press, 1984, 97-9.

⁷⁸Isaak Walton states that Donne had to explain himself to James; see S. C. Roberts (ed.), Izaak Walton: Lives of Donne and Herbert, Cambridge: CUP, 1949, 33-4.

⁷⁹See Geoffrey Keynes, A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne, 4th edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973, 31-5.

⁸⁰Lambeth Palace MSS. Tenison 669/108

⁸¹See Nicholas Cranfield and Kenneth Fincham (eds.), 'John Howson's Answers to Archbishop Abbot's Accusations at his 'Trial', before James I at Greenwich, 10 June 1615', Camden Miscellany 29 (1987), 319-41. Howson was accused, among other things, of having said that James had not written the Apologie or A Premonition (p. 336). James, characteristically, did not uphold Abbot's charges, but advised Howson to preach against popery to prove his orthodoxy. For Howson, see also Kenneth Fincham, 'Oxford and the Early Stuart Polity', in Tyacke (1997), 179-210.

⁸²George Abbot, The Coppie of a Letter, Oxford: b. John Lichfield & James Short, 1622, STC 33

⁸³John Howson, To the Minister Church-Wardens, [Oxford: b. John Lichfield & James Short, 1622], STC 13880

⁸⁴Of the three copies of The Coppie of a Letter, all bound with To the Minister Church-Wardens, one is in the British Library, shelfmark 1608/1117, and two are in the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, shelfmarks Φ.A.I.10(3-4) and Φ.A.I.10(11-12). In the first two copies, Coppie precedes Church-Wardens, but

in the third copy, the order is reversed. Church-Wardens exists separately in the Bodleian Library, shelfmark Wood 516.8. Falconer Madan claims that Church-Wardens is simply part of Coppie, in The Early Oxford Press, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895, p. 117.

⁸⁵There is a need for more research into James's relationship with printers and booksellers; his awareness of their importance, and his inability to assert royal control over them, are suggested in numerous contemporary documents. An entertaining example, in which James is made to sound on the verge of hysteria, is reprinted in the Bannatyne Miscellany, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: 1827, 197-215, entitled 'A Relation of the Imprisonment and Examination of James Cathkin, Bookseller. June, M.DC.XIX.'

⁸⁶James VI & I, The Kings Maiesties Letter to the Lords Grace of Canterbury, touching Preaching, and Preachers, n.p., n.d. Despite the differences, both surviving copies share the single reference STC 14379.5. The bibliographical confusion surrounding this work is not helped by the fact that the University Microfilms catalogue describes the film of the Emmanuel copy of STC 14379.5 on reel 649 of the first series of Early English Books as 'STC 33'.

⁸⁷It seems unlikely that the reader was comparing his work with the official *printed* edition, as a few of his marginal corrections do not correspond with the text in STC 33/13880; for example, on sig. A3^r, he inserts the word 'haue' where STC 13880 sig. [*3^v] reads instead 'pass', which is also the reading in PRO SP 14/132/85. Presumably he was using one of the manuscript copies, based on PRO SP 14/132/85, distributed among the clergy. I have not found any version, either printed or manuscript, which corresponds exactly to these annotations: any further information on this matter would be gratefully received.

⁸⁸PRO 14/132/85; STC 13880, sig. [*2^v]

⁸⁹Anthony Milton mentions another fascinating instance of an attempt to soften James's remarks relating to Puritans; in Pierre du Moulin's Defence de la Foi, a work produced to support James's writings on the Oath of Allegiance, du Moulin slips from direct quotation into paraphrase when he has to justify a particularly anti-Puritan passage, and in doing so transforms the substance of James's argument; see Milton (1995), n. p. 480.

⁹⁰Curtis Perry's essay on James's late poems, many of which are satirical and circulated in manuscript, will appear in the forthcoming volume of essays on King James's writings edited by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier.

⁹¹Two texts are printed in Craigie (1958), 182-191. The text I have chosen to use, Craigie's printing of British Library MS. Harley 367, fol. 151^r-152^v, is reproduced in full in Appendix Two. I have corrected Craigie's erroneous line numbering after line 145. My interpretation of this poem differs to that in Goldberg (1983 [1989]), 18-21, 140-1, which is more cynical about James's strategies for regaining control of his readers. Sharpe (1994) describes the work as 'mock doggerel', which does not really do justice to its complex attempts to work through political and linguistic problems. See also Alastair Bellamy, "'Raylinge Rymes and

Vaunting Verse": Libellous Politics in Early Stuart England, 1603-1628', in Sharpe & Lake (1994), 285-310, p. 294

⁹²See James Craigie, 'Last Poems of James VI', SHR 29 (1950), 134-142.

⁹³Tom Tell Troath, sig. A3^r

⁹⁴Craigie (1944), 163; Sommerville (1994), 49. There may be an echo of Thomas More's Richard III, in which Richard's dissimulating delay in accepting the crown is described as a performance typical of such 'kings' games, as it were, stage plays, and for the most part played upon scaffolds, in which poor men be but the lookers-on' (Sylvester (1976), 83).

⁹⁵Heinemann (1980), 39

⁹⁶See note in Goldberg (1983[1989]), 262-3; also Lily B. Campbell, 'The Use of Historical Patterns in the Reign of Elizabeth', HLQ 1 (1938), 135-67. There may also be an echo of Castiglione's discussion of the implications of a prince taking part in masques (Castiglione, transl. Hoby, ed. Raleigh, 1900, 116-7).

⁹⁷The MS. has a full stop at the end of this line, but as this obviously conflicts with the sense I have removed it.

⁹⁸McClure (1939), Vol. 2, 473, 478

⁹⁹Craigie (1958), n. 262-5

¹⁰⁰Nicholas Tyacke notes the fact that Calvinist sermons resumed at St. Paul's Cross in 1624, and concludes that the Directions 'seem to have been largely inoperative', in Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, 103.

¹⁰¹Kenyon (1966), 48

¹⁰²Kenyon (1966), 49

¹⁰³However, Kenneth Fincham draws attention to the fact that the Letter and Directions was sometimes mentioned as an authoritative document in visitation articles of the 1620s and 1630s, in Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church, Vol. 2 (Church of England Record Society, 1998), pp. xviii, 15, 60-1. It would be worth researching the tendencies connecting those bishops who continued to think the Letter and Directions useful although it no longer commanded the support of its author. My thanks go to Dr. Fincham for his helpful suggestions. Julian Davies also suggests that the Letter and Directions can be understood as a step towards the restrictions imposed on preachers under Charles I, in The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism 1625-1641, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992, esp. 130-2.

¹⁰⁴Evidence for the revival of Elizabethan tradition in the 1620s and 1630s is presented in David Cressy, Bonfires and Bells - National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989, 130-40.

¹⁰⁵[Thomas Scott], Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost 'Printed in Paradise' [London: J. Beale?], 1624, STC 22084, Part 1, sig. A3^r, Part 2, sig. D1^v-3^r

¹⁰⁶See Heinemann (1980), 151-171, and the convincing account by Thomas Cogswell, 'Thomas Middleton and the Court, 1624: A *Game at Chess* in Context', HLQ 47 (1984), 273-88, which suggests that the play is a public representation of Buckingham's self-justifying account of the Spanish journey, which he claimed had

been made to expose the Spanish double-dealing in order to make war on them. A wider analysis of the plays produced in 1623-4 can be found in Jerzy Limon, Dangerous Matter: English Drama and Politics in 1623/24, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

¹⁰⁷[John Reynolds], Vox Coeli, 'Printed in Elisium', 1624, STC 20946.7, sig. H1^r

¹⁰⁸sig. H1^r

¹⁰⁹These pamphlets are summarised in Louis B. Wright, 'Propaganda against James I's "Appeasement" of Spain', HLQ 6 (1942-3), 149-72.

¹¹⁰I am using the text in The Svpplication of all the Papists, London: b. E. Griffin, 1642, Wing S6189, Thomason E. 151 (19), sig. [A4^r]

¹¹¹See Cust (1986), 72-3. On the debate over the authenticity of this letter, see [William Oldys], The Life of Dr. George Abbot, Guildford: f. & s. b. J. Russell, 1777, 35-7; also Richard A. Christophers, George Abbot - A Bibliography, Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1966, 86; Fincham (1988), 59.

¹¹²The case of the Letter and Directions certainly poses some problems for the revisionist claim that traditional histories have placed too much emphasis on printed pamphlets, which may reflect extreme and minority opinions to a greater extent than has been realised. There is clear evidence that the opposition which developed in 1622-3 was not simply a matter of a few marginal scribblers. James was resisted by a heterogeneous group of courtiers, preachers, printers and letter-writers, whose critical views were translated into action, which ultimately met with success.

Chapter Three: Rereading King James under Charles I, 1625-40

I. Rival traditions: King Charles and King James as a Calvinist poet

James's death in 1625 was marked by numerous literary tributes and speeches praising his learning and scholarship, many of which also recalled James's failure to control his texts and readers. John Williams, in James's funeral sermon, remarked:

So will it be a quæstion amongst Critiques in the Ages to come, whether this name of James doth more properly note an eminent King, or an eminent Scholler. And in that case, if ungratefull posteritie should forget the King, (as beleeve me it will not...) yet if it should, Learning will never forget the Scholler.¹

Would James's works indeed continue to play a part in the lives of his heir and subjects, even after the departure of their royal author, and would they retain any scholarly or kingly authority? Another commemorative publication, the sheet of verse entitled Mirth in Mourning: Or, Ioyes conquest of Sorrow, spoke hopefully of the new King Charles as a Solomon succeeding David.² It had been usual to praise James as a new Solomon, but this work transfers the title to his son, so as to avoid the suggestion that Britain was entering a period of civil war like Israel after Solomon, in which learning would be forgotten. Would Charles make use of his father's works, and take up the pen himself?

In fact, King Charles was not inclined to make use of his father's legacy of books and words.³ Today, James is largely remembered for his patronage of the 'Authorised Version' of the Bible; Charles is known as a promoter of visual art and architecture, and for his rôle in the scene at the Banqueting House on 30 January

1648/9.⁴ Charles had a different temperament to his father, and his difficulties in speaking as a child made him distrustful of language as a means of communication.⁵ However, Charles was clearly capable of eloquence, and did so in a private capacity to great effect.⁶ It is significant that during the military crisis of 1626-8 which opened his reign, Charles considered the merits of issuing a document explaining the reasons behind the English intervention in France, and apparently concluded that handing subjects more printed material to read and debate would not be to the crown's advantage.⁷ It seems likely that Charles's reluctance to use the communications skills inherited from his father was influenced by a belief that James's activities as an author had undermined his kingly status. There is evidence that Charles saw his father's works as something to be buried with him. Jonathan Goldberg discusses two states of an engraving of the royal family by Willem van de Passe; the first state, of 1622-4, places Prince Charles by a volume of James's Opera. In the second state, of 1625-30, James is still on the throne, now clutching a skull, but the Opera are obscured by Queen Henrietta Maria.⁸

Charles would have been aware of the damage inflicted on James's authority by his subjects' attempts to make him conform to their interpretation of his words during the Spanish match crisis, and he may have feared that these appropriations of James's words would multiply without the restraining presence of the living author, enfeebled as that presence had been in James's final years. Charles cannot have been reassured by new works which suggested that he, too, should conform to his father's words. A Fvneral Elegie Vpon The lamentable losse of our late Leige and Royall King James (1625) tried to sum up James's literary achievement in halting verse:

In Poetrie he likewise did excell,

And Oratorie as the World can tell;
 For divers volumes learnedly he writ,
 Stuft with deepe Art, and Quintessence of wit.⁹

The elegy went on to touch on the sensitive issue of whether James had failed to put into action his words against the Papacy:

He fought against her with that mightie Sword,
 Gods everlasting, undiminisht Word.
 And now may those, who wish Romes overthrow
 (He gave the onset) strike the second blow.
 It was enough for him that he defi'd her:
 And by his writings publiquely descri'd her:
 He shew'd that Enemie, which once must fall;
 Happie be they which shall breake downe her wall.

There seems to be a message to King Charles here; James's words need to be followed up by action by his successor. A rather remarkable passage follows:

Me thinkes I see his bookes taking their leave
 Of him, from whom they Being did receive,
 And leave his Soule speaking, as it was flying,
 Being about to leave his bodie dying,
 Farewell my works, but mayest thou never die,
 Which doest detect Papall Apostasie...

The image of James's books making their way into the world without their author, but still with a mission to accomplish, is rather striking.

It is not altogether surprising that after 1625, James's works seem to have been neglected, possibly even suppressed, by his son. It has been mentioned that James was apparently preparing a third volume of poems for the press, shortly after the publication of the 1617 Workes. Craigie's edition of the poems shows that Prince Charles had played an active part in editing the texts and structuring the volume as a whole.¹⁰ However, just as the Workes were not republished, so this volume had to wait until the twentieth century to be printed. This may be due in part to James's growing disillusionment with literary activity in the 1620s, and possibly to John Bill's

painful memories of the labour involved in printing and selling the Workes.¹¹ However, it does seem odd that Charles should have made no use of his father's writings whatsoever. Allan Westcott suggests of the poems that Charles decided 'not to expose them thus to the attacks of Puritan critics', and their style and subject matter, which is much more entertaining than that of his earlier collections, might well have occasioned disputes over the king's meaning similar to that occasioned by the Declaration of Sports.¹² Helena Shire suggests that Charles's editing work reflects a dislike of the way in which James treated writing as a game.¹³ Perhaps he eventually concluded that James's texts, even after revision, gave their readers too many openings.¹⁴

It seems more likely, however, that Charles was mainly reluctant to publish his father's work because James was widely known as a poet on the basis of his collections of verse published in 1584 and 1591, many of which are in a tradition of apocalyptic, confessional Calvinist verse. It has been mentioned in Chapter Two that James's sonnet on the Armada was exploited by opponents of the Spanish match, and although his late poetry is markedly less concerned with religious politics, Charles might not have wanted the memory of his father's experiments with Calvinist poetry to be revived. It is highly significant that in 1633, William Prynne's Histrio-Mastix was to praise James's poetry, along with that of the Huguenot poet Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas.¹⁵ While condemning the lavish entertainments of the establishment under Charles, Prynne argued that there was a place for art, if it fulfilled a moral purpose. Ignoring the fact that King James and Queen Anne had been closely involved in the production of the masques which Prynne despised,

Prynne identified cultural discontinuities rather than continuities between the reigns of James and Charles.

Prynne's claim that there was a literary tradition different to the one which thrived at the court of King Charles, but which included King James's verse, can be substantiated. The coupling of James and Du Bartas is highly significant; their friendship is in many ways a symbol of the close ties between the Protestant communities in Scotland and France, which received official encouragement before the union of 1603 and James's reaction against Calvinism.¹⁶ In 1584, James's translation of James of Du Bartas' 'L'Uranie' had appeared in The Essayes of a Prentise.¹⁷ In return for the latter translation, Du Bartas had translated James's epic poem 'Lepanto', a celebration of the defeat of the Turkish fleet in the battle of 7 October 1571, into French. Du Bartas' visit to Scotland in 1587 seems to have sealed the friendship, and both the English and French texts of 'Lepanto' were printed in His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres (1591).¹⁸

In the preface to the 1591 printing of 'Lepanto', James complained that manuscript copies of his poem had been circulating without his permission (as would be the case with Basilicon Doron), and that people had misunderstood his intentions in writing about a Catholic hero, when he was actually inspired to write in protest at the aggression of the Catholic League. At this stage in his literary career, James was still confident that his readers could be trusted to perform the correct interpretation without heavy-handed authorial interventions, particularly when he was writing as a private scholar or poet. This preface displays his disappointment at what he saw as their failure to live up to his expectations:

although till now, it have not bene imprinted, yet being set out to the publick view of many, by a great sort of stoln Copies, purchast (in truth) without my knowledge or consent, it hath for lack of a Præface, bene in some things misconstrued by sundry, which I of verie purpose thinking to have omitted, for that the writing therof, might have tended in my opinion, to some reproach of the skilfull learnednes of the Reader, as if his braines could not have conceived so uncurious a worke, without some maner of Commentarie, and so have made the worke more displeasent unto him: it hath by the contrary falen out, that the lack therof, hath made it the more displeasent to some, through their mistaking a part of the meaning therof.¹⁹

James went on to encourage his readers to make a reading of the poem as an allegory of militant Protestantism. For once, James's attempts to regain control over his work seems to have touched a chord with the great Calvinist reading communities, and his poem became a focus for Puritan and Huguenot sympathisers.

The version of 'Lepanto' translated by Du Bartas into French as 'La Leparthe' became incorporated into the canon of Du Bartas' works as part of La Seconde Semaine after his death in 1590, and in this way it continued to be republished and translated throughout Europe.²⁰ The Huguenot printer Hierome Haultin, who printed a French version of James's Ane Frvittfull Meditatioun (1588) on Revelation 20: 7-10 at La Rochelle in 1589 (it was not printed in London until 1603), printed the first continental edition of 'La Leparthe' in 1591, dedicated to James.²¹ The British Library copy of this edition was owned by one James Melvill, who dated his copy 1593, and corrected Du Bartas' spelling of Scottish place-names.²² If this is the same James Melvill who was later to denounce the anti-Presbyterian sentiments of Basilicon Doron, it is notable that his copy contains some manuscript verses in praise of James's literary achievement.²³ There may be a further illustration of the links between James's French Protestant readers and his Scottish Calvinist readers in the fact that the only surviving copy of Haultin's 1588 edition of La Seconde Semaine

(which does not include 'La Lepanthe') was recently discovered in Edinburgh University Library.²⁴

James's poem was independently translated from English into Dutch by Abraham van der Myl, and from English into Latin by Prince Charles's tutor Thomas Murray, whose version appeared entitled Navpactiados (1604).²⁵ Murray's translation was to be included in the important anthology of neo-Latin verse by Scottish writers, organised by Arthur Johnston and John Scot, Delitiæ Poetarvm Scotorvm hujus ævi Illvstrivm (1637).²⁶ Although this was probably intended as a royalist collection to rival the poems of George Buchanan, it would be interesting to know how this account of a Christian struggle against the infidel was received in Scotland just before the Covenanting revolution.²⁷ It is notable that Thomas Murray had Puritan sympathies, and was imprisoned for showing Prince Charles a tract against the Spanish Match.²⁸ It seems that the versions of 'Lepanto' printed on the Continent frequently found their way to Britain, as is indicated by holdings in British libraries today. A full-scale study of the various versions of 'Lepanto' and their impact is greatly needed. It is particularly interesting that although Hudson's 'Judith' was republished alongside every English version of Du Bartas' Weeks, including the translation made by Josuah Sylvester, 'Lepanto' was not fully reprinted in English after 1603, despite being frequently used in anthologies.²⁹ It seems likely that Charles feared that a revival of James's poetry, by 1625 more popular on the Continent than in Britain, would encourage religious traditions with which he had little sympathy, and complicate his endeavours to deal with increasingly vociferous critics of his ecclesiastical policies.

II. James's writings and opposition religious politics 1625-9: a prophetic legacy

As soon as the tone of the new reign was established, writers critical of certain religious positions had begun to invoke and cite the texts of King James. The writings of Richard Montagu, which questioned much Calvinist dogma, and invoked the authority of James for doing so, were particularly alarming to those who believed in the orthodoxy which had been threatened by the Spanish match negotiations.³⁰

From 1626 onwards, numerous works appealed to King Charles to compare the new teaching with the wise words of King James.³¹ Henry Burton's A Plea to an Appeale, a reply to Montagu's Appello Caesarem, warned that Montagu's rejection of the Synod of Dort was an attack on James, who had supported the Calvinist party.

Burton asks:

shall He, He (I say) His sacred ashes be rased up againe, and by an Appeale be urged to recant His former profession, to reverse His judgment, and to cancell, or to burne, His bookes, which no antiquity, no injury of time, no elementary flames, shall ever be able to abolish?³²

Just as in the early 1620s, particular interpretations of James's words are being invoked against what appear to be innovative religious policies. Burton goes on to sum up Montagu's claims, and to insist that Charles must accede in his father's judgement:

In a word, hee appeeles (I wisse) whither the judgment of King James, approving the Doctrine of the Synod of Dort, as agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of England, and both, to the holy Scriptures: or his owne judgment, in his disallowing and rejecting the Synod, as not agreeable to his owne fancies (for his words are, I have no part nor portion in them; either in them, that maintaine the Decrees; or, in the Decrees themselves) whither (I say) King James His judgment, or his owne, be rather to be intertained and

approved of His sacred Majestie His Son, whom God for ever preserve in all integrity of judgment, and love of the Truth.³³

The last line is a clear warning that Charles is expected to show a similar sense of judgment to his father. Burton was probably aware that Charles's religious views were not far removed from those of Montagu; by invoking the authority of King James against the new theology, Burton is touching on the most sensitive issues.

One suspects that Charles found the writings of Daniel Featley, domestic chaplain to Archbishop Abbot until 1625, and Provost of Chelsea College from 1630 (established by James as a centre for anti-papal scholarship), even more annoying.³⁴ An interesting and bold controversialist, Featley was fiercely opposed to any innovations which threatened the doctrines or structures of the Anglican church: he condemned Laud for introducing 'superstitious' ornamentation into churches, but was to be imprisoned in October 1643 after lecturing the Westminster Assembly on the merits of episcopacy.³⁵ Many of Featley's works seem to reflect on the actions and writings of King James. In 1623, for example, Featley had taken part in a disputation with the Jesuit Fathers John Fisher, known as Percy, and John Sweet, in which he had buried his opponents under a mountain of syllogisms. The published accounts of this acrimonious encounter contrast starkly with James's amiable discussions with Fisher in 1622 discussed above, and it is not surprising that James was vexed on hearing of the meeting.³⁶

Featley seems to have identified strongly with Abbot's opposition to James's policies regarding the Spanish match, writing in 1624:

What should I speake of the most happie and joyfull newes of our thrice-noble Prince's returne out of Spaine: whereof your Grace was the first silver Trumpet to the City? And (God bee blessed for it) the Trumpet gave not an uncertaine sound.³⁷

) | |

As Abbot's chaplain, Featley seems acutely aware of the embarrassment caused by James's Letter and Directions of 1622, and he seems to have dedicated himself to reversing its teaching. In early 1625, Featley was called before King James to explain why he had licensed two books which seemed to uphold Puritan teaching.³⁸ Featley stood up for himself and the authors, and James, probably delighted to have the opportunity of a real debate, explained his own opinions in unusual detail. While they were discussing William Crompton's Saint Avstins Religion, James rather casually compared the Pelagian heretics with modern-day Arminians.³⁹

Featley was struck by the usefulness of these remarks, which suggested James's earlier anti-Papal writings rather than his policies of 1618-1624, and used them as a basis for the title of his anonymous A Parallel of New-Old Pelagiarminian Error, which appeared in 1626.⁴⁰ In that work, he emphasised the significance of James's words, his last contribution to theological debate before his death. James had linked the ancient and modern errors:

his Majestie having occasion to touch upon the Treatises of St. Augustine, that are extant in the seventh Tome, (which hee might seeme prophetically to recommend as a souveraine antidote against an evill up-creeping since his death)⁴¹

Featley is re-casting the deceased king as the champion of Augustinian-Calvinist orthodoxy. Paradoxically, James's apparent flirtation with Catholicism in 1622 had made this possible. In the case of the Letter and Directions, it was popularly understood that the king had bowed to the demands of his readers, altering his words to conform to his earlier texts. Featley seems to have considered that the words James had uttered during their discussion in 1625 were also at his disposal. He felt free to cite James, after his death, in defence of the doctrinaire Calvinism James had

come to distrust. The dead king's hearers and readers had assumed control of his texts. Just as James's readers had tried to restrict the king's actions by insisting that he conform to interpretations of his own writings, so Charles's subjects found James's texts a useful polemical tool to guide their sovereign.

Charles could not easily tell established writers like Featley that they had misunderstood the authorial intention, and the king was bound to show at least a superficial respect for the words of his father. Many works seem to have exploited this weakness in Charles's position, and took the opportunity to honour James's memory by reproducing his words, while simultaneously turning them to political ends. In 1627, a collection of two hundred witty phrases attributed to James was published under the title Flores Regij.⁴² The compiler 'J. L. S.' is unknown, and there is no commentary or preface; however, much can be learned about the intentions of the editor by the contents. The genre of table-talk dates back to classical times, and had recently been revived by collections apparently made by Francis Bacon.⁴³ The subtitle seems to confirm that Flores Regij is recording James's contribution to the store of orally delivered wit ('Proverbs and Aphorismes, Divine and Morall. As they were at severall times upon sundry occasions, spoken by his Most Excellent Majestie').⁴⁴ However, the aware reader would rapidly have noted that several of the 'sayings' are also found in James's printed works, including A Premonition and Basilicon Doron. It is well-known that James was fond of quoting his own works at people, but it seems equally possible that the editor has simply extracted the phrases from his books.

It is interesting to consider the motivation behind the selections made. Basilicon Doron is the basis of at least six aphorisms, relating to self-control, the

nature of justice, the danger of idleness and profanity, and the authoritative commands of scripture.⁴⁵ All are warnings rather than words of advice. One of the most lengthy extracts relates to the need for children to honour their parents:

Many doe deceive themselves, in saying, they care not for the Father or Mothers Curse (so they deserve it not;) But beware, you must not invert the order of Nature, in judging your Superiours, chiefly in your owne particuler; For ever, the blessing or curse of the Parents, hath a Profitique power joyned with it.⁴⁶

This is an adaptation of part of the second book of Basilicon Doron:

Neither deceive your selfe with many that say, they care not for their Parents curse, so they deserve it not. O invert not the order of nature, by judging your superiours, chiefly in your owne particular! But assure your selfe, the blessing or curse of the Parents, hath almost ever a Propheticke power joyned with it⁴⁷

It is highly significant that this is the only passage from Basilicon Doron directly quoted in The Fathers Blessing, a compilation of proverbs and meditations published in 1616 which had introduced itself as 'Appropriated to the generall, from that perticuler example of Learning and Pietie his Majestie composed for the Prince his Sonne', but which has otherwise little connection with James's work.⁴⁸ Flores Regij is not using the text in The Fathers Blessing, but it is interesting that both works identify this passage as important.

The significance this text was understood to possess can be elucidated by reading it in the light of James's words to Prince Henry in the introductory epistle to Basilicon Doron:

To conclude then, I charge you, as ever yee thinke to deserve my Fatherly blessing, to follow and put in practise, as farre as lyeth in you, the præcepts hereafter following. And if yee follow the contrary course, I take the Great GOD to record, that this Booke shall one day bee a witness betwixt mee and you; and shall procure to bee ratified in Heaven, the curse that in that case here I give unto you. For I protest before that Great GOD, I had rather not bee a Father, and childlesse, then bee a Father of wicked children.⁴⁹

The will of King James resides in the words of Basilicon Doron: the blessing or curse presented in Flores Regij is Charles's submission to or rebellion against the words of his father. In his Meditation upon the Lords Prayer, written in 1618, James had announced that Basilicon Doron, originally written as James's legacy to Prince Henry, would now be inherited by Charles, 'who succeeds to it by right, as well as to all the rest of his brothers goods'.⁵⁰ Flores Regij is connecting the need for children to respect their parents to the need for Charles to accept James's testament of words, of which Flores Regij is part.

Many others seem to have tried to ensure that Charles lived up to James's writings. While James was alive, this seems to have met with some kind of official approval. In 1621, Patrick Scot published a work entitled A Table-Booke for Princes. Containing short Remembrances for the Government of themselves and their Empire, an advice manual for Prince Charles which seems rather like a new Basilicon Doron.⁵¹ Scot introduces the wise sayings it contains as 'crums falne from the Princely Table' of James, and goes on to make use of Basilicon Doron and the Meditation... on Matthew, emphasising the responsibilities of kings towards their subjects, and the burdens of kingship.⁵² Scot is emphatically a royalist, but even here there is a discernible strategy of trying to direct Charles in a certain direction, using his father's words. Scot warns him:

The words of a Prince are (like the oracles of Apollo) no sooner spoken, but taken holde of by all men: therefore great care is to be taken, that his wordes, his orations, his answeres and demandes, be consonant to the dignity of a Prince.⁵³

Scot seems to be suggesting that they should also be consonant to the opinions of King James. It is interesting that this tendency to impose limitations on Charles

apparently developed and intensified after James's death, as Charles began to implement his own policies. Flores Regij seems to suggest that Charles should be paying more respect to the values and intentions embodied in his father's literary will.

Among the metaphors which are being used to describe James's words in relation to the influence they may have on his son, the idea of the 'legacy' of instructions was established by James, but the idea of James's words as 'prophecy', mentioned by Featley, is rather new. Flores Regij invokes the idea of the 'legacy', but the idea of James's 'curse' having some supernatural power over his child suggests that this second way of understanding language, related to the 'prophecy' metaphor, is present. Flores Regij also attributes the following ominous remark to James:

It is a certaine rule in all darke Prophetesies, that they are never clearely understood til they be accomplished.⁵⁴

James's interest in the issue of whether or not prophecy had ceased since the revelation of Christ, and in the issue of extent to which his own words were divinely inspired, is an undercurrent in his writings. In his speech to Parliament of 9 November 1605, he had described the uncovering of the Gunpowder Plot in very striking terms:

the discovery hereof is not a little wonderfull, which would bee thought the more miraculous by you all, if you were aswell acquainted with my naturall disposition, as those are who be neere about me: For as I ever did hold Suspition to be the sicknes of a Tyrant, so was I so farre upon the other extremity, as I rather contemned all advertisements, or apprehensions of practises. And yet now at this time was I so farre contrary to my selfe, as when the Letter was shewed to me by my Secretary, wherein a generall obscure advertisement was given of some dangerous blow at this time, I did upon the instant interpret and apprehend some darke phrases therein, contrary to the ordinary Grammer construction of them, (and in an other sort then I am sure any Divine, or Lawyer in any Universitie would have taken them) to be meant by this horrible forme of blowing us up all by Powder⁵⁵

This sense of James's words being charged with a kind of supernatural power is quite distinct from the openly-articulated theory that the king's words are analogous to Scripture. However, after James's death, interest in these ambiguous, unorthodox suggestions about the power of the king's curse or the king's interpretation seems to have grown, particularly in works using James's words to reflect on the government of King Charles.

It may be argued that 'prophecy' and 'curse' are quite distinct terms, the one foreseeing that which will happen, the other making an event take place: however, it seems to me that these works are reliant on a predestinarian discourse in which the activities of 'foreseeing' and 'predetermining' are not differentiated. Nigel Smith argues that in the seventeenth century 'prophecy' was primarily defined as the interpretation of scripture, and only secondarily as the prediction of future events.⁵⁶ However, it does not seem to me that this distinction is particularly meaningful, at least not in the works discussed here. If James's interpretations of scripture, texts or events generally are inspired, they will inevitably function as prophecy. The implications for James's readers, and for King Charles, are far-reaching. It is one thing to speak of James's works as a model which he expected his son to follow, but to suggest that his words to Charles actually describe events that will take place is very subversive. Readers of James's texts could find not only the author's hopes and fears for his son's reign, but words praising or blaming Charles for things he had done or would do. This, potentially, suggests that readers can exercise some power over King Charles. Basilicon Doron was originally written by James in the expectation that his son would read it after his death: can the dead James, as interpreted by his readers, somehow judge Charles for the use he is making of his legacy?

In 1629, Featley published a detailed narrative of his discussions with James in 1625, under the title Cygneae Cantio. In his dedication to King Charles, Featley refers to the popular belief that a man's last words are of semi-supernatural significance:

The learned resolutions, and divine instructions which I lately received from your Fathers mouth, I value no lesse then peereless Pearles: And because the *last* speech of a departing friend maketh the deepest impression, and Art herein imitating Nature holdeth out long the *last* note of the dying sound in the Organ; I thought it my duty to offer unto your Majestie the ensuing Relation of the last polemical discourses of his Majesty your Father, in matter of controversie in Divinity.⁵⁷

Featley suggests that James's words have an extraordinary degree of relevance for the contemporary situation. By 1629, like Abbot, Featley was becoming increasingly isolated at court, as Neile, Cosin and Laud rose in royal favour, and his dissatisfaction is clear even in the dedication. Featley may be referring to the ambiguous closing words of James's Meditation on... Matthew, cited in Chapter Two above, when he speaks of the succession using the traditional metaphor for a good king following a good king, 'The Sunne set, and no night ensued thereupon'. Although the sentence is logically an affirmation of Charles's reign, its tone is dark, like the rest of the superficially complimentary dedication. The image of continuing light is mere rhetoric, for Featley believes that 1625 has marked a real and disastrous disruption in the development of the church.

The work goes on to give a narrative of the discussions of 1625, and presents James's cautious views on reading the Fathers, who were being 'rediscovered' by Laud and his supporters as representatives of a tradition from which both Romanism and Calvinism had diverged. Featley comments:

Whether his Majesty received these Observations from any ancient Father, or late judicious Writer: Or whether the same spirit which directed them immediatly, instructed him, I know not.⁵⁸

The implication is clear: the Holy Ghost is speaking through King James as a warning to King Charles. The work ends with a letter by Featley's publisher, Robert Milbourne, in which he asserts that James had read and approved Cyanea Cantio. Milbourne attacks an informer who was trying to get works by his various left-wing authors suppressed, including this text:

As for this Relation, I feare not his, nor any others misinformation, which had (three yeeres agoe) not onely the approbation of divers reverend Divines, but also of the most learned Prince King James, there being nothing contained in it, but that which tendeth to the glory of God, and the honor of that religious King; who shewed his constancie in the true Religion established, and his Zeale for it, as well against the Papists, as other Heterodox Opiniers even to the death.⁵⁹

It would be normal practice to refer to 'the true Religion *now* established'. Milbourne is suggesting that in the three years since James's death (presumably this was written in 1628) the church has fallen into corruption. The myth of the godly king James, whose own orthodoxy was greatly in doubt only a few years before, poses a serious challenge to Charles. He could hardly suppress works like Flores Regij and Cyanea Cantio, which pay honour to James and his writings, but neither could he ignore the way in which they talked of James's words as if they could bind King Charles.

The underlying conviction of Featley and Milbourne that Charles is destroying the achievement of James is recognised by William Prynne, who praises Cyanea Cantio in The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme.⁶⁰ Prynne, who is much more assertive in his use of James's writings against Charles, appeals to Parliament to consider James's words in his Meditation on the Lords Prayer, his Paraphrase upon the Revelation, and in the Cyanea Cantio, and to defend

the Calvinist orthodoxy expressed in those works. Prynne also invokes another work of 1626, Francis Rous' Testis Veritatis. The Doctrine of King James, which quotes from and refers to James's Meditation on the Lord's Prayer, his Declaration against the Dutch theologian Conrad Vorst (Vorstius), and his utterances at the Hampton Court Conference to prove that James believed in predestination and final perseverance.⁶¹ It was only a short step from using James's words to advise his son in impeccably royalist publications like Scot's Table-Booke to using them to denigrate the beliefs and policies of King Charles.⁶²

III. King Charles and the attempt to reclaim James, 1630-7: Psalms and Sports

Charles had good reason for not publishing James's love poetry and witty rhymes: it would have been an extremely provocative response to the readings of James's works made by Featley, Prynne and Rous, and would have given readers even more interesting material to use and misuse. However, by neglecting James's writings, Charles was allowing them to become the property of the political and religious opposition. It seems clear that the semi-official suppression, or at least neglect of James's writings was stimulating discussion of James's intentions and beliefs. Without a canon of James's works publicly owned by Charles, and subjected to Charles's interpretation, there was considerable room for speculation about the author's meaning. Charles seems to have decided that it was not worth entering the arena to reclaim Basilicon Doron, or other texts which were already in the hands of the people. Instead, he would try to re-construct the idea of James's inspired literary legacy, by issuing hitherto unpublished work of (in Charles's eyes) impeccable orthodoxy.

In 1631, the first new edition of a work ascribed to King James was printed at Oxford by William Turner, with full royal authority. It was a translation of the Psalms.⁶³ It was well-known that James had produced versions of the Psalms in Scots, and his translation of Psalm 104 from the Latin version of Tremellius had been printed in The Essays of a Prentise.⁶⁴ In his funeral sermon, Williams had referred to James's ambition to translate the Psalms, remarking that 'This worke was staid in the one and thirty Psalme'.⁶⁵ Another commemorative work published in 1625, John King's Cenotaphivm Iacobi, had lamented the fact that James's death meant that only

a fifth of the projected translation had been accomplished.⁶⁶ Unlike the poems, however, James's Psalms were, apparently, to be revived. In 1626, Charles had written to the Archbishop of St. Andrews:

Whereas it pleased our late dear Father of famous and eternall memorie, considering how imperfect the Psalmes in Meeter presentlie used ar, out of his zeal to the glorie of God, and for the good of all the Churches within his dominions, to translate them of new, Therfor, as We have gevin commandement to our trustie and weilbeloved Sr William Alexander knyght, to consider and review the meeter and poesie thairof, So our pleasour is, that zow and some of the most learned Divynes in that our kingdome confer them with the originall text, and with the most exact translations, and thairefter certifie back zour opinions unto ws concerning the same, whether it be fitting that they be published and sung in Churches, instead of the old translation, or not; To the intent that we may neglect nothing so much importing the memorie of our said late Father; and far less if zow find that it may tend to the advancement of the glorie of God...⁶⁷

The rights of printing these Psalms were granted to Sir William Alexander of Menstrie on 21 January 1627/8.⁶⁸

In the first printed edition of 1631, Charles introduces the work as if Alexander and the divines had been perfectly satisfied with his father's productions:

Haueing caused this Translation of the Psalmes (whereof oure late deare Father was Author) to be perused, and it being found to be exactly and truely done wee doe hereby authorize the same to be Imprinted...

However, the texts actually printed bear little resemblance to the translation of thirty Psalms which James probably made in the 1580s, extant in British Library MS. Royal 18.B.xvi.⁶⁹ The 1631 texts seem to be entirely the work of Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling.⁷⁰ James Craigie has described how James's actual work was 'kept closely guarded from curious eyes'.⁷¹ Charles's actions can perhaps be explained by the fact that he wanted the new translation of the Psalms to help in making the Scottish Kirk conform to English doctrine and liturgy. This has been seen, traditionally, as Charles's main motive for publishing the work: as has been shown,

he had other reasons for making use of James's words, but the immediate context of the publication cannot be overlooked. James's translations are into Scots. Perhaps Alexander, who anglicised many of his own texts, began by trying to anglicise James's Psalms, but eventually realised that it would be more practical to produce an entirely new version.⁷² It is possible that by 1631, with Charles's need to assert that King James's words were under his control and in accordance with his beliefs becoming urgent, there was no time to make any real use of James's genuine work, or to produce a text that showed some sensitivity towards the Scottish tradition.

The version of the Psalms which eventually appeared in print met with an extremely hostile reception, partly because of concern about the circumstances and significance of its composition.⁷³ In Scotland, it was immediately understood that the work was part of the campaign to suppress Presbyterianism. David Calderwood, the Presbyterian propagandist and historian, immediately wrote some Reasons against the reception of King James's metaphrase of the Psalms.⁷⁴ Calderwood is careful not to attack James himself, and stresses the fact, which seems to have been an open secret, that the work was largely not by James:

[The people call them Menstries Psalmes. Bot we heir that another, if not others, also hath had ane hand in them, and that these have revised King James his part. Of these, then, we mene in speciall when I speik of the new metaphrase.] I have not as zit compared ther translation with the originall, nor considered what libertie they have takin in the metaphrasing to add, insert or degresse.⁷⁵

Calderwood refers to James's translation of thirty Psalms which Williams mentioned in his funeral sermon, and he seems to mean this when he speaks of not having compared the new work with the 'originall'. He clearly *has* compared the text of the new Psalms to more authoritative versions, and later points out several places in

which Alexander departs from the inspired text. It is interesting that Calderwood should write as if he could have access to James's actual work, as if it had been printed in an earlier volume.⁷⁶

Calderwood goes on to argue that the poor quality of the translation is not as important as the fact that it is being imposed on the Kirk without consulting its members. It was an insult to the church that the new translation had been entrusted to 'a courteour or commone poet'.⁷⁷ He assumes that because of the secular authorship, the resulting translation has brought 'the elegancies and pleasant conceats of prophane poets... into so grave and austere a work'.⁷⁸ He gives a fascinating selection of passages which contain too many 'French, Latine, and hard English tearmes'.⁷⁹ It is worth noting that in the manuscript of the passage quoted above in which Calderwood denies that this is mainly the work of King James, the essential part in square brackets is deleted. If copies of the manuscript had circulated without this qualifying remark, the criticisms of the work of this 'commone poet' could be read as an unprecedented attack on James's pretensions to authorship. At any rate, hostility to a Biblical translation attributed to James and sanctioned by Charles was clearly most damaging to the authority of the king as head of the church. The revised editions of the Psalms in 1636 and 1637 took some of the criticisms on board, but the fact that the 1637 edition was issued and bound with the disastrous Scottish Prayer Book ensured its final rejection.⁸⁰ Many Scottish readers, who appear to have been the target audience of all these editions, were not prepared to accept these spurious posthumous writings, let alone read them.⁸¹ Instead, ironically, the next translation of the Psalms to meet with widespread Scottish approval was the work of Francis Rous, mentioned above, who had quoted James's words against Montagu.⁸²

It is now widely appreciated that the outbreak of rebellion in Scotland in 1637-8 was a major factor in the political breakdown in England in 1640-2.⁸³ However, Charles's unsuccessful attempts to get control of James's texts, which had been partly responsible for the revolt in Edinburgh, were in their own right a cause of the collapse of Charles's authority. Charles's endeavours to prove that his policies were not innovative, but fully in accordance with James's writings, only succeeded in drawing attention to the gulf between Charles's interpretation of James's works, and those readings supported by popular consensus. James had admitted in 1621 that an over-zealous defence of authority draws attention to weakness. F. S. Siebert writes of James and Charles that 'In publicly presenting a defense for their sovereign powers, they unconsciously invited retaliation and rejoinder'.⁸⁴ Equally, by insisting that 1625 did not mark a break in continuity, Charles reminded people of their perception that James's achievements were being disrupted. In part, this sense of disruption was the creation of those like Featley and Prynne, who sought to make the most of the uncertainty at the start of a new reign in order to promote their own policies. However, it seems clear that the belief that new teaching was being allowed to flourish under Charles was genuine and widespread.

Charles made an even more serious error of judgement in 1633, just after the Psalms had met their first rebuff, by republishing James's Declaration of Sports.⁸⁵ The original work, largely written by Bishop Morton but authorised by James, was the result of James's progress through Lancashire in 1617. James had received complaints from the local inhabitants, many of whom were Catholics, that the predominantly Puritan magistrates were preventing them from amusing themselves after church on Sundays. James was sympathetic, and drew up a declaration for

Lancashire, stating that the papists would not be converted if they believed that 'no honest myrth or recreacon is lawfull or tollerable in our religion'.⁸⁶ He ordered that:

after the en[d] of all Devyne service our good people bee not letted or discouraged from anie unlawfull⁸⁷ recreacion such as Pypinge Dansinge either men or women archerie for men leaping valtinge or anie such harmles recreation⁸⁸

In 1618, this was published nationally as The Kings Maiesties Declaration to His Subiects, concerning lawfull Sports.⁸⁹ However, James does not seem to have attempted to enforce the work, as he was later to do with the Letter and Directions. It was, after all, intended to offer people the freedom to choose their activities rather than to compel them to dance and sing.

The work which came to be known as the 'Book of Sports' would probably have been forgotten, if King Charles had not decided to make use of it against his Puritan opponents.⁹⁰ However, its republication in the autumn of 1633 generated such controversy that, as Craigie remarks, it has led to the work being given more attention than any of James's other writings.⁹¹ With Abbot's death in 1633, Charles had lost a prominent figure who reminded people of a Jacobean tradition very different to the one Laud wished to cultivate. One of Laud's first acts as Archbishop of Canterbury was to dismiss Abbot's chaplains.⁹² Another, apparently with strong support from Charles, was to take action against the local authorities in Somerset, who had attempted to suppress local feasts known as 'Wakes'. Charles seems to have been brought to see this as an attempt by secular bodies to impose Puritanism on the church. The result was a new edition of the Declaration of Sports, this time with the intention of enforcing its prescriptions.⁹³ Charles added a new directive specifically

mentioning the Wakes, explaining that this immediate problem was the reason he had been moved to 'ratifie and publish this Our blessed Fathers Declaration'.⁹⁴

Although the immediate reason for the publication was a provincial dispute, the significance of Charles's decision to resolve this dispute by invoking the tradition of his father's works has been overlooked. The 1633 'Book of Sports' can be read in terms of the struggle to control the tradition of reading King James. As with the Psalms, Charles seems to have sought works by his father which had not become the subject of acrimonious interpretations and counter-interpretations: in a sense, he seems to have been trying to re-make a canon of James's works which would support his own views. James's words were being used as a weapon in a political campaign. Charles had succeeded in turning a well-intended, non-compulsive text into a highly-charged work of propaganda, which would eventually be burned by order of Parliament.⁹⁵

The damage which Charles had done to his cause by organising the printing of the Psalms and the Declaration of Sports took time to become fully clear. In November 1636, Henry Burton, the author of A Plea to an Appeale mentioned above, preached two sermons in commemoration of the Gunpowder Plot, and took the opportunity to review the works of the king who God had preserved from Roman terrorism. These were published under the title For God, and the King.⁹⁶ This may have been intended to recall a semi-official tract on obedience which had appeared in 1615 entitled God and the King: or, a dialogue shewing that King James, being immediate under God doth rightfully claime whatsoever is required by the oath of alleageance.⁹⁷ James may well have had a hand in the writing of this pamphlet, which everyone was enjoined to accept in a proclamation.⁹⁸ Burton, too, presents himself as

loyal to the king, but his loyalty is very similar to that of those who preached against the Letter and Directions in 1622. His target is those prelates who are deceiving King Charles into permitting the introduction of popish doctrines and morals. Burton sees the Declaration of Sports as part of this strategy, and argues that it should not be accepted, because it does not contain an authentic expression of the royal meaning.

Burton acknowledges that 'the Booke of Sports was first published in Print in K. James his name', but makes the case that mere attribution does not entitle it to a place in the canon of James's works. As Calderwood had done with the Psalms, Burton tries to separate the supposed royal author from the text by stressing the circumstances of composition. He writes:

if wee consider the maner of putting forth of that booke at first, we shall finde how light it is, to hold waight, or to preponderate that learned and judicious Booke, honourably, Stiled *Basilicon Doron*. First it was procured, compiled, and published in time of his Majesties Progresse into Scotland, when he was more then ordinarily merily disposed. They that were the compilers of it (for we must not thinke the Kings leasure served him to doe it)... God rewarded them... Againe it was never read, nor yet pressed upon any Minister to be read, during King James his raigne, which lasted six yeares after the publishing of the said Booke in Print. Thirdly, it was not ratified under the Kings broad Seale, as publick royall Acts use to be, to make them authenticall. Fourthly, this booke was not inserted in his royall works sent to Oxford, as not sutable to be ranked among so many learned and pious workes. Lastly, it was never in his raigne used as a snare, and engine, to outt good Ministers...⁹⁹

Burton invokes Basilicon Doron, popularly understood as a work of orthodox Calvinism in opposition to Charles and Laud, against the Declaration of Sports. Charles's attempts to change the way people are reading King James are being countered by an assertion that the canon of works received by James's readers will not admit this document. Burton makes skilful use of the evidence, interpreting the fact that the work was not personally written by James to infer that it was procured

without his full support, and using the fact that it was not printed in the Workes to suggest that James never intended it to qualify what he had said in his earlier writings. It was probably a mistake to suggest that the work appeared while James was 'more then ordinarily merily disposed', a remark whose possible implications provoked a furious response from the hardline Laudian controversialist Peter Heylyn.¹⁰⁰ Overall, however, the attack is extremely successful.

Burton goes on to discuss the delicate matter of Charles's promotion of the work:

Quest. But how came it to be revived, & republished, K. James being dead, and this book also, having no place in his royall Workes to preserve the memory of it? Answer. By whose meanes it was raked out of the Ashes, I know not, but this I am sure of, that the republishing of it with some addition, was the first remarkable worke, which was done presently after the Lord of Canterbury tooke possession of his Grace-slip [*sic*].¹⁰¹

The Letter and Directions of 1622 had been rejected for conflicting with widely-accepted readings of James's works. Equally, the Declaration of Sports does not belong among James's works, and therefore must conflict with the beliefs of Charles, who had inherited James's works. Therefore, the republication must be blamed on Archbishop Laud. Burton makes the connection with the Letter and Directions explicit, discussing it as an earlier example of the prelates' endeavours to restore popery:

And to this purpose they procure another order in King James his name, for the inhibiting of young Ministers to preach of the Doctrines of Election and Predestination, & that none but Bishops & Deanes shall handle those points.¹⁰²

Charles's attempts to introduce new works into the canon of James's texts have resulted in the situation created by the Letter and Directions deteriorating further. In 1622, readers had resisted the obvious interpretation of the king's text on the basis

that it conflicted with his earlier writings: now, they are prepared to argue that works that seem to contradict their readings of James and Charles are simply not products of the royal pen at all.

Burton's most significant contribution to the debate on readings of James's texts, however, was his citation of James's speech of 21 March 1610 to support his arguments about the duties of kings.¹⁰³ James is quoted as having said:

The King bindes himselfe, by a double oath to the observation of the fundamentall Lawes of the Kingdome: Tacitly, as being a King, and so bound as well to protect, the People, as the Lawes of his Kingdome: and expressly, by his Oath at His Coronation: So as every just King in a settled Kingdome is bound to observe that paction made to his people by his Lawes, in framing his government agreeable thereunto, according to that paction, which God made with Noah after the deluge, &c. And therefore a King governing in a settled Kingdome, leaves to be a King, and degenerates into a Tyrant, as soone as hee leaves off to rule according to his lawes. And a little after: Therefore all Kings that are not Tyrants, or perjurd, will be glad to bound themselves within the limits of their Lawes: and they that perswade them the contrary, are Vipers and Pests, both against them, and the Common Wealth.

Burton concludes the extract with a comment:

Which words beseeming a just King, I have heere set downe as an honourable testimony of such a Father, of such a Sonne: and all to be for the stronger reason to all Subjects to performe all due obedience to their Sovereigne.

Burton gives a marginal note to James's Workes: however, if one compares this citation with the text printed during James's lifetime, a number of striking differences are evident. The text in the Workes runs as follows:

And so the King became to be *lex loquens*, after a sort, binding himselfe by a double oath to the observation of the fundamentall Lawes of his kingdome: Tacitly, as by being a King, and so bound to protect aswell the people, as the Lawes of his Kingdome; and Expresly, by his oath at his Coronation: So as every just King in a settled Kingdome is bound to observe that paction made to his people by his Lawes, in framing his government agreeable thereunto, according to that paction which God made with Noe after the deluge, *Hereafter Seed-time, and Harvest, Cold and Heate, Summer and Winter, and Day and Night shall not cease, so long as the earth remaines.*

And therefore a King governing in a settled Kingdome, leaves to be a

King, and degenerates into a Tyrant, as soone as he leaves off to rule according to his Lawes. In which case the Kings conscience may speake unto him, as the poore widow said to Philip of Macedon; Either governe according to your Law, *Aut ne Rex sis*. And though no Christian man ought to allow any rebellion of people against their Prince, yet doeth God never leave Kings unpunished when they transgresse these limits: For in that same Psalme where God saith to Kings, *Vos Dij estis*, hee immediatly thereafter concludes, *But ye shall die like men*. The higher wee are placed, the greater shall our fall be. *Ut casus sic dolor*: the taller the trees be, the more in danger of the winde; and the tempest beats sorest upon the highest mountaines.

Therefore all Kings that are not tyrants, or perjured, wil be glad to bound themselves within the limits of their Lawes; and they that perswade them the contrary, are vipers, and pests, both against them and the Commonwealth.¹⁰⁴

Burton has suppressed the immediate context of this passage, in which James is explaining how kingship has developed through history, from primitive military leadership into the model of the 'speaking law', where kings are prepared to allow their authority to be restricted by a framework of laws, and to express their authority only through these laws. James is quite clear that these concessions do not change the fact that kingship entails absolute power, but Burton uses the text to make it appear that James is speaking for the supremacy of law. Most significant, however, is Burton's suppression of James's argument that a tyrant could only be corrected by God, and that 'no Christian man ought to allow any rebellion of people against their Prince'. Burton's phrase 'And a little after' neatly re-connects the text, without the key passage which is the basis of James's argument. Burton's King James is apparently leaving the door open to resistance theory.¹⁰⁵

The important point about Burton's strategies in this work is not that they are outrageously manipulative, invoking the need for textual authenticity in the case of the Declaration of Sports, and silently editing James's words in the speech of 1610. The important point is that Burton's actions are logical and to some extent justifiable

within the context of the tradition of reading King James that was established by 1636. In the eyes of a significant group of readers, the events of 1622 had shown that the king could not be relied on to interpret his own works accurately. James's readers had had to remind him what his earlier texts had meant. Now, after the fiasco of the Psalms and the Declaration of Sports, it had become clear that Charles, equally, could not be trusted to read his father's writings in accordance with established patterns of interpretation. To modern eyes it may appear that writers like Burton were simply adjusting the king's words to suit their own purposes, but such a cynical explanation does not adequately explain the serious engagement with the text, the account of the circumstances of original publication, and the marginal references to the edition consulted. Burton and his fellow readers believed that they knew what King James had really meant, and they believed they had the right to re-model his words to make that meaning clear.

Burton seems to have influenced a tract by John Bastwick, who was punished by the court of Star Chamber with Burton and that other radical reader of King James, William Prynne, in 1637.¹⁰⁶ The Answer of Iohn Bastwick, Doctor of Physicke, To the exceptions made against his Letany (1637) is a powerful demand for reform of ceremonies and doctrines which savoured of Rome.¹⁰⁷ Bastwick is more explicit than Burton about the need to make Charles submit to his reading of the works of King James. Referring to James's Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, he reminds Charles that:

King James absolutely assevers, nay unanswerably proveth, that the Pope is Antichrist, and Rome the Whore of Babylon, and that salvation cannot be had in that church: and in the same faith he lived and dyed:- and in the same our gracious King Charles was bred and educated¹⁰⁸

It would be possible to quote many texts by James to show that he did believe that Catholics, even Jesuits, could be saved: but Bastwick has a fixed understanding of King James as an uncompromising Calvinist who never changed his mind. Bastwick goes on to attack those associated with the prelates who have told King Charles that he is above the law:

But concerning such men, heare what the learnedest King that ever was, (King James I meane) said in his speech to the Lords and commons at whitehall March 21. 1609. who had more policy in the paring of his nayles, then all the Grollish [*sic*] Polititians that are now extant in the whole body of them, yet he said, that those that perswade Kings to doe contrary unto their lawes, are vipers and pests, both against them and the common-wealth. And these are the words of a mighty, learned and prudent King, & this doctrine I have received from him. And if it would please his Highnes our renowned King whom God long preserve, well to consider what his father says; his Majesty would better Perceive the truth of it his speech for in it he spake not onely like a King of wisdom: but like an oracle of heaven.¹⁰⁹

King James's words have been removed from their context even further, being incorporated into an attack on Charles's court. Charles is told to read James's works again, presumably in the light of this reworking, and to acknowledge the supernatural force of his words. It has to be said that the idea of James as an oracle contrasts rather oddly with the earlier reference to the wisdom of his nail-parings, but Bastwick's overall strategy is quite clear. King Charles must be taught how to read, even at the expense of sacrificing the integrity of King James's texts.

By trying to change the tradition of reading King James, Charles had given this tradition a new self-awareness and hence renewed vigour. And as the extract from Burton shows, the tradition was now changing itself. It was one thing to use the 1610 speech to suggest that James had believed in the supremacy of law, but to remove James's cautions against rebellion was to open up new possibilities. Charles had apparently defied the laws by commanding obedience to his father's Book of

Sports; through Burton, the tradition replies by suggesting that James would not have supported obedience to such a tyrant. Bastwick makes the connection between James's warnings against bad government and King Charles even more explicit. Readings were becoming politicised and polarised.

IV. A revolution empowered by reading King James? 1638-1640

It is not, of course, my intention to argue that the Civil War was caused by disputes over the interpretation of King James's works. However, the pamphleteers of the 1630s and 1640s themselves looked back to the reigns of Elizabeth and James, and to the controversies of that period, in order to explain what was happening. It is perfectly acceptable to consider changing theological positions and patterns of Scriptural exegesis as factors in the breakdown of 1638-41, and it would seem reasonable to take developments in reading the secular scripture of James's works into account as well. It is intriguing that the opposition parties who ended up in arms against King Charles seem to have been instinctively conservative, backward-reading people. This seems to have been particularly true in Scotland, where the case that the 'rebels' were resisting unlawful innovations was even stronger than in England. The National Covenant signed in Greyfriars Kirk in Edinburgh on 28 February 1638 was not a Declaration of Independence, or a Declaration of the Rights of Man: it was not an entirely original work, but based on a sixteenth-century document with the authority of King James VI, the 'King's Confession' (often known as the 'negative confession') of 1581.¹¹⁰

The battle of words over the meaning of this text reveals much about the way readings of James's works had developed, and about the effect these developments were having on political events. The original, Ane Short and Generall Confession had been drawn up, on James's instructions, by his chaplain John Craig, in order to quash rumours that James was on the verge of converting to Catholicism.¹¹¹ Subscribed on 28 January 1580/1, and resubscribed in 1590, it was designed to

defend and clarify the position of the Scottish Kirk against Rome. In the seventeenth century, supporters of Presbyterianism decided that the work could be turned against Arminianism as well.¹¹² As Margaret Steele writes, the 1581 Confession 'lent a certain legitimacy to the National Covenant by establishing its signatories as emulators of a royal tradition'.¹¹³ Against the liturgical innovations, of which the translation of the Psalms ascribed to James formed a part, the Covenanters displayed James's declaration of orthodox Calvinism.

By September 1638, the Scottish Presbyterians and the English government were making preparations for war. It was at this point that Charles intervened by issuing his own version of the 1581 Confession, with a gloss that he hoped would encourage the signatories of the Covenant to see that their leaders had interpreted the text incorrectly, and to sign his work instead. The issue on which the debate came to depend was the question of whether the Confession had condemned episcopacy or not. David Stevenson describes the extraordinary manoeuvres undertaken by the pro-Presbyterian Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall, who apparently persuaded the king's supporters in Scotland to sign the document issued by Charles, with the intention that he could then announce that the royalists had signed a document which committed them to abolishing the bishops.¹¹⁴ Charles had not shown clearly that the Confession was in agreement with his policies. As a result, as Stevenson says:

Though most covenanters continued to refuse to sign the king's covenant they quickly adopted Craighall's interpretation of it and used it as evidence that king and council had agreed to abolish all innovations since 1581.¹¹⁵

Such confusion was possible because the Confession of 1581 was a provisional statement of anti-Roman policy rather than an unambiguous affirmation of eternal truths: it does not impose divine-right episcopacy or denounce prelacy. For the

readers of the 1630s, the text itself was less important than the king's meaning, as understood in terms of the tradition of reading. And once again, the tradition which made James's texts speak for orthodox Calvinism was stronger than Charles's attempts to rewrite it. David Mullan says of the 'interpretations' of the 1581 confession: 'The question was not legal and rational. It was a passionate battle against Antichrist or else a loyal and obedient word against sectaries'.¹¹⁶

The result of these debates was to give the rival parties more material about which to disagree. It is usual to date the outbreak of the 'pamphlet war' in 1642, but the tracts written on the controversy over the National Covenant anticipate the later flood of works, in terms of style and strategy. A good representative of the royalist attempts to reclaim the tradition of reading King James is A Large Declaration concerning the late Tumults in Scotland, which tries to identify the Covenanters with James's Catholic opponents during the controversy over the Oath of Allegiance. It claims:

their poore Arguments, which they have delivered in their seditious Pamphlets printed or written, are taken almost *verbatim* out of Bellarmine and Suarez, as appeareth to Us by Our Royall Father his Monitorie Preface to all Christian Kings and Princes, and his Apologie for the Oath of Allegeance, and in the Bookes writ by others in defence of them both; in all which these arguments are fully answered.¹¹⁷

The argument that the Covenanters have already been proved wrong by works written by James thirty years before suggests a curious attitude to real texts and real history. The work goes on to explain what James meant in subscribing the Confession of 1581, to show that he would have supported the new Scottish Liturgy.¹¹⁸ The author's desire to gain immediate control of the tradition of reading King James, and hence the authority behind the Covenanters' actions, outweighs all other concerns.

The risks inherent in such an approach are compounded by the fact that the work was published in the name of King Charles, and with his authority, although the pen is actually that of Walter Balcanquhall. Balcanquhall seems to be promoting his arguments by exploiting the words of James and Charles with little thought for the consequences this might have on the living monarch.¹¹⁹

A Large Declaration was met by W. Ker's anonymously published A True Representation of the Proceedings of the Kingdome of Scotland, which exposes Balcanquhall's proxy authorship, but still insists on replying to King Charles.¹²⁰ Ker is prepared to do anything with texts and histories in order to make the case that the Covenanters' position has a legitimate justification. He argues that because the 1581 Confession was re-subscribed in 1590, when there were no active diocesan bishops, it must have been intended to condemn episcopacy when originally written in 1581:

The intention of authority is manifest by the commanding to subscribe the Confession of faith in the yeare 1590. when we had no Bishops, and after Bishopricks were annexed to the Crown. It is not to be supposed that authority had one intention at this time, and a contrary intention in the yeere 1580. The Kings Majesty that then was, did write and subscribe with his own hand in the margine of a printed Sermon which was preached by D. Bancroft at Pauls crosse, these words: My speaking, writing, and actions, were ever one, and without dissembling or bearing up any thing whatsoever, ut quid asperius. IAMES REX.¹²¹

This last rather desperate example harks back to Thomas Scott's attempts to argue that the king can never change his mind, in the 1620s. The idea that the original meaning of a text can be determined by examining the interpretation its author puts upon it ten years later is as problematic as Balcanquhall's suggestion that James's texts of 1608-9 are intended to condemn the Covenanters of 1638.

The second part of A True Representation, entitled The Proceedings of the Commissioners sent from the Parliament of Scotland, appeals to Charles not to attack

Scotland, on the basis of Basilicon Doron and James's speech to the English Parliament on 31 March 1607.¹²² There is, unsurprisingly, a quotation from the passage in James's speech of 21 March 1610 used by Burton and Bastwick. The text refers to those who are trying to separate Charles from his kingdom:

Wee can give them no other Character, but that which your Majesties Father of blessed memorie gave them, terming such men, *vipers and pests against the King and his Kingdome*.¹²³

Whether the author of A True Representation is using Burton or James's Workes as his copy-text, the editing of the speech to make it fit in with the flow of the polemical argument marks a new extension of the possibilities for using King James's words.

The passage from the 1610 speech quoted by Burton and A True Representation seems to have had a fascination for the opposition pamphleteers, whether because of its appearance in Burton's sermons, or, more probably, because it is one of James's most conciliatory speeches. Detached from its original context, variants of the passage or parts of the passage seem to have passed from pamphlet to pamphlet in various guises, each time becoming more remote from King James. Glenn Burgess argues that the speech of 21 March 1610 is inherently open to interpretation by either political faction, claiming, 'One could choose whether to cite remarks relating to the king's absolute powers, or to cite those relating to his legal powers'.¹²⁴ However, I have only found one royalist tract of this period which makes use of the passage. This is Robert Filmer's Patriarcha, which Charles refused to allow to be printed in 1632, presumably because it was too extremist in its conception of monarchy, and which remained in manuscript until 1680.¹²⁵ Even Filmer makes no use of the speech's striking comparisons between God and the King.

He quotes the same passage as Henry Burton, in order to qualify his argument that the king is above the law:

Now albeit kings who make the laws be, as his late majesty teacheth us, above the laws, yet will they rule their subjects by the law... 'And a King, governing in a settled kingdom, leaves to be a king and degenerates into a tyrant so soon as he leaves to rule according to his laws.'¹²⁶

If the tradition of reading James as an argument for the supremacy of the law was strong enough to influence Filmer, it may be safely said that the royalist propagandists were fighting a losing battle from the start.¹²⁷

It seems clear, in fact, that the royalist party badly mishandled the initial stages of the pamphlet war, at least in terms of making use of the works of James.¹²⁸ Not only had the opposition parties had the initiative ever since the publications of Featley in the 1620s, but the royalist response to these publications always made the situation worse by exposing the words of James and Charles to more hostile criticism. The response to the Scottish Covenanter tracts was no exception. In 1640, an anonymous work called The Epistle Congratvlorie of Lysimachus Nicanor, probably by John Corbet or Bishop John Maxwell, was published at Dublin.¹²⁹ This immensely entertaining piece pretends to be the letter of a fanatical Jesuit in support of the Covenanters' attacks on the true church and the legitimate king. Like Balcanquhall, he refers to James's anti-Catholic writings, only this text pretends to be bitterly critical of them, emphasising passages in Basilicon Doron and A Premonition in which James accuses the Jesuits of adopting Puritan principles, in denying that bishops have their jurisdiction immediately from God.¹³⁰ The real intention is evidently to defend the Laudian establishment. However, the author hardly does much to increase reverence for James by allowing even a fictional Jesuit to abuse his

writings. In terms of satire, the work is very successful, but the very fact that it is a satire prevents it from reclaiming James for the Laudian reader. The references to James in this text are even further removed from their origins than those in Balcanquhall's book.

The paradoxes and contradictions in The Epistle Congratvlorie increase as the fictional Jesuit praises the Covenanters for preventing the Scottish people from signing the 1581 Confession as it originally stood, and for compelling them to sign it with 'a new Commenter upon it, directly contrarie to the meaning of King James, who first prescribed it'.¹³¹ He admires the illogicality of the Covenanters' Protestation of September 1638, in which they had refused to sign the 'king's covenant':

you made it one of your reasons why you could not subscribe it, because it was to be exacted according to the meaning of the exacter, which is King Charles, Heire of his fathers opinions, as well as of his Dominions

The Covenanters had argued that they were bound to respect the meaning of the 'realitie *rei juratae*' - the meaning the work had in 1581.¹³² The fictional Jesuit congratulates them for upholding an absurd argument: if you are swearing to a past meaning rather than to a document's current interpretation, surely the text is reduced to meaninglessness. However, his argument that James's authorial intentions could be inherited by Charles, equally, risks invalidating the idea of a binding document, by suggesting that meaning does not reside in the text.¹³³ This work is designed to mock the Covenanters for acting as if their interpretation of the Confession equated to its original intention: but this is very similar to the author's own claim that Charles has the right to decide what James meant. Propagandists on both sides are behaving as if the intention of a text is determined by whoever had control over its interpretation.

The royalists, who supposedly believed in the authority of the royal word, were subverting their own case to score points.

Both sides are neglecting the words of the texts in question, and the real thoughts and opinions of James and Charles over the years. All that matters is the present moment, and the way in which the past is being read by significant groups of people. Joseph Black describes the continuity of opposition movements from Elizabethan times to the Civil War, which believed that 'the test of truth was the consensus of an interpretative community.'¹³⁴ Such communities could include many different traditions and political opinions, but still interpreted the same texts in the same way. Thus, as will be seen, it is possible to find writers holding beliefs ranging from neo-Independency to moderate Presbyterianism producing substantially the same reading of James's speech of 21 March 1610.¹³⁵ They may have held fundamentally incompatible beliefs, but they acted in unison to resist a single common source of oppression. Under intense political and intellectual pressure, these communities tended to defend their interpretive positions even at the expense of disregarding or distorting the real texts and events out of which their communities had evolved.¹³⁶

To some extent, this was only a hardening of attitudes already established, based on the idea of the unchanging validity of the royal word, which actually conceded great power to its readers, discussed in earlier chapters. However, the growing tendency to manipulate readings of King James by changing his words, putting new words into his mouth or dragging them into entirely new contexts had the potential to establish new traditions of reading King James which would be particularly dangerous for the royalist party, even though royalist pamphlets were

stimulating the development of such readings. As Balcanquhall's work cited above shows, people did not make a clear distinction between what could be done with the words of King James, and what could be done with the words of King Charles. How much power did the reading communities have over the words of their kings?

Robert Baillie, the Scottish minister whose amiable diaries are still extant, wrote a reply to A Large Declaration and The Epistle Congratvlorie, entitled Ladensivm...The Canterbvrians Self-Conviction.¹³⁷ This work shows how far the royalist exploitation of James's works was leaving their position open to attack.¹³⁸ Baillie turns the argument that Charles is heir to James's opinions on its head by declaring that James's intentions bind his successor. Commenting on the apparently pro-Arminian stance of A Large Declaration, issued in Charles's name, he writes:

This boldnesse can not in any reason by imputed to our gracious Sovereigne: For how is it possible that he upon any tollerable information, should ever have suffered himself to be induced to write or speak in such a straine of these things, which so latelie by his learned Father was declared in print, and that in latine to be no lesse then heresies.¹³⁹

Baillie's marginal references show that he has a copy of James's Workes, and in this passage he is probably referring to James's Declaration against the Dutch theologian Conrad Vorst (Vorstius). By taking issues of text and authorship seriously, rather than evading and confusing them like Balcanquhall and the author of The Epistle Congratvlorie, Baillie makes a strong case for the Presbyterians. He suggests that Balcanquhall is only the 'penman' of A Large Declaration, and Archbishop Laud the real culprit.¹⁴⁰ Charles is exculpated as far as possible, and even brought onto his side.

Speaking of the right to resist tyranny, Baillie writes:

Wee confesse freely that our heart is much opposite to such a Monarchie: yet

no more then our gracious Prince, King Charles and his glorious Father King James give us expresse warrant...¹⁴¹

Baillie returns to James's speech of 21 March 1610, which must have been quite familiar to pamphlet readers by now, describing King James:

in his Parliamentary speech making that Prince a perjured tyrant, who would not gladly bound himselfe within the limits of his lawes, and these men to be taken for vipers, pests, and common enemies to princes and people, who would assay by their flatteries to loose Princes from their pactions made with their people at their Coronation, & the settled laws of their Kingdome...¹⁴²

This paraphrase is most interesting, particularly for the way in which Baillie refers to the 'flatteries' of those who are seducing the king from his laws: this word is not in the original, and belongs to the language of the critics of Charles's court rather than to James. Baillie adds authority to his paraphrase by giving, in the margin, what appears to be the full citation:

A King governing in a settled Kingdome, leaveth to bee a King, and degenerateth into a tyrant as soone as hee leaveth off to rule according to his Lawes. Therefore all Kings that are not tyrants or perjured, will bee glad to bound themselves within the limits of their Lawes: They that perswad them the contrair are vipers, and pests both against them and the Commonwealth.¹⁴³

The reference to 'Page 531' in the Workes is correct, but Baillie seems to have followed Henry Burton in removing James's reminder that rebellion is not permissible in any case. Burton's tracts were being distributed in Scotland at this period, along with those of Bastwick and Prynne.¹⁴⁴ Baillie may have developed an interest in Burton via his good friend, Archibald Johnston of Warriston, who wrote in his diary that on 12 February 1638 'I read much in Burton, and thanked God for the fitt passages I fand in him to our purpos'.¹⁴⁵ Baillie corresponded with Johnston while preparing the Ladensivm.¹⁴⁶ Despite his genuine awareness of the real

processes of writing, publication and interpretation, which make his tracts so convincing, Baillie is as ready as his forerunners to make free with the king's words if it serves his purpose. J. P. Sommerville has commented, 'It is certain that Charles did not see eye to eye with Baillie on this matter, and his father would probably have been less than delighted to see his words put to such a purpose.'¹⁴⁷ However, the effectiveness of such propaganda, with a powerful tradition of reading King James behind it, is undeniable.

The failure of the royalist party to make more successful use of James's works is partially explained by the fact that they were having to try to recover them from the clutches of the anti-Arminian, pro-Parliament reading communities. However, the blundering attempts to impose a new translation of the Psalms under James's name, to suppress Puritanism by means of the Declaration of Sports, and to defeat the Covenanters by means of the 'King's covenant', seem remarkably inept. It is difficult to argue that Charles did not appreciate the danger in allowing his father's words to be turned against him: the above publications show a clear awareness of the importance of controlling King James's works. However, one has to ask why Charles did not, for example, reprint the Workes, or just The True Law of Free Monarchies, to confront his opponents with texts that were certainly part of the received canon of James's writings. As has been mentioned, it is understandable that Charles was reluctant to reissue books like Basilicon Doron which had already been the subject of endless unwelcome reinterpretations. Nevertheless, one feels that Charles might have done better to have directly confronted those like Featley and Prynne on their own ground, rather than shifting the battle of words onto hitherto peaceful territory like that of the Declaration of Sports. The best explanation seems to be that Charles

really found James's writings incompatible with his principles. In that case, he would have been wiser to have ignored them completely.

A number of royalist works containing James's words and accounts of his reign were printed during the 1620s and 1630s, but they seem to have little connection with the attempts of either the opposition or the court to use James's words as propaganda. Lying outside the main reading traditions, they could have been exploited by Charles as evidence that he had not broken with his father's beliefs, but this opportunity seems to have been wasted. The neglect of Robert Filmer's Patriarcha, which cites many of James's texts in support of its attack on contractualist theories of kingship, has already been mentioned. Another very different example is Isaac Wake's Rex Platonicvs, a panegyric account, in Latin, of James's visit to Oxford University in 1605. This was first printed in 1607, and went through new editions in 1627, 1635, and 1636.¹⁴⁸ Although it contains several of James's speeches on tobacco-smoking and religion made during the visit, the work seems to be essentially a piece of self-congratulation on the part of the university for hosting such a successful visit, and does not seem to be particularly concerned with the king himself.¹⁴⁹ Nevertheless, there was material which Charles could have used against his opponents, had he chosen to do so.

It is significant that several of the royalist works which make use of the words of King James, without really engaging with the political debate, are in Latin. In early 1640, a work was printed by Richard Badger, printer to the Prince of Wales and Archbishop Laud, called ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΑ ΔΟΞΑ, sive, Sylloge Epistolarum, Orationum, & Carminum Regalium.¹⁵⁰ This had received the imprimatur of Thomas Wykes on 21 December 1639, and was entered in the Stationers' Register on 5 February

1639/40. It seems highly likely that the work had the approval of the court. The texts consists of a selection of writings by English rulers, placed in chronological order. James, who is portrayed as the latest and greatest in a long line of learned monarchs, receives the most hyperbolic praise in the introduction:

Reprimo igitur me, & Henrici Regis ad Erasmus verbis hîc legendis, Jacobi Regis manes alloquens utor; Quid ego tuam (Magne Jacobe) laudare terrarum orbem est nobilitata scienta? Nihil queo equidem in tuam laudem effingere, quod tam consummat â istâ hâc eruditione satis dignum sit. Quare tuas laudes omitto, de quibus silere satius puto, quàm nimis parcè dicere.¹⁵¹

[Therefore I curb both myself, and King Henry's words to Erasmus, for you are waiting for me to speak of King James; How should I (O great James) praise you whose renown is known throughout the world? Indeed, I can say nothing in your praise, that would sum it up in a way sufficiently worthy of such learning. For which reason I omit your praises, considering it better to say nothing of them, rather than to say too little.]

The editor goes on to invoke a tradition of reverence for the royal word:

Non possum non recognoscere quàm strictè & accuratè Regum (& eorum præsertim) verba in sacris Archivis reponuntur ac recensentur; In quibus habemus non solùm integros Davidis ac Solomonis, patris & Filii, Regum, Libros: sed & alios eorum voces divinas & memorabiles...¹⁵²

[We cannot fail to recall how closely and carefully the words of kings (and theirs especially) were deposited and recorded in the holy archives, in which we have not only all the books of King David and King Solomon, father and son, but the divine and memorable voices of other kings]

However, the work does not make full use of its potential to assert the continuity of wise rulers against those who argued that Charles was being led into making bad decisions. The emphasis is on the extent to which kings have been academic scholars, or rather supporters of scholarship, and not on the way in which their learning has assisted them in successfully governing the country. Already separated

from the main pamphlet debate by the choice of Latin, the texts the editor chooses to illustrate his argument are not exactly at the centre of popular attention.

Although the title (Basilica Dora, 'the kingly gifts') recalls Basilicon Doron, and the introduction refers to the Opera, James's literary output is actually represented by two letters and four poems. The texts include a letter from James written in 1602 to the scholar Isaac Casaubon, trying to persuade him to bring his talents to Scotland.¹⁵³ Rather surprising is the inclusion of a letter, written in 1617, in praise of Archbishop Spalatro's book in defence of the Church of England.¹⁵⁴ As mentioned in Chapter Two, Spalatro was a discontented Catholic prelate who had abandoned his Dalmatian see, fled to England and defected to Anglicanism, to James's delight. Unfortunately, from James's point of view, when it became clear that he would not be given an English diocese to rule, Spalatro recanted his Anglicanism and returned to Italy in the belief that the Pope would reward him. In fact, he was arrested by a suspicious Inquisition, and died in prison. Thomas Middleton had made use of the popular myths surrounding this character by using him as the basis of the Fat Bishop in A Game at Chesse. If this letter is intended to show James's discerning support for learned men, it is singularly ill-chosen.¹⁵⁵

The Latin texts of James's two poems on the death of Philip Sidney, taken from the volume of laudatory poems published as Academiæ Cantabrigiensis Lachrymæ in 1587, are perhaps more appropriate inclusions.¹⁵⁶ Equally, the two poems eulogising the astronomer Tycho Brahe give a sense of the broadness of James's interests.¹⁵⁷ However, it is striking that this volume makes no use of the works which were, by 1640, being used by several different opposition parties. There is, equally, no significant attempt to relate James's words to the need to respect King

Charles and his policies. The work seems to display an abiding wariness of James's writings, and a hesitation to confront the reading traditions which were proving increasingly dangerous for Charles. Just as Wake's Rex Platonicvs diverts attention from the king to the splendours of Oxford University, so Basilica Dora diverts attention from the king to the colourful writers and theologians he had patronised. No successful literary challenge to pamphleteers like Burton had yet been mounted.

¹John [Williams], Great Britains Salomon, London: b. John Bill, 1625, STC 25723a, sig. [H4^{r-v}]. For this sermon, delivered before the royal hearse, see J. Newman, 'Inigo Jones and the Politics of Architecture', in Sharpe & Lake (1994), 229-255, p. 241.

²Mirth in Mourning: Or, Ioyes conquest of Sorrow, London: f. I. T[rundle]. & H. G[osson]., [1625], STC 14426.3

³It is worth noting that Charles allowed the project for a 'British Academy' for the study and promotion of history and literature, supported by James, to be consigned to oblivion. See Willson (1956, 1962), 297; also Ethel M. Portal, 'The Academ Roial of King James I', Proceedings of the British Academy (1915-16), 189-208.

⁴See Linda Levy Peck, 'The Mental World of the Jacobean Court: An Introduction', in Peck (1991), 1-17, p. 7.

⁵See Reliquiæ (1658), sig. [A6^v].

⁶Kevin Sharpe notes that although Charles actively promoted his reputation for silence, he read widely and wrote extensively on various subjects - he could have followed in his father's footsteps had he seen it desirable to do so; Sharpe (1994), 132.

⁷For Charles's reluctance to issue the 'Manifest', see Thomas Cogswell, 'The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the People in the 1620s', JBS 9 (1990), 187-215, esp. 211.

⁸Goldberg (1983, reprinted 1989), 90-4; see James's Opera, Londini: apud Bohamum Nortonium & Ioannem Billium, 1619, STC 14346. For the evidence for a reaction against the Renaissance belief in reading in favour of a more visually-oriented culture during the seventeenth century, see Svetlana Alpers, The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century, John Murray, 1983.

⁹A Fvneral Elegie Vpon The lamentable losse of our late Leige and Royall King James, London: f. Iohn Wright, [1625], STC 14423.3

¹⁰See Chapter Two; Craigie (1958), xxii-xxiii, 206-218.

¹¹See Greg (1967), 257-8. John Bill made journeys in person to sell James's Workes at Frankfurt between 1605 and 1622; see Birrell (1987), 26 (note).

¹²Westcott (1911), xiii

¹³Shire (1969), 89

¹⁴Some contemporary responses to James's poetry are recorded in Craigie (1955), 274-81.

¹⁵William Prynne, Histrion-Mastix, London: b. E. A[lldde, A. Mathewes, T. Cotes] & W. I[ones] f. Michael Sparke, 1633, STC 20464, (entered 16 October 1630, Liber D, p. 207), sig. 501^v. I owe this reference to Anne Lake Prescott, 'The Reception of Du Bartas in England', Studies in the Renaissance 15 (1968), 144-73, p. 154; see also Lamont (1963), 28+. A good modern study of Du Bartas' verse is James Dauphiné, La Bibliothèque de Du Bartas, Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 1994.

¹⁶James's involvement with Du Bartas, and the production of the various texts of 'Lepanto', is explored in detail in Craigie (1955), xxiii-xxiv, xlvi+, liv-lxi, xci.

¹⁷The Essayes of a Prentise (1584), sig. [C2^r]-G1^r. James apparently assisted Thomas Hudson with his translation of Du Bartas' 'La Judit', which appeared as The Historye of Ivdith Tho[mas]. Hudson, The Historye of Ivdith, Edinbvrgh: b. Thomas Vautroullier, 1584, STC 21671, sig. A3^r.

¹⁸His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises (1591), sig. [G3^r]-P1^v; see Urban Tigner Holmes, John Coridan Lyons and Robert White Linker (eds.), The Works of Guillaume de Salluste Sieur Du Bartas - a critical edition with introduction, commentary, and variants, Vol. 1, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935, 19; Susan Snyder (ed.), Josuah Sylvester (transl.), The Divine Weeks and Works of Guillaume de Saluste Sieur Du Bartas, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979, Vol. 1, 18+.

¹⁹sig. [G4^r]

²⁰There is an excellent summary of translations of 'Lepanto' in Peter Skrine, 'James VI & I and German Literature', Daphnis 18 (1989), 1-57, esp. pp. 14-25. For an interesting example of a parallel French-German text published in 1641, see the extract on microfilm in the National Library of Scotland, shelfmark Mf. 2(10); see Craigie (1955), ci-cii.

²¹'La Lepanthe' is printed in Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas, Les Trophees, La Rochelle: par Hierosme Haultin, 1591, sig. E3^v-[F5^r]. Haultin's dedication to James is on sig. A2^{r-v}; see also Du Bartas, II. Partie de la Svite des Oevvres, n. p., [Genève: par H. Haultin] pour Iacques Chouët, 1598 (copy in the Drummond Collection of Edinburgh University Library, shelfmark De.2.116), sig. *2^r-3^r. See Louis Desgraves, Les Haultin 1571-1623, Genève: E. Droz, 1960, 51 (note), 70-1; Yvonne Bellenger (ed.), Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas, Les Suites de la Seconde Semaine, Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1994, iii-vii; Holmes (1935), 105; Craigie (1955), xciii.

²²Du Bartas, Les Trophees (1591), British Library shelfmark C.189.d.8(2), bound with Du Bartas, La Seconde Sepmaine, La Rochelle: par Hierosme Haultin, 1591. Melvill owned the whole volume. For Melvill's marginal corrections, see sig. [B6^v]. See Birrell (1987), 27-9.

²³Mentioned in Craigie (1955), 278-9.

²⁴Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas, La Seconde Semaine, n. p., [par H. Haultin], 1588, Edinburgh University shelfmark *5.33.45; see Bellenger (1994), iii, Desgraves (1960), 46-7.

²⁵A. Beekman, Influence de Du Bartas sur la Littérature Néerlandaise, Poitiers: A. Masson, 1912, 71-2; Thomas Murray [Thoma Moravio], Navpactiados, Londini: excudebat Johannes Norton, 1604, STC 14386; see Craigie (1955), xc-xci, 282-289.

²⁶Delitiæ Poetarvm Scotorvm hujus ævi Illvstrivm, Amsterdami: apud Iohannem Blaev, 1637, Vol. 2, sig. H6^v-I4^v

²⁷For more information about the nature and significance of Delitiæ, and the place of Murray's contribution, see Jack (1988), 225, and W. T. Johnston (ed.), Delitiæ Poetarvm Scotorvm, Amsterdam, 1637. Contents, Edinburgh: Sgann Microforms, 1983. I am most grateful to Professor Jack for his discussions of the Delitiæ, and for allowing me to see the manuscript of a recent English translation.

²⁸See Morgan (1957), 54, and DNB.

²⁹See Snyder (1979), Vol. 1, 35; see also James Carscallen, 'English Translators and Admirers of Du Bartas 1578-1625', Oxford B.Litt thesis, 1958, esp. pp. 101-11, and Doelman, 'Accession' (1994), 23-7.

³⁰See Richard Mo[un]tagu, A Gagg for the New Gospell?, London: b. Thomas Snodham f. Matthew Lownes & William Barrett, 1624, STC 18038, and Appello Caesarem, London: f. Matthew Lownes, 1625, STC 18030, (entered 18 February 1624/5, Liber D, p. [98]), esp. sig. a3^{r-v}, 2P2^v.

³¹For the controversies related to Montagu and his writings, see Tyacke (1987), 125-63; White (1992), 213-32; Davies (1992), 103-13; for the evidence that James was sympathetic to Appello Caesarem, see Sheila Lambert, 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship', Past and Present 124 (1989), 36-68.

³²H[enry]. B[urton]., A Plea to an Appeale, London: b. W. I[ones]., 1626, STC 4153, sig. N1^v

³³sig. N2^v-3^r.

³⁴There is an article on Featley in the DNB; see also P. W. Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969, 44-5; Milton (1995), 62. Featley's important translation of Lawrence Humfrey's life of Bishop Jewel is discussed in Donald A. Stauffer, English Biography before 1700, New York: Russell & Russell Inc., 1964, 65-7.

³⁵See Robert S. Paul, The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the 'Grand Debate', Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1985, 105. It is interesting that the Stationers' Register has an entry for 20 November 1645, 'Severall speeches made by Dr. Featley before the Assembly of divines, with King James his advice &c.' This work, entered to the royalist publisher Richard Royston, does not appear to have been printed (Liber D, page number lost; see G. E. Briscoe Eyre, H. R. Plomer, C. R. Rivington (eds.), A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers; from 1640-1708 A. D., Vol. 1, Privately Printed, 1913, 202).

³⁶See The Fisher Caught in his Owne Net, 1623, STC 10732. There is a considerably enlarged version in which Featley acknowledges his authorship, The Romish Fisher Cavght and Held, London: H. L[ownes] & W. Stansby]. f. Robert Milbourne, 1624, STC 10738; for James's reaction, see sig. [¶4^v]. For the publication of these works, see Bennett (1970), 62, and Milward (1978), 220+.

³⁷The Romish Fisher (1624), sig. H1^v

³⁸[William Crompton], Saint Avstins Religion, [b. G. Purlove], 1625, STC 6060, (entered 3 August 1624, Liber D, p. 83); Edward Elton, Gods Holy Mind Tovching Matters Morall, b. A. M[athewes] & I. N[orton], 1625, STC 7619, (entered 7 October 1624, Liber D, p. 86)

³⁹See Featley's account of the conference, Cygnea Cantio, London: [b. M. Flesher] f. Robert Mylbourne, 1629, STC 10731, sig. F1^{r-v}.

⁴⁰See Milward (1978), 43-4.

⁴¹[Daniel Featley], A Parallel of New-Old Pelagiarminian Error, London: f. Robert Milbourne, 1626, STC 10735, sig. [A4^r]

⁴²Flores Regijj, 'collected by J. L. S.', London: b. B. A[lsop]. & T. F[awcet]. f. Ben. Fisher, 1627, STC 14375. Benjamin Fisher was eventually to acquire the rights to part of Basilicon Doron, on 12 August 1635, Liber D, p. 319. Unfortunately he

does not seem to have printed an edition. Fisher was involved in the publication of several works which have been interpreted since as attempts to re-direct Charles's government through appealing to the past, including Walter Raleigh's Instructions to his sonne and to posterity, [J. Beale?], f. B. Fisher, 1632+, STC 20641.5+, (entered 13 April 1632, Liber D, p. 242), and Robert Cotton's anonymous A Short View of the Long Life and Raigne of Henry the Third, [J. Okes & B. Alsop & T. Fawcet f. Ben. Fisher], 1627, STC 5864. See William A. Jackson, 'Sir Robert Bruce Cotton's *A short view of the long life and raigne of Henry the third*', Harvard Library Bulletin 4 (1950), 28-37, p. 30. Cotton's work was described as 'presented to King James'; details of other works dedicated to James after his death can be found in Franklin B. Williams, Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books Before 1641, London: Bibliographical Society, 1962, 106.

⁴³Francis Bacon, Apophthegmes New and Old, London: f. Hanna Barret & Richard Whittaker, 1625, STC 1115

⁴⁴For the genre of 'table-talk', see F. P. Wilson, 'Table-Talk', HLQ 4 (1940), 27-46; collections of sayings attributed to James are noted on pp. 40-1. The sayings in Flores Regij are not related to those collected by James's tutor Peter Young in British Library MSS. Add. 34,275; see George F. Warner, 'The Library of James VI. in the hand of Peter Young, his tutor, 1573-1583', Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1893; Westcott (1911), xxi.

⁴⁵See Flores Regij, sig. E1^v (cf. Basilicon Doron, in Craigie, 1944, 25; Sommerville, 1994, 12), sig. E2^{r-v} (BD 1944, 69; 1994, 24), sig. E4^v (BD 1944, 169; 1994, 51), sig. F3^{r-v} (BD 1944, 47; 1994, 18), sig. H1^r (BD 1944, 29; 1994, 13).

⁴⁶sig. F2^v-3^r

⁴⁷In Sommerville (1994), 47; also in Craigie (1944), 155

⁴⁸The Fathers Blessing, London: [b. B. Alsop] f. Leonard Becket, 1616, STC 14358, (entered 29 October 1615, Liber C, f. 264^v), sig. [A4^v-5^r]. This work seems to have been exceedingly popular; the seventh and last edition appeared in 1632. Dorothy Leigh's The Mothers Blessing, London: f. Iohn Budge, 1616, STC 15402, (entered 26 February 1616, Liber C, f. 269^r), was probably influenced by The Fathers Blessing (which was entered in the Stationers' Register several months before Leigh's work), at least in terms of the title. Leigh's pleasant religious advice went through many more editions, and was still being reprinted in the 1670s. See Craigie (1950), 48-9 (Craigie is using one of the later editions).

⁴⁹Sommerville (1994), 3; Craigie (1944), 11

⁵⁰James VI & I, A Meditation vpon the Lords Prayer, London: b. Bonham Norton & Iohn Bill, 1619, STC 14384, sig. A4^r; also in The Workes, London: b. Robert Barker & John Bill, 1620, STC 14345, sig. 3C1^v.

⁵¹Patrick Scot, A Table-Booke for Princes, London: b. Bernard Alsop, 1621, STC 21860, (entered 31 March 1621, Liber D, p. 14). For Scot's use of Basilicon Doron, see Craigie (1950), 46-8.

⁵²sig. A3^v, B3^v, [B5^v]

⁵³sig. [C7^v]

⁵⁴sig. H4^v

⁵⁵James VI & I, His Maiesties Speach, London: b. Robert Barker, 1605, STC 14392, sig. B4^r; Sommerville (1994), 150

⁵⁶See Nigel Smith, Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989, [23]-72, esp. 26.

⁵⁷Cygnea Cantio (1629), sig. [A4^{r-v}]

⁵⁸sig. F1^v

⁵⁹sig. G1^v-[G2^r]

⁶⁰William Prynne, The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme, [A. Mathewes & Eliz. Alde f. Michael Sparke], 1629, STC 20457; for reference to Cygnea Cantio, see sig. a2^r (mis-signed).

⁶¹Francis Rous, Testis Veritatis. The Doctrine of King James, London: b. W. I., 1626, STC 21347. See Patterson (1997), 286. For Vorstius, see James's Declaration dv Serenissime Roy, Londres: [Eliot's Court Press] chez Iean Norton, 1612, STC 9229. The British Library copy at shelfmark 859.i.16(3) is a printers' proof, with some manuscript corrections (in French) by James on sig. D1^r; see Birrell (1994), 407.

⁶²It will be clear from my arguments in this and subsequent sections that I am unable to share Kevin Sharpe's view that contemporary accounts of serious religious conflict during the personal rule of Charles I are to be treated as a distortion of reality (Sharpe, 1992, pp. xxii, 360-2, 603-12, 684-6). Sharpe's study is masterly in its handling of evidence to show that for the majority of English people, the 1630s were a decade of relative peace and prosperity. However, by playing down the significance of the Puritan and Arminian pamphlets, Sharpe creates the curious impression that the most learned and intelligent commentators of the day were quite out of touch with reality, and, even more problematically, that their distorting polemics had no real social impact. For an impressive reconsideration of this approach, see Sharpe and Lake (1994), 1-20. Sharpe's earlier study portrays the breakdown in 1640 as the unfortunate result of multiple coincidences, rather than the consequence of developing mistrust and dissent. I would suggest that an understanding of the near-breakdown in 1622 is essential to explain the consensus and conflict of the 1630s.

⁶³The Psalmes of King David, STC 2732; according to STC, printed at Oxford by William Turner, 1631; Madan (1895), 152-3

⁶⁴Essayes of a Prentise (1584, STC 14373), sig. N2^{r-4v}; in Craigie (1955), 85-8

⁶⁵Williams (1625), sig. F2^v

⁶⁶John King, Cenotaphivm Iacobi, Oxoniae: Iohannes Lichfield & Guilielmus Turner, 1625, STC 14992, sig. D2^{r-v}

⁶⁷See David Laing (ed.), Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, Vol. 3, 1842, 530

⁶⁸See Greg (1967), 73

⁶⁹See Craigie (1958), xi-xxii, 1-63

⁷⁰See L. E. Kastner and H. B. Charlton (eds.), The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: STS, 1921, xiii (note)

⁷¹Craigie (1958), 269-70

⁷²For Alexander's gradual removal of Scots from his poetry, see Kastner (1921), cxciv-cc.

⁷³An article by James Doelman on the reception of the translation of the Psalms attributed to King James will appear in the forthcoming volume of essays edited by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier.

⁷⁴David Calderwood, 'Reasons against the reception of King James's metaphor of the Psalms. MDCXXXI.', Bannatyne Miscellany, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1827, 227-56, using Advocates' Library MS. Calderwood XLII.M.6-9. No. 98-104

⁷⁵Calderwood (1827), 237

⁷⁶There is an intriguing reference in the catalogue of New College Library, Edinburgh, to a translation of the psalms by King James believed to have been printed in 1625-6. No copy, however, can be found at the shelfmark indicated (E14/b4). Probably the catalogue is mistaken, but it is interesting to speculate that James's actual work might have been printed and suppressed.

⁷⁷Calderwood (1827), 239

⁷⁸Calderwood (1827), 239-40

⁷⁹Calderwood (1827), 240-1

⁸⁰The Psalmes of King David, b. Thomas Harper, 1636, STC 2736; the editions printed by Harper in 1637 are STC 2736.5, 2736a. See Laing (1842), 531-2; Willson (1956, reprinted 1962), 215-6; for the prayer book, see Gordon Donaldson, The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1954, esp. chapters 3-4.

⁸¹However, in the 1633 edition of John Monipennie's The Abridgement or Summarie of the Scots Chronicles (Edinburgh: b. I. W[reittoun] f. Iohn Wood, STC 18015), the first of several of James's works to be praised is his translation of 'some part of Davids Psalmes' (sig. [M5^r]).

⁸²Laing (1842), 532+

⁸³See Russell (1991), in which it is argued that 'the drive for uniformity within multiple kingdoms led only to disaster' (524).

⁸⁴Frederick Seaton Siebert, Freedom of the Press in England 1476-1776: the Rise and Decline of Government Control, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952, reprinted 1965

⁸⁵There is a text of the Book of Sports in Craigie (1982), 101-109, with commentary 217-41; the context is described in Sharpe (1992), 351-9.

⁸⁶Craigie (1982), 104

⁸⁷This is presumably an unfortunate slip for 'lawfull'.

⁸⁸Craigie (1982), 106

⁸⁹James VI & I, The Kings Maiesties Declaration to His Subjects, concerning lawfull Sports, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, 1618, STC 9238.9

⁹⁰For the claim that Charles was the main promoter of the 'Book of Sports', rather than Laud as was widely stated during the 1640s, see Sharpe (1992), 285.

⁹¹Craigie (1982), 217

⁹²Sharpe (1992), 648

⁹³For a fuller account, see Craigie (1982), 224-230

⁹⁴Craigie (1982), 238

⁹⁵The order for burning the Book of Sports was published nearly ten years later: see the Ordinance of Parliament of 5 May 1643 - Die Veneris, London: f. Thomas Underhill, 1643, not in Wing, Thomason 669.f.7(12).

⁹⁶Henry Burton, For God, and the King, 1636, STC 4141. See Bennett (1970), 43-5.

⁹⁷There were several editions of this tract, first published as Deus & Rex, Londini: 1615, STC 14415, and translated into English as God and the King, London: [b. J. Beale?], 1615, STC 14418.5. For the nature of the work, and the possible authorship of Richard Mocket, see Burgess (1992), 135-7.

⁹⁸Proclamation of 8 November 1615; see Larkin & Hughes (1973), 355-6

⁹⁹Burton (1636), sig. H1^v-H2^r

¹⁰⁰Peter Heylyn, A Briefe and Moderate Answer, London: b. Ric. Hodgkinsonne, s. b. Daniel Frere, 1637, STC 13269, (entered 1 July 1637, Liber D, p. 362), sig. G2^{r-v}. It is worth noting that Heylyn was later to write comparing James to the decadent emperor Tiberius (MacGillivray, 1974, 36-7).

¹⁰¹Burton (1636), sig. H2^r

¹⁰²Burton (1636), sig. P1^v

¹⁰³Burton (1636), sig. [E4^{r-v}]. For an overview of pre-Civil War readings of the 1610 speech, see Sommerville (1986), 132-4; for an introduction to its ideas in context, see Alan G. R. Smith, 'Constitutional Ideas and Parliamentary Developments in England 1603-1625', in Smith (1973), 160-76, esp. 161-3.

¹⁰⁴Workes (1616/7), sig. Yy2^r; Sommerville (1994), 183-4

¹⁰⁵The debate regarding the point at which a king becomes a tyrant dates back to Aristotle, and had been continued by writers like Erasmus; see Craigie (1950), 204. Thomas More wrote a Latin poem whose title translates as 'The Difference between a Tyrant and a King' (Sylvester (1976), 140). James's interest in the definition of a tyrant dated back to his early Scottish reign, and is probably related to George Buchanan's De Jure Regno apud Scotos Dialogus (1579); see Mason, 'Rex Stoicus' (n.d.). It is notable that the design of coins issued by James was often influenced by Buchanan, and those issued in 1591-3 bear the inscription 'His Differt Rege Tyrannus'; see Ian Stewart, 'Coinage and Propaganda: An Interpretation of the Coin-Types of James VI', in Anne O'Connor & D. V. Clarke (eds.), From the Stone Age to the 'Forty-Five: Studies Presented to R. B. K. Stevenson, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1983, 450-62, p. 458. James may also have been concerned by the Huguenot Vindiciæ Contra Tyrannos, which deals with closely related issues; see Oscar Jászi and John D. Lewis, Against the Tyrant: The Tradition and Theory of Tyrannicide, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957, 53-80, and Harold J. Laski (introd.), A Defence of Liberty Against Tyrants: A Translation of the Vindiciæ Contra Tyrannos by Junius Brutus, London: G. Bell & Sons, 1924. For other instances of James's interest, see the second book of Basilicon Doron (Craigie, 1944, 53-7; Sommerville, 1994, 19-21) and James's letter to Cecil, in Akrigg (1984), 239-42.

¹⁰⁶For the trial, see Sharpe (1992), 758-65

¹⁰⁷John Bastwick, The Answer of Iohn Bastwick, [Leiden: W. Christiaens], 1637, STC 1573

¹⁰⁸sig. B1^v

¹⁰⁹sig. D2^v

¹¹⁰For texts of the 1581 confession and the 1638 National Covenant, see Gordon Donaldson (ed.), Scottish Historical Documents, Edinburgh & London: Scottish Academic Press, 1974, 150-3, 194-201.

¹¹¹See Robert Peters, 'Some Catholic Opinions of King James VI and I', Recusant History 10 (1970), 292-303, p. 299.

¹¹²See John Morrill, 'The National Covenant in its British Context', in John Morrill (ed.), The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990, 1-30, also in Morrill (1993), 91-117; see also Margaret Steele, 'The "Politick Christian": the Theological Background to the National Covenant', in Morrill (1990), 31-67, esp. pp. 38-9

¹¹³Steele (1990), 38

¹¹⁴David Stevenson, The Scottish Revolution 1637-1644 - The Triumph of the Covenanters, Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1973, 102-112

¹¹⁵Stevenson (1973), 112

¹¹⁶David George Mullan, Episcopacy in Scotland: The History of an Idea, 1560-1638, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986, 183; there is a good discussion of the episode on pp. 178-97.

¹¹⁷[Walter Balcanquhall], A Large Declaration, London: Robert Young, 1639, STC 21906, sig. B2^{r-v}

¹¹⁸See esp. sig. C4^v-D1^r, K3^v

¹¹⁹A Large Declaration is discussed by Kevin Sharpe, who argues that the propaganda of the Covenanters had forced Charles to break his silence on politics 'in a truly massive way'; unfortunately Sharpe does not analyse the significance of the fact that the work was not actually written by Charles (Sharpe, 1994, 134). For a rather different analysis of Charles's response to the crisis, see Peter Donald, An Uncounselled King: Charles I and the Scottish Troubles, 1637-1641, Cambridge: CUP, 1990.

¹²⁰[W. Ker], A True Representation, [Edinburgh: b. R. Bryson], 1640, STC 21929

¹²¹sig. I1^v. Bancroft's sermon had been an attack on presbyterianism, which had invoked a pro-episcopal declaration drawn up by Archbishop Patrick Adamson in 1585 in James's name and probably with James's support. In the context of the presbyterian ascendancy in Scotland in 1590, it was embarrassing for James to be reminded of this document, as it suggested that he had changed his religious opinions to suit the times. See Mullan (1986), 67-70, and Lockyer (1998), 180.

¹²²The Proceedings of the Commissioners sent from the Parliament of Scotland, 1640, old STC 21927, sig. B2^v, D1^{r-v}

¹²³sig. [A4^r]

¹²⁴Burgess (1992), 148. See Kevin Sharpe, 'Introduction: Rewriting Sir Robert Cotton', in C. J. Wright (ed.), Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy, British Library, 1997, 1-39, p. 11.

¹²⁵J. P. Sommerville (ed.), Robert Filmer: Patriarcha and Other Writings, Cambridge: CUP, 1991, vii

¹²⁶Sommerville, Robert Filmer (1991), 41-2

¹²⁷For Filmer's place in royalist thought, see John Sanderson, 'But the People's Creatures': The Philosophical Basis of the English Civil War, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 1989, 43-6.

¹²⁸For Charles's reluctance to compete with the pamphlets, see Sharpe (1992), 653, 815.

¹²⁹The Epistle Congratvlorie of Lysimachus Nicanor, [Dublin: Society of Stationers], 1640, STC 5751

¹³⁰sig. D2^v-D3^r; G2^{r-v}

¹³¹sig. H1^r

¹³²sig. H1^v-H2^r

¹³³The argument that those swearing to the 'king's covenant' had to accept it as King Charles intended it to be accepted (i.e. as upholding episcopacy), because the opinions of King James and King Charles were identical, is voiced in another tract attributed to John Maxwell, which may make it more likely that he was the author of this work rather than John Corbet; see Episcopacie Not Abivred, [Dublin]: 1641, Wing M1380, sig. F2^r.

¹³⁴Black (1996), Chapter Five, p. 273

¹³⁵There is an excellent analysis of the divergent opinions of many of these pamphleteers in Lamont (1963), 20-1, 34+, 49+.

¹³⁶The evidence does lend some credit to Stanley Fish's model of interpretive communities, although I would suggest that the Calvinist communities under discussion here exist chronologically as traditions of reading, and not just spatially as groups of living readers. See Stanley Fish, Is There a Text in This Class? - The Authority of Interpretive Communities, Harvard University Press, 1980, esp. 13-14, 338+.

¹³⁷Robert Baillie, Ladensivm...The Canterbvrians Self-Conviction, [Glasgow: b. G. Anderson], 1640, STC 1205

¹³⁸For the unprecedented nature of this work, see Morrill, 'The Scottish National Covenant', in Morrill, 1993, 114.

¹³⁹sig. D2^{r-v}

¹⁴⁰sig. D2^v

¹⁴¹sig. A4^r

¹⁴²sig. [A4^r]

¹⁴³sig. [A4^r]

¹⁴⁴See Joseph Black, "'Pikes and Protestations": Scottish Texts in England, 1639-40', Publishing History 42 (1997), [5]-19, p. [5], 12-13.

¹⁴⁵George Morrison Paul (ed.), Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston 1632-1639, Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, First series, Vol. 61, 1911, 314; see Sharpe (1992), 738, 818-9.

¹⁴⁶For example, see Laing, Vol. 1 (1841), 242+.

¹⁴⁷Sommerville (1986), 133

¹⁴⁸Isaac Wake, Rex Platonievs, Oxonjæ: excudebat Josephus Barnesius, 1607, STC 24939. The last edition was printed in 1636, STC 24942.5.

¹⁴⁹A rather amusing corrective to Wake's account, apparently written by a Mr. Stringer, is reproduced in John Nichols (ed.), The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, London: J. B. Nichols, 1828, Vol. 1,

530-62 (based on MS. Harl. 7044. fol. 201). This makes it clear that not everything went as smoothly as the university would like to remember: James had a low boredom threshold and college entertainment seems to have driven him over it on several occasions. See also John R. Elliott, 'Drama', in Tyacke (1997), 641-58, esp. pp. 648-51.

¹⁵⁰ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΑ ΔΟΞΑ, Londini: typis Richard Badger, 1640, STC 14347, (entered 5 February 1639/40, Liber D, p. 471); for Badger, see Henry Plomer, A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers, Bibliographical Society, 1907, 10-11, and Sheila Lambert, 'The Printers and the Government, 1604-1637', in Robin Myers and Michael Harris (eds.), Aspects of Printing from 1600, Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987, [1]-29, p. 10.

¹⁵¹sig. A3^v

¹⁵²sig. A3^v-A4^r

¹⁵³sig. D1^r-D2^v; see Mark Pattison, Isaac Casaubon 1559-1614, 1875, 2nd edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892. For James's connections with continental scholarship, see Sommerville (1991), and Patterson (1997).

¹⁵⁴sig. D3^r-D4^r

¹⁵⁵In Good Covnsells for the Peace of Reformed Churches, Oxford: b. Leonard Lichfield f. William Webb, 1641, Wing D319, a letter of Isaac Casaubon's to Cardinal du Perron is printed, in which Casaubon praises James's moderate ideas about those things necessary for salvation. Like the poems printed in Basilica Dora, James's thoughts on international ecumenism are of great interest today, but they were not particularly relevant to the pamphlet war. (Falconer Madan, Oxford Books, Vol. 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912, no. 997, suggests that Good Covnsells was edited by John Durie, whereas Wing credits John Davenant with the authorship).

¹⁵⁶sig. D4^v-D5^r; see Craigie (1958), 104, 162, notes pp. 233-4, 249.

¹⁵⁷sig. D5^v-D6^r; see Craigie (1958), 100-1, notes pp. 231-2.

Chapter Four: Reading King James in the pamphlet war of 1642

I. King James his Letter and Directions: the 1642 versions

The failure by the royalists to produce a tradition of texts and readers capable of challenging that invoked by their opponents may have created space for the explosion of pro-Parliamentary reprints of works by people like Francis Bacon and Queen Elizabeth in 1641-2.¹ As in many earlier pamphlet controversies, such as the Marprelate tracts of the 1580s, the opposition parties sought to legitimise their position by locating themselves within established textual and authorial traditions; it is not surprising to find reprints of many works by Elizabethan Presbyterians in the 1640s.² There seems to have been particular interest in figures whose work was suppressed or destroyed under James or Charles. The appearance of previously unpublished lives of Prince Henry in 1641, for example, seems to indicate a desire to reread the history of the last forty years as a collection of lost opportunities and betrayals.³ Christopher Hill has written a fascinating account of the ways in which works by Walter Raleigh and Edward Coke were revived in the new context of the 1640s.⁴ Graham Parry gives an excellent account of Robert Cotton's A short view of the long life and raigne of Henry the third, first published anonymously in 1627, which was reprinted in 1642, apparently to discredit the Stuart regime.⁵ Kevin Sharpe says in relation to reprints of Cotton's works:

As Cotton reinterpreted the past with changing circumstances, so generations reread his writings and applied them to new conditions... There is a whole history to be written of such readings.⁶

The same is true of the writings of King James.

In some cases, no doubt, publishers saw reprints of earlier texts as a simple way of making a profit; there are instances of pamphlets which consist of unsold sheets from old editions, with a new title page. Such instances are still useful, however, in that the new title pages show how traditions of earlier texts were being invoked and reconceived at the outbreak of the Civil War. For example, the anonymous tract Anti-Montacvtvm. An Appeale or Remonstrance of the Orthodox Ministers of the Church of England; Against Richard Mountagu, originally published in 1629, was re-issued in early 1641 with a new title - An Appeale of the Orthodox Ministers of the Church of England: Against Richard Mountague Late Bishop of Chichester, now Bishop of Norwich.⁷ By dropping the 'Anti-Montacvtvm', the new title widens the appeal of the work, making it seem less specifically related to the case of Montagu, and more to do with the state of religion in England generally. Equally, however, the new title page seems to acknowledge the fact that this is not an original publication, and the reference to Montagu's elevation from Chichester to Norwich appeals to a consciousness of developments since 1629, of the struggle between the two factions in the church, to which the original publication had been a contribution. The pages which follow appeal to the authority of, among others, King James and his writings.⁸ There is a sense of James's works being situated in the past and yet being powerfully relevant in 1641; this double characteristic of suppressing and emphasising the original context is a feature of many reprints of earlier works in the first years of the 1640s.

There were many traditions of reading on which the opposition parties could draw, but it seems clear that texts by and relating to King James were exploited more

than most. During 1641, interpretations of texts originally written in connection with the religious tensions during James's first two years on the English throne were being turned against Laud with some subtlety. Many works from this period were reprinted or quoted, often with references to James and his writings. In May 1641, William Thomas made a speech in the House of Commons, later published, in which he argued against episcopacy by referring to James's words at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604.⁹ Thomas, rather brilliantly, interprets James's famous aphorism 'No bishop, no king', to mean 'that those that dislike a Church-government will hardly admit Regall rule'. It is a political, rather than a theological statement. Thomas supports this extraordinary interpretation by referring to James's Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, which he published in 1608, arguing that James's attacks on the papacy mean that at the Hampton Court Conference he had opposed prelacy.¹⁰ The fact that such extreme distortions of James's texts were becoming possible indicates how convinced the opposition parties were that they possessed the true tradition of reading King James.

In November 1641 several pamphlets sought to commemorate the Gunpowder Plot to promote church reform.¹¹ A significant number of works invoke the tradition of the violent Popish conspiracy, mainly in order to blacken the reputation of the prelates and the Book of Common Prayer.¹² November the 5, 1605. The Qvintessence of Crvelty, which was available by the anniversary date in 1641, is an enlarged version of a work by Francis Herring, translated by John Vicars.¹³ Vicars' translation of Herring's Latin verses had first appeared in 1617 as Mischeefes Mysterie.¹⁴ In this dramatic poem, in line with the emerging tendency to discuss

James's works as prophecy mentioned in Chapter Three, James describes how he read and miraculously interpreted the obscure warning letter:

At last our prudent-King, Apollo's sonne,
Fair Englands Joseph, thus to them begun;
(Weighing each circumstance with deep discretion)
Well, sirs, our judgements must take more impression,
This is no triviall work or fantasie,
But must be fitted with great scrutiny¹⁵

The 1641 edition emphasises the significance of the plot in relation to the events of the 1640s, and draws particular attention to a supposed anti-Parliamentary plot of 1641.¹⁶ Readers are urged to remember the plot and to continue the national tradition of resistance to Rome.¹⁷ The work concludes with 'A Paraphrasticall Psalm of thanksgiving', a version of Psalm 124, in which Jehovah is thanked for delivering the English Parliament. The writer suggests that the paraphrase has two speakers, 'King David against the Philistins', and 'King James against the Antichristians'.¹⁸ After the furore over the attempts by Charles to impose the version of the Psalms ascribed to James, this dramatic reclamation of the tradition of James as the Davidic king shows just how confident the opposition pamphleteers had become. As King Charles's government drew near to political collapse, the opposition writers knew that King James was on their side.

After the collapse of censorship in London following King Charles's withdrawal from the city on 10 January 1642, many more reprints appeared at the press, suggesting a desire to interpret the current crisis by finding parallels in earlier texts and events. Sometimes these strategies are only represented by a reference in a pamphlet's title, as is the case in A Discoverie of the Hellish Plot against divers particular of the Nobility of the Kingdome of England. Also the Papists Gunpowder

Plot, brought to light, which described a conspiracy against the leaders of the beleaguered Irish Protestants without otherwise mentioning the plot of November 1605.¹⁹ In other works, like A Sermon Preached before the late King James, a reprint of a sermon made by the Puritan minister John Burges in 1604, the intention of applying past literature to the present is so obvious that the editor does not feel it necessary to explicitly apply the text to events in 1642.²⁰ In his sermon, Burges described the duty of kings towards their subjects. The text recounts the history of kings who have been deposed for opposing the true religion, and reminds James, 'It was a noble speech (and blessed be God that put it into the Kings royall heart) to say, He would shed the last drop of his blood, rather then tolerate another Religion.'²¹ James clearly disapproved of the sermon, as the text reveals by including Burges' attempts to justify himself in letters to James and the privy council after he had been imprisoned following the sermon. Yet the mere fact that James had listened to such arguments is enough to allow a contrast to be made with the inflexibility of King Charles.

In May 1642, the month in which Charles's attempts to gain control of the arsenal at Hull were forcing both sides simultaneously to refine their intellectual positions and to prepare for war, a new edition of King James's Letter and Directions of 1622 appeared. This was the first of many new editions of James's works to be published in 1642. Not since James's accession to the English throne in 1603, when most of James's published prose was reprinted for London stationers, had there been such an interest in republishing his works. Particularly interesting, in terms of reception history, is the fact that the 1642 texts did not all appear at once, but over the course of that turbulent year. Although they seem to have been produced by

different editors and publishers, for different purposes, several of these texts contain references to other new editions. We can thus learn much about the debate over the interpretation of King James's writings, at least in terms of the way it was being conducted before a public audience of readers.

King James his Letter and Directions to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; concerning Preaching and Preachers contains James's letter to Archbishop George Abbot, the directions for preachers, and Abbot's two letters in support of the directions.²² The text is not identical with that in any of the printed editions of 1622, and it seems likely that the editor is making use of one of the manuscript copies in circulation. The text appears to be based on a version of the official edition, but it is worth noting that the way in which the various documents are structured is closer to the format of the unofficial editions. Particularly interesting is the way in which George Abbot's longer letter, written on 4 or 5 September 1622, is printed before his shorter letter, which was written on about 12 August 1622. As described in Chapter Two, Abbot's long letter is a complex and critical response to James's directions, unlike Abbot's short letter, written before the scale of public opposition had become known, which is simply a brief note ordering that the directions be obeyed. In the 1642 version, the long letter is given its accepted date of 4 September 1622, but the short letter which follows it is undated. This gives the impression that the author's attitude is hardening. The title page, in fact, makes use of the short letter, stating that James's letter is printed along with 'the Bishop of Canterburies Letter to the Bishop of Lincolne, Lord Keeper, desiring him to put in practise the Kings desires, that none should preach but in a Religious forme. And not that every young man should take to himselfe an exorbitant Liberty, to preach what he listeth, to the offence of his

Majesty, and the disturbance and disquiet of the Church and Commonwealth'. This is a quotation from Abbot's letter. What were the motives behind this confrontational restructuring?

Firstly, it is worth noting that the work purports to have been printed for Thomas Walkeley, a known royalist bookseller, who lost his estates in 1642.²³ It seems most unlikely that he would have published such a work at this time. The dispute between King Charles and Parliament was on the edge of becoming a military conflict; every announcement by anyone in authority was read with great care. It would have been provocative in the extreme for a royalist to remind the world of past actions by monarchs to repress preachers, particularly in view of the recent fall of Archbishop Laud. It is more probable that this version was printed under Walkeley's name by a Parliamentary sympathiser to make readers think that the royalists subscribed to the extremist position in the letter and directions. By emphasising the hectoring tone of Abbot's first letter, the editor could link the two archbishops. In 1622, Abbot had resisted the Letter and Directions, and his long letter had been used by others seeking to resist the text: in 1642, however, the editor finds it more useful to identify Abbot with the work, perhaps to suggest that he seduced James into passing the document, just as Laud had imposed his policies on Charles. In 1622, the continuation of episcopal government in England had not been an issue of serious debate, particularly in view of Abbot's Calvinist views: in 1642, however, the Letter and Directions makes very useful propaganda for the reforming party.

This publication marks a significant development in the history of the reception of King James's texts. It seems likely that the persons who prepared the 1642 version held similar beliefs to those who had prepared the unofficial editions of

1622. There is a common resistance to pro-Catholic policies, and a common sympathy with the left-wing preachers. However, the different editors use the same text quite differently. The unofficial edition of 1622 had tried to tone down the king's words and had omitted Abbot's shorter letter altogether. The 1642 text stresses the importance of Abbot's less ambiguous letter, and prints James's controversial reference to the need to support the 'non-preaching ministers'. It does not argue that James could not possibly mean what he appeared to be saying, or quote his earlier works to show that the Letter and Directions did not accord with accepted readings of James's oeuvre. Equally, there is no attempt to contrast misguided King Charles with wise King James. This work seems to be suggesting, quite simply, that James and his bishops were wrong in 1622, just as Charles and his bishops are wrong in 1642.

Thomas Cogswell and Nigel Smith have shown that the events surrounding the Spanish marriage in the 1620s were seen as closely paralleling the events which had led to the break between Charles and his Parliament.²⁴ Once again, the king was conducting policies which involved closer links with Catholicism, trying to restrict free speech, and issuing ambiguous and threatening declarations. People wanted to know whether there was a precedent for resisting the royal word. The editor of the new Letter and Directions might have been trying to suggest that the current crisis would blow over as quickly as the crisis in 1622, and that Charles would repudiate his declarations as rapidly as James had jettisoned the letter and directions. However, the main purpose of the republication seems to be to link King Charles and his supporters to a tradition of repression and hidden agendas, and, equally, to a tradition of royal weakness and inconsistency.

Other editions of texts relating to events in the 1620s seem to confirm this. In June, a work appeared with the striking title Behold! Two Letters ('Printed in the yeare of Discoveries 1642').²⁵ This consists of a letter written by Pope Gregory XV to Prince Charles in 1623, and Prince Charles's amicable reply: both seem to be genuine. As with the new version of the Letter and Directions, there is no commentary, but the implication seems to be that Charles, and therefore presumably James, were in league with the Papists from the start. Another work, The Svpplication of all the Papists of England to King James, which also appeared in June, reprinted the Catholic appeal for a toleration made to James at the start of his English reign.²⁶ The implication is that the Papists were treacherous, and the title-page informs the reader how soon the Gunpowder Plot followed their petition. However, the text also suggests that James was gullible and too sympathetic to the Catholics. The 1642 re-publication includes the letter, purportedly written by Archbishop Abbot in 1623, in which he warned James against tolerating the heretical doctrines of Rome. The Parliamentary propagandists do not seem to have agreed on a consistent interpretation of Abbot's opinions. Their concern was to use Abbot's words to subvert the authority of the royal word and the royal policies, whether by presenting him negatively, as an uncritical supporter of repression, or positively, as a brave opponent of the king. The reforming party, who controlled the tradition of reading King James in the 1620s and 1630s, had become so confident that they were now using past texts and events to support their cause without bothering to preserve a coherent version of history.

Abbot's letters in support of the Letter and Directions were published again in 1642 with the printed date of 15 July, in a collection of miscellaneous pro-

Parliamentary declarations and petitions entitled Remarkeable [sic] Passages, with the imprimatur of the clerk of the House of Commons.²⁷ The long letter, which precedes the short letter, as in the 1642 version of the complete Letter and Directions, is introduced as 'The Arch-Bishop of Canterburies Letter to the Arch-Bishop of Yorke'.²⁸ Richard A. Christophers seems to be right when he remarks, 'This work seems to be a tract of government propaganda, and the titlepage, significantly, does not mention Abbot. Perhaps the publishers hoped that Laud's name would be understood'.²⁹ Without James's directions, Abbot's ironic subtext is lost, and the writer sounds as though he is promoting a new programme of repression. However, the long letter is given its correct date of 4 September 1622.³⁰ The editor seems to be allowing the reader to interpret the work in two different ways, which would be equally damaging to the 'High Church' party. The work could be read as a last attempt by Laud to repress the Puritans, or as evidence that the 1622 Letter and Directions, reprinted in May, is highly relevant to the current crisis. It may be significant that the short letter, which is given the ambiguous signature 'CANT' rather than 'G. CANT' as with the long letter, is followed by a petition from the distressed Irish Protestants to Charles. Whether the work is understood in relation to James or Charles, Abbot or Laud, the point is made that the Protestant church is suffering as a result of these bad policies.

This renewed interest in the Letter and Directions, and the related change in the way of reading King James, is not only represented by new printed editions like those discussed above. It seems clear that copies of various parts of the Letter and Directions were circulating in manuscript well into the mid-seventeenth century. When the republican historians of the 1650s began to produce their revisionist

accounts of James's reign, the Letter and Directions featured prominently. Arthur Wilson and John Rushworth reprinted the work with commentary clearly setting the text and its reception in the context of the breakdown in 1642, and were answered by William Sanderson, Thomas Fuller and John Hacket, who defended James's actions.³¹ These historians print versions of the work which contain an extraordinary number of textual variants, which is difficult to explain unless manuscript copies were more readily available than the surviving copies of the official printed edition.

A version of the Letter and Directions was clearly used to produce Charles II's Directions Concerning Preachers, which was published in 1662 to assist with the enforcement of the restored episcopal system, and this document was republished by James VII & II.³² The revival of interest in the document at the Restoration may have been the reason why Archbishop William Sancroft began to research the state of the text; as a believer in the divine right of kings, it must have been disconcerting to see the extent to which James had lost control over his words. Sancroft read and annotated a copy of the 1642 version of the complete Letter and Directions, now in Durham University Library (shelfmark R.37.B.11), and on the first page wrote 'see y^e 2^d pt of y^e Cabbala'. In Scrinia Sacra... a Svpplement of the Cabala (1654), a pro-republican collection of Jacobean documents, a version of the Letter and Directions is printed.³³ Was Sancroft comparing the version of 1642 with the later version? Many of his annotations do correspond to the text in Scrinia Sacra; however, there are many differences between the two texts which Sancroft does not mark, and sometimes his marginalia suggest a change to text which is identical in Scrinia Sacra and the 1642 text. Sancroft was presumably comparing the 1642 version to a

manuscript copy, perhaps trying to account for the origin of the text in Scrinia Sacra.³⁴

Sancroft's interest in this confusing multiplicity of texts is further indicated by the fact that one of the two surviving copies of the 1622 unauthorised edition (STC 14379.5) is among the books he donated to his college, Emmanuel.³⁵ Bound in a volume of tracts relating to ecclesiastical history, Sancroft lists the work in a table of contents in his own handwriting. One suspects that he had examined the other copy of STC 14379.5, and that its current presence in the library of Durham University is connected to Sancroft's time at Durham in the 1660s.³⁶ Although Sancroft's annotations to the Durham copy of the 1642 version do not relate to either of these two earlier versions, it seems more than likely that he was aware of their existence, and perhaps of their significance as subversive reworkings of King James's words. To return to the situation in 1642: the fact that the work could still command this level of interest in the 1650s and 1660s suggests that the republication of the Letter and Directions in 1642 was a major event in the development of pro-Parliamentary readings of King James.³⁷

II. A royalist response? The Trve Law of Free Monarchy and A Puritane Set Forth in his Lively Colours

On 2 July 1642, Thomason received a pamphlet containing one of the most important expositions of the Parliamentary position, Henry Parker's anonymous Observations upon some of his Majesties late Answers and Expresses, which traced the origins of the current crisis back to James's accession to the English throne. Parker argued that for 'almost 40 yeeres' court corruption had grown, cutting off the king from the 'country', the mass of his subjects.³⁸ The tendency to use King James's texts to show that both James and Charles belonged to a tradition which should be rejected was part of an increasingly dangerous intellectual movement. The royalist pamphleteers could not afford to let these tracts go unanswered. Some time in July, the first reprint of The True Law of Free Monarchies since 1620 appeared under the title The Trve Law of Free Monarchy.³⁹

The text seems to be a reasonably faithful reproduction of one of the editions printed in London in 1603. James did not officially acknowledge his authorship of this tract on absolute monarchy until its inclusion in the Workes of 1617; here, it appears under its original pseudonym 'Philopatris', and the 1642 title-page additionally describes the author as 'a well affected subject of the Kingdome of Scotland'. There are the usual errors by the compositor, and a few instances in which James's unfamiliar Scotticisms are replaced by English words which destroy the sense of a passage. For example, James wrote, 'there can not be a more deceivable argument, then to judge ay the justnes of the cause by the event thereof'.⁴⁰ The 1642 text reads 'there cannot be a more deceivable argument; then to judge *by* the justnesse

of the cause by the event thereof [my italics].⁴¹ Although the new description of the author might suggest that this edition is intended to be read in connection with events in Scotland, there is clearly no Scot in the printing-house.

Several of this version's unique features seem to indicate practical motives; the paragraphing is greatly reduced to fit the words onto the sixteen pages of the pamphlet, a redundant phrase is removed, and even so, the printer is forced to use a smaller type on the last pages.⁴² There are more interesting changes, however. For example, the powerful phrase "*So is hee [the king] master over every person that inhabiteth the same, [the whole country] having power over the life and death of every one of them*" is not italicised in the earlier versions.⁴³ It was mentioned in Chapter Three that the True Law, with its emphasis on the wickedness of rebellion in any circumstances, might seem a useful text for royalists wishing to oppose pro-Parliamentary readings of James's works. This may be an example of a royalist publisher doing just that. Readers who had been convinced by Burton and Baillie that James's words could be used to correct King Charles, or who had been persuaded by the reprints of the Letter and Directions that James's texts should be rejected along with the declarations of his son, could now read James's uncompromising doctrine of royal supremacy.⁴⁴ The 'Advertisement to the Reader', in particular, seems rather appropriate to the current situation, as James tells his audience:

The profit I would wish you to make of, it is, as wel so to frame all your actions according to these grounds, as may confirme you in the course of honest and obedient subjects to your King, in all times comming, as also, when ye shall fall in purpose with any that shall praise or excuse the by-past rebellions, that break forth either in this Countrey or in any other, ye shall herewith be armed against their Siren songs, laying their particular examples to the square of these grounds.⁴⁵

It would be possible to read this work as James's prophetic warning to the new rebels.

However, there are a number of features which suggest it is wise to be cautious before identifying this work as a royalist publication. Firstly, the elusive stationer 'T. P.', who seems to have flourished in 1641 and 1642, printing and selling tracts on current affairs, mainly produced works overtly sympathetic to Parliament.⁴⁶

James Craigie remarks of the 1642 version of the True Law:

Some of the surviving copies of this edition are seriously defective. Thus, that in Glasgow University consists of sig. A only and in each of the two copies in the National Library of Scotland sig. B belongs to an as yet unidentified work on the relations between Charles I and his subjects in 1642, which would seem to have come from T. P.'s printing house since the types used in printing it are identical with those used for sig. A. It looks as if the sheets of the two works had become mixed in the printing house, which could quite easily have happened since they are so similar to each other.⁴⁷

The 'unidentified work' is A Remonstrance or the Declaration of the Lords and Commons... the 26 of May, 1642, printed at London for E. Paxton and T. P.⁴⁸ This was one of the most important declarations by Parliament before the outbreak of military hostilities, in response to Charles's demand that they should surrender Hull. The work, probably drawn up by Pym and Hampden, begins to articulate the distinction between Charles as a man and the kingly powers he exercised which was to provide the intellectual justification for Parliament's actions over the next few years.⁴⁹ It is completely opposed to the doctrine laid down in the True Law, and if the joining of sig. A of King James's work with sig. B of the Remonstrance was accidental, it was a rather extraordinary blunder.

The last page of sig. A in the True Law ends as follows:

And under the Evangell that King, whom Paul bids the Romaines Obey and serve for conscience sake, was Nero that bloody Tyrant, an infamy to his age, and a monster to the world, being also an Idolatrous persecutor, as the K. of

Babel was. If then Idolatry & defection from God, tyranny over their people, & persecution of the Saints, for their profession sake, hindred not⁵⁰

In the 'defective' copies, the text on sig. B reads on as follows:

of the Papists here, doe in likely-hood depend) than his Maiesties absenting himselfe, in that manner that he doth from his Parliament, and setting forth such sharp Invectives against them, notwithstanding all the humble Petitions, and other means which his Parliament hath addressed unto him for his return, and for his satisfaction concerning their proceedings.⁵¹

The two passages are not connected grammatically, but it is possible to imaginatively associate the early Christians' vain appeals to Nero, evoked by James, with Parliament's petitions to Charles. The implications of such a reading of the 'combined' text are extremely subversive. Sig. B of the Remonstrance goes on to appeal to the people to consider the nature of Charles's evil counsellors:

whether if they could master this Parliament by force they would not hold up the same power to deprive us of all Parliaments, which are the ground and pillar of the Subjects liberty, and that which onely maketh England a free Monarchie.⁵²

One version of 'free monarchy' is being set up against another. This echo, at least, seems too felicitous to be a coincidence. As with the reprint of the Letter and Directions, it seems likely that some very subtle strategies are at work. The 1642 edition of the Trve Law was probably intended to subvert the royal cause, by presenting the case for absolute monarchy in the most extreme and unacceptable way, just as Abbot's letters in support of the directions for preachers had been used to emphasise the intolerance of the prelates. By tampering with some copies of the work, presumably using up old copies of the Remonstrance which had been lying around since May, the editors could contrast the extremism of the Stuart position with the Parliamentary theory of monarchy.

It seems more likely that A Puritane Set Forth in his Lively Colours: Or, K. James his description of a Puritan, the next pamphlet based on King James's writings, was genuinely intended to promote the royalist cause.⁵³ George Thomason apparently received his copy on 23 August 1642, the day after King Charles had raised his standard at Nottingham. The title is conventional, and can be related to earlier works like Oliver Ormerod's The Pictvre of a Puritane (1605), which quotes James's writings to prove the Puritans to be schismatics and troublemakers.⁵⁴ The title-page of A Puritane Set Forth also promises 'The Round-Heads Character' and 'The Character of a Holy Sister', and rather brazenly states that these descriptions are 'All fitted for the times'. James is introduced as 'the King of Prophets in these later times, and a Prophetical King'.⁵⁵ It is tempting to suggest that true prophecy should be fit rather than fitted for the times. Writers like Daniel Featley had made use of the idea that James's writings were a prophetic warning against the innovations of Laud and Charles, and there would seem to be no reason why royalist propagandists should not use the same strategy. However, the crudeness of this pamphlet ensures that its strategies remain glaringly obvious; its abuse of James's words and their historical context strikingly resembles the use made of the Bible by prophetic Civil War writers described by Christopher Hill.⁵⁶ It reads like the work of a controversialist in 1642, seeking to blacken the reputation of his adversaries, rather than a presentation of interesting phrases which seem to conform to traditions of reading King James, and to shed light on the current situation.

To make the argument that James anticipated the consequences of a Puritan victory, the editor appeals to Basilicon Doron, which he sees as a prophetic legacy in accordance with the tradition described above. Unlike Featley, however, this editor

is arguing that James's words bind Charles to fight and destroy the Puritans.⁵⁷ The editor describes how James:

did in the second Book of his Basilicon Doron, that Kingly gift, which he bequeathed unto our Royall King Charles, (whom God long prosper with his just and religious designes) as his last Will and Testament, among other of his Princely Admonitions, gave him this *caveat*, to beware of this monstrous brood.⁵⁸

This is one of the passages which had occasioned most controversy when Basilicon Doron was first published. In his preface to the first public edition, James had qualified his original remarks, agreeing that the word 'Puritan' could only be applied strictly to the Family of Love, and that he did not mean to attack those who disliked the ceremonies and bishops of the Church of England.⁵⁹ However, the passage, which A Puritane Set Forth quotes fairly accurately, using the text of one of the English editions, is still powerful propaganda:

Take heed (saith he) of these Puritans, the very pests (or plagues) in the Church & Common-wealth; whom no deserts can oblige; neither oathes, nor promises binde; breathing nothing but sedition and calumnies; aspiring without measure, railing without reason, and making their owne imaginations (without any warrant of the Word) the square of their conscience, I protest before the great God, and since I am here, as upon my Testament, it is no place for me to lie in, that you shall never finde, with any Highland, or Border-theeves, greater ingratitude, and more lies, and vile perjuries, then with these phanatick spirits. And suffer not the principals of them to brook your land, if you like to sit at rest; except you would keep them for trying your patience, as Socrates did an evill wife.⁶⁰

The text continues, however, by a remark which exposes the processes of the editor's work, connecting two separate passages in this way:

And (in the page before) he speaks thus of them: I was oft-times calumniated by these fiery-spirited men in their popular Sermons; not for any evill or vice in me; but because I was a King: which they thought the highest evill.⁶¹

Henry Burton, in connecting two passages from James's speech of 1610, had used a similar phrase, 'And a little after...'. However, at least there was the semblance of

logic in omitting a few phrases to move on to the next relevant point: in A Puritane Set Forth, the idea of the editor flipping back a page to get a reference he had forgotten is rather comic.

Even more revealing is the way in which the text then repeats the first quotation, turning it into the editor's paraphrase in the third person:

So that then, if any man shall propound that old Quaere, *What is a Puritan?* We may resolve the Question, and describe him in his true colours, out of K. James, after this manner: A Puritan, is one of the pestilent party, the very plague of the Church and Common-wealth, whom no deserts can oblige, nor oathes, nor promises binde; one that breathes nothing but sedition and calumnies; aspiring without measure, and railing without reason; making his owne imaginations (without warrant of the Word) the square of his conscience. He is a phanatick spirit; with whom you may find greater ingratitude, more lies, and viler perjuries, then amongst the most infamous theeves. And if the principals of them be suffered in a Kingdome, it can be to no other good purpose, but for the tryall of the Kings patience: for when they speak evill of Kings, it is not because Kings deserve it; but because it is naturall in these men to deprave them.⁶²

The editor's purpose is presumably to make James's text into a more general and impersonal description, more amenable to prophetic interpretation. To make James's words of the 1590s relevant to the religious strife of the 1640s, they need to be removed still further from the context. However, the fact that the original text and its reworking are juxtaposed strikingly reveals the activity of the editor, and the fact that the original text is not the same as the interpretation being placed upon it in 1642.

The reworking of the quotation is followed by the conclusion:

This was the judgement and opinion of K. James of happy memory and learned experience: in whose dayes, we enjoyed the flourishing estate of the Gospel; with a great deale of peace, plenty, and prosperity. But now to our grieffe we see the truth of his Divine Prediction, and by wofull experience are too too [*sic*] sensible of their conditions.⁶³

The fact that this follows the paraphrase of the text rather than the text itself would logically suggest that King James's opinion was to be found less fully in his own

writing than in the interpretation of a royalist commentator. So much attention is being drawn to the mechanics of rereading that the idea of prophecy, which was meant to mask such processes, is not successfully sustained. The editor's claim that James's text has some supernatural authority is subverted by the way he has to rewrite that text to make it function as he wishes.

It is possible that this work is so badly-constructed because the editor, as a committed royalist, is anxious to safeguard the integrity of the king's words while using them as propaganda, and consequently feels obliged to show the reader what he is doing with them. The opposition pamphleteers, whose reworkings of James's texts rely on the tradition of reading them rather than on the authority of the king himself, have no such scruples. Perhaps, ironically, A Puritane Set Forth is an unsuccessful 'prophecy' because the editor really believed that the king's words were inspired, and that it would therefore be wicked to manipulate them. Radical writers could make use of the metaphor of prophecy as part of their overall strategy to persuade Charles to conform to their wishes, without needing to take the implications of such language too seriously. The dilemma of the royalists was that they needed to simultaneously revere and exploit the royal word.⁶⁴

III. King James His Judgement

A Puritane Set Forth seems to have triggered a rapid response by the supporters of Parliament. On 9 September 1642, three days after Parliament had published a declaration refusing to lay down their arms, George Thomason received his copy of King James His Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant. Extracted out of His own Speech at White-Hall.⁶⁵ The title invokes the facile commentary of the conclusion to the earlier work, and sets out to appropriate James's 'judgement' for one of the very factions A Puritane Set Forth seems to be attacking, the Scottish Covenanters. It seems likely that the editor was the rigid Scottish Presbyterian Alexander Leighton, who had been harshly punished by Archbishop Laud after publishing anti-episcopal material, some of which had recently been reprinted.⁶⁶ The tract begins by quoting James's speech of 21 March 1610. The passage selected is the one chosen by Burton, Bastwick and Baillie; the text is so close to that printed by Burton that it seems probable that the editor wished to repeat the polemical success of For God, and the King:

A King (saith King James) in a settled Kingdome, binds himselfe to a double Oath; to the observation of the fundamentall Laws of His Kingdome, Tacitly; as by being a King, and so bound to protect, as well the People, as the Laws of his Kingdome: and expressly, by his Oath at his Coronation. So as every just King in a settled Kingdome is bound to observe that Paction (or Covenant) made to his People by his Laws, in framing his government agreeable thereunto, according to that Paction made with Noah after the Deluge (Gen.9.22.) And therefore a King governing in a settled Kingdome, leaves to be a King, and degenerates into a Tyrant, as soone as he leaves off to rule according to his Laws, Therefore, all Kings that are not Tyrants, or perjured, wilbe glad to bound themselves within the limits of their Laws; and they that perswade them the contrary, are Vipers and Pests both against them and the Common-weale.⁶⁷

The editor has followed Burton and Baillie in omitting the passage in which James denounces rebels for taking into their hands matters that should be left to God. A new feature of this version, however, is the way he glosses 'paction' as '*covenant*', which invokes the highly-charged implications of religious duty the word had come to acquire by 1642, rather than the pragmatic arrangement which James seems to be implying. The editor continues by satirically rebutting the conclusion of A Puritane Set Forth, declaring 'This was the opinion of our geud King James' to counter the earlier text's presentation of James's 'judgement and opinion'.⁶⁸

By placing the extract from James's speech at the start of the main text, rather than using it as an illustration as Burton does, or leaving it in the margin as does Baillie, the editor is making his argument depend on getting his readers to interpret James's words in the way he wants. To conceal the fact that his chosen text, if read in the original, would be counter-productive to his argument that James had legitimised resistance to tyranny, the editor makes much of the authenticity of his text. He explains that the context of the speech was a reply to Bishop Harsnett's sermon in support of the king's absolute power, which had outraged the Commons. The editor remarks, 'So as the occasion gives much strength to his words. And sithence they are the Kings own words, I advise every wise man in England to take the better notice of them, and to Observe these particulars', before going on to extrapolate a course of political action from the text.⁶⁹ He paraphrases the speech in sections, without resorting to the absurd repetition in A Puritane Set Forth. The interpolated word '*covenant*' is vital to the fifth paraphrase:

That a King governing in a settled Kingdome, as the Kingdome of England is, leavs [*sic*] to be a King so soon as he leaves off and failes to rule according to his Laws. And so leaving off to be a King, the Covenant on his part is

infringed, so as the People are no longer his Subjects to obey him in his lawlesse Government, then he is their King governing them according to his Laws.⁷⁰

This version of the speech is being used to infer the very conclusions James had resisted.

The editor goes on to deride the protestations issued from the court of the king, of which 'hardly a word' is true.⁷¹ He then paraphrases his own paraphrase, to make his conclusions even more extreme:

That if Kings cease to be Kings, setting up an absolute Tyranny over the people, to governe them no longer by the Laws as free-borne liege people, but lawlesly as vassalls and slaves, then on the other side the people leaving to be Subjects, do owne them no more obedience, as being none of their Kings, but usurping Tyrants.⁷²

The editor clearly has no respect for James's real opinions and judgements, but wishes to find material with which to condemn Charles and promote the Covenanting cause. In doing so, at one point he would seem to implicitly oppose James's 'judgement', demanding to know 'By whose authority, and for what end was it, that that more then heathenish Beuk for sports, to prophane the Lords day, was published in every Kirke in England?'⁷³ Unlike the editor of A Puritane Set Forth, this editor is not hampered by a need to convince himself that he is respecting the original authority of the text. It does not particularly matter that James originally commissioned the Book of Sports, or that the speech of 1610 was not intended to justify rebellion; what counts is the use that the royalists have been making of James's words, and the need to use their own strategies against them.

This work confronts not only royalist appropriations of King James like A Puritane Set Forth, but the words of King Charles himself. Having argued that James's speech gives grounds for resistance to tyranny, and having discussed

Charles's behaviour in writing to the Pope in 1623, the editor poses some questions to his readers. He asks:

Whether so many Proclamations, Declarations, Protestations or Remonstrances, as are published in the Kings name, being so full of manifest and palpable falshoods, and shamelesse untruths, wherby the true meaning people are most pittifully abused, seduced, deluded and blindfoulded...ought not to be laid upon the King himselfe, as the supreme Author of them, seeing he is pleased to be the owner and maintainer of them?⁷⁴

King James His Iudgement is, in a way, an essay on authority and responsibility. In demolishing the arguments of A Puritane Set Forth, the editor reveals the implications for the royalists of making King James into an authority for their position. If the royalists want to credit James's texts with prophetic power, and to make them into a weapon against the Puritans, they must be prepared to see their interpretation of them challenged. Equally, if words attributed to King Charles are to be used as propaganda, the royalists must not be surprised when Charles is called to account for them. The royalists were appealing to the authority of James and Charles, and by summoning the spectre of authority they had given the opposition writers something more to oppose. As James well knew, to insist on power is to invite resistance.

It has been seen in the case of the 1642 texts of parts of the Letter and Directions that it was now possible for the opposition pamphleteers to respond to the royalist use of James's works in at least two different ways. James's words could be displayed and reworked as evidence that Charles had rebelled against his father's good teaching, or they could, increasingly, be rejected as part of the tradition from which King Charles and his bad policies had sprung. It was much more difficult to rework or take control of the words of King Charles, as the author was present and

volubly insisting on his meaning. Parliament had so far been avoiding the problem by refusing to acknowledge that Charles had actually written those declarations appearing in his name.⁷⁵ However, as King James His Iudgement makes clear, this position had something unreal about it. If the king's words could not be subordinated to the Parliamentarians, then they would eventually have to take issue with the king himself. The editor of this work was clearly going beyond the official Parliamentary position in directly attacking Charles, and this work was burned by order of Parliament on 12 September.⁷⁶ However, it shows how profoundly the debate over the interpretation of King James's works was related to the ideological developments which would lead to the abolition of the monarchy in 1649.⁷⁷

The royalist response to King James his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant reveals the extent to which reading King James had become problematic. The next pamphlet containing King James's words, King James His Iudgment by way of counsell and advice to all His loving Subjects, extracted out of His own speeches by Doctor Willet concerning Politique gouvernement in England and Scotland, appeared just before the Battle of Edgehill on 23 October 1642, Thomason giving his copy the date 19 October.⁷⁸ The title suggests a further development in the debate over James's 'judgement', and the reference to Willet suggests that the radical ideology of King James his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant is to be countered by a reading of James by the Jacobean textual scholar and Anglican divine, Andrew Willet.⁷⁹ Willet would seem to be a useful authority for the royalists and episcopalians to cite, as a reformer, opposed to the Spanish Match, who nevertheless remained in conformity with the Church of England.⁸⁰ However, the text does not fulfill these expectations. It does not engage with the construction of James as a supporter of

insurrection, or indeed adopt a polemical tone at all, but simply and nostalgically describes conditions in England under James, expressing the hope that Charles will be able to continue along the same lines.

The phrase 'extracted out of His own speeches' is misleading, as it invites the reader to expect a direct retort to the earlier work 'extracted out of his own speech at White-Hall'. In fact, the author of King James His Iudgment by way of counsell seems to understand the three works he quotes, Basilicon Doron, the Meditation on Chronicles, and the Meditation on Revelation, as containing James's 'speeches', and does not refer to any of James's orally delivered works, let alone the 1610 speech. Furthermore, the work's claim to be by Andrew Willet, who had died in 1621 while James was still alive, reads rather oddly in the light of its retrospective praise of James's reign. Equally striking is the way in which the text is set in the framework of a historical narrative, in which the quotations containing James's plans and hopes for the future seem quite out of place. For example, we may consider the use made of Basilicon Doron here:

Whereas the peace of this Church had beene hindred by the opposition of strange, and new Doctrines, he restored the peace of the Church, and brought it to one uniforme Doctrine, whose Princely advice is, Pag.20.1.1. That if any do urge to embrace their own fantasies in the place of Gods Word &c, acknowledg [*sic*] them for vaine men &c. and gravely and with authority redact them into order againe.⁸¹

The text in the 1603 editions of Basilicon Doron runs as follows:

And when any of the spirituall office-bearers in the Churche, speaketh unto you any thing that is well warranted by the word, reverence and obey them as the heraulds of the most high God: but, if passing that bounds, they urge you to embrace any of their fantasies in the place of Gods word, or would colour their particulars with a pretended zeale, acknowledge them for no other then vaine men, exceeding the bounds of their calling; and according to your office, gravely & with authoirty redact them in ordour againe.⁸²

There is no logical connection between James's ideas about church government, and the actual state of the church under his rule. The peculiarity of basing an account of James's English reign solely upon texts written before his accession to the throne seems to be another symptom of the royalists' difficulties in making use of James's works. The editor seems to be trying to magnify the authority of the royal word, developing the idea of reading James's works as prophecy to suggest that his written intentions actually produced the historical events of his reign. However, the unskilful way in which this is done does great damage to the integrity of both James's texts and history itself. As in A Puritane Set Forth, the process of turning James's words into propaganda is painfully obvious.

This remarkable text owes some of its unusual features to the fact that it is an unacknowledged reworking of a genuine work by Andrew Willet, the preface to his Ecclesia Triumphans, published in 1603 to welcome the new king, and to express hopes that his writings indicate that his rule would be beneficial for the English church.⁸³ The response to the appearance of Basilicon Doron has already been discussed. James Craigie has described how James's accession to the throne inspired a number of publications seeking 'to discover his principles of state-craft and from them to anticipate what he would do so that, even if only dimly, there might be seen in outline the shape which the future was to take'.⁸⁴ Willet, like many others, read the new English editions of the three works referred to above as pointing to a benevolent, reform-minded philosopher-king who happened to coincide with Willet's ideal ruler.⁸⁵ Willet suppressed, whether consciously or not, the fact that he was appropriating James's words for a purpose; that he was trying to force James's words to match a particular model of reality.

It is not surprising that the royalists performing a similar reading activity forty years later should have turned to Willet's example. However, King James His Judgment exposes the strains in such practices by trying to appropriate not merely James's words, but a *reading* of them. The editor seems to have taken Willet's predictions as prophecy, not merely interpretation, and he seems to have projected this prophecy back upon James's reign, as though it had all really happened. The effect of approaching James through an earlier interpretation which had already imagined his work as charged with semi-prophetic power is to distort his texts almost beyond recognition. Willet's text is based upon a series of meditations on Psalm 122, which he relates to James's writing to show how James seems likely to purify the church in the same way as King David. The 1642 text omits this exegetical foundation, with the result that the editor appears to be treating James's works as the primary scripture. James's writings simply cannot support this burden. Willet's purpose is summarised by his lines:

Under David true religion was continued: and by our Sovereigne the faith of the gospell by his Majestie truely professed, and in his princely bookes protested, shall still be maintained.⁸⁶

The garbled reworking shows the difficulty of reimagining James's texts in this way:

By his Majesty King James of blessed memory, the faith of the Gospell was truely professed, and his Princely Bookes protested still maintained.⁸⁷

James's books are made not just to profess the true faith, but to protest that James was actually maintaining it. The boundaries between words and reality are made to disappear.

The confusion caused by these dislocations is magnified by the editor's textual errors in reading Willet's own imperfect reading of James.⁸⁸ Willet praises James's words of support of impartial justice, commenting that James:

as he is no forrainer, so giveth counsell to his princely heire, To have ordinarie counsels and justice seates in every kingdome, of their owne countrimen.⁸⁹

Willet gives a marginal reference to 'pag.55', meaning to the 1603 edition of Basilicon Doron. He is paraphrasing James, whose actual words of advice, in the context of advising Prince Henry to visit all his kingdoms every three years, were:

hearing your selfe their complaintes; and having ordinary counsels and justice-seats in every kingdome, of their owne country-men: and the principall matters ever to be decided by your selfe when ye come in those parts.⁹⁰

But if Willet takes the text out of context, the 1642 editor, either through an attempt at compression or simple misreading, writes that James:

as he was no forrainer; so gave he counsell to his Princely heire, p.55. To heare ordinary Counsels, and Justice seates in every Kingdome, of their own Countrymen.⁹¹

Substituting 'heare' for 'haue' makes the king's task rather more onerous than James had intended. There are other notable errors, particularly in the misplacing or mistaking of Willet's scrupulous marginal references. The 1642 editor's ignorance of James's original texts makes him completely dependent on Willet's reading; while making great claims for the power of James's words, this work empties out any sense of James's original 'judgement', any sense of an authority outside the immediate context of the pamphlet war.

King James his Judgment concludes with a postscript which contains the only direct attempt to give the work contemporary relevance. The editor expresses his hope for peace in these terms:

The Jewes returning from Captivitie did so wonder at their strange deliverance, that they seemed to be as men that dreame. As strange a worke may it please God to worke for the Church of England if he please at this time; And though our divisions be not yet turned into peace, yet have wee many yeares under our Gracious Sovereigne enjoyed both true Religion and Peace; and though there be now such great feares, and distempers in this Kingdome, under so godly, pious and Religious a Prince, who is even a pattern of true piety and love to all Prince of the World: yet us not faint, oh let us pray, to God that as his Royall Majesty after his Royall Father King James, was settled in Peace; so this Kingdome may againe be reduced to that flourishing Peace, wherein under our gracious King it hath hitherto stood as before under his Royall Father...⁹²

This history of the benevolent monarchy of James and Charles has been revealed as nothing more than a reading of a reading, and this passage itself is a violent appropriation of Willet's words. The source text in Ecclesia Triumphans comes at the start, not the end, and is not an expression of hope for the future, but a comment on the historical replacement of Elizabeth by James:

The Jewes returning from captiuitie, did so wonder at their strange deliverance, that they seemed to be as men, *that dreame*: Psal.126 I. As strange a worke hath God wrought for the Church of England: for though we are not come from thraldome to libertie, or from captivitie to our owne countrie, having many yeares under our late Sovereigne enjoyed both true religion, and therewith, as the handmaid waiting upon her mistresse, all flourishing peace: yet in respect of our deliverance from that danger to the state, which many feared, the change of religion in the church, which some doubted, others desired, we can no lesse wonder at the Lords strange worke, and say with the Church of God: *The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we rejoyce*, Psal.126.3.⁹³

The structural inversion reflects the conceptual reworking: whereas the main body of the 1642 text is an attempt to project Willet's prophecy back onto history, this passage is an attempt to turn Willet's history into prophecy - the text is being forced into a completely new historical model. The awkwardness is evident even if the reader does not know of the relationship with Ecclesia Triumphans.

It seems likely that the printer and bookseller Thomas Cooke bears much of the responsibility for this publication. His name appears on several anonymous works in late 1642, all of which are badly printed, highly-derivative pamphlets, which apparently attempt to use existing documents to make an intervention in the political debate. Generally, however, the resulting work is so confused that it is difficult to determine the guiding intention. An example is A Learned Speech Spoken to His Excellency the Earl of Essex, dated 27 September 1642, which gives the speech of a minister, Thomas Springham, to encourage Essex on his departure to confront the king's army.⁹⁴ The speech is followed by a letter explaining that Springham's words were pointless as Essex was not actually ready to go at all. Equally puzzling is A Exact and True Relation of the Battell...at Acton, a tract dated 14 November 1642, which juxtaposes news with a semi-literate Puritan prayer that England may not become like Germany, which 'was the flourishingest Lingdom [*sic*] in all Christendome'.⁹⁵ Another peculiar work is The Examination of Colonell Lunsford, which is dated 19 November, and which contains contains a royalist speech, about which George Thomason noted on his copy 'this was formerly printed as spoke by another'.⁹⁶ Cooke's incompetent use of other works may reveal a mercenary desire to print as many cheap pamphlets as possible. It is, however, interesting to speculate that the predominantly pro-Parliamentarian tone of Cooke's pamphlets may indicate that King James His Iudgment by way of counsell is, like the 1642 versions of the Letter and Directions and The True Law of Free Monarchies, a subversive attempt to put people off the royalist pamphlets.

IV. The Ghost of King James and the Trial of King Charles

On 21 October, Thomason received another pamphlet which makes it clear that the king's party had lost the battle over King James even before they had experienced any major military action. Strange Apparitions, or, The Ghost of King James is a delightful dramatic sketch in which the ghost of Buckingham is confronted with the spirits of those he murdered.⁹⁷ There had been rumours of poison at the time of James's death, spread by James's wayward doctor George Eglisam, but this was a normal occurrence at the death of a great man in the seventeenth century, and need not be taken seriously.⁹⁸ More significant was the fact that in 1626 Parliament had tried to use the accusations to get Buckingham removed from office, but had come up against Charles's determination to retain his favourite.⁹⁹ This made it possible to advance the fantastic but fascinating claim that Charles had been privy to the murder conspiracy himself. Eglisam's appeal to the 1626 Parliament had been reprinted in 1642, Thomason giving his copy the date 30 September, under the title The Fore-Runner of Revenge, in which it is emphasised that Charles is responsible for bringing the truth to light.¹⁰⁰ King James His Judgement of a King and of a Tyrant, too, had demanded to know why Charles had dissolved the Parliament as soon as the question was raised.¹⁰¹

In Strange Apparitions, a shifty Buckingham is denounced by Eglisam and the Marquis of Hamilton as well as James, for the number of victims has seemingly grown over the years. James is made to suggest that Charles has betrayed him:

A Petition was drawn by my Doctor George Eglisam, wherein hee most lovingly amplified the ingratitude of thee my Favourite Buckingham, in poysoning mee his Sovereigne which he then presented to my sonne King

Charles, and to the Parliament, (for hee had vowed to revenge our deaths) but they taking no course for the examination of that guiltinesse, by reason of thy plot which dissolved that parliament, Doctor Eglisam was faine to go over into Holland to avoid the fury of thy malice.¹⁰²

Buckingham is made to admit his crimes, and to acknowledge that others were involved, who 'time shall produce'.¹⁰³ This is all very damaging for the king's cause, and these insinuations were reproduced in ever-more provocative forms as the pamphlet war continued. On the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot, Thomason received a tract entitled Articles Drawn up By the now Iohn Earle of Bristoll and presented to the Parliament, against George late Duke of Buckingham, in the yeare 1626.¹⁰⁴ In 1641, this anniversary had been marked by Vicars' appeal to people not to forget the conspiracy of Papists against the king: in 1642, it is being implied that the kingdom is threatened by plots associated with Charles himself.

Eglisam had told his readers that James had:

often publicly Protested, even in the Presence of his apparant heire, that if his owne sonne should commit murther or any such execrable act of injury, he would not spare him, but would have him die for it, and would have him more severely Punished then any other: For he very well observed, no greater injustice, no injury more intollerable can be done by man to man, then murther.¹⁰⁵

Eglisam's text does not appear to accuse Charles of complicity in the murder, and this passage was probably intended to be read in 1626 as a reminder that kings should bring all to justice, even close friends like Buckingham. However, in the context of pamphlets implying that Charles had played a part in James's death, this passage could be read as a prophetic judgement against King Charles. James's words could be used not only to criticise Charles, but to condemn him to execution.

Later reprints show a strong unease at the real threat to Charles posed by such publications. On 9 November 1642, Thomason received a work entitled King

Charles His Defence Against some trayterous Observations, Vpon King Iames His Judgement of a King, and of a Tyrant.¹⁰⁶ As the title suggests, it is yet another response to the pamphlet King Iames His Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant, this time by a moderate Parliamentarian, who believes that Charles has been seduced by bad counsel but not that he ought to be charged with any crimes. Unlike the response in King Iames His Iudgment by way of counsell, this work does not take the risk of launching yet another rereading of James's texts. The author makes no attempt to deny that James had upheld resistance theory, and does not even make the obvious point that King Iames his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant had quoted James inaccurately. He seems to be aware that Alexander Leighton was rumoured to be the author of King Iames his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant, and argues that the author is adopting the guise of a Scottish Presybterian to advance a more radical programme, describing him as:

one subtle Machiavellian (who would seem by some few words to be a Scot, but by most of his language, as by common fame, appeareth english bred, and who, I am well assured, is either Brownist, Anabaptist, or Separatist).¹⁰⁷

However, the author of King Charles His Defence does not uncover the far less subtle strategies involved in the reworking of James's words. This text seems to concede that King James has been lost to the radicals, and concentrates on defending King Charles against the accusations which have developed out of the rereading of James's 1610 speech.

The author adopts a rather theoretical approach, discussing the difficulty of interpreting an authorial intention, and the consequent difficulty of making Charles responsible for the words issued in his name. The title page quotes Ecclesiastes 8:4, 'Where the word of a King is, there is power: and who may say unto him, what dost

thou?¹⁰⁸ The quotation seems to have become a stock phrase in royalist writing, and was used in God and the King, the catechism on absolutism promoted by James in 1615.¹⁰⁹ Here, it seems to be not only a recollection of James's assertion of authority, but a retort to the title quotation of King James his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant, from Ecclesiastes 4:13 - 'Better is a poore and wise Child, then an old and foolish King, who will no more be admonished'. The writer here argues that if Charles were a bad king, the situation would not be so desperate: he could be converted. The problem is, rather, that Charles's good and binding words are being mediated and manipulated. The text acknowledges that the words appearing in Charles's name are not acceptable, but claims they have been misused.¹¹⁰ He describes Charles's letter to the Pope, which had been invoked by King James his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant as evidence of Charles's true religious proclivities, as a forgery, made up 'for the most part of Inkhorne fustian or affected words, beneath a Kings Dialect or manner of writing'.¹¹¹ The author seems to be avoiding the debate over what the king had meant by arguing that he had not said it in the first place.

Ultimately, however, this evasive response raises more questions than it actually answers. The author tries to defend King Charles by arguing that the words appearing in his name do not contain his meaning. It is significant this is a strategy which the opposition writers had been using since 1622. Henry Burton, Robert Baillie and Parliament itself had continually tried to shape the course of events by arguing that certain texts issued in the king's name were not an authentic expression of the royal will. Unlike James, however, Charles had not shown himself ready to acquiesce in the readings of his subjects. Now, an increasing number of radical

pamphlets were insisting that the king should be taken at his own word, and rejected as a tyrant. Supporters of the monarchy faced the problem that if they continued to describe Charles's declarations as products of the royal will, they would place Charles in danger of complete rejection.

The moderate author of this work decides, instead, to defend the word of a king by suggesting that no-one, currently, has access to the king's true words. However, by stressing the way in which the royal word is changed through meditation and interpretation, this work makes the title quotation highly problematic. If James's and Charles's words reach the reader in a form which does not bear the royal authority, does the idea that 'where the word of a king is, there is power' have any *practical* significance? As James had briefly acknowledged in 1621, the way to defend the 'power' of a king's intentions and words against hostile readers was silence: this work's refusal to reclaim James's speech of 1610 for the moderates is perhaps an admission that rereading the king's words is not going to advance his cause. The royalists were trapped: they needed to make use of the king's words against their adversaries, but to do so was to subvert the king's power still further. It is notable that on 22 January 1649, Charles intended to deliver a written repudiation of the High Court of Justice to his accusers, including, as a rebuke, Ecclesiastes 8:4, as used in God and the King and the anonymous author of King Charles His Vindication. He was not permitted to deliver the document, and the subjection of the word of the king to the power of the Parliamentarians, which was already well under way in 1642, was complete.¹¹²

No more of James's writings were reprinted in 1642 until the appearance of His Maiesties Declaration, Touching his proceedings in... Parliament, dated 14

December by Thomason.¹¹³ This is a faithful reprint of King James's Declaration of 1622, in which James gives his account of the misconstructions placed upon his words by fractious spirits in Parliament which had led to the dissolution.¹¹⁴ The title of this reprint does not mention the fact that it was originally by James, suggesting that the editors hoped readers would interpret the work as part of Charles's campaign to consign the Long Parliament to history. Like the reprints of the Letter and Directions, this work invokes a tradition of kings abusing their power, and extending their prerogative at the expense of the rights of Parliament. Equally, it invokes a tradition of the king being forced onto the defensive. Once again, there was little that the royalist propagandists could do about such reprints. Embarrassing though King James's words in 1622 might be, they could hardly repudiate them. The fact that this reprint has no commentary, and few significant revisions, means that the royalists have no direct evidence of their adversaries' involvement in the publication, and therefore nothing to get a hold on. Like the Letter and Directions of 1642, this pamphlet does not seem to have received a direct answer.

The 1642 pamphlet war over King James seems to have been closed a few days later by The Dutie of a King in His Royall Office, which Thomason dated 19 December.¹¹⁵ In many ways, this publication seems a deliberate attempt to sum up the issues which had been debated in relation to James and his writings during 1642. The title promised that the work would define, among other things, 'The True Glory of Kings' and 'The Difference between a King and a Tyrant'. The reader would not have been surprised that the work starts with an extract from James's speech of 21 March 1610. Beginning at James's announcement that 'The State of Monarchie is the supremest thing upon earth', this work gives the famous passage relating to the

relationship between the theoretically absolute powers of the king, and the limitations imposed on those powers in a kingdom with settled laws. Unlike the opposition propagandists from Burton onwards, however, this text gives James's words accurately, and in full. The crucial phrases in which James condemns any rebellion are printed without change or commentary.

However, this work is not simply a reprint of James's speech. Although the editor does not acknowledge it, most of this work is taken up by a reprint of the second book of Basilicon Doron, which bears the title used for The Dutie of a King. There is no indication that the extract from the speech has come to an end, and that the reader is being presented with quite a different text. In fact, the two works, which had been at the centre of the debate about James's 'opinion and judgement', are neatly joined together. The way in which this is done is most interesting. The passage from the 1610 speech ends:

I will not be content that my power be disputed upon: but I shall ever be willing to make the reason appeare of all my doings, and rule my actions according to my Lawes.¹¹⁶

The text of the 1642 publication goes on:

A Prince as he is clothed with two callings, so much the more ought he to be carefull for the discharge of them both: that as he is a good Christian so he ought to be a good King discharging his Office in the points of Justice and Equitie which in two sundrie wayes he must do: the one, in establishing and executing (which is the life of the Law) good Lawes among your people...¹¹⁷

This is the opening of the second book of Basilicon Doron, which starts, in the English version:

But as ye are clothed with two callings, so must ye be alike carefull for the discharge of them both: that as ye are a good Christian, so ye may be a good King, discharging your office (as I shewed you before) in the points of justice and æquity: whiche in two sundry waies ye must doe: the one, in establishing

and executing, (whiche is the life of the lawe) good lawes among your people...¹¹⁸

The transition in 1642 is made all the more seamless by the fact that the first few lines from Basilicon Doron are transposed into the impersonal, theorising mode of the 1610 speech. James seems to be continuing and enlarging upon the same theme.

It is quite interesting to read the second book of Basilicon Doron, which deals with similar issues of authority and justice, in the light of the speech delivered more than a decade later. In the second book of Basilicon Doron, James tells Prince Henry to 'consider first the true difference betwixt a lawfull good King, and an usurping Tyran [*sic*]'.¹¹⁹ James expresses the same belief as in 1610 that rebellion is unlawful in all circumstances, but in Basilicon Doron he admits that:

a Tyrannes miserable & infamous life, armeth in end his own subjects to become his burreaux: & although that rebellion be ever unlawful on their part, yet is the world so wearied of him, that his fall is little meaned by the rest of his subjects, and but smyled at by his neighbours.¹²⁰

This pragmatic attitude to rebellion, and the emphasis on the king's responsibility for preventing rebellion, is not so present in James's speech of 1610, which related to England rather than Scotland, and theory rather than practice. James's words in Basilicon Doron are reproduced with great care in The Dutie of a King, even to the extent of retaining the numerous marginal notes. The result of this skilful fusion of texts is that James seems to be adopting an increasingly sympathetic attitude towards oppressed subjects.

James Craigie reads The Dutie of a King as a contribution to the royalist cause, but the way in which it connects the texts at the sensitive points when James is discussing the need for the king to respect the law suggests that this is a pro-Parliamentary work, bringing together the texts which the opposition pamphleteers

had conclusively won for their side in 1642.¹²¹ It is difficult not to compare this work with the 'defective' copies of the 1642 edition of The True Law of Free Monarchies. If this is another pro-Parliamentary pamphlet, then this is the first time that any lengthy part of Basilicon Doron has been published for a non-royalist purpose. When responding to the crude use made of Basilicon Doron in A Puritane Set Forth, the author of King James his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant had not reused Basilicon Doron, but had quoted the speech of 1610 instead. It was certainly felt that the authority of Basilicon Doron could be invoked, to persuade Charles to respect his father's testament. However, the strategy of using the work to advise Charles differed little from that adopted by royalist writers like Thomas Fuller, whose 1642 publication The Holy State recommends Basilicon Doron as essential reading for all princes as 'next to Gods word'.¹²² A lingering reverence for a work so closely associated with the king seems to have prevented writers who felt that Charles had failed to live up to Basilicon Doron from appropriating, manipulating and reworking it in the same way as James's other works. By December 1642, however, this was no longer the case. As will be seen, this was not the end of the attempts to use James's texts in the pamphlet war, but The Dutie of a King does seem to mark a significant victory by the Parliamentarians. They had yet to win the war, but they had completed their conquest of the works of King James.

¹See for example Francis Bacon, A Speech, London: Printed, 1641, Wing B326, Thomason E. 158 (6); Francis Bacon, Three Speeches, London: b. Richard Badger f. Samuel Brown, 1641, Wing B337, Thomason E. 199 (1); Elizabeth I, Injvnctions given by the Qveenes Majestie... 1559, [London]: Printed, 1641, Wing E529; Elizabeth I, Qveene Elizabeths Speech to her Last Parliament, [1642], Wing E534, Thomason E. 200 (15).

²See Joseph Black's excellent unpublished papers, 'The Marprelate Tracts and the Popular Voice', given at Sixteenth Century Studies Conference, Toronto, 1998, and 'Radical Religion and Textual Communities in Early Modern England', given at the 33rd International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, 1998; see also Black (1996), esp. Chapters Four and Five.

³For example, see Charles Cornwallis, A Discourse of the most Illustrious Prince Henry... 1626, London: f. John Benson, 1641, Wing C6329, Thomason E. 178 (6), mentioned in Strong (1986), 11.

⁴Christopher Hill, Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965

⁵Graham Parry, 'Cotton's Counsels: The Contexts of *Cottoni Posthuma*', in Wright (1997), 81-95, esp. p. 82+

⁶Sharpe (1997), 26

⁷Anti-Montacvtvm, 'Edenbvrgi' [London: b. B. Alsop & T. Fawcet], 1629, STC 18040; An Appeale of the Orthodox Ministers, 'Edenbvrgi' [London: b. B. Alsop & T. Fawcet], 1641, Wing A3566, Thomason E. 206 (11). It should be noted that the work which appears on University Microfilms reel 1999 of the first series of Early English Books is not STC 18040 as stated in the catalogue, but Wing A3566; the cataloguer may have been misled by a contemporary manuscript note which gives the original date '1629'.

⁸sig. b1^{r-v}, Biii^r

⁹William Thomas, A Speech, London: b. Tho. Harper, 1641, Wing T985, Thomason E. 198 (9)

¹⁰sig. D1^v-[E1^r]

¹¹For example, see A Gun-powder Plot in Ireland, London: f. John Thomas, 1641, Wing C6868, Thomason E. 175 (6), in which one Thomas Creamor apparently exposed a plot to blow up a Dublin Protestant church on 5 November (sig. A2^r). The way in which the commemoration of the Gunpowder Plot became a vehicle for the promotion of Puritanism is discussed by David Cressy, 'The Protestant Calendar and the Vocabulary of Celebration in Early Modern England', JBS 29 (1990), 31-52.

¹²G. K. Fortescue, (Catalogue of the Pamphlets, British Museum, 1908, Vol. 1) suggests that The Abolishing of the Booke of Common Prayer, [London]: b. & s. b. Samuel Satterthwaite, 1641, Wing A97, Thomason E. 178 (2), appeared in November 1641. It is possible that this work, which claims to be the substance of a petition against ritualism delivered to James on 1 December 1605, is intended to recall the anti-Papist backlash which followed the Gunpowder Plot. This work reminds readers that James had agreed with the Kirk of Scotland in rejecting certain

ceremonies. The arguments used in 1605 are now, the title suggests, 'well worthy of the serious consideration of the High Court of Parliament.' See Black (1996), 263+.

¹³Francis Herring, transl. & enlarged by John Vicars, November the 5, 1605. The Qvintessence of Crvelty, London: b. G. M. f. R. Harford, 1641, Wing H1602, (entered 28 September 1641, Liber D, p. [553], Thomason E. 1100 (1). See Cressy (1990), 49; for the context of Herring's original, see Cressy (1989), 157, 143.

¹⁴Herring's original work was published in two parts: Pietas Pontificia, b. J. Roberts f. R. Boyle, 1606, STC 13244; Pietas Pontificia...sive secunda Historiæ pars, b. J. Windet, 1609, STC 13245. The first part appeared anonymously. Vicars' translation was printed by E. Griffin, 1617, STC 13247.

¹⁵sig. [D6^v-D7^r]

¹⁶sig. G3^v

¹⁷sig. [G6^v-G7^r]

¹⁸sig. [H7^v-H8^r]

¹⁹A Discoverie of the Hellish Plot, London: f. John Greensmith, 1642, Wing D1653, Thomason E. 132 (14). The 'Letter sent from a Noble-man' is dated 11 January 1642.

²⁰John Burges, A Sermon preached before the late King James... 1604 London: b. Thomas Brudenell, 1642, Wing B5720, Thomason E. 145 (5). This appeared in April, according to Fortescue (1908), Vol. 1.

²¹sig. C2^v. I have not found a source for this attributed saying.

²²King James his Letter and Directions, [London]: f. Thomas Walkeley, 1642, Wing J139, Thomason E. 147 (16). For the dating of this, and subsequently for all pamphlets in the Thomason collection which Thomason did not date himself, see Fortescue (1908).

²³See Plomer (1907), 187; CSPD, 1641-3, 426-7

²⁴Cogswell, 'England and the Spanish Match' (1989), 110-11, 130; Nigel Smith, Literature and Revolution in England 1640-1660, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994, 31

²⁵Behold! Two Letters, n. p., 1642, Wing G1880, Thomason E. 238 (18)

²⁶Mentioned in Chapter Two. The original text is reproduced in an early Protestant response by Gabriel Powel, The Catholikes Supplication, b. F. Kyngston f. E. Weaver, 1603, STC 20141.

²⁷Remarkeable Passages, [London]: f. W. G., 1642, Wing R922, Thomason E. 155 (17)

²⁸sig. [A1^v]

²⁹Christophers (1966), 38

³⁰sig. [A3^r]

³¹Arthur Wilson, The History of Great Britain, London: f. Richard Lownds, 1653, Wing W2888, sig. [2C3^v-2C4^v]; John Rushworth, Historical Collections, London: b. Tho. Newcomb f. George Thomason, 1659, Wing R2316, sig. I3^v-K2^r; William Sanderson, The Reign and Death of King James, London: b. Henry Hills, 1655, second part of A Compleat History of the Lives and Reigns of Mary Queen of Scotland, and of her Son, London: f. Humphrey Moseley, Richard Tomlins & George Sawbridge, 1656, Wing S647, sig. 4a2^r-[4a3^r]; Thomas Fuller, The Church-History

of Britain, London: f. John Williams, 1655, Wing F2416, sig. 402^v-[404^r]; Hacket (1693), sig. N1^{r-v}.

³²Charles II, To the most Reverend Father in God, William, colop: London: b. John Bill & Christopher Barker, 1662, Wing C3613. There are particularly striking similarities between the first direction (sig. [A2^v]), and the fourth direction of the 1622 version. This was republished by James VII & II, To the most Reverend Fathers in God, colop: London: b. Charles Bill, Henry Hills & Thomas Newcomb, 1685/6, Wing J389. There were several other editions, Wing J390, J391, J391A.

³³Scrinia Sacra, London: f. G. Bedel and T. Collins, 1654, Wing C184, Thomason E. 228 (2), sig. 2A2^r-[2A3^v]

³⁴Sancroft's interest in such collections of documents is attested by the fact that he apparently possessed the manuscript of Hacket's Scrinia Reserata; see MacGillivray (1974), 86.

³⁵For full references see Chapter Two.

³⁶See the article on Sancroft in DNB.

³⁷The 1642 version of the complete Letter and Directions, Wing J139, seems to have had an unusually high print run compared to other reprints of James's works, judging by the number of copies which survive today.

³⁸[Henry Parker], Observations upon some of his Majesties late Answers and Expresses, [London: 1642], Wing P412, Thomason E. 153 (26), sig. B2^r. For the importance of this pamphlet, see James Daly, 'The Idea of Absolute Monarchy in Seventeenth-Century England', Historical Journal 21 (1978), 227-50, p. 235.

³⁹The Trve Law of Free Monarchy, London: b. & s. b. T. P., 1642, Wing J145. For the popularity of the True Law during James's lifetime, see Yamada (1986), esp.78-9.

⁴⁰Craigie (1982), 59

⁴¹sig. A2^r

⁴²For the redundant phrase see Craigie (1982), 73, l. 32-4.

⁴³sig. B2^r; in Workes (1616/7), sig. [R6^r]; in Craigie (1982), 72.

⁴⁴It has been strongly argued that the True Law was more of a theoretical treatise than a practical guide to government; see Wormald (1991).

⁴⁵sig. A1^v; see Craigie (1982), 58. It may be significant that the earlier editions read 'brake forth' rather than 'break forth', which could be a direct attempt to give the text contemporary relevance.

⁴⁶I am using Paul G. Morrison, Index of the Printers, Publishers and Booksellers in Donald Wing's Short Title Catalogue, Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 1955.

⁴⁷Craigie (1982), 201

⁴⁸A Remonstrance or the Declaration of the Lords and Commons... the 26 of May, 1642, London: f. E. Paxton & T. P., 1642, Wing E2226A. I am using the copy in the National Library of Scotland, shelfmark Ab.6.2(1).

⁴⁹The work is attributed to Pym and Hampden in the copy microfilmed for University Microfilms, in the series Early English Books 1640-1700, reel 1382. There is an abbreviated version in Kenyon (1966), 242-4, with commentary on 196.

⁵⁰sig. [A4^v]; see Craigie (1982), 68-9

⁵¹sig. B1^r

⁵²sig. [B4^r]

⁵³A Puritane Set Forth in his Lively Colours: Or, K. James his description of a Puritan, London: f. N. B., 1642, Wing J142, Thomason E. 113 (11); see Craigie (1950), 53.

⁵⁴Oliver Ormerod, The Pictvre of a Puritane, London: b. E. A. f. & s. b. Nathaniel Fasbroke, 1605, STC 18851, facsimile reproduction Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1975. Ormerod cites Basilicon Doron against the Puritans on sig. [C4^v]-D1^r, D3^r, [D4^v], and his speech of 19 March 1604 on sig. N3^v.

⁵⁵sig. A2^r

⁵⁶Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution, London: Temple Smith, 1972, 70-85, esp. 76.

⁵⁷See Chapter Three

⁵⁸sig. A2^v

⁵⁹See Chapter One; Craigie (1944), 15-17; Sommerville (1994), 6-7. For the controversy over these references, see Doelman, 'Reception', (1994), esp. 3-5.

⁶⁰sig. A2^v. In Sommerville (1994), 26-7; Craigie (1944), 79

⁶¹sig. A2^v. In Sommerville (1994), 26; Craigie (1944), 77

⁶²sig. A2^v-A3^r

⁶³sig. A3^r

⁶⁴Lois Potter suggests that the strategies of royalist writers are frequently designed to conceal their fear that the royal word might be empty, that 'there might be no mystery at all', Secret Rites and Secret Writings - Royalist Literature, 1641-1660, Cambridge: CUP, 1989, 212.

⁶⁵King James His Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant. Extracted out of His own Speech at White-Hall, [London]: 1642, Wing J137, Thomason E. 116 (20). The printed date of the work is 8 September 1642.

⁶⁶Leighton's most notorious work was the anonymously published An Appeal to the Parliament; or Sion's Plea against the Prelacie [Amsterdam: successors of G. Thorp, 1629, STC 15428.5], which has an epistle to the reader citing the authority of Basilicon Doron against episcopacy. Part of this work was reprinted, in a revised form, but still anonymously, as A Decade of Grievances, [London]: 1641, Wing L1023, Thomason E. 172 (5). The full second edition appeared in about 1644 under the name of 'Layton', An Appeal to the Parliament, 2nd edition, [Amsterdam: 1644?], Wing L1022. For Leighton's various tribulations, see Bennett (1970), 49; Black (1996), Chapter Four; Lamont (1963), 45-6; Leighton's own An Epitome, London: b. I. D., 1646, Wing L1024, Thomason E. 354 (2); and DNB. Some recently discovered poems by Leighton are discussed in Frances Condick, 'The Self-Revelation of a Puritan: Dr. Alexander Leighton in the Sixteen-Twenties', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 55 (1982), 196-203.

⁶⁷sig. A1^r

⁶⁸The idea of King James's 'judgement' may also suggest a relationship with Henry Burton's A Plea to an Appeale, discussed in Chapter Three.

⁶⁹sig. A1^r

⁷⁰sig. A1^v

⁷¹sig. A1^v

⁷²sig. A2^r

⁷³sig. A3^v

⁷⁴sig. A4^v

⁷⁵See the Declaration of the Lords and Commons...Concerning the publishing of divers Proclamations...in His Majesties Name, London: f. Ed. Husbands & Jo. Franck, dated 6 July 1642, Wing E1398, Thomason 669. f. 5 (54).

⁷⁶CJ, Vol. 2, 762; See James Anson Farrer, Books Condemned to be Burnt, 1892, [Elliot Stock, 1904], 101.

⁷⁷John Morrill makes the point that this is the first work openly to charge King Charles, rather than the bishops, with tyranny, in 'Charles I, Tyranny and the English Civil War', in Morrill (1993), 285-306, esp. 292-3. Other works seem to have been quick to employ this terminology; see The Definition of a King, With the Cure of a King wilfully mad, and the way to prevent Tyranny (London: f. Thomas Banks, 1642, Wing D825), an anonymous pamphlet which Thomason received on 21 September - Thomason E. 118 (18). For a good introduction to Parliamentary theories of resistance, see Sanderson (1989), 1-37.

⁷⁸King James His Iudgment by way of counsell and advice, London: f. Thomas Cooke, 1642, Wing J136, Thomason E. 123 (12)

⁷⁹There is a useful case study of Willet as a moderate Puritan in Milton (1995), 15-27.

⁸⁰David Daiches speculates on the possible reasons why Willet was not chosen to help prepare the 1611 Bible, in The King James Version of the English Bible: An Account of the Development and Sources of the English Bible of 1611 with Special Reference to the Hebrew Tradition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941, 157-8.

⁸¹sig. A2^v

⁸²Craigie (1944), 49-50; Sommerville (1994), 19

⁸³Andrew Willet, Ecclesia Triumphans, [London]: b. John Legat f. Simon Waterson, 1603, STC 25676. Legat and Waterson were also responsible for publishing William Willymat's verse adaptation of Basilicon Doron, A Princes Looking Glasse, [London]: b. John Legat s. b. Simon Waterson, 1604, STC 14357. See Parry (1981), 231-5; Doelman, 'Reception', (1994), 2; Craigie (1950), 43. For the Legat family, see David McKitterick, A History of Cambridge University Press - Vol. 1 - Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge 1534-1698, Cambridge: CUP, 1992, 306.

⁸⁴Craigie (1950), 2-3

⁸⁵For the 1603 editions of James's writings, see Chapter One. In 1603 Willet had another work published, An Antilogie, London: f. Thomas Man, STC 25672, in which he made copious use of James's writings to support his arguments; at times it seems that the anti-Catholic argument is simply a pretext for praising the wisdom of the new king.

⁸⁶sig. ¶6^r

⁸⁷sig. A1^r

⁸⁸Willet's reading of James must have been done in some haste, as Ecclesia Triumphans appeared in the same year as the English editions of James's works it uses.

⁸⁹sig. ¶¶2^r

⁹⁰Craigie (1944), 97, Sommerville (1994), 31-2

⁹¹sig. A2^v

⁹²sig. A4^{r-v}

⁹³sig. ¶5^r

⁹⁴Thomas Springham, A Learned Speech Spoken to His Excellency the Earl of Essex, n. p., f. Tho. Cooke, 1642, Wing S5082, Thomason E. 200 (60)

⁹⁵A Exact and True Relation of the Battell...at Acton, London: f. Tho: Cook, 1642, Wing E3614, Thomason E. 127 (8), sig. A3^f

⁹⁶The Examination of Colonell Lunsford, n. p., f. Tho: Cooke, 1642, Wing E3715, Thomason E. 127 (29)

⁹⁷Strange Apparitions, or, The Ghost of King James, London: f. J. Aston, 1642, Wing S5880, Thomason E. 123 (23)

⁹⁸See George Eglisam, The Forerunner of Revenge, 'Franckfort' [STC suggests Netherlands]: 1626, STC 7548; the first edition was in Latin, Prodromus Vindictæ, [Brussels]: 1626 - see Cogswell (1990), 191 (n.), 198 (n.).

⁹⁹For possible connections between Eglisam's charges and the assassination of Buckingham, see Frederick W. Fairholt (ed.), Poems and Songs relating to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, and his Assassination by John Felton, August 23, 1628, Percy Society, 1850, xxiii (n.), 20 (n.).

¹⁰⁰There seem to have been several editions in 1642; I am using The Forerunner of Revenge, London: 1642, Wing E256cA, Thomason E. 119 (15). For this reprint, see Bellamy (1994), 309.

¹⁰¹sig. [A3^v]

¹⁰²sig. A2^f

¹⁰³sig. [A4^r]

¹⁰⁴Articles Drawn up By the now Iohn Earle of Bristoll, London: f. I. A., 1642, Wing B4791, Thomason E. 126 (20)

¹⁰⁵sig. A3^v

¹⁰⁶King Charles His Defence Against some trayterous Observations, n. p., [1642], Wing C2291, Thomason E. 126 (32)

¹⁰⁷sig. A1^f

¹⁰⁸For example see [Edward Browne], Rules for Kings and Good Counsell for Subjects: Being a collection of certaine places of holy Scripture, f. T. Paibody & E. Dobson, 1642, Wing B5105A, sig. A1^f

¹⁰⁹I am using God and the King, London: [b. W. Jaggard, E. Allde etc.], 1615, STC 14419.5, sig. D3^v.

¹¹⁰This moderate point of view bears comparison with A Vindication of the King, London: 1642, Wing W533C, Thomason E. 118 (3), attributed by Wing to Edmund Waller, which Thomason had received on 17 September. This work supports the reforms of the Long Parliament, but urges them to trust Charles, who had voiced his intentions '(in the Word of a King) with such unusuall expressions, that if they came from a Stranger... I was bound to beleeve in Charity' (sig. A2^v). After Edgehill, it was more difficult for Parliamentarians supporting compromise to take Charles's words at face value.

¹¹¹sig. A3^f

¹¹²Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ, 'Hagve: b. Samuel Browne' [i.e. London: b. R.

Norton f. Richard Royston], 1650, Wing C2072, sig. 2C12^v; also in Charles Petrie (ed.), The Letters Speeches and Proclamations of King Charles I, Cassell, 1935, 259-61.

¹¹³His Maiesties Declaration, Touching his proceedings in... Parliament, London, Printed, 1642, Wing J133, Thomason E. 130 (19)

¹¹⁴For His Maiesties Declaration, 1621/2, see Chapter Two. Also in Sommerville (1994), 250-267.

¹¹⁵The Dutie of a King in His Royall Office, London: f. I. B., 1642, Wing J135, Thomason E. 244 (14)

¹¹⁶sig. A2^v; in Sommerville (1994), 184.

¹¹⁷sig. A2^v

¹¹⁸Craigie (1944), 53; Sommerville (1994), 19-20

¹¹⁹Craigie (1944), 55; Sommerville (1994), 20

¹²⁰Craigie (1944), 57; Sommerville (1994), 21. 'Burreaux' = 'executioners'.

¹²¹Craigie (1950), 53

¹²²Thomas Fuller, The Holy State, Cambridge: b. Roger Daniels f. John Williams, 1642, Wing F2443, sig. 2X1^v; see Craigie (1950), 52-3.

Chapter Five: Reinterpreting King James 1643-1649 - wider contexts and diminishing authors

I. Discontinuous readings: ecclesiastical policies and the rise of the text, 1643-5

It is important that after 1642 there seems to have been a break in the continuity of the developing traditions of reading King James. The debate over whether James had authorised resistance to tyranny is not continued in the printed pamphlets of 1643, although the debate over whether King Charles was a tyrant or not was only just beginning, and reprints of works dealing with kingship and tyranny by people like George Buchanan would continue to appear throughout the 1640s.¹ After 1642, the Letter and Directions is not reprinted or discussed in print for many years, and the works which had been at the centre of the pamphlet war in 1642, Basilicon Doron and the speech of 21 March 1610, are suddenly given a rest from public attention. The neglect of Basilicon Doron, which had been of such importance as late as December 1642, is particularly striking; there does not seem to have been any new version before 1646, when Pierre Ménard's translation into French appeared in Paris². Conceivably the royalists shrank from rehandling the texts they had handled so ineptly, and in view of their silence, the Parliamentary editors may have felt that The Dutie of a King had closed the debate. However, one also gets the impression that by 1643 the struggle to control readings of King James's texts had somehow destroyed existing concepts of the unified, semi-inspired Workes which had proved such a powerful construction between 1622 and 1642.

Many of James's other works were reproduced in various forms in 1643 and successive years, but it is surprisingly difficult to connect these editions, at least in comparison with the way it had been possible to trace readings of King James through earlier versions of his works. This is partly because so many different works were being reprinted. Between 1643 and 1645 alone, one can find new versions of or extracts from James's speech to Parliament of 31 March 1607, A Counterblaste to Tobacco, his speech to the judges in 1616, A Premonition, and several letters and state documents, none of which had been discussed extensively in the 1642 pamphlet war, or indeed since James's death. The problem for reception history is complicated further by the fact that these diverse works appear in a wide variety of political, literary and journalistic contexts. A cursory examination of reprints of James's words in the years after 1642 creates the initial impression that the sense of common interpretive ground present in the debates which had lasted well into the pamphlet war had given way to a host of unconnected individual readings. Certainly, readers and writers were beginning to realise that the collapse of censorship had created conditions in which the expression of personal opinion was increasingly possible, and in which overt adherence to established reading communities and traditions of reading was no longer so essential. However, there is a sense of doubt and confusion about the editions of James's works which appear in 1643 and after which contrasts so markedly with the texts of 1642 that it is difficult to suppress the feeling that both the imagined corpus of James's words, and the traditions of reading which were inseparable from this imagined corpus, had suddenly come apart.

There are, fortunately, still patterns and trends in the way people were using and re-using King James's texts, even if they do not reveal themselves to analysis based on chronological order of publication. Some of the most interesting texts containing the words of King James published during this period can be categorised under the genre of works of religious controversy. In a broad sense these continue the tradition, established by James himself and invoked by Willet, Burton, Leighton *et al* of citing the king's words in defence of particular doctrinal, liturgical or exegetical positions. However, the tendency shown in the 1642 versions of the Letter and Directions to make use of James's words without showing respect for his kingly authority is increasingly evident in the tracts of 1643-9. In 1642 writers and editors had adopted all kinds of tactics to ensure that the sacred authority of King James was seen to legitimise their position; after 1642, writers on both sides seem less able and less eager to invoke the spirit of divinely-appointed monarchy in their texts. Perhaps, because the words of King James and King Charles had been dragged through the mud-slinging of the pamphlet wars, the names of power were no longer so clearly effective. The religious literature continues to use James's texts, but this is increasingly for the value of the words in their own right, in relation to some specific context or issue, rather than for using his name to generate an aura of power.

A typical example is A New Discovery of Old Pontificall Practises for the maintenance of the Prelates Authority and Hierarchy, which Thomason dated 31 January 1642 [1643].³ This anonymous tract is a contribution to the debates on the removal of episcopacy and its replacement. It argues that episcopal government has always been tyrannical, adducing as evidence the persecution of John Udall, an

English minister who was tried in 1590 for having written a tract against the bishops. The editor appends a letter by James written to Queen Elizabeth on 12 June 1591 in which he asked her to show clemency to Udall and other ministers suffering for anti-episcopal beliefs.⁴ James's appeal delicately reminds Elizabeth that the Kirk held views similar to those of Udall, and the tone urges compromise on such matters:

at this present we cannot (weighing the duty which we owe to such as are afflicted for their conscience in that profession) but by our most effectuous and earnest Letter interpone us at your hands to [stay] any harder usage of them for that cause: Requesting you most earnestly, that for our cause and intercession it may please you to let them be relieved of their present strait⁵

The point of including this letter, however, is not to assert the authority of the Presbyterian King James against his bishop-loving son, but rather to show that Udall's case was genuine and that there were other reformist sympathisers at the time.⁶ Earlier in the text, the editor had described how James's initial support for the godly cause had faltered on his accession to the English throne:

it is observable that they seduced that Learned King, after he once came amongst them; and that is evident by the difference between his Letter in this Relation, and his conclusive sentence to maintaine the Prelates Authority, at the Conference at Hampton Court⁷

The text goes on to lambast Udall's son for his enthusiasm for James's Book of Sports.⁸ This work bears comparison with the reprint of the Letter and Directions in 1642. Just as that reprint had suggested the authority of Abbot and James could be rejected, so here there is no attempt to portray James's opinions as inspired, unchanging and binding upon his successor. His words are only useful to illustrate a particular situation in a specific historical context.⁹

Whereas in 1642 readers were urged to accept distorted readings of James's words which made him speak for a faction, in 1643 these coercive strategies are

increasingly absent, and the words tend to be allowed to speak for themselves, to support an argument rather than to declare that royal authority enjoined it. On 5 March 1643, a spurious royal proclamation appeared, A Proclamation for the authorizing an uniformitie of the Booke of Common Prayer to bee used throughout the Realme.¹⁰ This is, in fact, a reprint of James's proclamation of 5 March 1604, in which he declared that the recently-concluded Hampton Court Conference had made it clear that the reforms to the doctrine and discipline of the church which the 'Puritan' faction had proposed were unacceptable. However, he was prepared to make a conciliatory gesture to them by commissioning a revision of the Book of Common Prayer with expanded explanatory notes.¹¹ It seems very likely that the 1643 reprint, dated exactly thirty-nine years later, was the work of those seeking to discredit the episcopalian cause by presenting the reactionary tendencies of its defenders.

The new edition does not mention James's authorship. There may, possibly, be evidence of an attempt to revise the text to conceal the original context, and to make it appear that King Charles is issuing a defiant response to the preparations for the Westminster Assembly, which was expected to propose considerable reform to the liturgy, and which was to hold its first meeting on 1 July 1643. The original proclamation of 1604 concludes by remarking:

how necessarie it is to use constancie in the upholding of the publique determinations of States, for that such is the unquietnesse and unstedfastnesse of some dispositions, affecting every yeere new formes of things, as, if they should be followed in their unconstancie, would make all Actions of States ridiculous and contemptible: whereas the stedfast maintaining of things by good advise established, is the weale of all Common wealths.

The 1643 version changes the passage so it concludes 'the wealth of all the Commonwealth'. This could be an attempt to give the document greater contemporary relevance, shifting from the general to the specific to suggest that King Charles is addressing the English community loyal to Parliament and the Puritan tradition. However, the many surviving references to events in 1604 probably would have ensured that a careful reader would realise that it was not a recent work. Interest in the Hampton Court Conference seems to have been high at this time, as the references in A New Discovery of Old Pontificall Practises suggest, and this proclamation could have been easily recognised as the work of James.¹² As with His Maiesties Declaration, Touching his proceedings in... Parliament (1642), the reader is left free to choose an author, as long as he or she makes the right interpretation. The reader could attribute the work to King Charles, or, on a more detailed inspection, to King James: the point of the work is to remind people how church governors, supported by the prelacy, have resisted and continue to resist liturgical reform. The reader is expected to respond to the tone of the language, and to the tradition of the struggle for reforming the Book of Common Prayer which the text evokes; its unidentified royal authors are not of such importance.

The royalist and episcopalian parties, who had failed to appropriate James's meaning successfully in the first pamphlet wars, clearly found the tendency to cite royal texts without invoking kingly authority hard to deal with. One of the few apparently genuine attempts to use James's texts to justify the religious opinions of his son is His Maiesties Declaration in Defence of The true Protestant Religion: As it was maintained by his Royall Father King James, which appeared dated 16 June

1643.¹³ The text in this pamphlet consists of an extract from the part of James's A Premonition (1609) in which he responded to Catholic accusations of heresy by making a personal confession of faith. The intention of the 1643 editor is apparently to rebut charges that King Charles was more sympathetic to Roman Catholicism than was compatible with his position as defender of the faith. However, this work reveals that the text's compilers had faced some serious conceptual difficulties which they had not been able to resolve successfully. The title, given above, suggests that this pamphlet is directed against those who have sought to denigrate and confuse the authorial identities of King James and King Charles, by showing clearly how two different rulers had shared a common faith. However, the subtitle greatly complicates this, describing the text as 'According to the true Copie written with his Majesties owne hand, and by his speciall Command appointed to be printed'. Does this refer to James or Charles?

The idea that Charles had copied out his father's work with his own hand is bizarre. However, the fact that the word 'Majesties' was used earlier in the title to mean Charles makes it difficult to apply this subtitle to James, and the purpose of the title (and indeed the whole work) is to persuade the reader that Charles's opinions are identical to the words of his father. There would be little polemical value in stating that James had written and published his own work, as this would not indicate any logical connection between his text and his son's beliefs. The subtitle was perhaps intended to mean that the text was 'according to the true copy' written with *James's* hand, and by *Charles's* 'speciall command appointed to be printed'. But it does not say this, and the result is a confused framework in which to read the text. Although

this work is intended to assert the authority of King Charles, the title is reluctant to mention him by name: one suspects that the success of the pro-Parliamentary writers in appropriating the words and authority of the king had made royalist and episcopalian editors hesitant about re-entering the conflict. As we have seen, a pro-Parliamentary or pro-Puritan pamphlet could play with the idea that a work might be by either King James or King Charles, allowing the reader to reach the correct interpretation via different routes. A pamphlet which seeks to exalt the authority of particular kings, however, cannot present a king's words in terms of ambiguity and anonymity like this without calling its own *raison d'être* into question.¹⁴

The text itself is as muddled as the title. The passage from the A Premonition given here, beginning with James's assertion 'I am such a Catholique-Christian, as believeth the three Creeds', is one of the most important sections in any of James's works, relating to his views on the Pope's primacy, the role of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the authority of ecumenical councils. Nevertheless, in 1643 many of James's arguments are rendered worthless by the most glaring textual errors. At one point in A Premonition, James turns on his opponents by accusing them of introducing novelties in religion:

Such are the priuate Masses, where the Priest playeth the part both of the Priest and of the people; And such are the Amputation of the one halfe of the Sacrament from the people; The Transubstantiation, Eleuation for Adoration, and Circumportation in Procession of the Sacrament; the workes of Supererogation, rightly named Thesaurus Ecclesiae; the Baptising of Bels, and a thousand other tricks: But aboue all, the worshipping of Images.¹⁵

In the 1643 version, this becomes the following:

Such are the private Masses, where the Priest playeth the part both of the Priest and of the People; and such are the imputations of the one halfe of the Sacrament from the people; the Transubstantiation, Election for Adoration,

and Circumportation in procession of the Sacraments, the work of supererogation, rightly named *Thesaurus Ecclesiae*, the baptising of Bells, and a thousand other tricks. But above all, the worshipping of Images.¹⁶

The copying must have been done in some haste; at any rate, it can hardly have done much to convince the reader that Charles (or James) understood much about the church he was supposed to be condemning. Catholics might have been amused to hear that other sacraments besides the Eucharist could be carried in procession, and Calvinists may have taken umbrage at the unintended attack on the doctrine of election. One gets the impression that this work was hastily produced, perhaps for the cheaper pamphlet trade, by people who were trying to conceal the fact that they did not know what to do with King James's words.

It might be suggested, reasonably enough, that this work is simply another Puritan attempt to subvert the cause of King Charles, presenting him as involved in a confused and ill-informed reconstruction of the Catholic faith. However, this would be evidence of the opposition pamphleteers adopting more subtle strategies than previously seen. One feature of the work which makes it seem more likely that it is an unsuccessful royalist and episcopalian pamphlet is the way in which the editor attempts to detach the text from its original context by removing James's references to other contemporary publications, and to his earlier works.¹⁷ It is difficult to see how such detailed revisions would further the creation of a text which would undermine itself and the episcopalian cause. It would make sense, however, if the royalist editor had done this to make the text seem more like the words of King Charles, although it is certainly difficult to reconcile the fact that these detailed and deliberate revisions co-exist with so many textual errors. Ultimately, more evidence

is needed before a conclusion about intentions can be firmly asserted, but it seems likely that this work is an example of the episcopalian pamphleteers struggling, and failing, to make use of the words and authority of King James and King Charles in a literary environment in which established theories and practices were breaking down and being transformed.

A Premonition was the basis for another rather peculiar pamphlet of a religious nature published in the Civil War. King James His Divine Prophecie of the Warres and Distractions of the present and future Times was received by Thomason on 20 March 1644/5.¹⁸ The title may well have been designed to evoke memories of A Puritane Set Forth (1642), and its description of James as 'a Prophetical King', but the ideological position of the later work is quite different. The text in this pamphlet is an extract, without commentary or significant revision, from A Premonition. In the chosen passage, James suggests two readings of the passage in Revelation 11 concerning the Two Witnesses, who testify to God's truth, are killed by the Beast, gloated over by the nations and then restored to life and raised to Heaven.¹⁹ In the 1609 work, James had turned to Revelation in search of a Scriptural justification for the great changes involved in the Reformation which his Catholic adversaries were criticising.²⁰ He had suggested that the prophecy of the Two Witnesses had been fulfilled in modern days, and that their death and resurrection signified the suppression of the Old and New Testaments by the Papists, and their triumphant restoration under Luther and Calvin. James also discussed the less controversial possibility that the 'witnesses' might be true teachers of the faith.²¹

By the mid-1640s, the question of whether this particular prophecy had been fulfilled was of the utmost importance, particularly for the radical millenarians, who were convinced that they were living in the era of the fulfilment of the prophecies contained in Revelation. If this prophecy had been fulfilled, another of the trials that would intervene before the Second Coming would be over, and they could rejoice that the signs of turmoil were signs of victory: if not, they could expect more suffering.²² A typical example of this interest in the prophecy is Francis Woodcocke's The Two Witnesses: Discovered in several Sermons (1643).

Woodcocke tells his readers:

The main reason, why I undertook the task of this Prophesie, is to try to satisfie that common question almost in every ones Mouth, What will become of us? What do you think of these times?... I thought could we finde out some more sure word of prophesie; such as might in a more speciall manner relate to our times, this might contribute much to our satisfaction... And while I was thus casting, this prophesie of the two Witnesses, offers it self, of all those that I can imagine most likely to aym at our times, and so best serve the purpose above mentioned.²³

Woodcocke argues that Parliament's vindication of the enemies of Laud fulfilled the prophecy of the resurrection of the witnesses, and that the happy conclusion of history is at hand.²⁴

King James His Divine Prophecie seems to have been published to support the same optimistic case, and to suggest that the struggle to reconstruct a national church in 1645 is simply a continuation of the divinely-ordained reformation which James saw in its early stages. The subtitle written for 1645 announces that the text will speak of the Witnesses in these terms:

their coming downe from Heaven, fighting, and how slaine by Antichrist, and being again risen in imitation of Christ, and cloathed in sackcloth, they work miracles and wonders, such as we have seen some already.

The aim of the editor is to make James's hopeful interpretation of the turmoil of the Reformation describe that of the Civil War. Using one of the versions published in 1609, rather than that in the 1617 Workes, the text seems to have been reproduced with reasonable care.²⁵ The nature of James's original work meant that little change needed to be made to the text to make it perform a new function in 1645; the passage has been skilfully selected, and the tone is so similar to that in much of the apocalyptic literature of the mid-1640s that no explanation or annotation is needed. James's celebration of the Reformation is a typical example:

And yet (praised be God) we begin now with our eyes, (as our Predecessors have done in some ages before) to see these Witnesses rise againe, and shine in their former glory... which exalting of the Gospell againe, hath bred such an earth-quake, and alteration amongst many Nations; as a tenth part, or a good portion of these that were in subjection to that great City, to wit Babylon, are fallen from her... This now is one of the wayes, by which (I think) this place of Scripture may be lawfully and probably interpreted.²⁶

It does not take much effort to imagine reading this passage as a description of the triumph of the 'godly' over the church of Laud, who had been executed on 10 January 1645. The text goes on to declare:

Let therefore these Miracle-mongers that surfeit the world, and raise the price of paper daily, with setting forth old, though new gilded miracles, and legends of lies, let such (I say) consider of this great and wonderfull miracle indeed, and to their shame compare it to their paultry wares.²⁷

James no doubt had in mind his Catholic opponents in the controversy over the Oath of Allegiance, but his words apply remarkably well to the royalist pamphleteers and news-writers.

It seems clear that this work is conceived in awareness of the tradition of reading James's work as inspired or prophetic. However, one gets the impression that

King James himself is no longer of great importance; although the editor feels it desirable to invoke his name, the power of the words is not derived from his authorship, but from the divine inspiration which lies behind them. The editor does not need to undertake the kind of laboured activity to prove that James really did predict the events of the 1640s seen in King James His Iudgement by way of counsell (1642). Although the text is described as King James's prophecy, it is not so much a prophecy which he has produced himself as one which he has passed on, direct from Revelation. This pamphlet displays its confidence in an eschatological model of history in which God's interventions are directly, and increasingly, visible; individuals, even kings, are not important, but their words can bear witness to ongoing cosmic events.

It is fascinating to compare this work with an earlier work making use of the Premonition. Pierre du Moulin's The Accomplishment of the Prophecies (1613) agrees with James's interpretation that the two witnesses have already come, and predicts the final conclusion of events in A.D. 2015.²⁸ Du Moulin speaks of James in the most obsequious terms:

He that would be more fully informed in these thinges, let him read the Kings kooke [*sic*]; For all that we can doe herein, is nothing else but to follow his steps... Experience will make it more manifest, and posterity shall hereafter reckon this amongst one of Gods wonderfull workes, that hee did set such a great King upon the Throne, to publish his secrets from an high place, and to expose the truth to the sight of all men.²⁹

King James His Divine Prophecie, however, has no apostrophes to the British Solomon, and it could be said that whereas Du Moulin expounds Revelation in the footsteps of King James, the 1645 work only mentions King James at all because he had written religious truth.

It is notable that King James His Divine Prophecie seems to succeed in becoming what it set out to be, unlike the pro-episcopalian attempt to manipulate A Premonition in His Maiesties Declaration in Defence of The true Protestant Religion (1643). Superficially, a confession of Protestant orthodoxy by James would appear to be potentially highly useful material for propaganda supporting Charles' religious position, whereas James's theological speculations in the same work might be considered a rather unpromising basis for millenary preaching. However, the former falls flat, while the latter is both entertaining and persuasive. This does seem to have something to do with the fact that approaches to reading King James were changing; the relationship between author, text and reader was being reconfigured. In the genre of ecclesiastical controversy, James was no longer being invoked as a living fount of wisdom, but his words were valued as they illustrated specific areas of debate, or reminded readers of wider movements in religious history. Those who still advocated the traditional hierarchy with bishop and king over the church found it difficult to use the words of formerly revered writers without appealing to semi-mystical authorities, and their pamphlets reveal the strain of trying to compete with pamphlets which place the text before the king.

II. Political controversy, Anglo-Scottish relations and literary history, 1643-6

The royalists and episcopalians found it equally difficult to use the words of King James in the genre of political controversy. One of the first works since 1642 to reveal that there was still interest in interpreting James's texts to uphold constitutional and procedural theories appeared in 1645. This was a reissue of the unsold sheets of a quarto edition of James's speech to the judges of 20 June 1616, introduced on the new title-page as King James His Learned and Wise Speech.³⁰ In this speech, James had argued that the king could act as a judge, making and interpreting the laws. The new title-page's reference to Proverbs 29: 4 - 'The King by Judgement, establisheth the Land' - may suggest that the publishers wished readers to interpret James's laudatory description of the royal prerogative as supporting Charles's claims. However, it is puzzling that the title-page describes the speech as having been made 'in the sixteenth yeare of his reigne'. More importantly, the lack of commentary on or revision to the actual text leaves the reader unsure how to interpret the work in its new context. It seems likely that this is another instance of the royalists trying to make use of James's text without explicitly identifying the words of King James in 1616 with politics in 1645, which would expose the person of the king to attack. Unsure about how to introduce James's works to modern readers, unable to decide whether to suppress the original date and authorship, the royalists seemed to have reached a practical and theoretical impasse.

An alternative approach to reading and using King James's texts was, however, becoming available. It will have been noticed that it is increasingly

possible to talk of new versions of James's works in terms of 'history' and 'historical awareness'. As we have seen, in 1643 and after, writers sought to avoid readings of King James that were little more than their own thoughts put into James's mouth by allowing James's texts to speak for themselves; this made it less likely that readers would reject the work as coercive, but also increased the potential for confusion by reducing the number of markers to guide readers through the text. One solution to this problem was to publish James's words within a more sophisticated, historically-based framework for formulating political positions, showing that a particular interpretation should be accepted not because the king had intended it, or because his words required it, but because it was in accordance with the text's original place in the sequence of earlier texts and events.³¹ It is significant that the royalists, whose strategies for using the works of King James had been close to collapse, were the first to make the most of this new approach.

An Old Mould to Cast New Lawes By (1643) is a royalist publication, which tries to attack the growing radicalism of Parliament by invoking literary history.³² The work consists of two extracts from works by Sir Thomas Smith and King James, which are correctly titled and not conflated like the two texts in The Dutie of a King (1642). The editor describes himself as 'a friend to old Bookes, and an Enemy to new Opinions', but he does not follow the example of his fellow-royalists in using old books to batter new opinions, generally causing more damage to the former than to the latter. Instead, he transcribes with reasonable accuracy two interesting passages, from Smith's Common-wealth of England and James's speech to Parliament of 31 March 1607, which deal with the English and Scottish Parliaments respectively.

Smith's important treatise, originally printed in 1583 under the title De Repvblica Anglorvm, relates the origins and structure of English government and society as he saw it under Edward VI and Elizabeth.³³ The work was reprinted many times during the early seventeenth century, and conceivably chapters like that entitled 'The definition of a king and of a tyrant' may have found many interested readers in the 1640s.³⁴ Mary Dewar records appropriations of Smith's writings by opponents of absolutism, commenting 'It would have come as a distinct surprise to the author could he have realized that later generations were to seize on the De Republica Anglorum as representing a bold and revolutionary assertion of Parliament's power, heralding in no uncertain terms the Stuart struggle to come'. Dewar notes that the leading opposition M.P. Sir John Eliot had owned one of the eight surviving manuscript copies of Smith's work; Christopher Hill adds that the work was used by Milton in The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates.³⁵ However, the 1643 royalist editor chooses to quote from Smith's description of the nature and extent of Parliament's authority, and the forms of its proceedings. This description emphasises ritual and tradition, the balance of power between Lords and Commons, and the need for the royal assent to every law.³⁶ Although Smith's theory of monarchy is considerably more limited than either James or Charles would have accepted, this selection from his work suggests a system which cannot operate without the sovereign, thereby implying that the London Parliament had no legitimacy or authority.

This implication is reinforced by the extract from James's speech, which follows that from Smith.³⁷ The 1607 speech was an appeal to Parliament to support James's cherished project for union between England and Scotland.³⁸ In the passage

presented here, James is replying to concerns voiced in Parliament that union could not work because of the different constitutional arrangements in the two countries, by arguing that the king's power to affirm or refuse proposed laws was substantially the same in Scotland as in England:

It hath been objected as another impediment, that in the Parliament of Scotland, the King hath not a negative voyce, but must passe all the lawes agreed on by the Lords and Commons. Of this I can best resolve you, for I am the eldest Parliament man in Scotland, and have sate in more Parliaments then all my Predecessors. I can assure you, that the forme of Parliament there is nothing inclined to popularity.³⁹

James's description of the authority of the King of Scotland in his Parliament smoothly follows Smith's description of the monarch at work in the English Parliament, thereby creating an impression of the importance of the king within the legislative system. This emphasis, probably not originally intended by Smith or James, is clearly designed by the editor to suggest that the 'rebels' in both countries were disturbing a beautiful and traditional mechanism.⁴⁰ Read in this way, James's remark that 'the forme of Parliament there is nothing inclined to popularity' may have seemed a striking piece of evidence against the Covenanters' claims to legitimacy.

However, the passages by Smith and James take on this contemporary relevance without the words being significantly revised: although by selecting and juxtaposing these texts the editor changes the original emphasis, he acknowledges the authorship and context of both works. Although something of the imagined magical or prophetic power associated with 'old Bookes' does linger in this work, the polemic function of this work seems to rely on a historical framework. Instead of using James's texts to argue that James had prophetically justified a particular Civil War faction, as in A Puritane Set Forth (1642), or trying to get James's words to fight for

the royalist cause on their own, as in His Maiesties Declaration in Defence of The true Protestant Religion (1643), this editor is expressing his conservative views by setting James's text in an implicit model of history in which tradition must be conserved and restored. James's words are incorporated into this version of history as supporting evidence.

The extent to which An Old Mould is an intervention in the controversy over the future direction of Anglo-Scottish relations is open to question, but it is notable that most works drawing on James's texts for the purposes of political controversy in the mid-1640s are increasingly focused on that debate. After 1642, James's works are rarely interpreted in relation to broad philosophical and constitutional issues, such as the nature of a king and a tyrant, the issue of allegiance and resistance, and whether the word of a king was controlled by the reigning monarch or somehow the property of his subjects. These topics seem to have been sidelined as the immediate concerns of the war and its conduct took precedence. Questions of whether the Scottish Covenanters should intervene in England to support the forces of Parliament, of whether a single Presbyterian system of church government could be imposed on both countries, and of how the union of crowns could work in the long term were being raised instead. As discussed in Chapter Three, readings of King James and his works had been of major importance in shaping the intellectual positions of the Scottish revolutionaries. Now that the excitement over the polemical power of the Psalms and the National Covenant had eased, readers seem to have gone back to James's works with a more historically-aware approach, to see how the first

king of both England and Scotland had articulated his understanding of national identity and difference.

After the collapse of the royalist forces in 1645, the issue of the future settlement of the English and Scottish churches became increasingly prominent. Many works were published to illustrate the situation, including several pamphlets whose use of literary history resembles that in An Old Mould (1643), but whose purpose is quite different. A Declaration made by King James, in Scotland; Concerning, Church-Government, and Presbyters, appeared in early 1646, Thomason giving his copy the date 6 April.⁴¹ This is a reasonably accurate reprint of A Declaratiovn of the Kings Maiesties Intention and Meaning toward the Lait Actis of Parliament, which was drawn up in James's name in 1585 as a justification of the 'Black Acts' passed in May 1584, which attempted to enforce state control of the Kirk.⁴² It orders the restoration of bishops, commands ministers not to meddle with the business of the secular government, and condemns the disturbances caused by religious fanatics. The work ends by giving a summary of what purport to be the intentions of the young King James:

His Maj. intention is, to correct, and punish sic as seditiously abuses the chyre of t[r]ueth and factiously appeis, or rather bewrays the text of the scripture, to the disquieting of the estate, and disturbing of the commoun-welth, or impaying of his Hienes and counsellis honour.⁴³

The people who arranged for this work to be republished in 1646 clearly felt that this expression of a Scottish king's thoughts on church politics would be highly interesting to an English audience, and took the remarkable step of writing an English translation which accompanies the Scottish original. At the time this work was published, the defeated King Charles was negotiating with the Scottish army in

preparation for his flight from Oxford to the north of England, which took place on 27 April 1646. This reprint seems likely to be a warning that the hopes of those who expected Charles to submit to Presbyterian and Parliamentary authority were ill-founded, on the basis of the traditional behaviour of Scottish kings. The printer helped to make the connection between James and Charles explicit by placing King Charles's arms on the title-page.

Robert Baillie, who had engaged with reworkings of James's words in the 1630s, was quick to see the dangers of this work, which he interpreted as a strategy by the supporters of Independency to destabilise the attempts currently being made to establish a Presbyterian system of church government in England. Baillie had been appointed one of the Scottish commissioners to the Westminster Assembly in London, and was attempting to promote a settlement for both England and Scotland which preserved a limited monarchy and a uniform national Presbyterian church. He was naturally concerned by a pamphlet that suggested that the king's views and those of the Covenanters were incompatible. He was equally concerned by the appearance of a pamphlet entitled The Burthen of Issachar: Or, the Tyrannical Power and Practises of the Presbyteriall Government in Scotland, which Thomason dated 6 May 1646, the day after Charles had surrendered to the Scots.⁴⁴ This was a new edition of Bishop John Maxwell's An Answer By Letter, a work written in 1644 to show 'how inconsistent presbyteriall government is with monarchy'.⁴⁵ Maxwell had made considerable use of the history of King James VI to show how the Presbyterian ministers had defied regal authority, giving amusing accounts of James being berated

by ministers like Robert Bruce, and citing his criticisms of the Scottish Kirk made at the Hampton Court Conference.⁴⁶

Baillie seems to have determined to write a tract replying to both pamphlets, showing that their use of literary history was manipulative. The Presbyterians had reprinted several texts from James's reign in recent years, including one of James Melville's letters to the king urging the suppression of bishops.⁴⁷ However, Baillie seems to have found it difficult to find sources relating to the 1580s in London. By May 1646, he was engaged in correspondence with the veteran Presbyterian campaigner David Calderwood, who had engaged himself against the translation of the Psalms ascribed to James, and who was now prepared to help Baillie with his historical research. On 19 May 1646, he wrote Calderwood a grateful and anxious letter:

Your papers have been exceeding helpfull to us for ane answer to King James's Declaration; which we are now hastening so soon as we may. Many call upon us for some answer to Maxwell Bishop of Rosse his scurrilous treatise against our Church, printed two or three year agoe at Oxford, and now reprinted here, under the name of Issachar's Burthen; a copie whereof we send yow herewith: It is full of odious histories, and matters of fact, whereof all of us are allutterlie ignorant. If you will be pleased to be againe at the paines to send us up some informations for our help against his wicked narrations, we shall readilie say something in answer to him.⁴⁸

Baillie displays a scholarly interest in the original circumstances in which these pro-Episcopalian works had been composed, and in the way in which they had become useful to the Independency movement's attempts to prevent a Presbyterian settlement. Thanks to Baillie's enthusiasm for consulting others about the processes of research and publication, we can learn much about the way in which he constructed his pamphlet.

On 26 June, Baillie wrote to his correspondent in the Netherlands, William

Spang:

At this time I yoke with Maxwell and Adamsone, who, with base pamphlets, hes done our Church here much harme. The Sectaries, of purpose, reprinted their books, and carefully spread them; but I shall make them repent it.⁴⁹

Baillie had decided to attack A Declaration made by King James (1646) on the basis of the evidence that the work of 1585 had been composed by Archbishop Patrick Adamson, and therefore could not be used to assert King James's hatred of Presbyterianism. Indeed, when the 'Black Acts' had been overturned, Adamson had been forced to admit his responsibility.⁵⁰ At the Kirk Assembly at St. Andrews in the spring and summer of 1591, Adamson had given a statement which was eventually printed as The Recantation of Maister Patrik Adamsone. Adamson admitted that the work had been composed without reference to James:

As quhair I am burdened, to haif ben the settair furth of the buke called *The Kings declaration*, quhairin the hol ordor of the kirk is condemned and traduced, I protest before God, that so I was commandit to wreitt the same by the Chancellair for the time, bot chieflie by N. (an uther grait courteor) quho him self penned in the second act of parliament, concerning the powar and authoritie of Judicator to be absolutelie in the Kinges powar⁵¹

This has generally been accepted as an accurate description of the making of the declaration.⁵² However, Adamson also asserts that the work was not in accordance with James's own opinions:

it conteanith litle or nothing of the Kings awin intention bot my awin at the tyme of the writting theirof: and the corrupt intentionnes of sic as for the tyme wer about the King and abused his minoritie.⁵³

It seems likely that in saying this, Adamson was simply capitulating to pressure from the ascendant party, and it seems probable that James broadly approved of his policy

of restraining the zeal of the Presbyterians.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, Baillie clearly found this retraction immensely useful when composing his work.

To his annoyance, Baillie found the printers slow to complete his pamphlet, and it was not until August 1646 that An Historicall Vindication of the Government of the Church of Scotland appeared, Thomason dating his copy 1 August.⁵⁵ In this powerful work, Baillie described what he claimed was the true literary history of Adamson's work, reproducing Adamson's retractions and explaining why the declaration had proved so useful to the Independency movement in some detail.⁵⁶ As an analysis of the politics of reading in the pamphlet wars, Baillie's work is of the utmost importance:

That pestiferous carcasse which with all possible infamy was buried so soone as borne, and did lye quiet in its grave of shame till a full Climaterick of three score and three yeers; our good friends have been so wise for themselves, and kind to us, as to dig up its stinking bones, and to carry it from house to house, from shire to shire over all England, and where ever else a printed pamphlet can goe, serving their Brethren of Scotland with this curtesie according to their Covenant. And least the antick face of so long buried a body, should not have been looked upon by the multitude with any contentment, they did choice [*sic*] to be at the cost of putting it in a fine new English dresse, and setting upon its head the Cape of a royall title: All to draw the eyes of the vulgar upon it, who otherwise might have passed by it wi[t]h neglect and disdain. In this they have put themselves to a peece of pains which I never knew or heard used with any other book: they do print it first in Master Adamsons owne old Scottish language, and thereafter translated it in good moderne English⁵⁷

Baillie seems to feel some pride in the 'old Scottish language', and his anger at the revival of an anti-Presbyterian text may be matched by his resentment at the appropriation of a Scottish work by his English opponents. Although Baillie's reply clearly intends to heal the growing breach between the English Parliament and the Covenanters, he continues by casting aspersions on the English authorities who had

allowed the pamphlet to be printed. Baillie explains that the Scottish representatives in London had heard of the forthcoming pamphlet:

When all this was told us, we made our addresse to the worshipfull Lycenser, intreating that a Pamphlet so extreamly injurious to our whol Church and Nation, might be smothered upon the Press, and returned to its pit where so long it had lyen in infamy; we were told by him that divers persons of eminency, at least for their place and present Station had strongly moved him with great importunity to give his License for its reprinting: Yet that upon our so just and reasonable desires he would doe his best to stop it: hereupon we rested satisfied, being assured of its suppression; notwithstanding, within two dayes after this promise it came abroad, the importunity and eminency of the persons who had drawne from the Licenser his Imprimatur, with greater ease did draw from the Presse some thousands of the printed Copies, and made them to be sold publikely, to our small contentment.⁵⁸

Baillie goes on to link the reprint with the works he had written against in 1640. He remarks:

They who have acquaintance with the Scots affaires of that time, doe know this writ to have no more relation unto King James, then the late *large Declaration* had to King Charles; both carry the name of Kings, but the specious pretence of a royal title was not able to save the true Authors of either, from the just censure which they deserved⁵⁹

It is interesting that whereas in 1640 Baillie had replied to Balcanquhall and Corbet's selective quotations from King James's writings by producing his own selective quotations, here the debate is not so much about the interpretation of the text as about the context. In 1640 Baillie was interested in reaching James's meaning through and at the expense of his actual words, but by 1646 Baillie has come to place a greater emphasis upon the history of the circumstances in which the text was created, transmitted and republished.⁶⁰

By choosing this new model of reading texts as part of literary history, Baillie greatly widens the possibilities for reading King James. He is able to respond to

Maxwell's evidence that James had opposed Puritanism by acknowledging that not all James's opinions were pleasing:

That King James at Hampton Court, and elsewhere did speak his pleasure of the Presbytery, makes it nothing the worse; his resolution to keep up E[p]iscopacy in England for his own ends, moved him to discounten[a]nce what ever opposed it; yet so, that in his *Basilicon doron*, & at divers other occasions he gave luculent Testimonies to many Presbyterian Divines of his own acquaintance, preferring them for grace and honesty before all those whom he could make willing to accept of bishopricks. The best Princes are not void of Errours, the greatest mistake of this wise Prince was in his too great affection towards Episcopacy⁶¹

Indeed, Baillie is even able to consider the repellent hypothesis that James really did authorise the 1585 Declaratiovn, reminding readers that 'many Proclamations and Declarations by false and wicked informations, have been drawne from King James and King Charles, and many other Princes, which upon better advisement have been called in and buried'.⁶² Baillie mentions the Book of Sports as an example. The texts invoked by the royalists can be incorporated within Baillie's model of history, because it relies on placing a work in a particular context, rather than on the meaning of the author or the correct interpretation of the words. A sense of literary history was giving new power to James's readers.

III. King Charles and the future of the monarchy 1646-49: textual theory in crisis?

Although Presbyterian writers like Robert Baillie believed in monarchy, and sought to ensure that King Charles would preside over a future political settlement, the increasingly confident and sophisticated use of King James's words in An Historical Vindication was linked to a growing sense that the king was now dependent on his subjects. After Charles's surrender in 1646, many attempts were made to reconstruct the traditional constitution. However, these attempts inevitably exposed the fact that real power had ceased to reside with Charles Stuart. Baillie had tried to rehabilitate the monarchy in the face of sectarian opposition, but his scholarly account of the history of James and his writings does not vindicate King Charles so much as reveal the potential this kind of scholarship had to rewrite the past. In the early stages of the pamphlet war, the main areas of dispute had been the correct interpretation of what King James had said. Now, with the rise of more text-based and context-based readings, deeper questions and more dangerous topics could be raised, relating to the place of kings and their words in history.

On 6 January 1647, as the Scottish army was preparing to surrender Charles to the English Parliament, Thomason received a book entitled King James His Opinion and Iudgement, concerning a Reall King and a Tyrant.⁶³ This is a new edition of King James his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant which had been at the centre of the 1642 pamphlet war. Whereas the first edition had been burned by order of Parliament, this edition announces that it is 'published according [*sic*] to Order of

Parliament'. The appearance of this work suggests the dangerous situation facing King Charles by early 1647: the charge of tyranny, so controversially raised against him in 1642, can now be revived in a work which dares to claim the support of Parliament. One suspects that radical Independents, who were a strong minority in the House of Commons, promoted this publication as they had A Declaration made by King James (1646), in order to subvert a Presbyterian settlement.

The text seems to have been completely reconceived, not only in the light of the end of the first Civil War, but in the light of the new ways of reading King James. The work is anglicised; the original text was probably written by Alexander Leighton in defence of the Scottish Covenanters, a tradition which the London Independents had no wish to uphold. The change in the title may be more significant than it seems; the new emphasis on James's 'opinion' suggests that the extract from the 1610 speech is not supremely authoritative, and more context-bound. Most important, however, is the deletion of the 'Certaine Quaeries of things done since King Charles his Reign began', which included the attack on the Book of Sports, and the suggestion that Charles should be made responsible for his words. This is replaced by a much shorter list of the promises made in the coronation oath of the kings of England:

You shall keep the Church of God, the Clergy and people, intirely in peace and concord in God, according to your power... You shall cause equall and right justice in all your judgements and discretion, in mercy and truth, according to your power... You shall grant just Lawes and Customes to be kept, and you shall promise that those shall be protected by you, and to the honour of God be strengthened, which the common people shall chuse, according to your power. He shall answer, I grant and promise it.⁶⁴

The implication is that Charles has broken this oath, and that by doing so he has broken the covenant between king and people, thereby dethroning himself.

The first edition had used James's words as rhetorical weapons against Charles's actions and words in 1642, but this edition strikes at the root of monarchy. Rather than suggesting that Charles should be resisted because he conforms to James's description of a tyrant, this edition creates the impression that a more permanent judgement against the king, and against kingship, can be made on the basis of an examination of what Charles and his father have said and done. There may be a relationship between this work and the publication of Charles's 'cabinet' letters, which were discovered by the Parliamentary forces after the battle of Naseby in June 1645.⁶⁵ This publication had exposed the correspondence of Charles and Henrietta-Maria with foreign powers, their plans to offer a Catholic toleration, and their scorn for the 'rebels'. In the printed edition, the correspondence was followed by a collection of Charles's public professions and declarations, in which he had disavowed any intention to use Irish troops, or to make any allowances for Papists. The editor, identified by Thomason as Henry Parker, invited the reader to make a comparison:

It concerns you to look both forward and backward, and having now taken the dimation of the Kings minde by his secret Letters, turne about awhile and looke upon the same in his publike Declarations. See if you can reconcile his former promises to his present designes; for as you have had some representation of the latter in the former part, you shall now be made Spectators and Judges of the former in this latter part.⁶⁶

The devastating effects this work had on the popular estimation of the royal word can hardly be overestimated; as the editor remarked, his annotations were hardly necessary ('we affirm nothing necessary to be beleaved, but what the printed papers will themselves utter in their own language').⁶⁷ King James his Opinion and

Judgement clearly responds to the new possibilities for using the king's words to condemn him; whereas the 1642 edition pointed out contradictions between the words of James and the actions of Charles, by 1647, Charles's words in public and in private have been shown to be incompatible. This approach would ultimately lead to the devaluing of both James and Charles, not just their words. It is worth noting that on the same day Thomason received his copy of King James his Opinion and Judgement, he also received a copy of an extremist pamphlet with the telling title Regall Tyrannie Discovered: or, a discourse, shewing that all lawfull (approbational) instituted power by God amongst men, is by common agreement, and mutual consent.⁶⁸

King Charles made many appeals to his father's intentions and actions during his negotiations with his adversaries between 1646 and 1649. Unfortunately, by this stage the rising party was increasingly inclined to reject and suppress the Stuart traditions rather than debate them. His discussions with Alexander Henderson, the Scottish Presbyterian minister, which took place in Newcastle in the summer of 1646, were printed after Charles's death, and contain an interesting instance of a last-ditch attempt by the two doomed factions to agree on a common reading of King James.⁶⁹ Charles argues that he has been faithful to James's religious teaching, to which Henderson replies:

Your Majesty knowes that King James never admitted Episcopacy upon Divine Right; That His Majesty did sweare and subscribe to the Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline of the Church of Scotland; that in the Preface of the latter Edition of *Basilicon Doron*, His Majesty gives an honourable testimony to those that loved better the simplicity of the Gospel, than the pomp and Ceremonies of the Church of England, and that he conceived the Prelats to savour of the Popish Hierarchy, and that (could his Ghost now speake to your Majesty) He would not advise your Majesty to run such hazards for those

Men who will chuse rather to pull downe your Throne with their own ruine, than that they perish alone.⁷⁰

Charles could not deny that the 1603 revised version of Basilicon Doron attempted to conciliate the Puritans who had been so heavily censured in the original text, and he replied by appealing to what James had said in private:

To your last, concerning the King my Father, of happy and famous Memory, both for his Piety and Learning; I must tell you, that I had the happinesse, to know him much better then you; wherefore I desire you, not to be too confident, in the knowledge of his Opinions; For, I dare say, should his Ghost now speake, he would tell you, that a Bloody Reformation was never lawfull, as not warranted by Gods word⁷¹

This mutual desire to hear the ghost of King James speak seems to reflect a growing doubt that interpretations of either James's words or actions can help to resolve the crisis. Henderson replies to Charles:

I will not presume upon any secret knowledge of the Opinions held by the King, your Majesties Father, of famous Memory; they being much better knowne to your Majesty. I did onely produce, what was profest by him, before the world.⁷²

By raising the possibility that there is a discrepancy between the king's words in public and in private Henderson is, perhaps unintentionally, calling into question the very concepts of tradition and authority upon which readings of King James had relied. Charles, without access to his libraries, and aware that James's words have all too frequently been used to his disadvantage, replies rather desperately:

For the King my Fathers opinion, if it were not to spend time (as I believe) needlesly, I could prove by living and written testimonies, all, and more, then I have said of Him, for His perswasion in these points which I now maintaine⁷³

The debate has raised more questions than it has answered: what was the relationship between James's words and his thoughts, or between a text of 1603 and

the situation in 1646? The tone of the debates suggests an awareness that the failure to reach any agreed interpretation threatened to make the strategy of making politics through reading King James futile. Equally, the inability of Charles and Henderson to construct a shared reading of church history left the way clear for the Independent party to impose their own version. A growing awareness of problems of textuality, authorship and intentionality, worked out by readers of the works of King James, had greatly complicated the plight of the British monarchies.

By the time of the discussions between Charles and the Parliamentary commissioners at Newport in 1648, it was no longer possible to invoke successfully the traditions of King James to find some common ground on which to debate a peace settlement. In the debate over reforming the ritual of the Church of England, Charles argued that he felt bound to follow in his father's footsteps:

His Majesty said, He had been bred and instructed in the way He stands for, and that by his Father, the wisest King, and best man in the world; therefore could not easily yeeld, nor must it be wondred if He did not.⁷⁴

Charles's opponents make it clear that they consider such appeals to tradition irrelevant:

The King in this debate asked, what fault they found in the Common prayer Book, one one [*sic*] of the Commis. answered, He had heard it was the saying of a very learned man, that the Liturgy was taken out of the Masse Book, only spoiled in the translation: Who was that, said his Majesty? It was replied, It was your Father King James: His Majesty said, If it were good in it self, that did not make it ill⁷⁵

James's support for the Prayer Book as a means of imposing discipline on the church increased during his English reign, and if he actually said these words it was probably intended to be a witty remark. However, Charles's opponents have cleverly exposed the difficulty Charles has in appealing to his father's authority. Firstly, there is

evidence that Charles's extreme religious views are not at all in line with those of James. Secondly, the very concept of defending a work by locating it within a particular tradition is now in question. Charles is forced to use the alternative idea of evaluating the book by its own inherent qualities. With the collapse of his own authority, Charles found that the authority of his father was disintegrating as well.

Although readings of King James were still of great importance in 1648, the sense of theoretical uncertainty and possible collapse, which was already present in 1643, was clearly intensifying. We have seen how readings tried to privilege the words of the text, or the historical context in which the work had appeared, all the time diminishing the presence of the royal author. The final, agonised struggles to reconfigure the role of Charles and the words of James had reached deadlock, and there was a sense of an approaching end to the readings and rereadings which had sought since 1642 for an interpretive solution to the debates. Ultimately, there was a limit to what could be done with James and Charles: by 1648, the search for a clear meaning of kingship and the king's words had failed. Every new attempt to reread or renegotiate had simply ended in more theoretical and practical complications. The disappearing presence of King James indicates the way in which the otherwise insoluble problem of the king and his works was to be tackled.

It is notable that Charles seems to have become more interested in his father's thought just as the debates over the interpretation of James's works were coming to an end. Εικὼν Βασιλική [Eikon Basilike, the King's Image], which appeared on the day of Charles's execution, is the only document attributed to Charles which approximates to James's numerous attempts to communicate with his people.⁷⁶ The

debates over who wrote which portion will probably never be fully resolved, but it seems quite likely that Charles did want to leave some kind of literary legacy, and that the first-person account of his sufferings is at least based on his own notes. The parallels with Basilicon Doron are striking, and Richard Hollingworth records the story, which he says reached him via James Clifford, that Jeremy Taylor had written to suggest that Charles should not call the work, 'The Royal Plea', on the basis that Eikon Basilike:

would be a better Title, and the less taken notice of by the Informers, being Greek, and withal, it agreeing with the Title of his Father's Book, called ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΟΞΟΝ; upon which Letter the King immediately consented to the alteration of the Title...⁷⁷

It has, additionally, been argued by Lois Potter that the frontispiece is influenced by Basilicon Doron.⁷⁸

The exact significance of these connections can be debated. Richard Helgerson argues that Eikon Basilike was intended, to a certain degree, to reverse the effect of James's Workes, particularly in terms of the way in which James's readers had come to see the king as irrelevant or a hindrance to the correct interpretation of his works. He advances the thesis that James's enthusiasm for appearing in print had contributed to Charles's downfall. James had given his readers a great deal of printed material to interpret and rework, allowing readers to produce so many different versions of the royal will that its authority was being undermined:

Though print served to represent a transcendently stable (and thus presumably authoritative) self, it at the same time made that self liable to hostile interpretation and even rejection... As the author of a book, the king becomes a subject, and his subjects become his judges... Though James may have found in the fixity of print a counterpart of his absolutist conception of kingship, in becoming an author he sacrificed the mystery of power so effectively preserved through performance by the medieval church, by

Shakespeare, and by Queen Elizabeth... He thus contributed to the movement that a generation later led a nation of readers to try governing themselves without a king.⁷⁹

Eikon Basilike, on the other hand, tries 'to conceal its own bookishness' and to 'exist in the category of image and performance', presenting the image of the king evoked by the title, rather than the king's words which could be read, discussed, and appropriated.⁸⁰

One passage in Eikon Basilike, in particular, seems to confirm Helgerson's argument:

I have scarce leisure to consider those swarms of reproaches, which issue out of some mens mouthes and hearts, as easily as smoke, or sparks doe out of a fornace; Much lesse to make such prolix Apologies, as might give those men satisfaction: who conscious to their owne depth of wickednesse, are loath to believe any man not to be as bad as themselves. 'Tis Kingly to doe well, and heare ill: If I can but act the one, I shall not much regard to beare the other.⁸¹

The royal actor refuses to enter the politics of reading, and, indeed, Eikon Basilike carefully avoids getting involved in debates about particular books and personalities.⁸² Eikon Basilike tries to be an icon, a collection of liturgical texts, a legacy, anything rather than a contribution to the pamphlet war. In this sense it can be related to Charles's promotion of works like the Psalms ascribed to James, and the Declaration of Sports, shrinking from a real engagement with the dangerous reading traditions based on texts like Basilicon Doron and the speech of 1610.

Eikon Basilike is still, of course, composed of words rather than pictures, and would be reworked and discussed with great heat for many years to come. However, whereas King James's readers had appropriated and manipulated his words, considered them in a variety of contexts and from different theoretical perspectives, the debates over Eikon Basilike turned on the identity of the author, and his moral

excellence or culpability. It is fascinating to read some of the contributions to the controversy over the 'king's book', which led great divines, bibliographers and poets to write in the most intemperate fashion. Scholars have been tempted to respond to Eikon Basilike's iconic construction by treating the work as an image which brings out their personal obsessions and hatreds, rather than as a text to be interpreted and debated. It seems possible Charles and John Gauden intended to disrupt the destructive activity of reading which had transformed the works of King James, and subverted the authority of King Charles, and that they were successful to some extent. Kevin Sharpe notes how Milton's Eikonoklastes 'painstakingly contests all its claims, replacing them into the arena of verbal contest above which its author had succeeded in elevating them'. However, Milton's vitriolic attacks on Charles's faith, particularly regarding the inclusion of 'Pamela's prayer' from Sidney's Arcadia in Eikon Basilike's collection of royal prayers, only succeeded in triggering further pamphlets disputing the personal morality of Milton, Charles, and the various printers involved in the work, or indeed anything rather than the words of the text.⁸³ Editions of Eikon Basilike continued to pour from the press.⁸⁴ After Eikon Basilike, the debates over the nature of royal language, the responsibilities of readers, and the validity of written commands, which had arisen from reading King James, would be temporarily forgotten. Author, text and context are taken out of the arena and raised to the sphere of the mystical: the dangerous and complicating activity of reading is replaced by the easier actions of adoration or icon-breaking.⁸⁵

¹For example, [George Buchanan], Tyrannicall-Government Anatomized: A Discourse Concerning Evill-Councillors, London: f. John Field, 1642/3, Wing B5298, Thomason E. 88 (29), dated by Thomason 9 February [1643]. This pamphlet, licensed by John White for the House of Commons, is the first English translation of Buchanan's Latin drama Baptistes, written about 1540. This translation has been attributed to John Milton; see J. T. T. Brown, 'An English Translation of George Buchanan's *Baptistes* attributed to John Milton', in George Buchanan: Glasgow Quatercentenary Studies 1906, Glasgow: James MacLehose & Sons, 1907, [61]-173, and Salmon (1959), 81-2. Roger Mason points to the way in which certain characters in Herod's court, in which the action is set, could be identified as King Charles, Queen Henrietta-Maria, and Archbishop Laud, in '*Rex Stoicus*', n.d., 12-13, 32 (note). For the influence of sixteenth-century resistance theorists on Civil War thought, see Oakley (1962).

²See Craigie (1950), 38; Skrine (1989), 27.

³A New Discovery of Old Pontificall Practises, London: f. Stephen Bowtell, 1643, Wing U14, Thomason E. 87 (6). For this reprint, and other reprints of works dealing with Udall and his contemporaries, see Black (1996), Chapter Five.

⁴See Willson (1956, reprinted 1962), 108-9. There is evidence that James admired Udall's scholarship; see 'John Udall', DNB. David Daiches describes Udall as 'one of the most competent English Hebraists of the sixteenth century' (Daiches, 1941, 152).

⁵sig. G2^r. The text is obviously corrupt, and should read 'interpone us at your hands to stay any harder usage of them'; see Fuller (1655), sig. 3B4^r; for another text, see Akrigg (1984), 110-12, using British Library Harl. MS. 787.f.66. For this letter's place in the correspondence between James and Elizabeth, see Harrison (1935), 202-4.

⁶Udall's account of his sufferings in A New Discovery suggests that James's letter had had some impact on the proceedings against him (sig. G1^v-2^r), but he died almost immediately after the order for his release was given; see Sharpe (1992), 646. David Calderwood writes that the letter 'was not delivered' in The True History of the Church of Scotland [Edinburgh?]: 1678, Wing C279, sig. L11^r. Christopher Hill stresses the role of Raleigh and Essex in procuring his pardon; see Hill (1965), 171.

⁷sig. A3^v

⁸sig. [A4^r]

⁹A New Discovery can be compared to A Briefe Declaration of The Reasons that moved King James of blessed memory, and the State, to erect a Colledge of Divines, and other Learned men at Chelsey, London: b. E. P. f. Nicholas Bourne, 1645/6, Wing B4564, Thomason E. 324 (12), which included the text of James's letter of 5 May 1616 to the Archbishop of Canterbury, written to encourage fund-raising for Chelsea College, intended as a centre for anti-papal writing (sig. A2^{r-v}). This work seems to be designed to encourage a revival of Chelsea College, but there is no suggestion that James's words should be obeyed because he had uttered them;

the point is that the policies described were laudable. Another text of this letter can be found in context in Fuller (1655), sig. 4G1^v-4G3^r.

¹⁰A Proclamation for the authorizing an uniformitie of the Booke of Common Prayer, London: 1642/3, Wing C2601, Thomason 669.f.5(147)

¹¹For the original proclamation (STC 8344) see Larkin & Hughes (1973), 74-77. It should be read in conjunction with the proclamation of 22 February 1604 ordering Catholic priests and Jesuits to leave the country: James wished to suppress both extremes of opinion.

¹²For some recent studies of the Hampton Court Conference and its significance, see Fincham & Lake (1985), esp. 175-6.

¹³His Maiesties Declaration in Defence of The true Protestant Religion, 'First printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and since re-printed at London': 1643, Wing C2209, Thomason E. 106 (11); see Madan (1912), no. 1384.

¹⁴Falconer Madan describes this work as 'clearly a bogus issue, being only a reprint of King James's profession of faith, so entitled as to lead people to suppose it was by Charles i!' (Madan, 1912, 270).

¹⁵In the Workes (1616/7), sig. Cc2^r; in McIlwain (1918), 124. It is not clear whether the 1643 editor is using the Workes or one of the 1609 editions.

¹⁶sig. A2^v

¹⁷Cf. sig. A3^v - [A4^r] and the Workes (1616/7), sig. Cc3^{r-v}.

¹⁸King James His Divine Prophecie of the Warres and Distractions, London: f. R. Austin, 1645, Wing J134, Thomason E. 274 (10)

¹⁹A Premonition, (1609, STC 14402), sig. K1^v-I3^r; in the Workes (1616/7) this passage is on sig. Dd1^v-Dd3^v; McIlwain (1918), 135-40.

²⁰For James's reading of Revelation in the context of later millenary developments, see William M. Lamont, Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603-1640, Macmillan, 1969, esp. pp. [28]-55.

²¹This seems to be the position advocated in one of James's earliest works, A Paraphrase Upon the Revelation, first printed in the Workes (1616/7), sig. A1^r-[F6^v], esp. sig. [C4^v-6^v].

²²For the development of eschatological thought in the seventeenth century, see Peter Toon (ed.), Puritans, the Millenium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600 to 1660, Cambridge & London: James Clarke & Co., 1970.

²³Fra[ncis] Woodcocke, The Two Witnesses: Discovered in severall Sermons, London: b. J. R. f. Luke Fawne, 1643, Wing W3433, Thomason E. 100 (1), dated by Thomason 28 April, sig. A1^r.

²⁴sig. L2^r-3^v

²⁵There is considerable evidence that one of the 1609 editions is being used rather than that of 1616/7. For example, see sig. A2^v of the 1643 text, 'But I have too much laboured'; the 1609 text (STC 14402, sig. K2^v) reads 'But I haue too much laboured', but the 1616/7 text (sig. Dd2^r) reads 'So as I haue too much laboured'.

²⁶sig. [A4^r]

²⁷sig. [A4^v]

²⁸Peter [i.e. Pierre] du Moulin, The Accomplishment of the Prophecies, transl. I. Heath, Oxford: b. Ioseph Barnes & s. b. Iohn Barnes, 1613, STC 7306, sig. [R6^v], [Dd8^v]-Ff1^v; see Rimbault (1966), 68+.

²⁹ sig. [Gg8^r]

³⁰King James His Learned and Wise Speech, London: f. I. T., 1645, Wing J138. The quarto edition, with its original title page, is His Maiesties Speach in the Starre-Chamber, London: b. Robert Barker, [1616], STC 14397.7. For the practice of reissuing unsold sheets, see start of Chapter Four.

³¹My belief that it was gradually recognised that a 'historical' model of interpretation was more appropriate for political polemics than the more creative and manipulative 'literary' model of the editors in 1642 is influenced by Martine Watson Brownley, 'Sir Richard Baker's Chronicle and Later Seventeenth-Century English Historiography', HLQ 52 (1989), 481-500.

³²An Old Mould to Cast New Lawes By, 'Printed', 1643, Wing S4218. Unfortunately this was not collected by Thomason. Falconer Madan, who also identifies this work as a royalist publication, says the ornaments indicate that this was printed by Leonard Lichfield at Oxford (Madan, 1912, 328-9). The second edition of Wing erroneously ascribes this work to 'Susannah Smith'; my thanks to British Library staff for their assistance with this matter. It is hoped that future editions of Wing will include a cross-reference to this work under 'James I'.

³³Thomas Smith, De Repvblica Anglorvm London: b. Henrie Midelton f. Gregorie Seton, 1583, STC 22857

³⁴Book I, Chapter 7

³⁵Mary Dewar, Sir Thomas Smith: A Tudor Intellectual in Office, Athlone Press (University of London), 1964, 113-4; Hill (1965), 270-1.

³⁶Old Mould, sig. A2^r-B2^r; it seems probable that the editor is using the 1640 edition of De Repvblica under its English title The Common-Wealth of England, London: R. Young f. J. Smethwicke, STC 22867, in which the relevant passage, from Book II, Chapter 1, is on sig. [D7^v]-E5^v.

³⁷Old Mould, sig. B2^{r-v}; see James VI & I, His Maiesties Speech, London: b. Robert Barker, 1607, STC 14395, sig. [F4^{r-v}]. The same text can be found in the Workes (1616/7), sig. Xx3^v, and in Sommerville (1994), 174.

³⁸For the context of the 1607 speech, see Bruce Galloway, The Union of England and Scotland 1603-1608, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986, 116-7.

³⁹Old Mould, sig. B2^r.

⁴⁰It is possible that one reason for producing An Old Mould was to dispute the appropriation of the 1607 speech by A True Representation (1640), which had invoked a different passage from the speech in defence of the Scottish Covenanters and the liberties of Scotland: see Chapter Three.

⁴¹A Declaration made by King James, in Scotland; Concerning, Church-Government, [London]: f. Matthew Walbancke, 1646, Wing J132, Thomason E. 506 (27)

⁴²A Declaratiovn of the Kings Maiesties Intentiovn and Meaning, Edinburgh: b. Thomas Vautroullier, 1585, STC 21948. The only notable differences between the

1585 and the 1646 editions are simple errors by the compositor; for example, cf. 1585 sig. Bii^v and 1646 sig. C2^f, and 1585 sig. Cii^v and 1646 sig. [C4^f]; a few words have been skipped on both occasions.

⁴³A Declaration (1646), sig. [C4^{r-v}]

⁴⁴[John Maxwell], The Burthen of Issachar, [London]: 1646, Wing M1379, Thomason E. 336 (3)

⁴⁵[John Maxwell], An Answer By Letter, [Oxford: b. L. Lichfield], 1644, Wing M1377, Thomason E. 53 (13)

⁴⁶For the Hampton Court Conference, see The Burthen of Issachar (1646), sig. B3^r-[B4^r].

⁴⁷James Melville, Ad Serenissimum Jacobum Primum Britanniarum Monarcham, Ecclesiae Scoticae libellus supplex, Londini: excudebat J. R. pro Georgio Thomason & Octaviano Pullen, 1645, Wing M1655, Thomason E. 287 (2)

⁴⁸Laing, Vol. 2 (1841), 373-4

⁴⁹Laing, Vol. 2 (1841), 377. For the nature and purpose of Baillie's correspondence with Spang, see Paul (1985), 375-81.

⁵⁰See Mullan (1986), 54-73; Melvill (1829), 100-62, Calderwood (1678), sig. V2^r-Bb3^r.

⁵¹The Recantation of Maister Patrik Adamsone, [Middelburgh: b. R. Schilders], 1598, STC 149, sig. B1^{r-v}

⁵²See Lee (1990), 61 (note).

⁵³sig. C1^r

⁵⁴See Russell (1990), 46.

⁵⁵Robert Baillie, An Historicall Vindication, London: f. Samuel Gellibrand, 1646, Wing B460, Thomason E. 346 (11). For Baillie's troubles with the printer, see An Historicall Vindication (1646), sig. [B1^v], and Laing, Vol. 2 (1841), 385.

⁵⁶Adamson's retractions are on sig. E3^r-F2^v.

⁵⁷sig. [A4^r]

⁵⁸sig. [A4^{r-v}]

⁵⁹sig. A1^r

⁶⁰For Baillie's opposition to anti-historical chiliasm, see Toon (1970), 104-8.

⁶¹sig. [C3^v-4^r]

⁶²sig. [A4^r]

⁶³King James His Opinion and Iudgement, concerning a Reall King and a Tyrant, colop: [London]: 1647, Wing J140, Thomason E. 374 (3). This was not entered in the Stationers' Register until 29 January 1647, Liber E, p. 79. The practice of entering a book after it had actually been published seems to have been a more frequent occurrence than is generally realised.

⁶⁴sig. [A4^v]

⁶⁵For Parliament's decision to publish these letters, see Sheila Lambert (ed.), Printing for Parliament, 1641-1700, List and Index Society Special Series (Vol. 20), 1984, 102.

⁶⁶The Kings Cabinet Opened, London: f. Robert Bostock, 1645, Wing C2358, Thomason E. 292 (27), dated by Thomason 14 July, sig. H1^r

⁶⁷sig. [A4^r]. For a later, similar publication, see The Kings Packet of Letters, London: f. R. Austin and J. Coe, 1645, Wing C2359, Thomason E. 304 (22); for Charles's belief that the letters could be understood in an honourable sense, see his letter to Secretary Nicholas of 4 August 1645, in Reliquiæ (1650), sig. K4^{r-v}.

⁶⁸Regall Tyrannie Discovered, London: Printed, 1647, Wing L2172, Thomason E. 370 (12). Wing attributes this work to John Lilburne, but Pauline Gregg's description of the raid on Richard Overton's house in which copies of the pamphlet were discovered suggests that the Overtons were more probably responsible; see Pauline Gregg, Free-born John: A Biography of John Lilburne, George G. Harrap & Co., 1961, 150-1.

⁶⁹See Potter (1989), 177.

⁷⁰The Papers which passed at New-Castle, London: f. R. Royston, 1649, Wing C2535, Thomason E. 1243 (3), dated by Thomason 29 May, sig. B1^v. Also in Reliquiæ (1650), sig. X5^v-[X6^r].

⁷¹sig. B4^v; Reliquiæ (1650), sig. [X8^v]

⁷²sig. C3^{r-v}; Reliquiæ (1650), sig. Y1^r

⁷³sig. [C8^v]; Reliquiæ (1650), sig. Y5^r

⁷⁴Charles I, His Majesties Declaration and Speech, London: f. R. Smith, 1648, Wing C2186, p. 2 (unsigned). Thomason's copy, E. 467 (26), is dated 13 October.

⁷⁵p. 3

⁷⁶There are a great number of editions of Eikon Basilike: I am using Eikon Basilike, [London: Richard Royston], 1648, Wing E272; see Francis F. Madan, A New Bibliography of the Eikon Basilike, Oxford: OUP, 1950, no. 2.

⁷⁷Richard Hollingworth, Dr. Hollingworth's Defence of K. Charles the First's Holy and Divine Book, London: f. Samuel Eddowes, 1629 [i.e. 1692], Wing H2503, sig. [C3^v]

⁷⁸Potter (1989), 162

⁷⁹Helgerson (1987), 6-7

⁸⁰Helgerson (1987), 8-9

⁸¹sig. [G8^v]; also in Philip A. Knachel (ed.), Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitudes and Sufferings, Ithaca & New York: Cornell University Press, 1966, 66.

⁸²See Knachel (1966), xiii.

⁸³For the various bizarre and absurd accusations which circulated after Milton's discovery of 'Pamela's prayer', see Milton J. French, (ed.), The Life Records of John Milton - Vol. 2 - 1639-1651, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1950, 226-8, 301, and Merritt Y. Hughes (ed.), Complete Prose Works of John Milton - Vol. 3 - 1648-1649, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1962, 152-61, 362-7, 547.

⁸⁴Sharpe (1994), 138.

⁸⁵William Germano has a useful discussion of the way in which Charles's icon replaced James's 'literary icon', but does not consider the significance of the transformation wrought upon James's writings in the 1640s; see Germano (1981), 218-233.

Conclusion: Reading King James from the Republic to the Revolution

I. The destruction of James's literary reputation under the republic

After the abolition of the monarchy, the pamphlet debates relating the words of King James to the beliefs and intentions of King Charles came to an abrupt conclusion. If Eikon Basilike signalled the withdrawal of the royalist party from interpretation and literary analysis, the victorious republicans were equally swift to turn their attention away from the endlessly divisive process of reading. Out of the collapse of a shared theory and practice of receiving the royal word in the 1640s came not only iconography and icon-breaking, but a wave of revisionist histories and pseudo-histories which sought to fix both King Charles and King James in a colourful, mythological narrative.¹ Unlike earlier works such as An Old Mould to Cast New Lawes By and Baillie's An Historicall Vindication of the Government of the Church of Scotland, which had placed James's texts within a historical framework to guide readers towards a particular interpretation, the histories of the 1650s are neither subtle nor scholarly, but flamboyant in their partisanship, and determined to sell a story rather than to win readers' intellectual assent. In these narratives the words of King James are given little space, or are openly derided; the descendants of the communities which had appealed to James's texts in the 1620s, and exploited them in the 1640s, were now prepared to abandon them entirely.

I discuss the nature and origins of the historical satires of the 1650s, and the documentary histories which developed from them, in greater detail in Appendix Three. In summary, it can be said that in order to blacken the reputation of the exiled Charles II and his supporters, the government promoted numerous works portraying King James as a corrupt, irreligious, scheming hypocrite, whose successors had simply developed his plans for enslaving England. The works ascribed to Sir Anthony Weldon, in which James's words are dismissed as Machiavellian utterances with no truth-value, were of the utmost importance in establishing this narrative, and are still highly influential over popular accounts of James and his reign today. In the mid-1650s, attempts were made to give this narrative more conviction by setting it in a framework of historical documentation, just as the pamphlets of the 1630s and 1640s had gestured at scholarship through their use of marginalia. The histories of John Rushworth and Arthur Wilson reproduced many of James's letters and speeches, particularly those relating to the Spanish match and the Letter and Directions of 1622, but with the intention of incorporating them into an overall pattern which would lead readers to the same conclusion as the satires of Weldon: that the House of Stuart was inherently rotten. James's words were simply exhibits in the case against monarchy.

The results of reading King James's works through the rewriting of their author's life can be seen in publications like Thomas Gataker's His Vindication of the Annotations (1653). Gataker, an English Presbyterian, wrote to mock the predictions of William Lilly, and to argue that Lilly's expressed affection for the godly ministry masked a real hatred of Puritanism. Although not a republican, Gataker attacks Lilly by comparing his activities to the devious strategies of King James:

King James a Prince of more policy then puissance, while he was yet King of Scotland, penned, or owned, at least, a Book entituled Δωρον Βασιλικον; which whoso shal advisedly read, tho of no very sharp eyesight or deep reach, yet may easily discry a Design carried all along in it, to ingratiate himself, with the Popish side, by commending the fidelity of his Mothers servants, as to her, so to himself, with the Prelatical partie, by giving them hope of continuing that government that he should find here established, with the Common people, by allowing them their May-games and the like sports: onely he had bitterly expressed himself in high terms against the poor Puritans, whome he least feared, and deemed generally disaffected by those other three parties.

Howbeit, when the time drew neer of Queen [sic] Elisabeths departure, that his quiet [sic] coming in might not meet with any disturbance from that party, he prefixed a Preface to his Book then reprinted, wherein *on his Honor he protesteth, that by the name of Puritans he meant, not all Preachers in general, or others, that misliked the Ceremonies as badges of Poperie, and the Episcopacie as smelling of a Papal Supremacie, but did eqally [sic] love the lerned and grave on either side; intended onely such brainsick and heddy Preachers, that leaned too much to their own dreams, contemned all authority, counted all prophane that Would not swear to all their fantasies, &c. but whether his carriage toward such of that side, who went under that name, when he came to the Crown here, argued such an equal [sic] affection and love to them, I had rather any other should consider, then my self say.*²

The fact that there is clearly some truth in Gataker's charges, and the fact that his paraphrasing shows he was thoroughly familiar with Basilicon Doron makes the interpretation compelling.³ Nevertheless, the context in which Basilicon Doron was written suggests a more plausible explanation of the positive words accorded to each religious grouping. James had written the work to strengthen Prince Henry's grip on the throne by keeping his ecclesiastical options open; it was hardly a coherent 'design' for ruling through deceit, more an overly optimistic attempt to convince himself and his son that the king could please everyone. However, the idea of James's works as interventions to increase his royal authority, whether by stealth or coercion, has persisted since the 1650s. The two-dimensional picture of James's life as a conspiracy to maximise his power had room to include his literary works as another telling detail.

It seems, in fact, that the success of the attempt to rewrite Jacobean history as a series of conspiracies resulted in a widespread assumption that the works attributed to James were part of some kind of malevolent plot. Even writers whose concerns were not primarily political seem to have assimilated this way of reading King James. For example, Thomas Ady, who wrote against the persecution of witches, arguing that there was no evidence that the devil actually gave human beings power over others, found it necessary to refute James's Daemonologie.⁴ Ady, who had access to the 1617 Workes, was clearly ignorant of the fact that Daemonologie had been originally published in Scotland in 1597, and makes the remarkable suggestion that the work had actually been written by James Montagu, Bishop of Winchester and the editor of the Workes.⁵ He goes on to make the equally strange claim that the work had been written to uphold Catholic doctrine:

Whether this Work was either composed by King James, or by the Bishop, may be very well suspected, or rather by some Scottish man, blinded by some Scottish Mist, who desired to set forth his own Tenents for the upholding of Popish errours, and Popish Writers, sufficiently confuted before by Scot, in his Discovery of Witchcraft, he not being able any whit to answer Scot in his Discourse, laboureth to uphold false Tenents and Doctrins, by the authority of a King, because he could not finde any thing in the Scriptures to uphold them⁶

Ady goes on to remark 'this Author wrote not according to Scripture, but by phantasy and imagination', and his deconstruction of James's arguments and examples is overwhelmingly successful.⁷ However, the suggestion that Daemonologie was a piece of Catholic propaganda, cunningly using the authority of James's name to win the respect its reasoning failed to command, is not only untrue but superfluous to Ady's argument. Now that the original circumstances in which James's works were written and published were being forgotten, it was all too easy to read them through the prism of republican scandal and satire.

The royalists attempted to produce their own accounts of Jacobean times, but seem to have been unable to break free from the paradigm of exposing secrets and private letters established by the republican narratives. In particular, it is striking that there does not seem to have been any concerted effort to rehabilitate James's status as a writer. At the core of many of the royalist and episcopalian histories, already hampered in their defence of James by the success of their opponents' format, is the real dislike of the fact that King James had written at all, which had been evident in the writings of many royalist authors from James Montagu to King Charles himself. Thomas Fuller, in The Church-History of Britain (1655), which is partly written against the Puritan combination of documents and narrative that is Arthur Wilson's The History of Great Britain (1653), makes a strangely feeble appeal to James's books:

His judgment was most solid in matters of Divinity, not fathering Books of others, (as some of His Predecessours) but His Works are allowed His own by His very adversaries.⁸

A mere assertion of James's authorship was hardly going to reappropriate James's writings for the episcopalian cause, or rehabilitate James's reputation. Although some writers, like Gataker and Ady mentioned above, had denied that James had really written the works issued in his name, many of the writers of scandal-history were only too ready to accept James's responsibility for writings they scorned.

The satirist Francis Osborne, for example, who claimed that James had murdered Prince Henry, and suggested that he had practised sodomy, remarked of James's books that they were 'said, and no doubt truly, to be of his writing'. Osborne went on to tell how James had made himself ridiculous by issuing publications, which were:

252

praised by flatterers; which elated his imagination to so high an esteeme of his Wisdome, that he out of an impertinent emulation was thought to affect S^r Walter Rawly the lesse because of the great repute that followed him for his excellent Penne...⁹

Osborne, deploring James's intolerant attitude towards the Catholics, recounted how James had:

increased their despaire by daily threats of worse, and Invectives owned as written by himselfe, which though some might consider as too Theatricall to be real, yet others not so well vers'd in his Majesties Royall craft... may be excus'd in part...¹⁰

Osborne took particular delight in recalling the proclamations of the 'Sylvan Prince' against those who had killed his deer.¹¹ Fuller's assertion that James had written all he claimed simply facilitates Osborne's attempt to deal another blow to the Stuart reputation.

Later editions of Osborne's Advice to a Son contain the following crushing passage, which is very much in Osborne's style if not actually by him:

And, though King James had such an over-esteem of his own Learning, that he Imagined all who deserved in that kind, robbed the Monument he sought to build to his Fame: the Foundation of which he fondly conceited to have laid in the Opinion of the World by his Printed Books, believing they would be valued by impartial Posterity, at the same rate his Flatterers set them up to in his life time; Yet in this he was so far exceeded by his Son, that all that came after may learn, Experience is a better Tutor than Buchanan.¹²

The royalist and episcopalian histories cannot help confirming this picture of James's writings as the products of vanity which escaped from his control. The cursory remarks of writers like Fuller in relation to James's writings suggests that they cannot see how to liberate James's works from the narrative of their adversaries which emphasises writings like the Letter and Directions to uphold the account of James as a manipulative and bigoted despot whose people eventually assumed control over the interpretation of his words. The royalists are being led to the same conclusion as

their opponents: that James's works were conceited, unnecessarily provocative and ultimately self-defeating.

This is explicitly acknowledged by one of the more thoughtful exponents of the episcopalian cause, Godfrey Goodman, the Bishop of Gloucester, whose work The Court of King James was written in the 1650s, but not printed until 1839.¹³ Goodman, perhaps the most Roman of all the Caroline Anglo-Catholic bishops, wrote to record the history of his times, apparently drawing on his friendship with James's Treasurer Lionel Cranfield.¹⁴ Goodman is particularly interested in exposing the inconsistencies of Weldon, to whom he refers, with mock courtesy, as 'the knight'. Goodman is so successful because he is not afraid that his attack on the republicans will prove damaging to King James; perhaps because he was not writing for publication, he does not hesitate to criticise James for having an exaggerated view of his authority, and for promulgating the theory of passive obedience.¹⁵ Goodman does not spare James for his literary activities:

In the next place I will tax my good old master King James, being a king and having so much employment and business in state affairs, for taking upon himself to write controversies in religion, and, which is more, to expound the Apocalypse, and therein to point out the Antichrist. Certainly he did not advise with his divines; or if he did, they out of their timorous dispositions were afeard to displease him, or to contradict anything which he himself had conceived: which I do believe by many instances; as where he writes, that he was as good a man as the Pope.¹⁶

It seems likely that Goodman was only articulating a view held by the majority of royalist and pro-episcopal writers, and probably by King Charles himself. If such leading royalists felt that James should not have set pen to paper, that may explain, in part, their failure to justify him.

The royalists were clearly unable to incorporate a satisfactory account of James and his writings within narratives upholding the policies and beliefs of King Charles. It is interesting that Royce MacGillivray, in his important survey of Interregnum and Restoration histories, concludes that in general the royalist historians were much more confident in justifying the rule of the Stuarts, than their opponents were in criticising it.¹⁷ This does not seem to be true of the controversies over King James and his words, and as MacGillivray reveals, Laudian royalists like Peter Heylyn were fiercely critical of the king they understood to have created the problems which King Charles and the Anglican church would be destroyed while trying to undo.¹⁸ An Aunt Sally to the republicans, a painful embarrassment to the royalists; by the end of the 1650s the prospects for James's literary and political reputation seemed bleak.

II. Reading King James after 1660: a Restoration?

The history of the reception of King James's writings does not, of course, terminate in 1660; nor do the patterns which have been traced in this thesis give a complete picture of what became of his words. There were other traditions of reading which did not end in destructive satire or historical collections, and which survived through the 1650s and beyond. The appearance of editions of James's 'table-talk' published between 1643 and 1715, which largely managed to escape being appropriated for polemical purposes, and the revival of interest in A Covnter-Blaste to Tobacco as a piece of witty literature in the 1670s, qualify the above account, and are discussed in detail in Appendix Four, which it is hoped will form a basis for future research.

Equally, my contention that the authority of works like Basilicon Doron was severely damaged by its abuse by political factions in the Civil War needs to be qualified in the light of the fact that several of James's political works were revived under Charles II and James II, and were used as interventions in the debates over the king's religious policies. Although this happened on a smaller scale in comparison with the exploitation of James's works in the 1630s and 1640s, it is an significant indication that despite the huge interpretive shift in the 1640s and 1650s, his texts were still alive. The reading communities which had inherited the long tradition of struggles to reinterpret Basilicon Doron, to turn the Letter and Directions into a weapon against repressive prelacy, and to make the 1610 speech into a vehicle for resistance theory, were still drawn to writings which they had previously abandoned or rejected. In particular, the Puritan reading community, who had rejected James's

words in the time of their ascendancy, now returned to pick up their discarded literary weapons.

In 1660, a work entitled King James His Apology for the Oath of Allegiance was published in London.¹⁹ This was a reprint of Triplici Nodo, Triplex Cuneus. Or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, James's attempt to justify the new oath designed to separate politically loyal Catholics from those who might be inclined to actions like the Gunpowder Plot, which was first printed in early 1608. The text seems to be based on either one of the editions printed in 1609 and issued with A Premonition, or the text in the 1617 Workes. It seems highly likely that the Restoration was the catalyst for this republication, which was perhaps intended as a contribution to the attempts to persuade all English and Scottish subjects to believe the Declaration of Breda and submit to Charles II, even though they might differ from him in points of religion.

It is easier to see how Triplici Nodo was being conceived by another reprint, The Best Fence Against Popery, which was probably published in about 1670.²⁰ This work, written 'By a Learned Divine', is an explicit defence of the Congregationalist position, and argues that Independent beliefs are entirely compatible with the Oath of Supremacy. The writer's intention is clearly to promote Congregationalism by presenting the movement as faithful subjects. In order to show that the Oath does not give kings any spiritual power over the beliefs of individuals, the author quotes James explaining the limited purpose of the Oath of Supremacy.²¹ The work concludes with a 'postscript' containing an extract from Triplici Nodo, probably using the first edition of 1607/8, in which James distinguishes between the Oath of Supremacy and the new Oath of Allegiance, and argues that Catholic subjects who

would not take the latter would effectively endorse rebellion.²² Although the writer edits James's text to make it more concise, one suspects that he had not fully understood the nature of James's argument, which is almost entirely concerned with the Oath of Allegiance, with which The Best Fence is not really concerned. The writer is aware that James's texts could be useful for the Independent cause, but his use of Triplici Nodo suggests he was not particularly familiar with the nature and origins of the material he cites.

Post-Restoration attempts to revive James's political writings frequently seem to reproduce texts just because a word or phrase suggests they have some relevance to contemporary debates, even when this is hardly the case. King James His Charge to the Judges, a short tract published in 1679, was probably intended to stimulate the mood of popular excitement caused by the Popish Plot, and to encourage the judges to be rigorous in punishing those Catholics hauled before them accused of treason.²³ This is an extract from James's speech in the Star Chamber of 20 June 1616, in which he advises the judges how to deal with the various kinds of recusants.²⁴ James informs them that they should be lenient to peaceable Catholics, both priests and laity, but strict with those who led others to Rome, who refused to take the Oath of Allegiance, or who broke from prison. In the 1679 edition, there is no commentary, but the selection of text suggests that the editor had come across a work in which a king was giving orders for dealing with papists, and had decided to publish it without considering the fact that James was actually pursuing a moderate course of action, and in very different circumstances to the 1670s.

One suspects that the republication of the complete Basilicon Doron in 1682 was also connected with Charles II's attempts to reaffirm his authority in the

aftermath of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, but once again, the lack of commentary makes it difficult to discern the publisher's intentions. The fact that the copy in the National Library of Scotland is bound up with an edition of Eikon Basilike printed in 1681 may indicate a royalist purpose, but it is difficult to say much about the purpose of this reprint.²⁵ It may, however, have contributed to an interesting debate over the intentions of Basilicon Doron. A pamphlet entitled Presentments of the Grand-Jury for the Town and Borough of Southwark appeared in 1683, and cited Basilicon Doron as evidence that James had opposed the Puritan party, in order to urge the suppression of the dissenters.²⁶

This pamphlet met with a robust response, A Just Vindication of the Honour of King James, apparently printed in 1683.²⁷ In defence of the dissenters, suffering persecution after the fall of the Whig party, A Just Vindication gives a detailed account of the writing and first publication of Basilicon Doron, in order to show that James's meaning was not anti-Puritan in the modern sense. After explaining how details of the work had been leaked after the first printing of seven copies, the writer comments:

So Great a King could not want Enemies; The Sun it self is obscured by those ungrateful Vapours which are raised out of the Earth by his Influence: but amongst all his Enemies, none were more concern'd out of Interest to Asperse his Pious Intentions, than the Jesuits... who have greedily laid hold on some few passages in the Book, to Reproach the Puritans, by which Title, they branded in those days all Reformed Protestants.²⁸

Overlooking the fact that it was the Kirk Assembly which had first criticised James's expressions, the author makes a case that the Catholic party had deliberately misinterpreted Basilicon Doron in order to turn him against his own people. The writer describes James's decision to issue the work publicly, and notes James's

attempts in the new preface to clarify what he meant by 'Puritans'. The conclusion is easily reached that

the Words of King James are grosly mistaken, or wilfully misapplied; That he means not by *those Puritans*, such as the generality of Dissenters now are; and that he has in his Preface to his said Book, abundantly satisfied the World of his true and pious Intentions.²⁹

The tone of the pamphlet is irritable, and there are some striking errors in this argument, such as the assumption that the public edition of Basilicon Doron first appeared in London.³⁰ Despite the attempt to muster some bibliographical scholarship to support the reappropriation of James for the Puritan cause, again one gets the impression that James's texts are not being understood, and consequently not performing the political act required of them. The writer of this pamphlet feels the need to rebut his opponents, but does not really want to get involved in the task of rereading King James.

The same is true of a complete reprint of James's speech to Parliament of 19 March 1604, which was published 1689 as The Speech of King James.³¹ This reprint has an address to the reader which explains:

The Inducement to the Publishing of this worthy Speech, is no other than to intimate to the World the disrelish that so Learned a King had against the Impious Faction of Jesuitism and Popery; both which have always been look'd upon as the Enemies of our Peace and Unanimity; so that it pleased God to appoint him in a great measure, to make us Happy in our Pious, and now well secured Reformation.

The editor clearly wishes to insinuate that the beliefs of James VI & I should be contrasted with those of the recently-deposed James VII & II. However, it is difficult to see how this aim is furthered by printing the whole speech, which deals with a wide variety of topics, and which was written to appease Catholics as much as the

Puritans. The garbling of the text suggests further that this is not a particularly well-informed republication.³²

One work of 1681, however, bears a title which sets it firmly in the tradition of the Civil War pamphlets which had turned James's words against King Charles with such skill. Vox Regis: Or, the Difference Betwixt a King Ruling by Law, and a Tyrant by His Own Will describes itself on the title-page as 'an Appendix to Vox Populi'.³³ Although both 'Vox Regis' and 'Vox Populi' were titles of pamphlets purportedly written by Thomas Scott during the Spanish Match crisis, the pamphlet to which this work claims to be an appendix is probably Vox Populi: or the Peoples Claim to their Parliaments Sitting, published in 1681 to appeal for a Parliament-led crackdown on Catholics. Vox Populi stresses the importance of the need to distinguish between a king and a tyrant, and cites both Eikon Basilike's warnings against 'legal tyranny' and a few lines from the familiar passage from James's speech of 21 March 1610, using the text in Arthur Wilson's History (1653).³⁴

The 1681 Vox Regis sets itself even more squarely in the tradition of earlier pamphlets. The work consists of extracts from James's speech to Parliament of 19 March 1604, the speech of 21 March 1610, and the second book of Basilicon Doron, all of which are acknowledged with their original dates. In the reproduced section of the 1604 speech, James distinguishes between a king and a tyrant, claiming that as a lawful king his main aim is the welfare of his people.³⁵ There are a few omissions from the original text, but the only interesting change is the removal of James's word 'vassals' used to describe his subjects. James's condemnation of tyranny in 1610, which had been cited by Henry Burton, John Bastwick and Robert Baillie, is then reproduced, without omitting James's reminder that rebellion is unlawful.³⁶

Particular phrases warning that kings who disobey their own laws become tyrants, and denouncing those who encourage kings to act tyrannically, are italicised. The work goes on to give extracts from the same speech in which James praises the common law and denies that he disapproves of it; the impression created is one of James as a staunch upholder of the rights of law and Parliament. The editor includes James's words directed especially to the House of Commons regarding grievances, and by neatly suppressing the passages in which James tells them they have overstepped the mark, creates the impression that James was simply thankful to the representative body for having aired the discontents of the nation.³⁷

The extracts from the 1610 speech are followed by an extract from the second book of Basilicon Doron, in which James advises his son against tyranny.³⁸ This coupling obviously recalls The Dutie of a King (1642), and if it were not for the fact that the editor notes that he is using the Workes, one might suspect that he was using the earlier pamphlet. The text in the 1681 version contains several errors, but there does not seem to be any attempt to manipulate the text any more than has been done by selecting and juxtaposing it with the other passages. The overall effect of this work is quite powerful, not just because the extracts are so skilfully chosen, but because of the tradition in which the work sets itself. In the context of the disintegration of the Whig movement in 1681, and the revival of Tory and Catholic groupings, Charles II is being reminded in the most provocative manner that a significant body of his subjects will not tolerate actions they see as undermining established laws and customs. By recalling the Civil War pamphlets, the title informs Charles II that both James and Charles I had needed similar reminders.

Whereas the attempts of people like Henry Burton to use the words of King James for the same purpose had met with severe punishment, this work, which openly states its publication details, does not seem to have been suppressed. Other traditions of reading King James might have dissipated in the 1650s, but the pattern of using James's words against tyranny to correct unpopular policies was too powerful to be repressed in the 1680s. It seems likely that this publication influenced John Locke's Two Treatises of Government (1690), written against Robert Filmer, who had also made use of the 1610 speech. In a passage of the eighteenth chapter of the second treatise, which was probably written in about 1679-81, Locke quotes the speech in order to justify resistance to tyranny in certain circumstances.³⁹ As in earlier reworkings of the speech, Locke omits James's reminder that rebellion can never be justified.

It is extremely interesting that the overthrow of the House of Stuart in 1688 seems to have occasioned a celebratory publication based on Vox Regis. K. James's Opinion of a King, of a Tyrant, published in 1689, contains the extracts from the speeches of 1604 and 1610, but not the passage from Basilicon Doron.⁴⁰ Richard Baldwin, who published The Speech of King James, mentioned above, in the same year, clearly perceived a persisting interest in applying James's words to contemporary politics. There is a remarkable continuity of reading King James on this subject, from the 1630s to the end of the 1680s: James might be forgotten or despised in other respects, but his words against oppressive rulers remained powerfully alive.

I have endeavoured to sketch the outlines of a history of the reception of James's works, but future research will have much to add. The transmission of

James's writings across Continental Europe has been touched upon, but many questions remain unanswered. James Craigie's bibliographies for the editions published by the Scottish Text Society indicate that the translation and republishing of his works in many different countries continued when interest in England and Scotland was restricted to using a few of the political works for propaganda. Work could be done on the publication of Assertio Juris Monarchici in Regno Scotorum, a Latin version of The True Law of Free Monarchies printed in 1653, probably in the Low Countries.⁴¹ The translation into Latin is a completely new one, despite the availability of the text in the Opera of 1619. This may be linked with the activities of the exiled court of Charles II, or may represent genuine local interest in James's policies. Equally, it would be most interesting to know why the complete Latin Opera was republished at Frankfurt in 1689.⁴² This account has been based on reprints of and extracts from James's works in printed books: a survey of manuscript copies of and commentaries upon his texts might fill in or alter the structure of this narrative. A full bibliography of James's works, with a detailed study of library holdings and provenance information, would greatly facilitate such work. As has been shown, the fate of James's writings is closely bound up with the progress of the pamphlet wars, and more work needs to be done on the bibliography of the surviving pamphlet collections, and on the theories of authorship and readership they display.

Such studies have great potential to illuminate early modern literary practice and theory, and consequently the origins of modern critical thought. The writing of more studies of the seventeenth-century pamphlets which rely on or recycle earlier texts, which would look at the transmission of works by writers like Francis Bacon, Walter Raleigh, Queen Elizabeth or Robert Cotton as well as King James, would be a

major contribution to literary scholarship. Modern research into seventeenth-century culture and politics has tended to brilliantly illuminate particular incidents or conditions at the cost of losing a sense of temporal continuity. A study of traditions, readings, and recycling can point to the enduring existence of networks and communities of scholars, editors, controversialists and preachers, and can show the real connections between early modern literary theory and practice, and the development of the great constitutional conflicts. The history of readings of King James is without doubt simply one thread of many untraced patterns, which reveal the activities of real people endeavouring to understand and use texts in relation to the pressing concerns of a changing society.

The importance of these readings of James's words will only become clear once the wider picture is available. However, the fact that so many versions of his texts circulated during the Civil War, and that these texts remained at the centre of many political and religious controversies until after the Revolution, suggests that these readings will hold a special place in a future history of seventeenth-century interpretive history. James VI and I might not have approved of the doctrines which his readers espoused, but it is pleasant to think that in some strange way the remarkable extent to which reading communities had been empowered through his texts confirms his belief in the power of the word of a king. James had frequently lamented his inability to control readings of his words, but he did not realise that the transformative potential of the written word existed because of its very vulnerability to interpretation by readers. James's oversight ensured that his writings persisted in the minds of his reading subjects, and that interpretations of his words would continue to live and grow down to the start of the eighteenth century.

¹There is an excellent introduction to post-Civil War historical controversy in Ronald Hutton, The Royalist War Effort 1642-1646, London & New York: Longman, 1982, [xi]-xvi.

²Thomas Gataker, His Vindication of the Annotations, London: b. J. L. f. Christopher Meredith, 1653, Wing G328, sig. L1^v-2^r. Part of this passage is given in Craigie (1950), 15-16.

³The passage in italics is a paraphrase from the preface of Basilicon Doron; the relevant text can be found in Craigie (1944), 14-17 and Sommerville (1994), 5-7.

⁴Ady is discussed in Craigie (1982), 156, and in Stuart Clark, 'King James's *Daemonologie*: Witchcraft and Kingship', in Sydney Angelo (ed.), The Damned Art: Essays in the Literature of Witchcraft, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977, 156-181, p. 173.

⁵James VI & I, Daemonologie, Edinbvrgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, 1597, STC 14364; see Dunlap (1975).

⁶Thomas Ady, A Candle in the Dark, London: f. Robert Ibbitson, 1655, Wing A673, sig. T2^v. There were several more editions of this work in the 1650s.

⁷sig. T3^v; the analysis of Daemonologie runs from sig. T2^r-V3^v.

⁸sig. 4P1^v

⁹In 'Traditionall Memoyres on the Raigne of King James', the second part of Osborne's anonymously published Historical Memoires, London: b. J. Grismond, s. b. T. Robinson, 1658, Wing O515, sig. H4^v.

¹⁰sig. [H6^v-7^r]

¹¹sig. [I7^v]

¹²Francis Osborne, The Works, 'Eighth edition', London: f. R. D. s. b. Allen Banks, 1682, Wing O506, sig. B3^r; see Craigie (1950), 55.

¹³Godfrey Goodman, ed. John S. Brewer, The Court of King James the First, 2 vols., London: Richard Bentley, 1839

¹⁴Menna Prestwich, Cranfield: Politics and Profits under the Early Stuarts - The Career of Lionel Cranfield Earl of Middlesex, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966, 12, 584

¹⁵Goodman (1839), 267-70

¹⁶Goodman (1839), 214

¹⁷MacGillivray (1974), [226]-227

¹⁸MacGillivray (1974), 29-37.

¹⁹King James His Apology for the Oath of Allegiance, London: f. Henry Eversden, 1660, Wing J126. I am using the copy in the National Library of Scotland, shelfmark Gray.135, which has been annotated by a reader clearly sympathetic to James's opinions.

²⁰The Best Fence Against Popery, London: f. J. Robinson & S. Crouch, n.d., Wing B2056. Wing gives this work the date 1670, but the BLC dates one of its copies 1640, the other 1656; as the work discusses Charles II's declarations of 1660, Wing's date seems more likely. It is possible that the British Library has copies of earlier editions not recorded by Wing.

²¹sig. C2^r; Triplici Nodo (1607/8) sig. [F4^r], O2^v (the page references given in The Best Fence are inaccurate); Sommerville (1994), 103, 129

²²sig. [K3^{r-v}]; Triplici Nodo (1607/8), sig. F3^v-G2^r; Sommerville (1994), 103-5

²³King James His Charge to the Judges, London: f. Langley Curtise, 1679, Wing J129. There is a highly readable account of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis in George Macaulay Trevelyan, England under the Stuarts, 19th edition, Methuen, 1947, 318-54.

²⁴In Sommerville (1994), the relevant text is on 223-4.

²⁵ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ, London: b. M. Flesher f. Joseph Hindmarsh, 1682, Wing J128, National Library of Scotland shelfmark XX.5/1.1(3); see Craigie (1950), 149-50. The work was also issued with a different title page - ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ, London: b. M. Flesher f. Samuel Mearne, 1682, Wing J128A.

²⁶Presentments of the Grand-Jury for the Town and Borough of Southwark, colop: London: f. Benj. Tooke, 1683, Wing P3291

²⁷A Just Vindication of the Honour of King James, colop: London: f. R. Oswell, [1683], Wing J1243. This Wing entry is misplaced, as the work refers to James VI & I, not James VII & II. James Craigie strangely interprets this work as an attack on the 'sectaries', in the tradition of A Puritane Set Forth (1642); Craigie (1950), 53.

²⁸sig. A1^r

²⁹sig. [A2^r]

³⁰sig. A1^v

³¹The Speech of King James, London: f. Richard Baldwin, 1689, Wing J144

³²See for example sig. [B3^r], where the text reads 'partakers' instead of the correct 'perturbers'.

³³Vox Regis: Or, the Difference Betwixt a King Ruling by Law, and a Tyrant by His Own Will, London: f. Francis Smith, 1681, Wing J148. I am using the copy in the Bodleian Library, shelfmark C.8.24(6)Linc. See Craigie (1950), 185-6.

³⁴Vox Populi: or the Peoples Claim to their Parliaments Sitting, London: f. Francis Smith, 1681, Wing V729, sig. A2^v, [B3^{r-v}]

³⁵sig. A2^r; Sommerville (1994), 143-4

³⁶sig. A2^v-[A4^r]; Sommerville (1994), 183+

³⁷sig. [A4^r]; see Sommerville (1994), 189-90.

³⁸sig. [A4^{r-v}]; Craigie (1944), 54-59; Sommerville (1994), 20-1

³⁹Peter Laslett (ed.), John Locke - Two Treatises of Government - A Critical Edition, Cambridge: CUP, 1960, 417-8. See Burgess (1992), 148.

⁴⁰K. James's Opinion of a King, of a Tyrant, colop: London: f. R[ichard]. Baldwin, 1689, Wing J141. I am using the copy in the National Library of Scotland, shelfmark Jolly.1040(11), which is bound in a collection of tracts approving the deposition of James VII & II.

⁴¹Assertio Juris Monarchici in Regno Scotorum, [Netherlands?]: 1653, Wing A4020 (old edition). The new edition of Wing removes this work as a continental publication. See Craigie (1982), 202. I am using the copy in the National Library of Scotland, shelfmark L.C.1686

⁴²See Craigie (1950), 160.

Bibliography of Printed Books Cited

As previously stated, if no place of publication is mentioned, it can assumed to be London. Many early seventeenth-century pamphlets, particularly those which are in some way 'recycled', are notoriously difficult to catalogue - should they be entered under the name of the original writer or the editor / translator, the author whose name appears on the title-page or the author identified by Wing? When several options are available, I have frequently opted to record such works by *title*. For simplicity's sake I have arranged works placed under the heading 'James I' in STC and Wing in the same order chosen by those catalogues, and any works with an STC entry between 14344 and 14419.5, or a Wing entry between J126 and J149 should be sought under the heading 'James VI & I'. These entries can be checked against those listed chronologically in Appendix One. It should be noted that all works mentioned for the first time in the appendices are given an entry in this bibliography.

I. Works printed before 1700

- Abbot, George, The Coppie of a Letter, Oxford: b. John Lichfield & James Short, 1622, STC 33
- Abolishing of the Booke of Common Prayer, The, [London]: b. & s. b. Samuel Satterthwaite, 1641, Wing A97, Thomason E. 178 (2)
- Ady, Thomas, A Candle in the Dark, London: f. Robert Ibbitson, 1655, Wing A673
- Answer vnto the Nine Points of Controuersy, proposed by our late Soueraygne, The, [St.Omer: English College Press, 1625], STC 10911
- Anti-Montacvtvm, 'Edenbvrgi' [London: b. B. Alsop & T. Fawcet], 1629, STC 18040
- Apophthegmata Aurea, Regia, Carolina, London: b. William Du-gard f. Francis Eglesfield, 1649, Wing A3560A, Thomason E. 1217 (1)
- Appeale of the Orthodox Ministers, An, 'Edenbvrgi' [London: b. B. Alsop & T. Fawcet], 1641, Wing A3566, Thomason E. 206 (11)
- Articles Drawn up By the now Iohn Earle of Bristoll, London: f. I. A., 1642, Wing B4791, Thomason E. 126 (20)
- Assertio Juris Monarchici in Regno Scotorum, [Netherlands?]: 1653, Wing A4020 (old edition)
- Bacon, Francis, Apophthegmes New and Old, London: f. Hanna Barret & Richard Whittaker, 1625, STC 1115
- _____, A Speech, London: Printed, 1641, Wing B326, Thomason E. 158 (6)
- _____, Three Speeches, London: b. Richard Badger f. Samuel Brown, 1641, Wing B337, Thomason E. 199 (1)
- Baillie, Robert, An Historicall Vindication, London: f. Samuel Gellibrand, 1646, Wing B460, Thomason E. 346 (11)
- _____, Ladensivm...The Canterbvrians Self-Conviction, [Glasgow: b. G. Anderson], 1640, STC 1205
- Baker, R[ichard], A Chronicle of the Kings of England, London: f. & s. b. Daniel Frere, 1643, Wing B501
- [Balcanquall, Walter], A Large Declaration, London: Robert Young, 1639, STC 21906

- Bastwick, John, The Answer of Iohn Bastwick, [Leiden: b. W. Christiaens], 1637, STC 1573
- Bayly ['Baylie'], Tho[mas]., Certamen Religiosum, [London]: b. H. Hills s. b. George Whittington, 1649, Wing B1506, Thomason E. 1355 (1)
- Bayly, Tho[mas]., The Golden Apophthegms of His Royall Maiesty King Charles, London: b. John Clowes, 1660, Wing G1012, Thomason E. 184 (3)
- B[ayly]., T[homas]., Worcesters Apophthegmes, London: b. J. Clowes f. Edward Blackmore, 1650, Wing W3535, Thomason E. 1350 (2)
- Behold! Two Letters, n. p., 1642, Wing G1880, Thomason E. 238 (18)
- Best Fence Against Popery, London: f. J. Robinson & S. Crouch, n.d., Wing B2056
- B[lount]., T[homas]., Animadversions upon Sr Richard Baker's Chronicle, Oxon: H. H. f. Ric. Davies, 1672, Wing B3327
- Briefe Declaration of The Reasons that moved King James of blessed memory, and the State, to erect a Colledge of Divines, and other Learned men at Chelsey, A, London: b. E. P. f. Nicholas Bourne, 1645/6, Wing B4564, Thomason E. 324 (12)
- [Browne, Edward], Rules for Kings and Good Counsell for Subjects: Being a collection of certaine places of holy Scripture, f. T. Paibody & E. Dobson, 1642, Wing B5105A
- [Buchanan, George] (ed.), De Maria Scotorum Regina, [London: b. John Day, 1571], STC 3978
- Buchanan, G[eorge]. (ed.), A Detection of the Actions of Mary Queen of Scots, Printed, 1651, Wing B5281, Thomason E. 1383 (2)
- B[uchanan]., G[eorge]. (ed.) [transl. T. Wilson?], Ane Detectioun of the Duinges, [London: b. John Day, 1571], STC 3981
- [Buchanan, George], Tyrannicall-Government Anatomized: A Discourse Concerning Evill-Councillors, London: f. John Field, 1642/3, Wing B5298, Thomason E. 88 (29)
- Burges, John, A Sermon preached before the late King James... 1604 London: b. Thomas Brudenell, 1642, Wing B5720, Thomason E. 145 (5)
- Burton, Henry, For God, and the King, 1636, STC 4141
- B[urton]., H[enry]., A Plea to an Appeale, London: b. W. I[ones]., 1626, STC 4153
- Cabala, Mysteries of State, in Letters of the Great Ministers of K. James and K. Charles, London: f. M. M. G. Bedell & T. Collins, 1654, Wing C183, Thomason E. 221 (3)
- Calderwood, David, The True History of the Church of Scotland [Edinburgh?]: 1678, Wing C279
- Carier, [Benjamin], A Treatise, n. p., [English Secret Press], 1614, STC 4623.5
- Cat May look upon a King, A, London: f. William Raybould, 1652/3, Wing W1271, Thomason E. 1408 (2)
- Charles I, His Majesties Declaration and Speech, London: f. R. Smith, 1648, Wing C2186
- Charles II, To the most Reverend Father in God, William, colop: London: b. John Bill & Christopher Barker, 1662, Wing C3613
- Cook, John, King Charls his Case, London: b. Peter Cole f. Giles Calvert, 1649, Wing C6025, Thomason E. 542 (3)

- Cornwallis, Charles, A Discourse of the most Illustrious Prince Henry... 1626, London: f. John Benson, 1641, Wing C6329, Thomason E. 178 (6)
- [Cotton, Robert], A Short View of the Long Life and Raigne of Henry the Third, [J. Okes & B. Alsop & T. Fawcet f. Ben. Fisher], 1627, STC 5864
- Covrt of the Most Illvstrious and Most Magnificent James, The, 'A. D. B.', London: b. Edw. Griffin, 1619, STC 1022
- [Crompton, William], Saint Avstins Religion, [b. G. Purlowe], 1625, STC 6060
- Curll, Walter, A Sermon... 28. of April, London: b. John Bill, 1622, STC 6132
- Declaration of the Commons, A, London: f. Edward Husband, 1647/8, Wing E2559, Thomason E. 427 (9)
- Declaratiovn of the Kings Maiesties Intentiovn and Meaning, A, Edinburgh: b. Thomas Vautroullier, 1585, STC 21948
- Declaration of the Lords and Commons...Concerning the publishing of divers Proclamations...in His Majesties Name, London: f. Ed. Husbands & Jo. Franck, 1642, Wing E1398, Thomason 669. f. 5 (54)
- Definition of a King, The, With the Cure of a King wilfully mad, and the way to prevent Tyranny, London: f. Thomas Banks, 1642, Wing D825, Thomason E. 118 (18)
- Delitiæ Poetarvm Scotorvm hujus ævi Illvstrivm, Vol. 2, Amsterdami: apud Iohannem Blaev, 1637
- Die Veneris, London: f. Thomas Underhill, 1643, Thomason 669.f.7(12)
- Discoverie of the Hellish Plot, A, London: f. John Greensmith, 1642, Wing D1653, Thomason E. 132 (14)
- Discription of Scotland, A, by observation of doctor Corbett in his majesties progresse into that country, 'The fourth edition', [Netherlands?], 1626, STC 25228.5
- Donne, John, A Sermon, London: f. Thomas Jones, 1622, STC 7054
- Dravidio, Georgio, Bibliotheca Classica, Francofurti ad Moenum: impensis Balthasaris Ostern, 2 vols., 1625
- Du Bartas, Guillaume de Saluste, La Seconde Sepmaine, La Rochelle: par Hierosme Haultin, 1591
- _____, La Seconde Semaine, n. p., [par H. Haultin], 1588
- _____, Les Trophees, La Rochelle: par Hierosme Haultin, 1591
- _____, II. Partie de la Svite des Oevvres, n. p. [Genève: par H. Haultin] pour Jacques Chouët, 1598
- Du Moulin, Pierre ['Peter'], transl. I. Heath, The Accomplishment of the Prophecies, Oxford: b. Ioseph Barnes & s. b. Iohn Barnes, 1613, STC 7306
- Eglisham, George, A Declaration to the Kingdome of England, Concerning The poysoning of King James, London: f. Geo. Horton, 1648, Wing E255, Thomason E. 427 (5)
- _____, The Forerunner of Revenge, 'Franckfort' [i.e. Netherlands?]: 1626, STC 7548
- _____, The Fore-Runner of Revenge, London: 1642, Wing E256cA, Thomason E. 119 (15)
- _____, Prodromus Vindictæ, [Brussels]: 1626
- Eikon Basilike, [London: Richard Royston], 1648, Wing E272
- Elizabeth I, Injvnctions given by the Qveenenes Majestie... 1559, [London]: Printed, 1641, Wing E529

- _____, Qveene Elizabeths Speech to her Last Parliament, [1642], Wing E534, Thomason E. 200 (15)
- Elton, Edward, Gods Holy Mind Tovching Matters Morall, b. A. M[athewes] & I. N[orton], 1625, STC 7619
- English Pope, The, London: f. Robert Bostock, 1643, Wing E3109, Thomason E. 56 (13)
- Epistle Congratvlorie of Lysimachus Nicanor, The, [Dublin: Society of Stationers], 1640, STC 5751
- Everard, Giles, Panacea; Or The Universal Medicine, London: f. Simon Miller, 1659, Wing E3530, Thomason E. 1907 (2)
- Everartus, Ægidius (ed.), De Herba Panacea, Vltrajecti: pro Davide ab Hoogenvysen, 1644
- Exact and True Relation of the Battell...at Acton, A, London: f. Tho: Cook, 1642, Wing E3614, Thomason E. 127 (8)
- Examination of Colonell Lunsford, The, n. p., f. Tho: Cooke, 1642, Wing E3715, Thomason E. 127 (29)
- Fathers Blessing, The, London: [b. B. Alsop] f. Leonard Becket, 1616, STC 14358
- Featley, Daniel, Cygnea Cantio, London: [b. M. Flesher] f. Robert Mylbourne, 1629, STC 10731
- [____], The Fisher Caughted in his Owne Net, 1623, STC 10732
- [____], A Parallel of New-Old Pelagiarminian Error, London: f. Robert Milbourne, 1626, STC 10735
- _____, The Romish Fisher Cavght and Held, London: H. L[ownes & W. Stansby]. f. Robert Milbourne, 1624, STC 10738
- Five Yeares of King James, The, London: f. W. R., 1643, Wing W2887, Thomason E. 101 (14)
- [Frankland, Thomas], The Annals of King James and King Charles, London: b. Tho. Braddyll f. Robert Clavel, 1681, Wing F2078
- Fuller, Thomas, The Church-History of Britain, London: f. Iohn Williams, 1655, Wing F2416
- _____, The Holy State, Cambridge: b. Roger Daniels f. John Williams, 1642, Wing F2443
- Fvneral Elegie Vpon The lamentable losse of our late Leige and Royall King James, A, London: f. Iohn Wright, [1625], STC 14423.3
- Gataker, Thomas, His Vindication of the Annotations, London: b. J. L. f. Christopher Meredith, 1653, Wing G328
- Good Covnsells for the Peace of Reformed Churches, Oxford: b. Leonard Lichfield f. William Webb, 1641, Wing D319
- Gretser, James, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ, sive Commentarius Exegeticus, Ingoltstadii: 1610
- Gun-powder Plot in Ireland, A, London: f. John Thomas, 1641, Wing C6868, Thomason E. 175 (6)
- Hacket, John, Scrinia Reserata, [London]: b. Edw. Jones f. Samuel Lowndes, 1693, Wing H171
- Herring, Francis, transl. John Vicars, Mischeefes Mysterie, b. E. Griffin, 1617, STC 13247

_____, transl. & enlarged by John Vicars, November the 5, 1605. The Qvintessence of Crvelty, London: b. G. M. f. R. Harford, 1641, Wing H1602, Thomason E. 1100 (1)

[_____] , Pietas Pontificia, b. J. Roberts f. R. Boyle, 1606, STC 13244

_____, Pietas Pontificia...sive secunda Historiæ pars, b. J. Windet, 1609, STC 13245

Heylyn, Peter, A Briefe and Moderate Answer, London: b. Ric. Hodgkinsonne, s. b. Daniel Frere, 1637, STC 13269

Heylyn, P[eter], Cyprianus Anglicus, London: f. A. Seile, 1668, Wing H1699

His Maiesties Declaration in Defence of The true Protestant Religion, 'First printed at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield, and since re-printed at London': 1643, Wing C2209, Thomason E. 106 (11)

Hollingworth, Richard, Dr. Hollingworth's Defence of K. Charles the First's Holy and Divine Book, London: f. Samuel Eddowes, 1629 [i.e. 1692], Wing H2503

Howson, John, To the Minister Church-Wardens, [Oxford: b. John Lichfield & James Short, 1622], STC 13880

Hudson, Tho[mas]., The Historye of Ivdith, Edinbvrgh: b. Thomas Vautroullier, 1584, STC 21671

Is. Casaboni Corona Regia, [abroad], 1615, STC 4744.7

James VI & I, A Commission with Instrvctions and Directions, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, 1622, STC 9242

_____, Declaration dv Serenissime Roy, Londres: [Eliot's Court Press] chez Iean Norton, 1612, STC 9229

_____, His Maiesties Declaration, Touching his Proceedings, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, 1621/2, STC 9241

_____, The Kings Maiesties Declaration to His Subiects, concerning lawfull Sports, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, 1618, STC 9238.9

_____, The Qvestions to be Resolvit, Edinbvrgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, 1597, STC 21891

Works by James VI & I, arranged as in STC

James VI & I, The Workes, London: b. Robert Barker & John Bill, 1616/7, STC 14344

_____, _____, London: b. Robert Barker & John Bill, 1620, STC 14345

_____, Opera, Londini: apud Bohamum Nortonium & Ioannem Billium, 1619, STC 14346

_____, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΑ ΔΟΩΑ, Londini: typis Richard Badger, 1640, STC 14347

_____, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΟΩΟΝ, Edinburgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, 1599, STC 14348

_____, _____, Edinburgh: b. Robert Walde-grave, 1603, STC 14349

_____, _____, 'Edenbvrgh: b. Henry Charteris' [abroad?], 1603, STC 14349.5

_____, _____, London: b. Felix Kyngston f. John Norton, 1603, STC 14350

_____, The Copie of His Maiesties Letter, London: [b. F. Kingston f. C. Burby], 1604, STC 14361

_____, The Copie of the K. Maiesties Letter to the L. Maior, [Edinburgh: b. R. Waldegrave, 1603], STC 14362

_____, A Covnter-Blaste to Tobacco, London: b. R[obert]. B[arker]., 1604, STC 14363

- _____, Daemonologie, Edinbvrgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, 1597, STC 14364
- _____, Daemonologie, London: [b. R. Bradock] f. William Aspley & W. Cotton, 1603, STC 14365
- _____, Declaration du Serenissime Roy, Londres: par Iehan Bill, 1615, STC 14367
- _____, A Remonstrance...for the Right of Kings, Cambridge: b. Cantrell Legge, 1616, STC 14369
- [_____] , The Essayes of a Prentise, Edinbrugh [*sic*]: b. Thomas Vautroullier, 1584, STC 14373
- _____, Flores Regij, 'collected by J. L. S.', London: b. B. A[lsop]. & T. F[awcet]. f. Ben. Fisher, 1627, STC 14375
- _____, Ane Frvitfvlll Meditatioun contening ane... Expositioun of ye 7. 8. 9. and 10 versis of the 20 Chap. of the Reuelation, Edinbvrgh: b. Henrie Charteris, 1588, STC 14376
- _____, A Fruitefull Meditation... laying open of the 7. 8. 9. and 10. verses of the 20. chap. of the Revelation, [London: b. R. Read] f. John Harrison, 1603, STC 14377
- _____, His Maiesties Graciovvs Letter to the Earle of Sovth-Hampton, London: b. Felix Kyngston, 1622, STC 14378
- _____, His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres, Edinburgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, 1591, STC 14379
- _____, His Maiesties Lepanto, London: b. Simon Stafford & Henry Hooke, 1603, STC 14379.3
- _____, The Kings Maiesties Letter to the Lords Grace of Canterbury, touching Preaching, and Preachers [no details of publication, 1622?], STC 14379.5
- _____, Lettre dy Roy D'Angleterre A Madame La Princesse de Condé, [London?], 1617, STC 14379.7
- _____, Ane Meditatiovn vpon the xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxviii, and xxix verses of the xv Chapt. of the first buke of the Chronicles, Edinburgh: b. Henrie Charteris, 1589, STC 14380
- _____, A Meditation vpon the xxv. xxvi. xxvii. xxviii. and xxix. verses of the xv. Chapter of the first Booke of the Chronicles, London: f. Felix Norton, 1603, STC 14381
- _____, A Meditation vpon the 27, 28, 29, verses of the XXVII Chapter of St. Matthew, London: b. Robert Barker & John Bill, 1620, STC 14381.5
- _____, _____, London: b. Iohn Bill, 1620, STC 14382
- _____, A Meditation vpon the Lords Prayer, London: b. Bonham Norton & Iohn Bill, 1619, STC 14384
- _____, transl. Thomas Murray ['Thoma Moravio'], Navpactiados, Londini: excudebat Johannes Norton, 1604, STC 14386
- [_____] , The Peace-Maker: Or, Great-Brittain's Blessing, London: b. Thomas Purfoot, 1618, STC 14387
- _____, The Kings Maiesties Speech, London: b. Robert Barker, 1604, STC 14390 - 14390.3
- _____, His Maiesties Speach, London: b. Robert Barker, 1605, STC 14392
- _____, His Maiesties Speech, London: b. Robert Barker, 1607, STC 14395
- _____, The Kings Maiesties Speach, London: Robert Barker, 1609/10, STC 14396

- _____, His Maiesties Speach in the Starre-Chamber, London: b. Robert Barker, [1616], STC 14397 - 14397.7
- _____, His Maiesties Speach in the Vpper House, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, 1621, STC 14399
- _____, Triplici Nodo, Triplex Cuneus. Or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, London: b. Robert Barker, 1607/8, STC 14400
- _____, A Premonition of his Maiesties to all most mightie Monarches, London: b. Robert Barker, 1609, STC 14401-14402
- [_____] , The Trve Lawe of free Monarchies, Edinbvrgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, 1598, STC 14409
- [_____] , The Trve Lawe of Free Monarchies, London: b. T. C[reede], 1603, STC 14410
- _____, Deus & Rex, Londini: 1615, STC 14415
- _____, God and the King, London: [b. J. Beale?], 1615, STC 14418.5
- _____, God and the King, London: [b. W. Jaggard, E. Alde etc.], 1615, STC 14419.5

Works by James VI & I, arranged as in Wing

- James VI & I, King James His Apology for the Oath of Allegiance, London: f. Henry Eversden, 1660, Wing J126
- _____, ed. B[enjamin]. A[gar]., King James his Apopthegmes; Or, Table-Talke: as they were by Him delivered Occasionally, London: b. B. W., 1643, Wing J127
- _____, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ, London: b. M. Flesher f. Joseph Hindmarsh, 1682, Wing J128
- _____, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ, London: b. M. Flesher f. Samuel Mearne, 1682, Wing J128A
- _____, King James His Charge to the Judges, London: f. Langley Curtise, 1679, Wing J129
- _____, A Commission with Instrvctions and Directions, [Oxford?]: f. H. H., 1644, Wing J130, Thomason E. 80 (3)
- _____, King James His Counterblast to Tobacco, London: f. John Hancock, 1672, Wing J131
- _____, A Declaration made by King James, in Scotland; Concerning, Church-Government, [London]: f. Matthew Walbancke, 1646, Wing J132, Thomason E. 506 (27)
- _____, His Maiesties Declaration, Touching his proceedings in... Parliament, London, Printed, 1642, Wing J133, Thomason E. 130 (19)
- _____, King James His Divine Prophecie of the Warres and Distractions, London: f. R. Austin, 1645, Wing J134, Thomason E. 274 (10)
- _____, The Dutie of a King in His Royall Office, London: f. I. B., 1642, Wing J135, Thomason E. 244 (14)
- _____, King James His Iudgment by way of counsell and advice, London: f. Thomas Cooke, 1642, Wing J136, Thomason E. 123 (12)

- _____, King James His Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant. Extracted out of His own Speech at White-Hall, [London]: 1642, Wing J137, Thomason E. 116 (20)
- _____, King James His Learned and Wise Speech, London: f. I. T., 1645, Wing J138
- _____, King James his Letter and Directions, [London]: f. Thomas Walkeley, 1642, Wing J139, Thomason E. 147 (16)
- _____, King James His Opinion and Iudgement, concerning a Reall King and a Tyrant, colop: [London]: 1647, Wing J140, Thomason E. 374 (3)
- _____, K. James's Opinion of a King, of a Tyrant, colop: London: f. R[ichard]. Baldwin, 1689, Wing J141
- _____, A Puritane Set Forth in his Lively Colours: Or, K. James his description of a Puritan, London: f. N. B., 1642, Wing J142, Thomason E. 113 (11)
- _____, Regales Aphorismi, London: b. B. A., 1650, Wing J143, Thomason E. 1408 (1)
- _____, The Speech of King James, London: f. Richard Baldwin, 1689, Wing J144
- _____, The Touchstone Or, Trial of Tobacco, London: printed, 1676, Wing J144A
- _____, The Trve Law of Free Monarchy, London: b. & s. b. T. P., 1642, Wing J145
- _____, A True Relation of the Commissions and Warrants for the Condemnation and Burning of Batholomew Legatt and Thomas Withman, London: f. Michael Spark, 1650, Wing J146
- _____, Two Broad-Sides Against Tobacco, London: f. John Hancock, 1672, Wing J147
- _____, Vox Regis: Or, the Difference Betwixt a King Ruling by Law, and a Tyrant by His Own Will, London: f. Francis Smith, 1681, Wing J148
- _____, Wittie Obseruations Gathered from our late Sovereign King James in his ordinarie Discourse, [London: 1643], Wing J149, Thomason E. 75 (12)
- James VII & II, To the most Reverend Fathers in God, London: b. Charles Bill, Henry Hills & Thomas Newcomb, 1685/6, Wing J389
- Jonson, Ben, Workes, London: b. Will Stansby, 1616, STC 14751
- [Ker, W.], The Proceedings of the Commissioners sent from the Parliament of Scotland, [Edinburgh: b. R. Bryson], 1640, old STC 21927 (part two of STC 21929)
- [____], A True Representation, [Edinburgh: b. R. Bryson], 1640, STC 21929
- King, John, Cenotaphivm Iacobi, Oxoniae: Iohannes Lichfield & Guilielmus Turner, 1625, STC 14992
- King Charles His Defence Against some trayterous Observations, n. p., [1642], Wing C2291, Thomason E. 126 (32)
- King of Scotland's Negotiations at Rome for Assistance against the Common-Wealth of England, The, London: b. William Du-gard, 1650, Wing K571, Thomason E. 612 (6)
- Kings Cabinet Opened, The, London: f. Robert Bostock, 1645, Wing C2358, Thomason E. 292 (27)
- Kings Packet of Letters, The, London: f. R. Austin and J. Coe, 1645, Wing C2359, Thomason E. 304 (22)
- Leigh, Dorothy, The Mothers Blessing, London: f. Iohn Budge, 1616, STC 15402

- [Leighton, Alexander], An Appeal to the Parliament; or Sion's Plea against the Prelacie [Amsterdam: successors of G. Thorp, 1629, STC 15428.5]
- [____], A Decade of Grievances, [London]: 1641, Wing L1023, Thomason E. 172 (5)
- Leighton ['Layton'], Alexander, An Appeal to the Parliament, 2nd edition, [Amsterdam: 1644?], Wing L1022
- Leighton, Alexander, An Epitome, London: b. I. D., 1646, Wing L1024, Thomason E. 354 (2)
- Ley, James, A Learned Treatise Concerning Wards and Liveries, London: b. G. Bishop & R. White f. Henry Shepheard & Henry Twyford, 1642, Wing M687
- Life and Reigne of King Charls. The, Or the Pseudo-Martyr discovered, London: f. W. Roybould, 1651, Wing L2020C
- Lilly, William, Monarchy Or No Monarchy in England, London: f. Humfrey Blunden, 1651, Wing L2228, Thomason E. 638 (17)
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, Nicholas Machiavel's Prince, transl. E. D[acres]., R. Bishop f. Wil. Hils, s. b. Daniel Pakeman, 1640, STC 17168
- [Marcelline, George], The Triumphs of King James, [London: b. W. Jaggard] f. John Budge, 1610, STC 17309
- [Maxwell, John], An Answer By Letter, [Oxford: b. L. Lichfield], 1644, Wing M1377, Thomason E. 53 (13)
- [____], The Burthen of Issachar, [London]: 1646, Wing M1379, Thomason E. 336 (3)
- [____], Episcopacie Not Abivred, [Dublin]: 1641, Wing M1380
- May, Thomas, The History of the Parliament of England, London: b. Moses Bell f. George Thomason, 1647, Wing M1410
- Medicines against the Pest, Edinburgh: b. James Lindesay, 1645, Wing M1609
- Melville, James, Ad Serenissimum Jacobum Primvm Britanniarum Monarcham, Ecclesiae Scoticanæ libellus supplex, Londini: excudebat J. R. pro Georgio Thomason & Octaviano Pullen, 1645, Wing M1655, Thomason E. 287 (2)
- Mirth in Mourning: Or, Ioyes conquest of Sorrow, London: f. I. T[rundle]. & H. G[osson]., [1625], STC 14426.3
- Monipennie, John, The Abridgement or Summarie of the Scots Chronicles, Edinburgh: b. I. W[reittoun] f. Iohn Wood, STC 18015
- Mo[u]ntagu, Richard, A Gagg for the New Gospell?, London: b. Thomas Snodham f. Matthew Lownes & William Barrett, 1624, STC 18038
- _____, Appello Caesarem, London: f. Matthew Lownes, 1625, STC 18030
- Nalson, John, An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State London: f. S. Mearne, T. Dring, B. Tooke. T. Sawbridge & C. Mearne, 1682, Wing N106
- Naunton, Robert, Fragmenta Regalia, [London]: Printed, 1641, Wing N249, Thomason E. 158 (22)
- New Discovery of Old Pontificall Practises, A, London: f. Stephen Bowtell, 1643, Wing U14, Thomason E. 87 (6)
- None-Such Charles His Character, The, London: b. R. I. s. b. John Collins, 1651, Wing N1226A, Thomason E. 1345(2)
- Old Mould to Cast New Lawes By, An, 'Printed' [Oxford: b. Leonard Lichfield?], 1643, Wing S4218

- [Osborne, Francis], Historical Memoires, London: b. J. Grismond, s. b. T. Robinson, 1658, Wing O515
- _____, The Works, 'Eighth edition', London: f. R. D. s. b. Allen Banks, 1682, Wing O506
- Papers which passed at New-Castle, The, London: f. R. Royston, 1649, Wing C2535, Thomason E. 1243 (3)
- [Parker, Henry], Observations upon some of his Majesties late Answers and Expresses, [London: 1642], Wing P412, Thomason E. 153 (26)
- Perfect Description of the People and Country of Scotland, A, 'By James Howel', London: f. J. S., 1649, Wing W1277, Thomason E. 560 (7)
- _____, London: f. J. S., 1659, Wing W1277AB
- Perfect Description of the People and Countrey of Scotland, A, London: f. Rich. Lownds, 1659, Wing W1277A
- Peyton, Edward, The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts, London: f. Giles Calvert, 1652, Wing P1952, Thomason E. 1291 (1)
- Philotus. Ane verie excellent and delectabill Treatise intitult, Edinburgh: b. Robert Charteris, 1603, STC 19888
- Powel, Gabriel, The Catholikes Supplication, b. F. Kyngston f. E. Weaver, 1603, STC 20141
- Presentments of the Grand-Jury for the Town and Borough of Southwark, colop: London: f. Benj. Tooke, 1683, Wing P3291
- Proclamation for the authorizing an uniformitie of the Booke of Common Prayer, A, London: 1642/3, Wing C2601, Thomason 669.f.5(147)
- Prospective Glasse, A, Wherein The Child in understanding is enabled to see what the wicked Counsellours did above twenty yeares ago, 1644, Wing W3489A, Thomason E. 53 (1)
- Prynne, William, The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme, [A. Mathewes & Eliz. Alde f. Michael Sparke], 1629, STC 20457
- _____, Histrio-Mastix, London: b. E. A[lde, A. Mathewes, T. Cotes] & W. I[ones] f. Michael Sparke, 1633, STC 20464
- Psalmes of King David, The, [Oxford: b. William Turner, 1631], STC 2732
- _____, b. Thomas Harper, 1636, STC 2736
- Raleigh, Walter, Instructions to his sonne and to posterity, [J. Beale?], f. B. Fisher, 1632, STC 20641.5
- Recantation of Maister Patrik Adamsone, The, [Middelburgh: b. R. Schilders], 1598, STC 149
- Regall Tyrannie Discovered, London: Printed, 1647, Wing L2172, Thomason E. 370 (12)
- Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ, 'Hagve: b. Samuel Browne' [i.e. London: b. R. Norton f. Richard Royston], 1650, Wing C2072
- _____, 'Hague: b. Sam: Browne' [London: f. R. Royston, 1658?], Wing C2070
- Remarkeable Passages, [London]: f. W. G., 1642, Wing R922, Thomason E. 155 (17)
- Remonstrance or the Declaration of the Lords and Commons... the 26 of May, 1642, A, London: f. E. Paxton & T. P., 1642, Wing E2226A
- [Reynolds, John], Vox Coeli, 'Printed in Elisium', 1624, STC 20946.7
- Rous, Francis, Testis Veritatis. The Doctrine of King James, London: b. W. I., 1626, STC 21347

- Rushworth, John, Historical Collections, London: b. Tho. Newcomb f. George Thomason, 1659, Wing R2316
- [Sanderson, William], Aulicus Coquinariæ, London: f. Henry Seile, 1650/1, Wing S645, Thomason E. 1356 (2)
- _____, A Compleat History, London: f. Humphrey Moseley, Richard Tomlins & George Sawbridge, 1656, Wing S647
- _____, The Reign and Death of King James, London: b. Henry Hills, 1655, not in Wing
- Scot, Patrick, A Table-Booke for Princes, London: b. Bernard Alsop, 1621, STC 21860
- [Scott, Thomas], Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost 'Printed in Paradise' [London: J. Beale?], 1624, STC 22084
- Scrinia Sacra, London: f. G. Bedel and T. Collins, 1654, Wing C184, Thomason E. 228 (2)
- Sidney, Philip, An Apologie for Poetrie, London: f. Henry Olney, 1595, STC 22534
- Smith, Thomas, The Common-Wealth of England, London: b. R. Young f. J. Smethwicke, 1640, STC 22867
- _____, De Repvblica Anglorvm London: b. Henrie Midelton f. Gregorie Seton, 1583, STC 22857
- [Sparke, Michael], The Narrative History of King James, for the first fourteen Years, London: f. Michael Sparke, 1651, Wing S4818
- S[pencer]., J[ohn]., Catalogus Universalis Librorvm Omnium in Bibliotheca Collegii Sionii, Londini: ex officia typographica Rob. Leybourni, 1650, Wing S4959, Thomason E. 636 (7)
- Spottiswood ['Spotswood'], John, The History of the Church of Scotland, London: b. J. Flesher f. R. Royston, 1655, Wing S5022
- Springham, Thomas, A Learned Speech Spoken to His Excellency the Earl of Essex, n. p., f. Tho. Cooke, 1642, Wing S5082, Thomason E. 200 (60)
- Strange Apparitions, or, The Ghost of King James, London: f. J. Aston, 1642, Wing S5880, Thomason E. 123 (23)
- Svpplication of all the Papists, The, London: b. E. Griffin, 1642, Wing S6189, Thomason E. 151 (19)
- [Sydenham, Cuthbert], The False Brother, Or, A New Map of Scotland, London: b. R. W. f. Francis Tyton, 1651, Wing S6294, Thomason E. 620 (13)
- Thomas, William, A Speech, London: b. Tho. Harper, 1641, Wing T985, Thomason E. 198 (9)
- Tom Tell Troath, n.p., n.d., STC 23868
- True Portraiture of the Kings of England, The, London: b. R. W. f. Francis Tyton, Wing P429, Thomason E. 609 (2)
- Terrible Newes from Scotland, London: f. T. W., 1647, Wing W1277AC, Thomason E. 402 (7)
- Treasons Anatomie, Printed, 1647/8, Wing T2083, Thomason E. 427 (24)
- Vindication of the King, A, London: 1642, Wing W533C, Thomason E. 118 (3)
- Vox Populi: or the Peoples Claim to their Parliaments Sitting, London: f. Francis Smith, 1681, Wing V729
- W[eldon]., A[nthony]., The Court and Character of King James, London: b. R. I., s. b. John Wright, 1650, Wing W1273, Thomason E. 1338 (1)

- _____, _____, London: b. R. I., s. b. J. Collins, 1651, Wing W1274
- Wake, Isaac, Rex Platonivvs, Oxonjae: excudebat Iosephus Barnesius, 1607, STC 24939
- Ward, Samuel, Woe to Drvnkards, London: b. A. Math f. Iohn Marriott & Iohn Grismaud, 1622, STC 25055
- Willet, Andrew, Ecclesia Triumphans, [London]: b. John Legat f. Simon Waterson, 1603, STC 25676
- [Williams], John, Great Britains Salomon, London: b. John Bill, 1625, STC 25723a
- Willymat, William A Loyal Svbiects Looking-Glasse, London: b. G. Elde f. Robert Boulton, 1604, STC 25760
- _____, A Princes Looking Glasse, [London]: b. Iohn Legat s. b. Simon Waterson, 1604, STC 14357
- Wilson, Arthur, The History of Great Britain, London: f. Richard Lownds, 1653, Wing W2888
- Witty Apophthegms, London: f, & s. b. Edward Farnham, 1658, Wing W3236, Thomason E. 1892 (1)
- Woodcocke, Fra[ncis], The Two Witnesses: Discovered in severall Sermons, London: b. J. R. f. Luke Fawne, 1643, Wing W3433, Thomason E. 100 (1)
- Wotton, Henry, A Parallel betweene Robert late Earle of Essex, and George late Duke of Buckingham, London: Printed, 1641, Wing W3647
- ΞΕΙΠΘΣ ΤΩΝ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΩΝ, ΤΟ, Or, A Brief Narration of the Mysteries of State, 'Hague: Samuel Brown', 1651, Wing X2, Thomason E. 637 (2)

II. Works printed in or after 1700

- Adams, Simon, 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', in Kevin Sharpe (ed.), Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History, OUP, 1978 [new edition, Methuen, 1985], 139-71
- Akrigg, G. P. V. (ed.), Letters of King James VI & I, University of California Press, 1984
- _____, 'The Literary Achievement of King James I', University of Toronto Quarterly 44 (1974-5), 115-129
- Alpers, Svetlana, The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century, John Murray, 1983
- Anderson, Perry, Lineages of the Absolutist State, London: NLB, 1974
- Arber, Edward (ed.), James VI of Scotland, I of England. The Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie. Edinburgh. 1585. A Counterblaste to Tobacco. London. 1604., English Reprints, 1869
- Arbuthnot, P. Stewart-MacKenzie (ed.), Queen Mary's Book: A Collection of Poems and Essays by Mary Queen of Scots, London: George Bell & Sons, 1907
- Bald, R. C., John Donne: A Life, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970, reprinted with corrections 1986
- Beasley, A. W., 'The Disability of James VI & I', The Seventeenth Century 10 (1995), 151-162
- Beekman, A., Influence de Du Bartas sur la Littérature Néerlandaise, Poitiers: A. Masson, 1912
- Bell, H. E., An Introduction to the History and Records of the Court of Wards & Liveries, Cambridge: CUP, 1953
- Bell, Robin (transl. & ed.), Bittersweet Within my Heart: The Collected Poems of Mary, Queen of Scots, Pavilion Books, 1992
- Bellamy, Alastair, "'Raylinge Rymes and Vaunting Verse": Libellous Politics in Early Stuart England, 1603-1628', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds.), Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England, Macmillan, 1994, 285-310
- Bellenger, Yvonne (ed.), Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas, Les Suites de la Seconde Semaine, Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1994
- Bennett, H. S., English Books & Readers 1558 to 1603: being a study in the history of the book trade in the reign of Elizabeth I, Cambridge: CUP, 1965
- _____, English Books & Readers 1603 to 1640: being a study in the history of the book trade in the reigns of James I and Charles I, Cambridge: CUP, 1970
- Bevan, Bryan, King James VI of Scotland & I of England, The Rubicon Press, 1996
- Bindoff, S. T., 'The Stuarts and their Style', English Historical Review 60 (1945), 192-216
- [Birch, Thomas] (ed.), The Court and Times of James the First, Vol. 1, f. Henry Colburn, 1849
- Birrell, T. A., English Monarchs and their books: from Henry VII to Charles II, (Panizzi Lectures 1986), British Library, 1987
- _____, 'Some Rare Scottish Books in the Old Royal Library', in A. A. MacDonald, Michael Lynch & Ian B. Cowan (eds.), The Renaissance in Scotland - Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture offered to John Durkan, New York: E. J. Brill, 1994, 404-16

- Black, Joseph, 'The Marprelate Tracts and the Popular Voice', unpublished paper given at Sixteenth Century Studies Conference, Toronto, 1998
- _____, 'Pamphlet Wars: The Marprelate Tracts and 'Martinism', 1588-1688', PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1996
- _____, "'Pikes and Protestations": Scottish Texts in England, 1639-40', Publishing History 42 (1997), [5]-19
- _____, 'Radical Religion and Textual Communities in Early Modern England', unpublished paper given at 33rd International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, 1998
- Bossy, John, 'The English Catholic Community 1603-1625', in Alan G. R. Smith (ed.), The Reign of James VI and I, Macmillan, 1973, 91-105
- Bradner, Leicester (ed.), The Poems of Queen Elizabeth I, Providence: Brown University Press, 1964
- Breslow, Marvin Arthur, A Mirror of England: English Puritan Views of Foreign Nations, 1618-1640, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970
- Brown, J. T. T., 'An English Translation of George Buchanan's *Baptistes* attributed to John Milton', in George Buchanan: Glasgow Quatercentenary Studies 1906, Glasgow: James MacLehose & Sons, 1907, [61]-173
- Brown, Jennifer M. [Jenny Wormald], 'Scottish Politics 1567-1625', in Alan G. R. Smith (ed.), The Reign of James VI and I, Macmillan, 1973, 22-39
- Brown, P. Hume, Early Travellers in Scotland, Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1891
- Brownley, Martine Watson, 'Sir Richard Baker's Chronicle and Later Seventeenth-Century English Historiography', HLQ 52 (1989), 481-500
- Burgess, Glenn, The Politics of the Ancient Constitution - An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603-1642, Macmillan, 1992
- Calderwood, David, 'Reasons against the reception of King James's metaphor of the Psalms. MDCXXXI.', Bannatyne Miscellany, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1827, 227-56
- Campbell, Lily B., 'The Use of Historical Patterns in the Reign of Elizabeth', HLQ 1 (1938), 135-67
- Carscallen, James, 'English Translators and Admirers of Du Bartas 1578-1625', Oxford B.Litt thesis, 1958
- Carter, Charles Howard, The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625, New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1964
- Castiglione, Baldassare, transl. Thomas Hoby & ed. Walter Raleigh, The Courtier, publ. David Nutt, 1900
- Cerovski, John S. (ed.), Fragmenta Regalia, London & Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1985
- Christophers, Richard A., George Abbot - A Bibliography, Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1966
- Clarendon, Edward Earl of, ed. W. Dunn Macray, The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England begun in the year 1641, Vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888, reprinted Oxford: OUP, 1969
- Cobbett, [William], Parliamentary History of England, b. T. Curson Hansard f. R. Bagshaw *et al*, 1806

- Cogswell, Thomas, The Blessed Revolution - English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624, Cambridge: CUP, 1989
- _____, 'England and the Spanish Match', in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (eds.), Conflict in Early Stuart England - Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642, London & New York: Longman, 1989, 107-33
- _____, 'The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the People in the 1620s', JBS 9 (1990), 187-215
- _____, 'Thomas Middleton and the Court, 1624: *A Game at Chess* in Context', HLQ 47 (1984), 273-88
- Collier, Susanne, 'Recent Studies in James VI and I', ELR 23 (1993), 509-519
- Clancy, Thomas H., Papist Pamphleteers: the Allen-Persons Party and the Political Thought of the Counter-Reformation in England, 1572-1615, Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1964
- Clark, Peter, 'Thomas Scott and the Growth of Urban Opposition to the Early Stuart Regime', Historical Journal 21 (1978), 1-26
- Clark, Stuart, 'King James's *Daemonologie*: Witchcraft and Kingship', in Sydney Angelo (ed.), The Damned Art: Essays in the Literature of Witchcraft, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977, 156-181
- Condick, Frances, 'The Self-Revelation of a Puritan: Dr. Alexander Leighton in the Sixteen-Twenties', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 55 (1982), 196-203.
- Craigie, James (ed.), The Basilicon Doron of King James VI., STS, 2 vols., 1944, 1950
- _____, 'The Basilicon Doron: Semple's Transcript of James VI's Treatise', Scotsman, 4/3/1950
- _____, 'Last Poems of James VI', SHR 29 (1950), 134-142
- _____, 'The Latin Folio of King James's Prose Works', Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions 3 (1948), 17-30
- _____ (ed.), Minor Prose Works of King James VI and I, STS, 1982
- _____, 'Philotus: A Late Middle Scots Comedy', Scottish Literary Journal 6 (1979), 19-33
- _____ (ed.), The Poems of James VI. of Scotland, STS, 2 vols., 1955, 1958
- Cranfield, Nicholas and Kenneth Fincham (eds.), 'John Howson's Answers to Archbishop Abbot's Accusations at his 'Trial', before James I at Greenwich, 10 June 1615', Camden Miscellany 29 (1987), 319-41
- Cressy, David, Bonfires and Bells - National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989
- _____, 'The Protestant Calendar and the Vocabulary of Celebration in Early Modern England', JBS 29 (1990), 31-52
- Curtis, Mark H., 'The Alienated Intellectuals of Early Stuart England', 1962, reprinted in Trevor Aston (ed.), Crisis in Europe 1560-1660 - Essays from Past and Present, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965, 295-316
- Cust, Richard, 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England', Past and Present 112 (1986), 60-90
- Dahl, Folke, A Bibliography of English Corantos and Periodical Newsbooks 1620-1642, Bibliographical Society, 1952

- Daiches, David, The King James Version of the English Bible: An Account of the Development and Sources of the English Bible of 1611 with Special Reference to the Hebrew Tradition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941
- Daly, James, 'The Idea of Absolute Monarchy in Seventeenth-Century England', Historical Journal 21 (1978), 227-50
- Dauphiné, James, La Bibliothèque de Du Bartas, Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 1994
- Davies, Godfrey, 'English Political Sermons, 1603-1640', HLO 3 (1939), 1-22
- Davies, Julian, The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism 1625-1641, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992
- Davison, M. H. Armstrong, The Casket Letters: A Solution to the Mystery of Mary Queen of Scots and the Murder of Lord Darnley, Vision Press Ltd., 1965
- Desgraves, Louis, Les Hautin 1571-1623, Genève: E. Droz, 1960
- Dewar, Mary, Sir Thomas Smith: A Tudor Intellectual in Office, Athlone Press (University of London), 1964
- Doelman, James, 'The Accession of King James I and English Religious Poetry', Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 34 (1994), 19-40
- _____, "'A King of Thine Own Heart": The English Reception of King James VI and I's *Basilikon Doron*', The Seventeenth Century 9 (1994), 1-9
- Donald, Peter, An Uncounselled King: Charles I and the Scottish Troubles, 1637-1641, Cambridge: CUP, 1990
- Donaldson, Gordon, The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1954
- _____, Mary Queen of Scots, English Universities Press Ltd., 1974
- _____, Scotland - James V to James VII, Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1965
- _____ (ed.), Scottish Historical Documents, Edinburgh & London: Scottish Academic Press, 1974
- Dunlap, Rhodes, 'King James and some Witches: the Date and Text of the *Daemonologie*', Philological Quarterly 54 (1975), 40-6
- Dwyer, John, Roger A. Mason and Alexander Murdoch (eds.), New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland, Edinburgh: John Donald, n.d.
- Elliott, John R., 'Drama', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), The History of the University of Oxford: Vol. 4 - Seventeenth-Century Oxford, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997, 641-58
- Erasmus, Desiderius, transl. Betty Radice, Praise of Folly and Letter to Martin Dorp, 1515, Penguin, 1971
- Eusden, John Dykstra, Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958
- Eyre, G. E. Briscoe, H. R. Plomer, C. R. Rivington (eds.), A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers; from 1640-1708 A. D., Vol. 1, Privately Printed, 1913
- Fairholt, Frederick W. (ed.), Poems and Songs relating to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, and his Assassination by John Felton, August 23, 1628, Percy Society, 1850
- Farrer, James Anson, Books Condemned to be Burnt, 1892, [Elliot Stock, 1904]

- Filloy, Richard A., 'Deciding the Authorship of a Doubtful Text: the Case of John Selden's Table-talk', Quarterly Journal of Speech 70 (1984), 41-52
- Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', JBS 24 (1985), 169-207
- Fincham, Kenneth (ed.), The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642, Macmillan, 1993
- _____, 'Oxford and the Early Stuart Polity', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), The History of the University of Oxford: Vol. 4 - Seventeenth-Century Oxford, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997, 179-210
- _____, 'Prelacy and Politics: Archbishop Abbot's Defence of Protestant Orthodoxy', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 61 (1988), 36-41
- _____ (ed.), Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church, 2 vols., Church of England Record Society, 1994, 1998
- Fischlin, Daniel, "'The Candie-Souldier", Venice, and James VI (I)'s advice on Monarchic Dress in *Basilikon Doron*', N&Q 240 (1995), 357-361
- _____, "'Counterfeiting God": James VI (I) and the Politics of *Daemonologie* (1597)', Journal of Narrative Technique 26 (1996), 1-29
- Fischlin, Daniel and Mark Fortier (eds.), The True Law of Free Monarchies and Basilikon Doron, Toronto: CRRS, 1996
- Fish, Stanley, Is There a Text in This Class? - The Authority of Interpretive Communities, Harvard University Press, 1980
- Forse, James H., 'An Echo of *Henry VI, Part 2*, in a Work by King James I?', ANQ 8 (Spring 1995), 3-6
- Fortescue, G. K., Catalogue of the Pamphlets, 2 vols., British Museum, 1908
- Foster, Elizabeth Read (ed.), Proceedings in Parliament 1610, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2 vols., 1966
- French, Milton J., (ed.), The Life Records of John Milton - Vol. 2 - 1639-1651, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1950
- Fussner, F. Smith, The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought 1580-1640, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962
- Galloway, Bruce, The Union of England and Scotland 1603-1608, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986
- Gardiner, Samuel R., History of England, Vol. 4, Longmans, Green & Co., 1886
- Germano, William P., 'The Literary Icon of James I', PhD thesis, Indiana University, 1981
- Goldberg, Jonathan, James I and the Politics of Literature - Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983 [reprinted Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989]
- Goodare, Julian, 'The Scottish Parliament of 1621', Historical Journal 38 (1995), 29-51
- Goodman, Godfrey, ed. John S. Brewer, The Court of King James the First, 2 vols., London: Richard Bentley, 1839
- Gosse, Edmund, The Life and Letters of John Donne, Vol. 2, William Heinemann, 1899
- Grayson, Christopher, 'James I and the Religious Crisis in the United Provinces 1613-19', in Derek Baker (ed.), Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-c1750, Oxford: Basil Blackwell f. Ecclesiastical History Society, 1979, 195-219

- Greg, W. W. (ed.), A Companion to Arber - being a calendar of documents in Edward Arber's *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967
- Gregg, Pauline, Free-born John: A Biography of John Lilburne, George G. Harrap & Co., 1961
- Harline, Craig E., Pamphlets, Printing, and Political Culture in the Early Dutch Republic, Dordrecht, Boston & Lancaster: Martinus Nijhoff, 1987
- Harris, William, An Historical and Critical Account of the Lives and Writings of James I. and Charles I., New edition., 5 vols., f. F. C. & J. Rivington *et al*, 1814
- Harrison, G. B. (ed.), The Letters of Queen Elizabeth, Cassell & Co., 1935
- Hawkins, M. J. (ed.), Sales of Wards in Somerset, 1603-1641, Somerset Record Society, 1965
- Heinemann, Margot, Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts, Cambridge: CUP, 1980
- Helgerson, Richard, 'Milton Reads the King's Book: Print, Performance, and the Making of a Bourgeois Idol', Criticism 29 (1987) 1-25
- Herrup, Cynthia, 'Revisionism: What's in a Name?', JBS 35 (1996), 135-8
- Hill, Christopher, Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965
- _____, Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century, Martin Secker & Warburg, 1958; new edition, Mercury, 1962
- _____, The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution, London: Temple Smith, 1972
- Holmes, Urban Tigner, John Coridan Lyons and Robert White Linker (eds.), The Works of Guillaume de Salluste Sieur Du Bartas - a critical edition with introduction, commentary, and variants, Vol. 1, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935
- Hutton, Ronald, The Royalist War Effort 1642-1646, London & New York: Longman, 1982
- Hughes, Merritt Y. (ed.), Complete Prose Works of John Milton - Vol. 3 - 1648-1649, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1962
- Jack, R. D. S. (ed.), The History of Scottish Literature - Vol. 1 - Origins to 1660 (Mediæval and Renaissance), Aberdeen University Press, 1988
- Jackson, William A. (ed.), Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1602 to 1640, Bibliographical Society, 1957
- _____, 'Sir Robert Bruce Cotton's *A short view of the long life and raigne of Henry the third*', Harvard Library Bulletin 4 (1950), 28-37
- James VI & I, His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres, [Anonymously edited, Edinburgh: 1818]
- Jansson, Maija, Proceedings in Parliament 1614 (House of Commons), Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988
- Jászi, Oscar and John D. Lewis, Against the Tyrant: The Tradition and Theory of Tyrannicide, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957
- Johnston, W. T. (ed.), Delitiæ Poetarvm Scotorvm, Amsterdam, 1637. Contents, Edinburgh: Sgann Microforms, 1983

- Jones, Emrys, "'Othello', 'Lepanto' and the Cyprus Wars', Shakespeare Survey 21 (1968), 47-52
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H., The King's Two Bodies: a study in Mediæval Political Theology, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957
- Kastner, L. E. and H. B. Charlton (eds.), The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: STS, 1921
- Kearney, Jillian, 'Donne's Devotions in the Context of his Early Sermons', D.Phil thesis, Oxford, 1995
- Keller, John Esten, Alfonso X, El Sabio, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967
- Kenyon, J. P., The Stuart Constitution 1603-1688, Cambridge: CUP, 1966
- Kernan, Alvin, Shakespeare, the King's Playwright - Theater in the Stuart Court 1603-1613, Yale University Press, 1995
- Keynes, Geoffrey, A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne, 4th edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973
- Knachel, Philip A. (ed.), Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitudes and Sufferings, Ithaca & New York: Cornell University Press, 1966
- Laing, David (ed.), Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 3 vols., Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1841-2
- Lake, P. G., 'Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match', Historical Journal 25 (1982), 805-825
- Lambert, Sheila, 'The Printers and the Government, 1604-1637', in Robin Myers and Michael Harris (eds.), Aspects of Printing from 1600, Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987, [1]-29
- _____, (ed.), Printing for Parliament, 1641-1700, List and Index Society Special Series (Vol. 20), 1984
- _____, 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship', Past and Present 124 (1989), 36-68
- Lamont, William M., Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603-1640, Macmillan, 1969
- _____, Marginal Prynne 1600-1669, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963
- Lang, Timothy, The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage: Interpretations of a Discordant Past, CUP, 1995
- Larkin, James F. and Paul L. Hughes (eds.), Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973
- Larkin, James F. (ed.), Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol. 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983
- La Rocca, John J., 'James I and his Catholic Subjects, 1606-1612: Some Financial Implications', Recusant History 18 (1987), 251-62
- Laski, Harold J. (introd.), A Defence of Liberty Against Tyrants: A Translation of the Vindiciæ Contra Tyrannos by Junius Brutus, London: G. Bell & Sons, 1924
- Laslett, Peter (ed.), John Locke - Two Treatises of Government - A Critical Edition, Cambridge: CUP, 1960
- Latham, Robert and William Matthews (ed.), The Diary of Samuel Pepys: A New and Complete Transcription, G. Bell & Sons, 1972, Vol. 6
- Lee, Maurice, Government by Pen: Scotland under James VI and I, University of Illinois Press, 1980

- _____, Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms, Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990
- Lievsay, John L., 'Paolo Sarpi's Appraisal of James I', in Heinz Bluhm (ed.), Essays in History and Literature: Presented by Fellows of the Newberry Library to Stanley Pargellis, Chicago: Newberry Library, 1965, 109-117
- Limon, Jerzy, Dangerous Matter: English Drama and Politics in 1623/24, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986
- MacGillivray, Royce, Restoration Historians and the English Civil War, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, transl. George Bull, The Prince, Penguin, 1975
- Madan, Falconer, The Early Oxford Press, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895
- _____, Oxford Books, Vol. 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912
- Madan, Francis F., A New Bibliography of the Eikon Basilike, Oxford: OUP, 1950
- Marshall, Joseph, 'Gender and Textual Discourse in the Works of King James VI and I', M.A. dissertation, University of Durham, 1996
- _____, 'Reading and mis-reading King James 1622-1642: responses to the Letter and Directions touching Preaching and Preachers', in Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (eds.), Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I, Wayne State University Press, forthcoming
- Mason, Roger A., 'Rex Stoicus: George Buchanan, James VI and the Scottish Polity', in John Dwyer, Roger A. Mason and Alexander Murdoch (eds.), New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland, Edinburgh: John Donald, n.d., 9-33
- McCabe, Richard A., 'The Masks of Duessa: Spenser, Mary Queen of Scots, and James VI', ELR 17 (1987), 224-42
- McClure, J. Derrick, "'O Phoenix Escossois": James VI as Poet', in Alisoun Gardner-Medwin & Janet Hadley-Williams (eds.), A Day Estivall - Essays on the Music, Poetry and History of Scotland and England & Poems Previously Unpublished - in honour of Helena Mennie Shire, Aberdeen University Press, 1990, 96-111
- McClure, Norman Egbert (ed.), The Letters of John Chamberlain, 2 vols., Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939
- McIlwain, Charles Howard (ed.), The Political Works of James I: reprinted from the edition of 1616, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1918
- McKenzie, D. F., 'Poetry, Politics and the Press', Sandars Lecture 1, 1976, circulated in typescript as The London Book Trade in the later Seventeenth Century
- McKitterick, David, A History of Cambridge University Press - Vol. 1 - Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge 1534-1698, Cambridge: CUP, 1992
- McNeill, William A. and Peter G. B. McNeill, 'The Scottish Progress of James VI, 1617', SHR 75 (1996), 38-51
- Melville, James, The Diary of Mr. James Melville, 1556-1601, Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1829
- Mill, A. J (ed.), 'Philotus', in Miscellany Volume of the Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh: STS, 1933), [81]-158
- Milton, Anthony, Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640, CUP, 1995

- Milward, Peter, Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age, London: Scolar Press, 1978
- Miscellany of the Abbotsford Club, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: 1837
- Morgan, Irvonwy, Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain, George Allen & Unwin, 1957
- Morrill, John, 'The National Covenant in its British Context', in John Morrill (ed.), The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990, 1-30
- _____, The Nature of the English Revolution, Longman, 1993
- _____ (ed.), The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990
- Morrison, Paul G., Index of the Printers, Publishers and Booksellers in Donald Wing's Short Title Catalogue, Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 1955
- Mullan, David George, Episcopacy in Scotland: The History of an Idea, 1560-1638, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986
- Newman, J., 'Inigo Jones and the Politics of Architecture', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds.), Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England, Macmillan, 1994, 229-255
- Nichols, John (ed.), The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, London: Vol. 1, J. B. Nichols, 1828
- Notestein, Wallace, Frances Helen Relf & Hartley Simpson (eds.), Commons Debates 1621, Vol. 2, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935
- _____, The House of Commons 1604-1610, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971
- Oakley, Francis, 'On the Road from Constance to 1688: The Political Thought of John Major and George Buchanan', JBS 1, no. 2 (1962), 1-31
- [Oldys, William], The Life of Dr. George Abbot, Guildford: f. & s. b. J. Russell, 1777
- Orgel, Stephen, The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975
- Ormerod, Oliver, The Pictvre of a Puritane, 1605, Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1975
- Parry, Graham, 'Cotton's Counsels: The Contexts of *Cottoni Posthuma*', in C. J. Wright (ed.), Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy, British Library, 1997, 81-95
- _____, The Golden Age restor'd - The culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42, Manchester University Press, 1981
- Patterson, Annabel, Censorship and Interpretation, University of Wisconsin Press, 1984
- _____, 'John Donne, Kingsman?', in Linda Levy Peck (ed.), The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, Cambridge: CUP, 1991, 251-72
- Patterson, W. B., King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom, Cambridge: CUP, 1997
- _____, 'The Peregrinations of Marco Antonio de Dominis' 1616-24', in Derek Baker (ed.), Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian, Oxford: Basil Blackwell f. Ecclesiastical History Society, 1978, 241-57

- Pattison, Mark, Isaac Casaubon 1559-1614, 1875, 2nd edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892
- Paul, George Morrison (ed.), Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston 1632-1639, Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, First series, Vol. 61, 1911
- Paul, Robert S., The Assembly of the Lord: Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the 'Grand Debate', Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1985
- Peck, Linda Levy (ed.), The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, Cambridge: CUP, 1991
- _____, 'The Mental World of the Jacobean Court: An Introduction', in Linda Levy Peck (ed.), The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, Cambridge: CUP, 1991, 1-17
- Peters, Robert, 'Some Catholic Opinions of King James VI and I', Recusant History 10 (1970), 292-303
- Petrie, Charles (ed.), The Letters Speeches and Proclamations of King Charles I, Cassell, 1935
- Philotus; a Comedy, reprinted from the edition of Robert Charteris, Edinburgh: Ballantyne & Co., 1835
- Philotvs: Edinburgh, 1603, Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1969
- Plomer, Henry, A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers, Bibliographical Society, 1907
- Portal, Ethel M., 'The Academ Roial of King James I', Proceedings of the British Academy (1915-16), 189-208
- Potter, George R. and Evelyn M. Simpson (eds.), The Sermons of John Donne, Vol. 4, Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959
- Potter, Lois, Secret Rites and Secret Writings - Royalist Literature, 1641-1660, Cambridge: CUP, 1989
- Prescott, Anne Lake, 'The Reception of Du Bartas in England', Studies in the Renaissance 15 (1968), 144-73
- Preston, Joseph H., 'English Ecclesiastical Historians and the Problem of Bias, 1559-1742', Journal of the History of Ideas 32 (1971), 203-220
- Prestwich, Menna, Cranfield: Politics and Profits under the Early Stuarts - The Career of Lionel Cranfield Earl of Middlesex, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966
- Princes's Cabala, The: or Mysteries of State, London: f. R. Smith & G. Strahan, J. Brown, J. Graves, s. b. R. Burleigh, 1715
- Rait, Robert S. (ed.), Lusus Regius - being poems and other pieces by King James the first, Archibald Constable & Co., 1901
- 'Relation of the Imprisonment and Examination of James Cathkin, Bookseller. June, M.DC.XIX.', in Bannatyne Miscellany, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: 1827, 197-215
- Rimbault, Lucien, Pierre du Moulin 1568-1658 - Un Pasteur Classique á l'âge Classique: Étude de Théologie Pastorale sur des documents inédits, Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1966
- Roberts, S. C. (ed.), Izaak Walton: Lives of Donne and Herbert, Cambridge: CUP, 1949
- Rostenberg, Leona, Literary, Political, Scientific, Religious & Legal Publishing & Bookselling in England 1551-1700, Vol. 1, New York: Burt Franklin, 1965
- Russell, Conrad, The Causes of the English Civil War, (Ford Lectures 1987-8), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990

- _____, 'Divine Right in the Early Seventeenth Century', in John Morrill, Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf (eds.), Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England - Essays presented to G. E. Aylmer, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, 101-120
- _____, The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637-1642, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991
- Rypins, Stanley, 'The Printing of *Basilicòn Dôron*, 1603', Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America 64 (1970), 393-417
- Salmon, J. H. M., The French Religious Wars in English Political Thought, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959
- _____, 'James I, the Oath of Allegiance, the Venetian Interdict, and the reappearance of French Ultramontanism', in J. H. Burns & Mark Goldie (eds.), The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1430-1700, Cambridge: CUP, 1991, 247-53
- Sanderson, John, 'But the People's Creatures': The Philosophical Basis of the English Civil War, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 1989
- Sawyer, Edmund (ed.), Memorials of State... from the original papers of... Sir Ralph Winwood, Vol. 3, London: b. W. B. f. T. Ward, 1725
- Schwarz, Marc L., 'James I and the Historians: Toward a Reconsideration', JBS 13 (1973-4), 114-134
- Scott, Thomas, The Workes, Utrick, 1624 (STC 22064), reprinted Amsterdam & New York: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1973
- Scott, Walter, Secret History of the Court of James the First, 2 vols., Edinburgh: Ballantyne, 1811
- Seaver, Paul S., The Puritan Lectureships - The Politics of Religious Dissent 1560-1662, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970
- Shami, Jeanne, 'Donne's 1622 Sermon on the Gunpowder Plot: His Original Presentation Manuscript Discovered', English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700 5 (1995): 63-86
- _____, "'The Stars in their Order Fought Against Sisera": John Donne and the Pulpit Crisis of 1622', John Donne Journal 14 (1995), 1-58
- Sharpe, Kevin and Peter Lake (eds.), Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England, Macmillan, 1994
- Sharpe, Kevin (ed.), Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History, OUP, 1978 [new edition, Methuen, 1985]
- _____, 'Introduction: Rewriting Sir Robert Cotton', in C. J. Wright (ed.), Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy, British Library, 1997, 1-39
- _____, 'The King's Writ: Royal Authors and Royal Authority in Early Modern England', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds.), Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England, Macmillan, 1994, 117-138
- _____, The Personal Rule of Charles I, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1992
- _____, 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of James VI and I', in John Morrill, Paul Slack & Daniel Woolf (eds.), Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England - Essays presented to G.E.Aylmer, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, 77-100

- Shire, Helena Mennie, Song, Dance and Poetry of the Court of Scotland under King James VI, Cambridge: CUP, 1969
- Siebert, Frederick Seaton, Freedom of the Press in England 1476-1776: the Rise and Decline of Government Control, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952, reprinted 1965
- Sisson, C. J., 'King James the First of England as Poet and Political Writer', in Seventeenth Century Studies presented to Sir Herbert Grierson, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938, 47-63
- Skrine, Peter, 'James VI & I and German Literature', Daphnis 18 (1989), 1-57
- Smith, Alan G. R., 'Constitutional Ideas and Parliamentary Developments in England 1603-1625', in Alan G. R. Smith (ed.), The Reign of James VI and I, Macmillan, 1973, 160-76
- _____, (ed.), The Reign of James VI and I, Macmillan, 1973
- Smith, David Nichol, Characters from the Histories & Memoirs of the Seventeenth Century, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918
- Smith, Nigel, Literature and Revolution in England 1640-1660, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994
- _____, Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989
- Snyder, Susan (ed.), Josuah Sylvester (transl.), The Divine Weeks and Works of Guillaume de Saluste Sieur Du Bartas, Vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979
- Sommerville, J. P., 'English and European Political Ideas in the Early Seventeenth Century: Revisionism and the Case of Absolutism', JBS 35 (1996), 168-194
- _____, 'Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance', PhD thesis, Cambridge, 1981
- _____, 'James I and the Divine Right of Kings: English Politics and Continental Theory', in Linda Levy Peck (ed.), The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, Cambridge: CUP, 1991, 55-70
- _____, (ed.), King James VI and I: Political Writings, Cambridge: CUP, 1994
- _____, Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640, Longman, 1986
- _____, (ed.), Robert Filmer: Patriarcha and Other Writings, Cambridge: CUP, 1991
- Spedding, James, Robert Leslie Ellis, Douglas Denon Heath (eds.), The Works of Francis Bacon, new edition, Vol. 3, London: Longmans & Co. et al, 1870
- Spencer, Lois, 'The Politics of George Thomason', Library (5th series) 14 (1959), [11]-27
- _____, 'The Professional and Literary Connexions of George Thomason', Library (5th series) 13 (1958), [102]-118
- Stauffer, Donald A., English Biography before 1700, New York: Russell & Russell Inc., 1964
- Stevenson, David, The Scottish Revolution 1637-1644 - The Triumph of the Covenanters, Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1973
- Steele, Margaret, 'The "Politick Christian": the Theological Background to the National Covenant', in John Morrill (ed.), The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990, 31-67
- Stewart, Ian, 'Coinage and Propaganda: An Interpretation of the Coin-Types of James VI', in Anne O'Connor & D. V. Clarke (eds.), From the Stone Age to the

- Forty-Five: Studies Presented to R. B. K. Stevenson, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1983, 450-62
- Strong, Roy, Henry, Prince of Wales, and England's Lost Renaissance, Thames & Hudson, 1986
- Sutherland, James (ed.), Lucy Hutchinson: Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson - with the fragment of an autobiography of Mrs. Hutchinson, OUP, 1973
- Sylvester, Richard S. (ed.), St. Thomas More: The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1976
- Thomas, P. W., Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969
- Thomson, Thomas (ed.), The History of the Kirk of Scotland, by Mr. David Calderwood, Vol. 7, Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1845
- Toon, Peter (ed.), Puritans, the Millenium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600 to 1660, Cambridge & London: James Clarke & Co., 1970
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay, England under the Stuarts, 19th edn., Methuen, 1947
- Tyacke, Nicholas, 'Anglican Attitudes: Some Recent Writings on English Religious History, from the Reformation to the Civil War', JBS 35 (1996), 139-67
- _____, Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987
- _____ (ed.), The History of the University of Oxford: Vol. 4 - Seventeenth-Century Oxford, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997
- Wadkins, Timothy H., 'King James I meets John Percy S.J.... An unpublished manuscript', Recusant History 19 (1988), 146-54
- Warner, George F., 'The Library of James VI. in the hand of Peter Young, his tutor, 1573-1583', Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1893
- Welsby, Paul A., George Abbot - the Unwanted Archbishop 1562-1633, SPCK, 1962
- Westcott, Allan F. (ed.), New Poems by James I of England - from a hitherto unpublished manuscript (Add. 24195) in the British Museum, New York: Columbia University Press, 1911
- White, Peter, Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War Cambridge: CUP, 1992
- Williams, Franklin B., Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books Before 1641, London: Bibliographical Society, 1962
- Williamson, Arthur H., 'Scotland, Antichrist and the Invention of Great Britain', in John Dwyer, Roger A. Mason and Alexander Murdoch (eds.), New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland, Edinburgh: John Donald, n.d., 34-58
- _____, Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI: The Apocalypse, the Union and the Shaping of Scotland's Public Culture, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1979
- Willson, David Harris, 'James I and His Literary Assistants', HLQ 8 (1944-5), 35-57
- _____, King James VI and I, Jonathan Cape, 1956
- Wilson, F. P., 'Table-Talk', HLQ 4 (1940), 27-46

- Woolf, D. R., The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War, Toronto, Buffalo & London: University of Toronto Press, 1990
- Wormald, Jenny, Court, Kirk, and Community: Scotland 1470-1625, Edward Arnold, 1981
- _____, 'James VI and I, Basilikon Doron and The Trew Law of Free Monarchies: the Scottish context and the English translation', in Linda Levy Peck (ed.), The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, Cambridge: CUP, 1991, 36-54
- _____, 'James VI and I: Two Kings or One?' (1977), reprinted History 68 (1983), 187-209
- Wright, C. J. (ed.), Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy, British Library, 1997
- Wright, Louis B., 'Propaganda against James I's "Appeasement" of Spain', HLQ 6 (1942-3), 149-72
- Yamada, Akihiro, 'The Printing of King James I's *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* with special reference to the 1603 editions', Poetica 23 (1986), 74-80
- Zaller, Robert, The Parliament of 1621 - A Study in Constitutional Conflict, Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971
- Zwicker, Steven N., Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689, Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1993

Appendix One: Annotated checklist of printed works of James VI & I, in chronological order of first publication

I. Introduction

A scholarly bibliography of King James's writings is urgently needed. At the time of writing, the best available guides to the published material are Wing and STC, which need to be studied in conjunction with Craigie's editions for the Scottish Text Society. There is no good guide to James's letters or speeches, and the manuscript material has never been studied systematically; it seems likely that many discoveries remain to be made. Older library catalogues often give rewarding information. An interesting example of a seventeenth-century library catalogue is that of Sion College, published in 1650; under the author-heading King James are listed works such as the translation of the Psalms, Daniel Featley's Cygneae Cantio, and A Declaratiovn of the Kings Maiesties Intentiovn (1585).¹ Continental catalogues also need to be examined, as new editions of translations of James's works may still come to light.²

¹See J[ohn]. S[pencer]., Catalogus Universalis Librorvm Omnium in Bibliotheca Collegii Sionii, Londini: ex officia typographica Rob. Leybourni, 1650, Wing S4959, Thomason E. 636 (7), sig. L2^r, [X4^r].

²For example, see Georgio Dravidio, Bibliotheca Classica, Francofurti ad Moenum: impensis Balthasaris Ostern, 2 vols., 1625, which lists many Latin translations of James's works; for examples, see sig. C1^v, C3^v, 2T2^r, 7Q3^v. The copy in Edinburgh University Library is at shelfmark *M.23.2-3.

The checklist below is intended to give a basic overview of James's literary activities, and may be compared with the STC / Wing-based list in my bibliography of works cited. (It will be noted that in my thesis I have not always cited a first edition). I have included works such as The Peace-Maker and God and the King because even if they are not wholly James's work, they were clearly produced at his instigation and under his direction. Official documents and proclamations have not been recorded. Several things become apparent when James's works are classified in this way. On the basis of the list below, James was responsible for thirty-three works, all published in a period of thirty-eight years, which went beyond the normal royal duties of publishing proclamations and commissions. These works include two volumes of poetry, five scriptural commentaries, five important letters, and seven speeches to various Parliaments, as well as more familiar works like Basilicon Doron, Dæmonologie, and A Covnter-Blaste to Tobacco.

It is also possible to make some generalisations about the ways in which James's literary interests changed over the years; rather like John Milton, he started writing poetry and poetic theory, then moved into theological and political prose. After his accession to the English throne, and the republication of his individual works, there was a period in which his main new publications were speeches to Parliament. From 1608, the anti-Papal controversial writings mark a new phase in his career, which James probably hoped would be crowned by the publication of the 1617 Workes. However, the writings published between 1618 and 1622 reflect the breakdown between king and subjects, author and reader; there were no major publications during James's last three years.

II. Annotated Checklist

1584

The Essayes of a Prentise, Edinbrugh [*sic*]: b. Thomas Vautroullier, STC 14373

1588

Ane Frvitfvlll Meditatioun contening ane... Expositioun of ye 7. 8. 9. and 10 versis of the 20 Chap. of the Reuelation, Edinbvrgh: b. Henrie Charteris, STC 14376 (not mentioned in thesis; republished in London in 1603)

1589

Ane Meditatiovn vpon the xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxviii, and xxix verses of the xv Chapt. of the first buke of the Chronicles, Edinburgh: b. Henrie Charteris, 1589, STC 14380 (republished in London in 1603)

1591

His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres, Edinburgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, STC 14379 ('Lepanto' republished separately in London in 1603)

1597

The Qvestions to be Resolvit, Edinbvrgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, STC 21891, (Not mentioned in thesis; James's proposals for matters to be discussed at the Perth Assembly of 1597)

Daemonologie, Edinbvrgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, STC 14364 (republished in London in 1603)

1598

The Trve Lawe of free Monarchies, Edinbvrgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, STC 14409 (republished in London in 1603; James's authorship not explicitly acknowledged until republication in the 1617 Workes)

1599

ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΝ ΔΟΞΟΝ, Edinburgh: b. Robert Walde-graue, STC 14348 (redesigned for the public edition of 1603, which was almost immediately republished in London)

1603

The Copie of the K. Maiesties Letter to the L. Maior, [Edinburgh: b. R. Waldegrave], STC 14362 (not mentioned in thesis, this is James's letter of 28 March 1603 thanking Lord Mayor Robert Lee for proclaiming him King of England)

1604

A Covnter-Blaste to Tobacco, London: b. R[obert]. B[arker]., STC 14363

The Kings Maiesties Speech, London: b. Robert Barker, STC 14390

The Copie of His Maiesties Letter, London: [b. F. Kingston f. C. Burby], STC 14361, (entered 27 June 1604, Liber C, f. 111^v), (not mentioned in thesis, this is James's letter to the House of Commons of 26 June 1604 explaining that he had no need of a subsidy)

1605

His Maiesties Speach, London: b. Robert Barker, STC 14392

1607

His Maiesties Speach, London: b. Robert Barker, STC 14395

1608

Triplici Nodo, Triplex Cuneus. Or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, London: b. Robert Barker, STC 14400

1609

A Premonition of his Maiesties to all most mightie Monarches, London: b. Robert Barker, STC 14401 (issued with a new edition of Triplici Nodo)

1610

The Kings Maiesties Speach, London: Robert Barker, STC 14396

1612

Declaration dv Serenissime Roy, Londres: [Eliot's Court Press] chez Iean Norton, STC 9229 (the declaration against Vorstius, later published in English)

1615

Declaration du Serenissime Roy, Londres: par Iehan Bill, STC 14367 (probably with the assistance of Pierre du Moulin; in 1616 this was translated into English by R. Betts)

Deus & Rex, Londini: 1615, STC 14415

1616

His Maiesties Speach in the Starre-Chamber, London: b. Robert Barker, STC 14397

1617

Lettre dy Roy D'Angleterre A Madame La Princesse de Condé, [London?], STC 14379.7 (not mentioned in thesis, this is a letter dated 1 January 1617 in which James expresses his sorrow at the imprisonment of the Prince de Condé)

The Workes, London: b. Robert Barker & John Bill, STC 14344 (a translation into Latin by T. Reid and P. Young appeared in 1619, and an enlarged English edition in 1620)

Paraphrase Upon the Revelation, (first published in the Workes, sig. A1^r-[F6^v]; the editor, James Montagu, states that it was actually the first of James's literary compositions (presumably excluding poetry), written before 1586, sig. [d3^v])

1618

The Kings Maiesties Declaration to His Subiects, concerning lawfull Sports, London:

b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, STC 9238.9

The Peace-Maker: Or, Great-Brittain's Blessing, London: b. Thomas Purfoot, STC

14387 (widely attributed to Thomas Middleton)

1619

A Meditation vpon the Lords Prayer, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, STC

14384 (republished in the enlarged Workes of 1620)

Oratio VI. habita in comitiis regni Scotiæ (speech to the Scottish Parliament of 28

June 1617, first printed in the Opera, sig. [3A6^r-3B5^r])

1620

A Meditation vpon the 27, 28, 29, verses of the XXVII Chapter of St. Matthew,

London: b. Robert Barker & John Bill, STC 14381.5 (republished in the enlarged

Workes of 1620)

1621

His Maiesties Speech in the Vpper House, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill,

STC 14399

1622

His Maiesties Declaration, Touching his Proceedings, London: b. Bonham Norton &

John Bill, STC 9241

His Maiesties Graciov's Letter to the Earle of South-Hampton, London: b. Felix

Kyngston, STC 14378 (not mentioned in thesis, this is James's letter urging the

establishment of a silk-making industry in Virginia rather than a tobacco industry)

The Kings Maiesties Letter to the Lords Grace of Canterbury, touching Preaching,
and Preachers, n. p., n. d., STC 14379.5 (the official text of James's letter is probably
that printed in To the Minister Church-Wardens, STC 13880 - see Chapter Two)

Appendix Two: The Answer to the Libell called the
Comons teares. The wiper of the peoples teares / The
dryer vp of doubtts and feares.

Reproduced from the text of British Library MS. Harley 367, fol. 151^r-152^v, printed in Craigie (1958), 183-191. I have not altered spelling or punctuation, but have corrected Craigie's line numbering where it is incorrect after line 145.

O stay *your* teares you who complaine
and saye as babes doe all in vaine:
Purblind people why doe you prate
too shallowe for the depth of State.
You cannot iudge whats truely myne 5
who see noe farther then the rine.
Kings walke the milkye heavenly way
but you by bye pathes gad astray.
God and Kings doe pace together,
but vulgars wander light as feather. 10
I should be sorry you should see
my actions before they be
brought to the full of my desires
god aboute men kings inspires.
Hold you the publique beaten way 15
wonder at kings and them obey.
ffor vnder God they are to chuse
what rights to take, what to refuse.
whereto if you will not consent
yet hold *your* peace least you repent 20
And be corrected for *your* pride
that kings designes dare thus deride
by raylinge rymes and vaunting verse
which your kings breast should neuer peirce
Religion is the right of kings 25
and they knowe best what good it brings
Whereto you must submitt *your* deeds
or be puld vp like stinkinge weeds.
Kings euer vse there instruments
of whome they iudge by the events 30
The good they cherishe and advance
and many things may come by chance.
Content *your* selues *with* such as I
shall take neare me & place high
The men you mou'd seru'd in there tyme 35
and soe may myne as cleare of crime
All seasons haue their *proper* vents

and bringe forth seuerall events
 whereof the choice doth rest in kings
 who punish and reward them brings 40
 O what a callinge were a kinge
 if he might giue or take nothinge
 but such as you shall to him bringe
 Such were a kinge but in a playe
 if he might beare noe greater swaye 45
 And then were you in worser case
 if soe to keep *your* ancient face
your face would soone out face his might
 if soe you would abridge his right
 Alas fond men play not *with* kings 50
with Lyons clawes or serpents stings
 They kill euen by there sharpe aspect
 the proudest mynde they can deiect
 Make wretched the most mighty man
 though he doe mutinye what he can 55
your censures are a hurryinge round
 that rise as vapours from the ground
 I knowe when it shalbe most fitt
with whome to fill and empty it.
 The Parliament I will appoint 60
 when I see things more out of ioynt.
 Then will I sett all wrye things straight
 and not vpon *your* pleasure waite
 where if you speake as wisemen should,
 if not by me you shalbe schoold. 65
 was euer kinge calld to account,
 or euer mynde soe high did mount,
 as for to knowe the cause and reason
 and to appoint the meanes and season.
 when kings should aske there subiects ayde 70
 kings cannott soe be made afrayde
 Kings will cmand and find the way
 how all of you may easiest paye.
which they'le lay out as they thinke best
 in ernest, and sometymes in iest. 75
 what counsell should be ouerthrowne
 if all were to the people knowne
 And to noe vse were Counsell Tables
 if State affaires were publique bables.
 I make noe doubt all wisemen knowe 80
 this were the way to all our woe.
 ffor ignorance of causes makes
 soe many grosse and foule mistakes
 The modell of our Princely match

you cannot make but marre or patch. 85
 Alas how weake would proue *your* care
 wish onely you his best welfare.
your patience cannot waite our ends
 soe mixt they are twixt foe & frends
 whereof againe ne're seeinge people 90
 straine not to see soe high a steeple
 Looke on the ground whereon you goe
 higher aspects will bringe *your* woe
 Take heed *your* places all be true
 & doe not discontentes renue. 95
 meddle not *with your* Princes cares
 for who soe doth, too much he dares
 I doe desire noe more of you
 but to knowe me as I knowe you.
 Soe shall I loue & you obey 100
 & you loue me in a right way
 O make me not, vnwillinge still
 whome I would saue vnwillinge kill.
 Examples in extremity
 are neuer the best remedy. 105
 Thus haue I pleasd my selfe not you
 and what I say you shall find true.
 Keep euery man his ranke and place
 and feare to fall in my disgrace
 you call our children, chidds of State 110
 you claime a right vnto there fate.
 But knowe you must be pleased *with* what
 shall please vs best in spite of that.
 Kings doe make lawes to bridle you
which they may pardon or imbrue 115
 there hands in the best blood you haue
 and send the greatest to his graue.
 The Charter *which* you great doe call
 came first from Kings to stay *your* fall.
 ffrom an vniust rebellion moued 120
 by such as Kingdomes little loued
 Imbrace noe more you well may hold
 as often doth the ouerbold.
 As they did who *your* Charter sought
 ffor there owne greatnesse, who soe wrought 125
with kings and you, *that* all prou'd nought.
 The loue *that* kings haue to you borne
 mould them thereto for to be sworne
 ffor where smale goods are to be gott
 were knowne to them *that* knowes vs not 130
 yet you that knowe me all soe well

why doe you push me downe to hell
 by makeinge me an Infidell
 Tis true I am a cradle kinge
 yet doe remember euery thinge 135
 That I haue heretofore put out
 and yet begin not for to doubt.
 O how grosse is *your* device
 change to impute to kings as vice
 The wise may chaunge, yet free from fault 140
 though change to worse is euer nought.
 Kings euer overreach you all
 and must stay you though *that* all fall
 Kings cannot *comprehended* be
 in Commons mouths, coniuere ye 145
 all what you can by teares or termes
 deny not what the kinge affirmes
 He doth disdain to cast an eye
 of anger on you least you dye
 Euen at the shadowe of his face 150
 yet giues to all *that* sue for grace
 I knowe my freinds I need noe teachinge
 proud is the foolish ouerreaching
 Come counsell me when I shall call
 wherefore beware of what may fall 155
 Kings will hardly take advice
 Of Counsells, they are wondrous nice
 Loue and wisdom lead them still
 there Counsell tables vp to fill
 They need not helpe in there choice 160
 the best advice is there owne voice
 And be assured that such be Kings
 as they vnto there Counsell brings
which alwayes soe comanded are
 as some would make & some would marre 165
 If I once bend my angry browe
your ruine comes though not as now.
 ffor slowe I am reuenge to take
 and *your* amendment wrath will slake
 then hold *your* pratlinge, spare *your* penne 170
 be honest and obedient men.
 vrge not my Iustice, I am slowe
 to giue you *your* deserued woe
 If *proclamacons* will not serue
 I must doe more peace to *preserue*. 175
 To keep all in obedience
 to driue such busie bodies hence.

Appendix Three: King James and the political historians, 1650-1659

I. Sir Anthony Weldon and the rewriting of Jacobean history

The satirical discourses published in the name of Sir Anthony Weldon have been of particular importance in shaping ideas of King James and determining the reception of his works from the 1650s to the present day. It is remarkable that despite more than a century of attempts to rehabilitate James's character and policies, popular history books continue to rely on scurrilous tales attributed to Weldon, a minor courtier whom James dismissed in 1617.¹ Many republican histories of the 1650s charged both James and Charles with sexual misconduct, religious hypocrisy and tyrannical behaviour, but Weldon's creation of James as a perverted, hypocritical, slobbering villain remains utterly compelling. Charles Howard Carter, writing in 1964, lamented the continuing enthusiasm for Weldon's polemic in the twentieth century, blaming Sir Walter Scott for republishing Weldon's satires when more accurate histories were available, and suggesting that The Fortunes of Nigel had continued Weldon's insidious work.² In 1977, Jenny Wormald remarked of Weldon, 'The consequences of the loss of his job have lasted to the present day; few men in history have had quite such revenge'.³ At the time of writing, a site on the World Wide Web dedicated to King James and his works as evidence for the living authority of a particular hard-line Anglican Protestant position feels it necessary to

devote much space to rebutting the accusations levelled by Weldon and his contemporaries.⁴

The first of the three major satires which have come to be known as Weldon's is the one most likely to have been written by him. This a letter written while accompanying James on his Scottish progress of 1617, in which the author described the poverty, bigotry and foolish traditions of the Scots to an English friend.⁵ The authorship of this work has been questioned: the Abbotsford Club has printed an early manuscript version signed 'John E.', and a fierce contemporary denunciation of the letter, which also refers to this unknown author.⁶ The printed edition of 1649, discussed below, claims, improbably, that the author is James Howell.⁷ One copy, which I have not examined, survives of an edition printed in the Netherlands in 1626, which intriguingly ascribes the authorship to the pro-Laudian divine Dr. Corbet.⁸ However, later anecdotal evidence certainly suggests this work is the one whose discovery led King James to dismiss Weldon, and the style is as pugnacious and observant as that of the later satires printed which bear his name.⁹

It is most interesting to compare the versions of the letter which circulated before the war with those that appeared in the 1640s and 1650s. Although this work was clearly offensive to James Stuart, the earlier versions of the letter all conclude with a conciliatory reference to James, explicitly denying that the Scottish king can be identified with his barbaric countrymen:

And therefore, to conclude, the men of olde did no more wonder that the great Messias should be borne in so poore a Towne as Bethlem in Judea, as I do wonder that so brave a Prince as King James should be borne in so stinking a Towne as Edenborough in l__sy [*lousy*] Scotland. From Lyeth neare Edenborough, 20 June, 1617.¹⁰

This concluding paragraph is transformed in the first edition to be printed in England, which appeared in 1647 with the title Terrible Newes from Scotland, into the following:

To conclude the woman of Jury [*Jewry*] in old time did ont [*sic*] more wonder that the great Messias should be born.¹¹

The editor has removed the parallel between King James and Christ, even at the expense of some absurdity.

Other features of the text in the 1647 edition suggest that this was a deliberate and strategic revision. George Thomason had received this work on 16 August 1647, shortly after the fall of the Presbyterian establishment in London had made a war between England and Scotland almost inevitable. The title-page, following the threat of 'terrible newes', goes on to promise:

A true Declaration of the late Councill of the Kingdome of Scotland, and how far they have proceeded in the raying of their forces with an exact representation of their Genealogies, lives, and manners, Written, By a gentleman employed in the Service for the Publique, and dedicated to the Commissioners of Scotland

The letter of 1617 which follows is, of course, quite different to this exciting packaging, but the purpose of publication is clearly to give a boost to the patriotism of English readers interested in the approaching conflict. The original text was primarily designed to ridicule Scottish culture, and perhaps to encourage feelings of indignation at the prominence of Scots in England under King James; the 1647 version, however, is revised in order to make the satire into a political tract supporting the English Parliament's attempts to rouse the country into action against Scotland, where King Charles's supporters were increasingly active.

Another substantial difference between the texts gives provides more evidence about the editor's attitude to the Jacobean work. In the early version of the letter cited above, the main text begins:

Ffirst, for the Countrey I must confesse yt is too good for those that possess yt, and too bad for others to be at the charge to conquer yt.¹²

The 1647 edition adds an introductory paragraph which untruthfully describes the work as the product of calm reflection upon many years of diplomatic work:

Having had the fortune (honour I will not say) to be imployed in weighty affaires of the publick, between this my native Kingdome of England, and the neighbour Kingdome of Scotland, and collecting from time to time with the greatest industry I could, the severall most materiall passages observable, during the time of my sad [*sic*] employment, at last seeing no end of the case I undertooke, I composed my selfe to a retired life, and began to reflect upon the Diary of my last five yeares action¹³

The editor clearly wishes to suppress the original context to make the work appear as a reliable guide to the contemporary situation. One gets the impression that the reader was expected to swallow the anti-Scottish sentiments, and to ignore the surviving references which make it clear that the letter concerns James's travels in 1617.

It is not surprising that the letter's concluding remarks are so heavily curtailed in the 1647 edition. There was clearly little point in mentioning King James's Scottish origins in a work designed to fan the flames of English nationalism. This satire continued to appear in new editions for years to come; of particular interest are the versions which appeared in 1659, as once again people were waiting to see whether forces would come from Scotland to restore the monarchy, this time under General Monk rather than Charles II.¹⁴ Republicanism and anti-Scottish feeling were repeatedly intertwined in the 1640s and 1650s, with damaging consequences for the

memory of the Scottish King James, as Robert Baillie had anticipated. It is interesting to speculate that it may have been Weldon's anti-Scottish hysteria which endeared him to the hearts of the English pamphlet readers, and which made the later satires published in Weldon's name so successful in destroying James's reputation.

Weldon is mainly known today for The Court and Character of King James (1650) and A Cat May look upon a King (1653).¹⁵ These works, printed after Weldon's death in 1649, were intended as propaganda to legitimise the republic by demonising the fallen regime. The texts may have been written by Weldon before the war, and revised for publication in the 1650s; this is probably the case with The Court and Character, which was attacked by Sir William Sanderson in Aulicus Coquinariæ for containing unacknowledged additions by the publisher. (Sanderson clearly knew that The Court and Character's author, identified as 'A. W.', was Weldon, as he comments on his recent death).¹⁶ Whatever their bibliographical origins, in their eventual printed form these two satires can be related to forms of modern political history which had been developing during the Civil War. Weldon's biting character studies are probably influenced by the genre of works containing intimate studies of the personalities of the great, which had proved very popular in Robert Naunton's Fragmenta Regalia, composed around 1630 and published in 1641. This account of the main characters in the Elizabethan political world went through many editions during the Civil War.¹⁷ Henry Wotton's A Parallel between Robert late Earle of Essex, and George late Duke of Buckingham (1641), which speculates on the psychological differences and similarities between the two great favourites, may also have been an influence.¹⁸

More important, however, is the influence of the tradition of subversive 'secret histories', which claimed to reveal details of persons and events which had been suppressed at the time, and which had enjoyed a revival during the Civil War. The classical model of Procopius was probably an influence on works like The Five Yeares of King James (1643), purportedly by 'S^r Foulk Grevill'. However, it seems unlikely that Fulke Greville could have written such a work, and it has been argued that it was actually composed by the Parliamentary supporter Arthur Wilson (1595-1652).¹⁹ Despite the title, this work analyses events in England from James's accession until the fall of Somerset, describing how James's good beginning was soon marred by economic mismanagement, the ascendancy of Scottish favourites, immorality and innovation. Most of the work is taken up with a detailed narrative of the Overbury scandal, which is seen as exposing the extent of the corruption that had developed behind an ordered facade. This approach differentiates such work from popular royalist histories, like Sir Richard Baker's A Chronicle of the Kings of England (1643), in which a positive account of James's reign is constructed out of a series of anecdotes, and in which the retelling of familiar incidents like the Gunpowder Plot is given prominence.²⁰ Baker, like many earlier writers, is happy to praise James as a semi-inspired writer ('though hee could not Prophesie, yet he could presage; and his Conjectures were little lesse than Oracles').²¹ The Five Yeares rejects the official presentation of James's reign, and gives the impression, at least, of delving below the superficial flow of events to discover and analyse secret proceedings which reveal the true nature of James and his court.

More damning still were works like A Prospective Glasse, Wherein The Child in understanding is enabled to see what the wicked Counsellours did above

twenty yeares ago, which took considerable satisfaction in showing how James had been 'over-reached in that, he himselfe calls King-craft'.²² Many of the Civil War tracts re-viewing the Spanish marriage, and printing the correspondence between Prince Charles and the Pope as is discussed in Chapter Four, belong to this genre. An example is The English Pope, a frenzied attack on James's dealings with the court of Rome which spoke of James ending his reign like Solomon, implying a decline into idolatry with implications of sexual scandal.²³ Even a serious and moderate work like Thomas May's The History of the Parliament of England (1647) had repeated the charge that James had temporized with Rome.²⁴ Alastair Bellamy writes that 'Representations of corruption at court maintained importance during the years of civil war and interregnum, eventually becoming part of the defence of republicanism'.²⁵ The two great satires attributed to Weldon brought all these strands together to form a striking picture of royal decadence.

George Thomason received his copy of The Court and Character of King James on 1 October 1650, a few weeks after the Battle of Dunbar. The work is designed to make readers identify James with the popular image of Machiavelli's model ruler, ruling by deception and conspiracy.²⁶ Daniel Woolf argues that early seventeenth-century advice books written for the ruler followed the example of The Prince by studying other monarchs for parallels. It could be said that The Court and Character subverts this genre, as it sets out to ridicule James and his court without drawing any moral lessons which could be applied to the government in 1650. There may also be a subversive allusion in the title, to The Covrt of the Most Illvstrious and Most Magnificent James, a work published in 1619 to defend the court against

charges of corruption, which also laid down various improving rules for courtiers.²⁷

The only rules seen to operate in The Court and Character are those of Machiavelli.

In particular, the author makes use of the eighteenth chapter of The Prince, entitled 'How princes should honour their word'. Describing James as one who, like Machiavelli's prince, knew how to play both the devious fox and the openly confrontational lion, which appear with James on the cover illustration, the author derides the idea promulgated by both James and Charles I of the king whose integrity was expressed in his words. The reader seems to be invited to recall at least one passage from the first English translation of The Prince, which had appeared in 1640, in which 'the word of a king' is seen in a new light:

How commendable in a Prince it is to keepe his word, and live with integrity, not making use of cunning and subtlety, every one knows well: yet wee see by experience in these our dayes, that those Princes have effected great matters, who have made small reckoning of keeping their words, and have known by their craft to turne and wind men about, and in the end have overcome those who have grounded upon the truth.²⁸

Using a distorted version of Machiavelli's analysis of kingly motivation as a basis for historical narrative, the major events in James's reign are given a colourful retelling, with much cynical speculation about James's motives, usually in relation to young men and Spanish gold. There is no attempt at psychological consistency, as James is described as deeply cunning and idiotically gullible according to the requirements of the story. Weldon's eye for detail, however, ensures that despite the improbability of the narrative as a whole, many of his observations are strikingly accurate. A. W. Beasley has shown that although Weldon's polemics are not to be trusted, passages such as his description of James's physiognomy are clearly the work of an eye-witness who could be reliable when he wanted.²⁹ It is therefore not surprising that

the work was readily received by a public who recognised the author's fidelity to the truth in superficial things, and therefore presumably assumed that his account of secret intrigues was equally trustworthy.³⁰ Carter describes The Court and Character as:

a compilation of backstairs court gossip, much of it salacious, laced with just enough undoubted fact to give it plausibility; as a historical work it falls in just about the same position that it does in time between Suetonius and modern 'scandal magazines'.³¹

The editor who prepared Weldon's text for posthumous publication in 1650 manipulates a manipulative account in order to present the work as a justification for regicide. The publisher's preface claims that King Charles I died as God's punishment for James's failure to fulfill his own promise to bring the murderers of Sir Thomas Overbury to justice. Readers are warned not to be 'opposers of Gods purpose, which doubtlesse is, to lay aside that Family, and to make it an example to posterity; according to the severall imprecations both of King James and King Charles'.³² James's words are being turned against him and his family in the most overt manner. The next edition of the work, in 1651, added a lengthier account of the disasters of Charles's reign, emphasising the fact that Weldon's writing was seen by those in power as evidence that the destruction of the monarchy was an inevitable culmination to years of misrule.³³

It may, indeed, have become apparent to the supporters of the regicide that it was easier to justify their actions by attacking James rather than Charles, who had the Eikon Basilike and the whole royalist press to defend him. Perhaps the royalists would be as reluctant to fly to the aid of James's memory as they had been slow to recover James's texts for their cause when the first pamphlet wars broke out. This

seems likely to have been the motivation behind A Cat May look upon a King, which was printed early in 1653, and which is popularly attributed to Weldon.³⁴ It seems reasonable to identify this work as a substantially contemporary production, in view of the aggressive confidence with which the kings of England from William the Conqueror to Charles I are derided. James, in particular, is described as 'the Fountain of all our late Afflictions and miseries'.³⁵ The preface openly admits that the text is a work of propaganda:

if any man aske why I have curtail'd the lives and persons of these thus; I answer, the Common people of this kingdome cannot attend to read Chronicles, and they are the major part whom it concerns; and now by the providence of God, that we are reduced to a Free State, in this little Book I would have them hereafter know for whom and for what they fight, and pray.³⁶

The ensuing account of James's reign is quite preposterous, including a description of how James left Charles instructions for how to exploit and ruin the kingdom. James's intellectual achievement is dismissed in one casual phrase:

He was a great pretender to Learning and Religion, and for the speculative part, had as much as any of our Kings upon record; but for the practical, and best part of it (if we may judge of the Tree by the Fruit) we may without breach of charity conclude him not guilty³⁷

This is hardly consistent with the idea of James as a tyrant whose schemes reach far into the future; character assassination is the sole purpose of this onslaught. There are also indications that James is being singled out for abuse because the writer hopes readers will associated James's Scottish origins with the attempts of Charles II to regain his throne from the north; at one point, the author demands that Scotland be 'reduced to an English Province, that there may never more be heard the name of a Kirk, or Covenant'.³⁸

The work also contains one of James's letters, written to Parliament in 1621 to warn them against discussing the Spanish marriage negotiations, as an example of his arrogance. The text, which had been printed in 1642 as part of His Maiesties Declaration, Touching his proceedings... in Parliament, is reproduced accurately.³⁹ However, the editor does not explain the circumstances in which the letter was written, and seems to want the reader to accept the letter as evidence that James was a tyrant without really examining the text. A Cat May look upon a King is as vigorous and entertaining as the pamphlets of the 1640s, but the imaginative energy is invested in story-telling, not in rereading the words of James and his fellow-monarchs. The effect is to reduce King James and his works to puppets in a republican comedy.

The open rejection of James in the works attributed to Weldon is found in a host of similar histories and pseudo-histories published during this period. The sequel to The Court and Character, entitled The None-Such Charles His Character (1651), goes far beyond Weldon in impugning James's morals and intentions in order to blacken Charles.⁴⁰ The editor again admits that he is writing propaganda:

As for King James, (the stirring of whose ashes might be spared, were not the Publickes interest to be preferred before that Punctillo) take this of him (besides that which his Court and Character hath presented unto you):...⁴¹

Other works articulated different versions of the conspiracy theories articulated in A Cat May look upon a King, all designed to incite popular fury against the Stuarts. The King of Scotland's Negotiations at Rome for Assistance against the Commonwealth of England, a work published in 1650, claims that Charles II has been collaborating with Rome just like King Charles and King James before him, referring to the texts associated with the Spanish Match as evidence.⁴²

The extraordinary theory that James transmitted to Charles his secret strategy for destroying England was rehearsed in The Life and Reigne of King Charls, Or the Pseudo-Martyr discovered (1651), Cuthbert Sydenham's The False Brother, Or, A New Map of Scotland (1651), and Edward Peyton's fanatical The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts [sic] (1652).⁴³ These works continue the strategy of demonising James as part of their rejection of the whole monarchical tradition, particularly the Scottish monarchical tradition, but without The Court and Character's interest in James as an individual. These can be related to an English version of George Buchanan's A Detection of the Actions of Mary Queen of Scots (1652), which included an edition of the damaging 'casket' letters and sonnets. This edition included a modern address to the reader, urging that the work be read as an instance of the innately malevolent tendencies of the House of Stuart. Mary's son is described as 'a Plague to this Nation', and the writer even calls into question the royal status of James: 'who though he were accounted a wise man, should be accounted with me much wiser if he had known his own father'.⁴⁴ The Stuart belief in the importance of heredity is being turned against Charles II, as these writers depict a continuity of evil plots and corrupt natures.

Henry Parker promoted an anonymous work entitled The True Portraiture of the Kings of England (1650) which includes a remarkable description of James:

A Prince that had many advantages to set up Prerogative, which he improved; he was too timorous to act, but most subtile in Council and designs, and no King did more sensibly and closely undermine the Liberties of England then himself; he gave us cause to remember whence he came; but his peaceable reign was the rail to his design, and did choak suspition; we were brought by him very nigh Rome and Spain, and yet knew it not... I will not rip up his personal failings after his death; he was the most profane King for oaths and blasphemies that England has besides, &c. He now grows old, and was judged only fit to lay the Plot, but not to execute it; the design being now ripe,

and his person and life the only obstacle and Remora to the next Instrument, he is conveyed away suddenly into another world, as his son Henry was, because thought unsuteable to the Plot, it being too long to waite, untill Nature and Distemper had done the deed.⁴⁵

This attempts to validate every conspiracy theory in circulation: James was a Scottish enemy to English liberty, a friend of Rome and Spain, a cunning coward, an open blasphemer and a dissembling hypocrite; furthermore, Charles had murdered James just as James had murdered Prince Henry.

As mentioned in Chapter Four above, many Civil War pamphlets had insinuated that Charles had undone James's good work, and some had gone so far as to suggest that Charles had poisoned his father. Parliament had cited the rumours of Charles's involvement in James's death as one reason for the resolution of 'no addresses'.⁴⁶ George Eglisam's accusations printed in 1642 as The Fore-Runner of Revenge were republished in 1648, in abbreviated form, as A Declaration to the Kingdome of England, Concerning The poysoning of King James.⁴⁷ John Cook's defence of the execution of Charles, King Charls [sic] his Case (1649) asks 'Was he fit to continue a Father to the people, who was without natural affection to his own Father?'⁴⁸ The astrologer William Lilly makes much the same case in Monarchy Or No Monarchy in England (1651).⁴⁹ The True Portraiture of the Kings of England, however, shows that it is possible to go beyond the strategy of lamenting the loss of James in order to turn people against Charles; in this work, a narrative is created in which James and Charles both belong to a corrupt family which advances its schemes by destroying its own members.

The number of works dedicated to the enterprise of fixing James and his writings in a popular conspiracy story suggests that there was an organised effort to

complete the destruction of the royalist version of events. It is interesting to consider the activities of those involved in the printing and publishing of the works mentioned above. Giles Calvert's radical sympathies are well known; Henry Plomer suggests that Francis Tyton held some official position under the Republic, and William Dugard was under obligations to the government who had imprisoned him in early 1650 for printing royalist tracts: he seems to have been released on condition that he would print official propaganda.⁵⁰ Just as the Puritan community of the 1620s and 1630s had invoked the authority of King James's words against the Spanish marriage negotiations and the Laudian innovations, now those connected to the emergent Republic were working together to systematically desecrate the memory of James and his writings in order to blacken the image of his son. As will be seen, the royalists would fight a successful battle to rehabilitate the memory of King Charles, but as ever they would overlook the need to contest the traditions which had preceded him.

II. Documenting the Republic: Reprints and Historical Collections

Once the initial frenzy of Weldon-esque publications began to ease after the consolidation of Cromwell's power, another genre of historical literature took over the task of assimilating the reign and works of King James into a tradition which legitimised the Republic. At least since Foxe's Acts and Monuments, works seeking to use history for polemical reasons had tended to incorporate into their narrative documents such as official letters, proclamations, resolutions and speeches.⁵¹ These lent a weight of authority to the argument, and the skilful editor could turn the most innocuous financial records or notes of a trial into a propaganda coup. Christopher Hill remarks: 'Precedents were interpretable as the Bible. The question that mattered, as Hobbes saw, was Who is to interpret?'.⁵² As has been shown, many of James's speeches, proclamations and letters had been republished during the Civil War. Other documents, relating to more technical legal, financial or administrative developments were also reprinted, although they frequently appeared as if in a vacuum, without commentary or revision to guide the interpretive activity of contemporary readers. As discussed in Chapter Five, this seems to have been particularly true of royalist publications.

For example, in 1644 James's instructions for reforming the Court of Wards in 1622 were accurately reprinted with the original title, A Commission with Instrvctions and Directions.⁵³ These directions express concern that despite previous instructions for reforming the system, wards are being committed to unfit persons without informing the Court, to the detriment of the youths concerned and of the king's revenues. It is not clear why A Commission was reprinted in 1644, although

there does seem to have been some interest in the Court of Wards during the early Civil War.⁵⁴ Charles had ordered the Court to adjourn to Oxford in a proclamation of 27 December 1642, but was unable to prevent the London Parliament from running a parallel organisation successfully. Later proclamations of 1643 show that the London court was depriving Charles of much of the revenue the Wards traditionally provided.⁵⁵ Both courts eventually disappeared under the victorious Parliamentary government, the Oxford court ceasing to exist with the fall of the city in 1646.⁵⁶ If this work was printed at Oxford, as Wing suggests, it may have been intended to contribute to Charles's efforts to persuade the public to apply to the royalist court by presenting an efficient administration, following the reformist traditions established under James. However, in many ways the work seems only relevant to the reformist policies of Lionel Cranfield, who administered the Court of Wards under James, and indeed the new title-page acknowledges the original date of 21 August 1622.⁵⁷ Nothing in the text says anything about the importance of royal control of the court, or about its long tradition which justifies its preservation. Perhaps the work is aimed at a particular section of the Oxford community who were involved in some debate about the operations of the court: this is a text for readers who needed no explicit interpretive markers.

In the 1650s, editors seeking to use the authority of documents to direct the political sympathies of large bodies of readers, and determined to promote the new political order without relying on fantastic narratives which had been forged in the heat of crisis, found a compromise in the model of documentary history. Imaginative history had been used to attack the royalists, but now victory needed to be consolidated by selecting and reproducing the evidence of the past which showed

why the republic had been necessary. The first work to do something like this appears to be The Narrative History of King James, for the first fourteen Years (1651), which was apparently compiled by its publisher, Michael Sparke, who signs the address to the reader 'Mi. Scintilla'. Sparke introduces the work as a collection of documents which reveal the operation of God's justice in history. He claims that the motivation for publication is to pre-empt distorted versions of the same material:

For had this still lien obscure, unhappily it might have come out here-after, as too many gleaning bastard pieces do, too often in these present times, and this piece might have had a new poyson added to this Copy, and so the truth of the story been quite altered⁵⁸

The work is in four parts, some of which appear to have been issued separately at other times. The first is a narrative history of James's early reign, which is an expanded version of The Five Yeares of King James (1643), now described as 'A Historical Narration of the first XIV. years of King James'. This is supplemented by the second part, called 'Truth Brought to Light By Time', which assembles documents relating to the divorce of Frances Howard and the Earl of Essex. This includes James's words in support of the divorce; the reader is left to relate this evidence to his knowledge of the Overbury scandal described in 'A Historical Narration'. The third part is an impressively detailed statistical survey of James's financial situation, entitled 'An Abstract or Brief Declaration Of the present state of his Majesties Revenew', which is presented as a reprint of existing material. Both the second and the third parts are supplying hard evidence to support the opening narrative's description of corruption and mismanagement.⁵⁹ The fourth part is 'A True Relation of the Commissions and Warrants for the Condemnation and Burning

of Batholomew Legatt and Thomas Withman', the account of the burning of two men accused of heresy in 1611, with James's letter ordering their execution.⁶⁰ The title-page of this part declares that the false opinions of the convicted men are in part 'the very same which our Ranters in these times profess to be their New Lights'. The documents of James's reign are being used to show both the shortcomings of the Stuart court which led to its downfall, and the good traditions it maintained which are now threatened by religious radicals. Although Sparke's beliefs are not disguised, he does not take undue liberties with his sources, and the resulting compilation is interesting, if somewhat disconnected.⁶¹

A fuller integration of document and narrative is found in Arthur Wilson's The History of Great Britain: being the life and reign of King James, which was published in 1652, probably shortly after Wilson's death that year.⁶² Like Weldon, he seems to have felt that posthumous publication of his greatest work would be safer. This work has the same tone of moderate anti-royalism found in The Five Yeares of King James, but succeeds in supporting its account with texts incorporated into the main body of the work. Wilson gives long extracts from and paraphrases of most of James's major speeches, frequently drawing attention to the gap between James's words and political reality. When paraphrasing the speech of 21 March 1609/10, he gives an ironic running commentary on James's description of the nature of kings:

'They can exalt low things, and abase high things, making the subjects like men at Chests [*sic*], a pawn to take a Bishop or a Knight'. (But he left out the power of a Pawn to take a Queen, or check a King) And when he had raised the Kings power to the height, with 'Vos dii estis', he brings them down again, with, 'They shall die like men'⁶³

James's speeches are depicted as theatrical performances, equally arrogant and foolish in their invocation of a power he did not possess. Ultimately, James's words

were just hot air. Wilson remarks on how James was unable to translate his utterances into action, 'though they tended to his own Preservation'.⁶⁴ Of James's government by the pen, Wilson says that the people initially submitted to his proclamations, taking them 'for good payment a great while, till the multitude of them lessned their valuation'.⁶⁵ James's texts are presented as symptoms of a decaying state.

The creation of the Protectorate in 1653, fifty years after James had established the Union of Crowns, may have been one reason why documentary histories analysing the half-century became so numerous. Cabala, Mysteries of State, in Letters of the Great Ministers of K. James and K. Charles, which was published after Cromwell's forced dissolution of the Long Parliament in 1653, gives even more space to original documents, at the expense of the narrative.⁶⁶ Perhaps it was felt that with a degree of political security, readers could be trusted to interpret the texts according to the revisionist narratives. The preface invokes scholarly ideals, claiming that the edited texts display the truth:

without any false glosse to writhe, or streighten, to deprave or extenuate, with more truth and sincerity, then all the Annals can show; where Passion and Interest sway oftentimes too much, and the cleanest hand makes blots and stains, carried away with Love or Hatred, to the side or man.⁶⁷

The selection of texts, however, suggests that England before the republic was an unhealthy state full of intrigue and conspiracies. In terms of James's writings, the editor chooses to include two letters. These are James's letter to the Lord Keeper of 3 October 1621, in which the king wonders what to do about the scandal which had arisen from Archbishop Abbot's accidental shooting of a keeper, and a letter of 30 September 1622 to Pope Gregory XV suggesting that they cooperate in the cause of

international peace.⁶⁸ These would all presumably have triggered readers to recall the charges of religious hypocrisy and pro-Catholic plots which had become an essential part of the republican narratives. The sequel to Cabala appeared in the early summer of 1654, entitled Scrinia Sacra: Secrets of Empire, in Letters of illustrious Persons, which claimed to reveal the truth about the making of foreign policy under Henry VIII, Elizabeth and James, but which also printed works relating to the crisis in the 1620s like James's Letter and Directions of 1622, and many letters relating to the Spanish match negotiations.⁶⁹ Although these works claim 'impartiality', even if they cannot be judged by the word in its modern sense, they are clearly endeavouring to fix King James's words within the republican narrative, and to ensure that readers associate James's writings with deception, tyranny and corruption.⁷⁰

By the late 1650s, the documentary history was so well established a genre that its practitioners began to reflect on the purpose and ideology of such writing. John Rushworth's Historical Collections, the first volume of which appeared in 1659, contain the most clearly articulated defence of documentary history. Rushworth's stated aim is not to defend the republic, which in 1659 was on the verge of collapse, as much as to explain the outbreak of the Civil War from a distinctly pro-Parliamentary viewpoint. He remarks that he had originally intended to start his collections with King Charles's first parliament, but

after I had perused, ordered, and compared my Printed and Manuscript-Relations of the First Year of that Parliament, I found they pointed at, and were bottomed upon some Actions of the late King, in dissolving four preceding Parliaments⁷¹

He therefore starts his collections in 1618, the year of the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War, thereby, once again, locating the roots of the Civil War in James's

diplomatic manoeuvres during his last years.⁷² Again, texts like the Letter and Directions of 1622 are printed. Rushworth is more sympathetic to James than some historians, refusing to use Weldon's writing on the grounds that it was originally anonymous.⁷³ However, the way in which Rushworth treats James's texts as merely illustrations of larger movements in history does discourage one from reading them as anything more than documentary evidence. In fact, at times he seems to think that texts obscure the truth rather than elucidate it.

Rushworth states that this work is intended to be a corrective to the imaginative pamphlets of the 1640s:

other mens Fancies were more busie then their hands, forging Relations, building and battering Castles in the Air; publishing Speeches as spoken in Parliament, which were never spoken there; printing Declarations, which were never passed; relating Battels which were never fought, and Victories which were never obtained; dispersing Letters, which were never writ by the Authors; together with many such Contrivances, to abet a Party or Interest.⁷⁴

Rushworth tries to detach his documents from the muddle of rumour and imaginative speculation that has accumulated around them, and fix them firmly in his narrative of the rise of Parliament. In this he displays an approach to history which is quite different from that realised in the heterogenous collection of his friend and publisher, George Thomason, as Lois Spencer has observed.⁷⁵ It is perhaps not surprising that although his Collections contain some brilliant writing, remarkable letters and powerful speeches, they have always been treated as a compilation of historical documents, not as a literary anthology.

Thomas Frankland or Franklin was to criticise Rushworth's scholarship in The Annals of King James and King Charles, accusing him of having placed words in the mouth of James which he never spoke.⁷⁶ The most detailed analysis of

Rushworth's handling of his sources, however, appeared in John Nalson's An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State, in which Rushworth's version of James's speech of 30 January 1620/1 is compared with versions in Frankland's Annals and in a manuscript owned by Archbishop Sancroft.⁷⁷ This speech, discussed in Chapter Two, contains the famous remark:

But as no man's actions, be he never so good, are free from sin, being a mortal, sinful creature, so some through a spice of envy have made all my speech heretofore turn like spittle against the wind upon mine own face⁷⁸

Rushworth's version is shorter:

Yet as no man's Actions can be free, so in me God found some spices of Vanity, and so all my sayings turned to me again without any success.⁷⁹

Nalson claims that the Sancroft manuscript gives the better reading:

as no Man's Actions, be they never so good can be free from Censure, in regard of the Excellency to make perfection, So, it may be, it pleased God seeing some Vanity in me to send back my words as wine spit' into my own Face.

It seems likely that had Nalson known just how many versions of James's words were in circulation, he might have revised his verdict on Rushworth.⁸⁰ Nalson's scholarship may be doubted; a marginal note refers to Frankland's version of James's speech, which is closer to the Sancroft manuscript than Rushworth's text: 'In Dr. Franklin's Copy it is, *Wind*, which being very improper, makes me judge this Copy the more perfect'. In fact, as the manuscript used by Wallace Notestein cited above suggests, 'wind' is a much better reading than 'wine', which makes very little sense.

Nalson goes on, however, to attack Rushworth for giving James speaking of 'the Two Estates' when Sancroft's version has 'Three Estates'.⁸¹ He concludes that:

To compare these two Speeches, one would believe, That Mr. Rushworth had given us only a Compendium and Epitome, or the Heads of the King's Speech. And indeed it looks like one of his Abridgments, at which as we

shall in due time see, he has a very notable Faculty, and herein he has been so punctual, as to abridge the Three Estates in Parliament unto two. But though we might pass by the other incoherences, and in many places almost want of sense, yet this being an Error in the very Fundamentals of our Government, a State Heresie of most pernicious and dangerous consequence, must by no means be passed over without some Animdaverision, and giving the Reader an Amulet against the Poison of this Principle⁸²

The beliefs and policies of James are of no real interest to Nalson in his attempt to prove Rushworth guilty of manipulating tiny textual details for political reasons; the frame of the documentary history has become much more important than the nature and context of the documents themselves. The very genre of the documentary history, even when employed by royalists like Nalson, acted to deaden the force of the royal word, and to diminish its authority by making it the subject of pedantic academic quibbling.

III. Royalist counter-propaganda, and the failure to rehabilitate King James

The royalist writers seem to have conceded much of the argument from the start, by engaging their opponents on the same ground, just as they had done by contesting the appropriation of James's words by the Parliamentarians in the 1640s. As Nalson's example suggests, their response to the republican documentary collections was to issue different versions of the same model: equally, their response to the fantastic conspiracy stories of Weldon and his like was simply to publish a different set of conspiracy stories. For example, the anonymous ΤΟ ΞΕΙΨΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΩΝ, Or, A Brief Narration of the Mysteries of State (1651) deals with the accusation that James and Charles had been in league with Spain by concocting the preposterous charge that it was in fact Cromwell who was the Spanish confederate, and that the execution of Charles I was the design of a Spanish-backed alliance of Papists and Independents.⁸³ Sir William Sanderson's pamphlet Aulicus Coquinariæ (1651) has been mentioned; although this straightforward reply to Weldon proclaims James's integrity and pure motivation, it is only a royalist version of Weldon's gossipy discussion of James's character and actions. The underlying paradigm, which was so damaging to James's image, is not confronted. There is no attempt, for instance, to rebut Weldon's charges by referring to James's writings. The tone of the conclusion suggests an awareness of lost opportunities:

And for the present, leave Him so great a King to His continued Memory, by His own excellent Impressions in Print, that fame Him to Posterity; whom we did not value, because we could not comprehend.⁸⁴

Sanderson's party has indeed failed to understand the potential value of James and his texts. The hope that the royal word will resist the attempt to suppress its author resembles the hopes of the publishers of Eikon Basilike that its readers would find in the royal words a substitute monarch to adore. However, if Sanderson hoped that this late reference could help James's works to perform like Eikon Basilike, he was mistaken. James's texts had failed to preserve their iconic status; political exigency had forced him to continue writing after the intended completion of his oeuvre in the 1617 Workes, and the royalists had done little to cultivate their iconographical potential. One way out might have been to allow James's works to speak out against the scandal-mongers, but Sanderson does not have the confidence to put into practice the solution acknowledged in his conclusion. James's words are left outside Sanderson's history, just as they are dismissed in Weldon's satires.

Sanderson went on to simultaneously reply to the charges in the scandalous pamphlets and to the insinuations in the documentary histories, with indifferent results. He attacked the arguments and suggestions of Weldon, Wilson, and the Cabala at greater length in A Compleat History of the Lives and Reigns of Mary Queen of Scotland, and of her Son (1655-6).⁸⁵ This large work is continually referring to the texts it is attempting to refute, which gives it the impression of being somewhat beleaguered.⁸⁶ A similar difficulty seems to have been shared by Thomas Fuller's The Church-History of Britain, also published in 1655. This large pro-episcopal history contains numerous extracts from original sources, and inevitably finds itself engaged against the Puritan sympathies of collections like Wilson's The History of Great Britain. Although Fuller seems to have made a genuine attempt to remain moderate and objective, by choosing to employ many of the techniques of

documentary history he finds it necessary to criticise other practitioners of the genre.⁸⁷ At one point, Fuller digresses in order to attack the theory expressed in several republican histories that James had known about the Gunpowder Plot all along, and had exposed it at the moment when it would win him the most admiration:

But, if wilde conjectures in such cases from obscure Authors, shall be permitted to justle for credit against received Records, all former unquestionable history, will be quickly reduced to an universal uncertainty. But there is a generation of people, who, to inhance [*sic*] the reputation of their knowledge, seem not only, like mothes, to have lurked under the carpets of the Counsel-Table; but, even like fleas, to have leaped into the pillows of Princes bed-chambers, thence deriving their private knowledge of all things, which were, or were not ever done, or thought of.⁸⁸

In particular, Fuller denounces Arthur Wilson as 'a witty Writer (but more Satyrist than Historian)'.⁸⁹ The fact that Fuller feels impelled to write in this way, however, emphasises the fact that Wilson's history was proving remarkably pervasive.

Particular tension is present in Fuller's work when he attempts to deal with King James's writings. The republican documentary histories had included texts like the Letter and Directions of 1622, and Fuller tries to respond in kind by including the same texts, but with a commentary more favourable to the king. However, the result of this endeavour is that the work repeatedly records the way in which James's writings had been turned against him. Fuller reveals the way in which James's reign had opened with the Millenary Petition and a similar offering from the Family of Love quoting James's Basilicon Doron in support of their religious programme.⁹⁰ He refers to James's Declaration against Vorstius, but shies away from actually giving the text because 'each word in His Majesties Declaration is so pure and pretious, that it cannot be lessened without losse'; perhaps Fuller was thinking of the way it had been taken out of context by Puritan writers like Francis Rous.⁹¹ By choosing to

include the Letter and Directions, Fuller obliges himself to give an account of its disastrous reception.⁹² In The Church-History of Britain, James's writings continue to undermine his authority.

The same is true of Archbishop John Spottiswood's The History of the Church of Scotland, published in 1655, like the works of Sanderson and Fuller.⁹³ Spottiswood had completed the work before his death in 1639 and so his posthumously-published work is not tied to the model of documentary history established in the 1650s. However, Spottiswood does seem to be influenced by the Puritan narrative of resistance to and unauthorised interpretations of James's texts, which had obviously shaped the format of the republican historical collections. In giving an account of the way in which Scotland's wise church government was increasingly threatened by Puritan extremists, Spottiswood ends up recounting James's failure to retain control over his words. He is forced to describe the furore over Patrick Adamson's Declaration issued in James's name, James Melvill's critical reading of Basilicon Doron which led James to issue the first public edition, and the reaction to the 1622 Letter and Directions.⁹⁴

If Spottiswood, writing in or before 1639, could not conceal the fact that James's words had been largely to the advantage of the Puritans, it is not surprising that pro-episcopalian writers in the 1650s, shaped by the models established by Weldon and Wilson, were quite unable to use the history and writings of King James for the advantage of their party. As discussed in my conclusion above, it seems that many royalist and episcopalian writers had grave doubts about the achievements of James, particularly his literary achievements. In view of this half-hearted approach, it is not surprising that the model of history into which King James was written in the

1650s was one which clearly testified to the triumph of the Puritans and Parliamentarians.

¹Bryan Bevan, King James VI of Scotland & I of England, The Rubicon Press, 1996, 148

²Carter (1964), 110-111. See Walter Scott, Secret History of the Court of James the First, 2 vols., Edinburgh: Ballantyne, 1811. See also Lockyer (1998), 1+.

³Wormald (1977[1983]), 191

⁴See <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/rumors.htm>

⁵The text is available in P. Hume Brown, Early Travellers in Scotland, Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1891, 96-103; see Galloway (1986), 140. Weldon's descriptions are dismissed in William A McNeill and Peter G. B. McNeill, 'The Scottish Progress of James VI, 1617', SHR 75 (1996), 38-51, esp. p. 40.

⁶Miscellany of the Abbotsford Club, Vol. 1, Edinburgh: 1837, [289]-317. See CSPD, 1623-25, 550-1, where the letter is dated 22 June 1617, and the author is given as 'John R.'

⁷A Perfect Description of the People and Country of Scotland, 'By James Howel', London: f. J. S., 1649, Wing W1277, Thomason E. 560 (7). Wormald discusses this edition in the belief that it is by Weldon (Wormald, [1977]1983, 190-1). The copy in the National Library of Scotland, shelfmark H.Br.51, has been carefully annotated by a reader who seems to have been noting differences between this and one of the later editions mentioned below, probably the 1659 edition printed for 'J. S.' (Wing W1277AB) or a variant.

⁸A Discription of Scotland, by observation of doctor Corbett in his majesties progresse into that country, 'The fourth edition', [Netherlands?], 1626, STC 25228.5; only copy in Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington D. C.

⁹See article on Weldon in DNB.

¹⁰British Library Harl. MSS. 5191, in Nichols, Progresses, Vol. 3, 338-43, p. 343.

¹¹Terrible Newes from Scotland, London: f. T. W., 1647, Wing W1277AC, Thomason E. 402 (7), sig. [A3^v]

¹²British Library Harl. MSS. 5191, in Nichols, Progresses, Vol. 3, 338.

¹³sig. A1^r

¹⁴A Perfect Description of the People and Country of Scotland, London: f. J. S., 1659, Wing W1277AB; A Perfect Description of the People and Countrey of Scotland, London: f. Rich. Lownds, 1659, Wing W1277A

¹⁵The Court and Character of King James, 'by Sir A. W.', London: b. R. I., s. b. John Wright, 1650, Wing W1273, Thomason E. 1338 (1); A Cat May look upon a King, London: f. William Raybould, 1652/3, Wing W1271, Thomason E. 1408 (2), dated 10 January by Thomason.

¹⁶[William Sanderson], Aulicus Coquinariae, London: f. Henry Seile, 1650/1, Wing S645, Thomason E. 1356 (2), sig. A2^r-3^v

¹⁷I am using Robert Naunton, Fragmenta Regalia, [London]: Printed, 1641, Wing N249, Thomason E. 158 (22); see John S. Cerovski (ed.), Fragmenta Regalia, London & Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1985; F. Smith Fussner, The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought 1580-1640, London:

Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962, 157. Naunton's significance is acknowledged by David Nichol Smith, Characters from the Histories & Memoirs of the Seventeenth Century, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918, [ix], which goes on to give extracts from Anthony Weldon and Arthur Wilson.

¹⁸Henry Wotton, A Parallele betweene Robert late Earle of Essex, and George late Duke of Buckingham, London: Printed, 1641, Wing W3647

¹⁹The Five Yeares of King James, London: f. W. R., 1643, Wing W2887, Thomason E. 101 (14), dated 10 May by Thomason. For Greville, see Woolf (1990), 175+, and DNB, where the case for his authorship of this work is rejected; for Wilson, see DNB, and anonymous article in N&Q 4th series, Vol. 2 (1868), 489-90.

²⁰R[ichard] Baker, A Chronicle of the Kings of England, London: f. & s. b. Daniel Frere, 1643, Wing B501, sig. 4Q1^r+. See Brownley (1989). For a critical response to Baker, see T[homas]. B[lount]., Animadversions upon Sr Richard Baker's Chronicle, Oxon: H. H. f. Ric. Davies, 1672, Wing B3327.

²¹sig. 4V2^r

²²A Prospective Glasse, Wherein The Child in understanding is enabled to see what the wicked Counsellours did above twenty yeares ago, 1644, Thomason E. 53 (1), sig. X2^v. Wing lists this work as part of an anonymous work by Hezekiah Woodward, Wing W3489A, but also suggests it was actually written by Henry Walker. For James's references to the 'craft' of kingship, see the second book of Basilicon Doron; in Craigie (1944), 142-5; Sommerville (1994), 44. Lucy Hutchinson also speaks of James having employed 'King-craft' to subvert true religion, see James Sutherland (ed.), Lucy Hutchinson: Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson - with the fragment of an autobiography of Mrs. Hutchinson, OUP, 1973, 43.

²³The English Pope, London: f. Robert Bostock, 1643, Wing E3109, Thomason E. 56 (13), dated by Thomason 1 July.

²⁴Thomas May, The History of the Parliament of England, London: b. Moses Bell f. George Thomason, 1647, Wing M1410, sig. C2^v-3^r. See Woolf (1990), 248-50.

²⁵Bellamy (1994), 309

²⁶Woolf (1990), 143-9

²⁷The Covrt of the Most Illvstrious and Most Magnificent James, London: b. Edw. Griffin, 1619, STC 1022. The dedication to Buckingham is signed 'A. D. B.', sig. [π4^v].

²⁸Niccolò Machiavelli, Nicholas Machiavel's Prince, transl. E. D[acres]., R. Bishop f. Wil. Hils, s. b. Daniel Pakeman, 1640, STC 17168, (entered 16 June 1639, Liber D, p. 442), sig. [G8^r]. See The Prince, transl. George Bull, Penguin, 1975, 99.

²⁹Beasley (1995), 151-6

³⁰Among those readers who enjoyed The Court and Character was Samuel Pepys, who describes it as 'worth reading, though ill intended' in his diary entry for 14 May 1665; see Robert Latham and William Matthews (ed.), The Diary of Samuel Pepys: A New and Complete Transcription, G. Bell & Sons, 1972, Vol. 6, 33, 102.

³¹Carter (1964), 110

³²sig. [A4^v]

³³A[nthony]. W[eldon]., The Court and Character, London: b. R. I., s. b. J. Collins, 1651, Wing W1274, sig. [M8^v]+

³⁴A Cat is not printed in Walter Scott's Secret History, which contains Weldon's Court and Character and A Perfect Description of Scotland.

³⁵p. 2 [unsigned before B]

³⁶sig. C3^v

³⁷sig. [C11^r]

³⁸sig. C4^v-[C5^r]

³⁹See Chapter Four; also in Sommerville (1994), 252-3.

⁴⁰The None-Such Charles His Character, London: b. R. I. s. b. John Collins, 1651, Wing N1226A, Thomason E. 1345(2)

⁴¹sig. [B7^r]

⁴²The King of Scotland's Negotiations at Rome for Assistance against the Common-Wealth of England, London: b. William Du-gard, 1650, Wing K571, Thomason E. 612 (6), sig. [D4^r]

⁴³The Life and Reigne of King Charls, Or the Pseudo-Martyr discovered, London: f. W. Roybould, 1651, Wing L2020C (improbably attributed to John Milton by the first edition of Wing), sig [A6^r]; [Cuthbert Sydenham], The False Brother, Or, A New Map of Scotland, London: b. R. W. f. Francis Tyton, 1651, Wing S6294, Thomason E. 620 (13) (dated by Thomason 27 December 1650), sig. [A4^r]; Edward Peyton, The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts, London: f. Giles Calvert, 1652, Wing P1952, Thomason E. 1291 (1), sig. B1^v

⁴⁴G[eorge]. Buchanan (ed.), A Detection of the Actions of Mary Queen of Scots, Printed, 1651, Wing B5281, Thomason E. 1383 (2), sig. *2^v, *5^r. For the original texts, see [George Buchanan] (ed.), De Maria Scotorum Regina, [London: b. John Day, 1571], STC 3978, and G[eorge]. B[uchanan]. (ed.), [transl. T. Wilson?], Ane Detection of the Duinges, [London: b. John Day, 1571], STC 3981.

⁴⁵The True Portraiture of the Kings of England, London: b. R. W. f. Francis Tyton, Wing P429, Thomason E. 609 (2), sig. F3^{r-v}. There is an analysis of this work's republican nature in Sanderson (1989), 146-7.

⁴⁶See A Declaration of the Commons (11 February 1647/8), London: f. Edward Husband, 1647/8, Wing E2559, Thomason E. 427 (9), sig. B2^v, and a reply, Treasons Anatomie, Printed, 1647/8, Wing T2083, Thomason E. 427 (24).

⁴⁷George Eglisam, A Declaration to the Kingdome of England, Concerning The poysoning of King James, London: f. Geo. Horton, 1648, Wing E255, Thomason E. 427 (5), dated by Thomason 14 February 1647/8.

⁴⁸John Cook, King Charls his Case, London: b. Peter Cole f. Giles Calvert, 1649, Wing C6025, Thomason E. 542 (3), sig. B2^v

⁴⁹William Lilly, Monarchy Or No Monarchy in England, London: f. Humfrey Blunden, 1651, Wing L2228, Thomason E. 638 (17), sig. M3^r

⁵⁰Plomer (1907), 185; see Leona Rostenberg, Literary, Political, Scientific, Religious & Legal Publishing & Bookselling in England 1551-1700, Vol. 1, New York: Burt Franklin, 1965, 130-159.

⁵¹Woolf (1990), 221, 255-259

⁵²Hill (1965), 254

⁵³A Commission with Instrvctions and Directions, London: b. Bonham Norton & John Bill, 1622, STC 9242; A Commission with Instrvctions and Directions, [Oxford?]: f. H. H., 1644, Wing J130, Thomason E. 80 (3)

⁵⁴For an example of a conservative account, see James Ley, A Learned Treatise Concerning Wards and Liveries, London: b. G. Bishop & R. White f. Henry Shephard & Henry Twyford, 1642, Wing M687

⁵⁵James F. Larkin (ed.), Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol. 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983, 834-7, 883-6, 971-2

⁵⁶H. E. Bell, An Introduction to the History and Records of the Court of Wards & Liveries, Cambridge: CUP, 1953, 150-8

⁵⁷The instructions of 1622 repeated those given in December 1618, after Cranfield had taken over the Court of Wards; he became treasurer in September 1621. See M. J. Hawkins (ed.), Sales of Wards in Somerset, 1603-1641, Somerset Record Society, 1965, xix, and Prestwich (1966), 232-41; Bell (1953), 60-1.

⁵⁸[Michael Sparke], The Narrative History of King James, for the first fourteen Years, London: f. Michael Sparke, 1651, Wing S4818, sig. a2^{r-v}. Sparke is known an author as well as the publisher of the works of William Prynne; see Plomer (1907), xii, 169, McKenzie (1976), 11-12, and DNB (Missing Persons); he also seems to have had an interest in the anti-Catholic tracts of Thomas Scott (see Jackson (1950), 32).

⁵⁹For the various economic and financial mishaps of James's reign, see the major analysis in Prestwich (1966), and the more positive account in Lockyer (1998), 78-99.

⁶⁰The separate issue of this part is A True Relation of the Commissions and Warrants for the Condemnation and Burning of Batholomew Legatt and Thomas Withman, London: f. Michael Spark, 1650, catalogued by Wing as J146. It is curious that the title-page speaks of 'Thomas Withman', when the text makes clear that the name of the second victim was Edward Wightman. See DNB, 'Bartholomew Legate' and 'Edward Wightman'.

⁶¹For Sparke's intention in this work, see MacGillivray, (1974), 28-9.

⁶²Wilson (1653), mentioned in Chapter Four. I am using the 1653 edition, Wing W2888, as the only copy of the 1652 edition apparently exists in Bristol Cathedral Library (not examined).

⁶³sig. [G3^v], see Sommerville (1994), 181-4

⁶⁴sig. 2P1^r

⁶⁵sig. C2^r

⁶⁶Cabala, Mysteries of State, in Letters of the Great Ministers of K. James and K. Charles, London: f. M. M. G. Bedell & T. Collins, Wing C183, Thomason E. 221 (3). The printed text is dated 1654, but Thomason gives his copy the date 31 October 1653.

⁶⁷sig. A4^r

⁶⁸sig. C2^v-[3^r], 2E2^{r-v}.

⁶⁹Scrinia Sacra (1654); for the Letter and Directions, see Chapters Two and Four.

⁷⁰For the debate over what seventeenth-century writers meant by 'impartiality', see MacGillivray (1974), 5-7, and Woolf (1990), 255+.

⁷¹Rushworth (1659), sig. b2^r

⁷²Christopher Hill connects Rushworth's decision to start his account in 1618 with Clarendon's decision to start the History of the Rebellion in 1625; see 'The English Revolution and the Brotherhood of Man', in Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century (first published Martin Secker & Warburg, 1958, my edition Mercury, 1962), 128. For Clarendon's statement that he could not trace the rebellion's origins to a period before Charles's reign, see Edward Earl of Clarendon, ed. W. Dunn Macray, The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England begun in the year 1641, Vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888, reprinted Oxford: OUP, 1969, 3.

⁷³sig. [X4^r]

⁷⁴sig. b1^v-2^r

⁷⁵Lois Spencer, 'The Politics of George Thomason', Library (5th series) 14 (1959), [11]-27, esp. 24-5

⁷⁶[Thomas Frankland], The Annals of King James and King Charles, London: b. Tho. Braddyll, f. Robert Clavel, 1681, Wing F2078, sig. [b2^r]

⁷⁷John Nalson, An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State London: f. S. Mearne, T. Dring, B. Tooke. T. Sawbridge & C. Mearne, 1682, Wing N106, sig. a2^v-[b4^v]

⁷⁸Notestein (1935), 2

⁷⁹Nalson (1682), sig. [a4^r]; Rushworth (1659), sig. [D3^r]

⁸⁰There is an excellent chapter on the Rushworth / Nalson controversy in MacGillivray (1974), [96]-119, which makes precisely this point (pp. 103-4).

⁸¹sig. [a4^r]

⁸²sig. [b3^v-4^r]

⁸³ΤΟ ΞΕΙΠΥΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΩΝ, Or, A Brief Narration of the Mysteries of State, 'Hague: Samuel Brown', 1651, Wing X2, Thomason E. 637 (2). The absurd theories in this work bear comparison with William Prynne's paranoid fears that swarms of Jesuits were roaming England committing crimes including the execution of Charles I, see Lamont (1963), 119+.

⁸⁴sig. [O7^r]

⁸⁵Sanderson, A Compleat History, mentioned in Chapter Four. The second part, The Reign and Death of King James, London: b. Henry Hills, 1655, should probably be treated as a separate Wing item.

⁸⁶Donald Stauffer dismisses this work as 'pure patchwork history', which confuses history and biography (Stauffer, 1964, 220-1).

⁸⁷For Fuller's moderation, which was criticised by extremists like Peter Heylyn, see Joseph H. Preston, 'English Ecclesiastical Historians and the Problem of Bias, 1559-1742', Journal of the History of Ideas 32 (1971), 203-220, pp. 206-8.

⁸⁸Fuller (1655), sig. 4E3^r

⁸⁹sig. 4H1^r

⁹⁰sig. 4C3^v, 4D3^r-[4D4^v]

⁹¹sig. 4H3^v. For the Declaration against Vorstius, and its use by Rous, see Chapter Three.

⁹²sig. 4O2^v-[4O4^r]

⁹³John Spotswood (more usually known as Spottiswood or Spottiswoode), The History of the Church of Scotland, London: b. J. Flesher f. R. Royston, 1655, Wing S5022. This work is discussed in relation to David Calderwood's rival Presbyterian history in Mullan (1986), 136-50.

⁹⁴sig. [2F5^r-2G5^r], [2Q6^r]+, [3A2^r]

Appendix Four: Alternative Traditions

I. Continuing Traditions 1643-1715: King James's 'table talk'

One collection of James's 'table-talk', Flores Regij (1627) has been discussed already; other collections continued to appear through the Civil War and right through into the eighteenth century. Although I have suggested that Flores Regij may have had some connections with the movement trying to direct King Charles's actions by appealing to his father's words, these later collections seem increasingly unrelated to the more prominent pattern of reading King James against his son, and are frequently framed by introductions and commentaries which give evidence of an emerging different approach. Two collections were published in 1643. George Thomason received Wittie Obseruations Gathered from our late Sovereign King James in his ordinarie Discourse, on 8 November 1643.¹ This consists of the first fifty-eight aphorisms in the 1627 collection of two hundred, which are reprinted without commentary. Interestingly, the editor incorporates two new remarks. They do not strike the reader as particularly different from the rest of James's sayings, but when considered in isolation, it is possible to argue that a political point is being made. The first reads:

I desire not to live longer then I am accounted honest, reasonable, of honest and reasonable men: no longer to be a King then I use my power to maintaine reason, and not to overthrow it.²

In the Civil War, the Parliamentary leaders were increasingly inclined to argue that as Charles was not being guided by 'honest and reasonable men', and not acting reasonably, his kingly authority had to be wielded by his Parliament alone.

The second interposition is more subtle: 'I will not reward any in matter of justice, for that is not mine, but Gods, and the peoples'.³ This could raise various interesting questions: in what sense is justice the property of the people, and how far are they able to control what they own? However, it is hard to believe that the average reader would have picked up on these political additions. The work claims to have been 'Licensed and entred according to Order', which might support the case that this reprint was intended to promote the London administration.⁴ Even so, it seems most peculiar that Parliamentary sympathisers would attempt to further their cause by means of such subliminal messages. Perhaps the editor had discovered some additional sayings attributed to James in manuscript, and decided to include in the new edition two which seemed relevant to the contemporary situation; there is, however, insufficient evidence to definitely ascribe a political motive. It seems possible that the extra aphorisms were included simply to add thought-provoking proverbial material.

It is interesting to speculate on the relationship between this work and King James his Apopthegmes; Or, Table-Talke: as they were by Him delivered Occasionally, a collection prepared by Benjamin Agar, which also appeared in 1643.⁵ Unfortunately this was not collected by Thomason, so it is not possible to ascertain which of the 1643 collections appeared first. The aphorisms in this collection are quite different to those previously published. Rather than neat snippets of wisdom, frequently extracted from James's written works, they tend to be lengthy anecdotes in which James's remarks are placed in a context, frequently with a precise date. This seems to have been possible because the collector was a member of the court from 1617, who accompanied James on his Scottish progress and recorded many of his

anti-Puritan observations made on that occasion.⁶ On the title-page, Benjamin Agar introduces himself to the reader as James's 'quondam Servant', and claims to have 'carefully received' the apophthegms, which are now 'humbly offered to publique view, as Not impertinent to the present Times'.

Agar's work is unusual for a book containing the words of King James in that it includes a lengthy reflective analysis of the nature of James's words and their reception. The preface praises James for:

the many, and manifold unparalleled Trophies of his excellencies yet remaining, which flowed not alone from his pen, and indefatigable dexterity, but sacred lips also, by eloquent discourses, as well as profound documents, and deep Commentaries; whereof a late extraction is yet extant in view⁷

This passage, particularly the reference to the work 'yet extant in view' (perhaps Flores Regij or Wittie Observations), suggests that James's words are conceived as being part of a precariously surviving tradition. Agar professes a feeling of responsibility for preserving James's literary relics, and continues:

I therefore conceived it a needfull duty, in pious imitation of the former, to revive the memory of so just and learned a master, in his ordinary discourses and Table-talke... conceiving it might be objected against me as a piece of ingratitude, to have deprived the time or posterity of such Gems and inferences, meet for discourse upon contingent occasions. These were heedfully observed, and carefully taken from the sacred mouth of the first Speaker, King James of famous memory, accidentally falling long time since upon discourse, and Table-talke, at open meales, in his Majesties royall presence, or privy Chamber⁸

This interest in the circumstances in which James's words were uttered could perhaps be related to the developing tendency, discussed in Chapter Five, to emphasise historical context. However, Agar is stressing the origins of James's work because he retains a religious belief in the words of the king, a belief which had largely disappeared from the royalist political pamphlets discussed in Chapter Four.

Agar upholds the need to acknowledge both the real historical context, and the enduring supernatural authority of James's words:

they were assiduously collected, as well at his Majesties own standing houses, as also in his forraigne progresse both in England and Scotland, with the sundry times and places, when, where, and upon what occasions, or arguments they were uttered, a Catalogue whereof, I have presumed hereafter to insert, for some peculiar use of these refractory times; all which I may boldly affirme have been providently preserved, and newly revised and published in times of distemper and distraction; who knoweth otherwise, then to make good and accomplish the ancient and moderne prophesies and predictions of these contingencies which have reference to the Royall Person of so incomparable a Sovereign; whereof some have had their period already, in and upon his Person living, and now since his decease, may from his Corps and Ashes, reflect some analogy and resemblance; as for example, in that of Mother Shepton, That England should tremble and quake for dread; A dead man that should speake, &c.⁹

This differs from the unsuccessful royalist attempt to imagine James's works as prophecy in works like A Puritane Set Forth (1642). Because Agar is not composing a polemical tract in which James's words are being used to justify King Charles, he does not need to distort his sources, or separate them from their original context. Although he suggests that the republication of James's sayings may lead to the fulfillment of old prophecies (presumably in accordance with monarchist aspirations), most of the following aphorisms are not 'prophetic', but are gossipy remarks about theology and culture. Agar has sufficient confidence in James's words to let them speak for themselves; this relaxed attitude makes his work stand out from the traditions of reading discussed earlier.

George Thomason received another collection, Regales Aphorismi, on 1 July 1650, which claims to consist of aphorisms 'collected by certain reverend and honourable personages attending on his Majesty'.¹⁰ Again, the editor seems to be of royalist sympathies. It is striking that whereas the supporters of Parliament had taken

over James's political writings, the royalists seem to have assumed control over the tradition of James's table-talk, despite the orientation of earlier versions like Flores Regij, and perhaps Witty Obseruations. This work opens with a dedicatory letter to Thomas Draper, signed by W. Stratton, who remarks:

To speak of Kings, was heretofore a task of as much difficulty as danger: but to receive what Kings have written, or what Kings have spoke, especially when their words have aimed at a publick end, as the advancement of the peoples happinesse, or the suppressing of enormities, is a work not onely safe but honourable; their precepts oftentimes being as powerfull as their examples: for the words of illustrious personages, do carry with them a secret attraction, and leave a deeper impression when the greatnesse of their persons is attended with the greatnesse of their Virtues.¹¹

Presumably, when the writer says that 'heretofore' it was dangerous to interpret the actions and intentions of the king, he is thinking of the period before Charles's execution. It is interesting that he establishes a difference between the consequences of speaking of kings and the consequences of discussing their words. It was dangerous to speak of kings, but it is safe to receive what they have said: does this imply that it is now safe to speak of kings, and that it was formerly dangerous to 'receive' their words? He may be recognising the way in which the pamphlet wars had made it possible to manipulate the king's words while professing loyalty to his person. Just as Agar's collection refuses to separate historical context and supernatural authority, so this collection warns against the danger of detaching the royal word from its author, who gives it its 'secret attraction'. Both works can be seen as criticising the theory and practice of the mainstream approach to interpreting James's words.

Stratton clearly regrets the absence of the living word of a reigning monarch, and goes on to give a glowing description of James's literary achievement matched in few royalist publications of this time:

The selected sayings of a King, who in the memory of many yet living reigned over this nation. A Platonick King, if we may trust the approbation of the age but immediately before us. A King who by his own books provided better for the title of a happy memory, than many of his Predecessors who left it to the flattery of the times, & the vanity and complement of custome. I shall here give you a sight of what sayings at several times did fall but carelessly and without premeditation from him, which being as short as they are acute, and acute as they are grave, I hope may not unfitly be termed Aphorisms: to speak more were to anticipate your understanding.¹²

Although this description is so positive, Stratton emphasises the responsibility of the reader for remembering and preserving the royal words. James exists only in the memories of his contemporaries and in his books. The text is full of qualifying words and phrases which suggest that the precariousness of this tradition. James is remembered, but only in the memories of those 'yet living'. Stratton is aware of the fickleness of interpretation, and that the mainstream tradition has now come to reject King James, in despite of the opinion 'of the age but immediately before us.' There is no attempt to use this publication as a vehicle to urge the restoration of the monarchy, and the lack of reference to King Charles is interesting; perhaps, by comparing James's preparations for posterity to his predecessors' trust in flattery and custom, Stratton may be inviting the reader to draw a comparison between James's legacy of learning and Charles's legacy of ruin. The fragility of the royal achievement is suggested by the way in which the editor describes how the sayings fell 'carelessly and without premeditation'. James never suspected that one day his aphorisms would be collected as relics of kingship, without a reigning king to validate and re-enact his words.

This is all quite a way from typical royalist discourse, and the anonymous 'Advertisement to the Reader' is equally thoughtful:

This Book hath a preheminance above any other which as yet hath ever been published in King James his name. For though the other books were dictated by him, and some passed more immediately under his own hand, yet these Apothegms proceeded immediately from his own voice; and as the voice is the more immediate Organ, and more near of kin unto the soul than the hand is, so this book doth carry a more lively representation, and of it self doth justly claim an entertainment suitable to those exquisite indowments which gave breath unto that voice.¹³

The argument that orally delivered texts are superior to premeditated compositions suggests the model of spontaneity and authenticity in King Charles's prayers collected in Eikon Basilike. However, there is no attempt to persuade the reader that this work can be a substitute for the king; it is only a 'representation'. Easy consolations are resisted. The 'Advertisement' continues by informing the reader that a new aphorism has been discovered, not printed in any of the previous collections, relating to the scheming of the Dutch:

when his Majesty demanded of Gondomar what where [*sic*] the consultations of the deliberate States in Holland, Gondomar replied to his Majesty, that his intelligence did onely represent them to be busie in the overthrowing of the two vast and most exorbitant powers of this world. viz: The power of the Devil, and the power of Kings. King James made no answer at all unto it, but by his silence seemed not to controvert it, and by his smile to allow and to owne the Apothegm.¹⁴

The privileged saying turns out to be unspoken. In this ideal situation, James's words are known without him actually having to utter them: the presence of the king is more valuable than his words, even if words are all that is now available.

The main body of sayings which follows integrates the moralisations in Flores Regij (1627), also found in Wittie Obseruations (1643), with the religious observations in King James his Apothegmes (1643). It also adds some new sayings,

mainly about military matters, which have a tone of royal paranoia which suggests King Charles ('Prepare to war when thou propoundest for peace'), although they are not acknowledged as such.¹⁵ One suspects that the Apophthegmata Aurea, Regia, Carolina (1649), which broke up Eikon Basilike to produce a collection of King Charles's aphorisms, influenced this publication, although I have not identified any aphorisms which appear in both collections.¹⁶ The version of the sayings in Flores Regij given in Wittie Observations (1643) does not appear to have been used, possibly because of its pro-Parliamentary sympathies. For example, Flores Regij opens with the following ambiguous remark:

Wordes are not the difference of good men and bad, for every man speaks well, therefore how noble a thing is Vertue; when no man dares professe any thing else.¹⁷

In Wittie Obseruations, this saying is rather garbled, concluding 'how noble thing is Virtue when no man dares professe any thing but it'.¹⁸ Regales Aphorismi uses the 1627 text.¹⁹

Those sayings which come from King James his Apopthegmes are revised to make the style of James's anecdotes seem more dignified. One passage in the 1643 text, in which James is recalling his difficulties with the Kirk during his reign in Scotland, runs as follows:

At Newmarket... That one man whom the King openly called unto him in his Sermon, did afterwards complayn to the Presbitery, that the King molested him in the Preaching of Gods word; To which complaynt his Majestie gave answer in this manner; viz. God forbid that I should molest any in the Preaching of Gods word; but I confesse that the preacher told mee before my face, many tales of a tub, as what I said to him at such a time, and what his replie was to me, and all this raylingly in a Pulpit, me thought I could not conteyn my selfe, &c. but the same Minister was afterward deprived, and by other Ministers it was acknowledged to be justly done.²⁰

In Regales Aphorismi, this rather delightful account forms the basis of a shorter and less colloquial remark:

That he hath been constrained to make answer to Preachers in the midst of their Sermons; who digressing from the word of God, have told him openly before his own face, of certain communications wherein he hath not pleased their humours, although it had been privately done by men unto them, &c.²¹

The editor of Regales Aphorismi is clearly sensitive to a description of the public criticism of the king's words. The collection also includes a remark from James's speech to Parliament of 14 March 1624:

When Jupiter speaks, he uses to joyn thunder to it: so a King should not speak, except he maintain it by action.²²

Regales Aphorismi is highly aware of the responsibility incurred both by kings and by those who repeat their words; it does not wish to exalt the authority of the royal speaker to an absurd degree, but seeks to allow James's words to articulate a cultured wisdom which could be seen as an attribute of monarchy.

This determination to convey something of the sense of James as the centre of a learned and lively society, a Solomon sharing his proverbs with his court, without necessarily demanding submission to particular persons or policies, is continued in several later collections. Some of the apophthegms originally recorded by Benjamin Agar are described as having arisen from James's discussions with Thomas Bayly, an attendant on King Charles who later converted to Roman Catholicism, and who produced his own collections of aphorisms. It would be interesting to know more about table-talk collectors like Agar and Bayly, the connection between them, and their reliability as a source for remarks made by James.²³ Bayly had attended King Charles at Ragland Castle in 1646, and recorded with great personal interest the attempts of the Catholic Earl of Worcester to convert the king to his faith; if

Worcester failed with Charles, he seems to have succeeded with Bayly.²⁴ Bayly made a collection of pithy remarks by Worcester, which was printed as Worcesters Apophthegmes in 1650.²⁵ This work was used to produce Witty Apophthegms, an anthology of sayings by several notable persons, including not only Worcester, but King James, King Charles, Francis Bacon and Thomas More, which appeared in 1658, after Bayly's death in 1657.²⁶

Witty Apophthegms makes use of known aphorisms by James, whether the editor is remembering them from travels with James's court, or extracting them from one of the printed collections. Equally, he preserves in the royalist tradition while the republic was still apparently thriving, informing the reader:

Here is presented to thy View the timely fruit of those once famous Monarchs, and Reeves of this Realm, whose yet living Fame for Majestick Wisdom and high Discretion, is able still to gain them life and Glory, maugre all the dirt, and filth, which this ungratefull Age hath flung both upon their Persons and works.²⁷

One could recall James's description of his speech of 21 March 1610 as a mirror which his readers tended to disfigure or neglect. The royalist collector knows that in attempting to win people back to the words of the king he is attempting a difficult task, in view of the success the republicans had enjoyed in besmirching James's reputation. What he does is to produce a text which is almost a parody of the documentary collections of Cabala and Arthur Wilson. The selected witticisms are arranged in no strict order, and are not set in a particular historical context; the work has an air of delightful carelessness.²⁸

The following saying is ascribed to Worcester:

The Marquesse discoursing of the small profit generally got by disputation in matters of Religion, said, that men are often in arguing, carried by the force of

words further asunder then their question was at first, like two ships going out of the same haven, their journies end is many times whole Countries distant.²⁹

However, this is not in Bayly's 1650 edition of Worcester's sayings. It comes from the group of James's sayings transmitted by Flores Regij and Regales Aphorismi, where no context is given and the aphorism begins: 'Men are often in arguing, carried by the force of wordes further asunder then their question was at first'.³⁰ Many other sayings are conflated or displaced in a similar manner, with the result that the various figures are given appropriate witticisms to say in an appropriate context. As the work progresses, the apophthegms by Bacon are more frequently extended anecdotes, and the section containing the sayings of Thomas More ends with a lengthy account of his execution.³¹ The aim, indeed, seems to be to vindicate Catholic and royalist culture by integrating James's words into a piece of entertaining literature, in which different characters express their shared civilised heritage.

On 18 June 1660, just after the Restoration, Thomason received another collection of famous sayings attributed to Charles and Worcester, entitled The Golden Apophthegms, and again attributed to Thomas Bayly.³² Some clearly derive from Bayly's attendance on the king at Ragland Castle, but others originate in other collections of table-talk. For example, James's phrase from Basilicon Doron, on the need for justice to be 'blinde and friendlesse' (i.e. dispensed impartially), is reproduced in a garbled form ('blind and friendly'), and printed as if by Worcester.³³ Had Bayly heard Worcester quoting Basilicon Doron, or the aphorism in one of the printed collections, or has a later editor decided to include the saying to fill space? It seems highly likely that The Golden Apophthegms is drawing on Witty Apophthegms (1658) which itself seems to be using Regales Aphorismi (1650) as the

aphorisms which appear in both tend to appear on the same page in each work. The tradition of table-talk appears to involve a great deal of recycling, and very little returning to original editions or authorities, which is another feature distinguishing it from the traditions of interpretation discussed above.

The continuity of this tradition is remarkable; for example, in 1715 a work called The Princes's Cabala: or Mysteries of State appeared claiming to reproduce sayings by James collected by Sir Thomas Overbury.³⁴ In fact, the selection of sayings is, once again, composed of sayings attributed to James in earlier collections, and aphorisms from quite different sources.³⁵ As the title Cabala suggests, these works seem to have been reacting against the tradition to fix the words of James and his contemporaries in a chronological documentary history which inscribed his words into republican history. Instead, a rich body of proverbs is created which can be transferred from one speaker to another; James and his words are present, and are respected, but they are no longer his exclusive, sacred property. Is it going too far to suggest that in the 1650s and after those who compiled these collections were performing an activity comparable to that of the Puritan reading communities in the 1620s and 1630s? Belatedly, some royalists at least seem to have developed a sense of identity which included King James, and had created a literary tradition in which his words could live.

II. King James on Tobacco: literary entertainment and social comment, 1644-1676

A similar tradition of reading James's works as part of a broad cultural heritage, rather than using them to make particular political interventions, can be seen in the later editions of his A Covnter-Blaste to Tobacco (1604). This witty analysis of the low origins and anti-social effects of smoking was reprinted in James's 1617 Workes, and in the Latin Opera, where it was given the new title 'Misocapnus, sive de abusu tobacchi' (the smoke-hater, or of the abuse of tobacco), and the sub-title 'Lusus Regius' (the king's game).³⁶ Scholars have speculated as to whether this indicates that James intended his work to be read as a humorous production: A Covnter-Blaste is certainly one of his most entertaining texts, full of amusing anecdotes and stylistic experimentation, but it seems unlikely that its intention is wholly ironic.³⁷ Certainly those who edited and republished the work after James's death seem to have understood it as an entertaining essay which would also appeal to the social principles of the moderate Puritans.³⁸

In 1644, the text in the Opera was republished in De Herba Panacea, a collection of Latin essays on the virtues of tobacco claiming to be edited by one Ægidius Everartus.³⁹ It is striking that James's essay is included in a volume dedicated to the praise of the weed; perhaps the editor assumed from the title 'Lusus Regius' that the work was not to be taken at face value, or that James was only commenting on the more extreme abuses of the drug. One has to consider the possibility that the editor simply collected well-known texts dealing with tobacco without closely examining their contents.⁴⁰ However, De Herba is not a polemical

work, and in the editor's desire to amuse as well as instruct, he might well have felt it appropriate to include alternative points of view.

More can be learned about the intentions of this edition by examining the tradition of works debating the merits of the herb. The attribution to 'Everartus' is clearly related to the fact that in 1587 Ægidius Everardus (Giles Everard) had published a work on tobacco entitled De Herba Panacea in Antwerp, a work which was translated and reprinted several times in the seventeenth century. The 1644 work is probably the work of people involved in the republication of the 1587 De Herba.⁴¹ Indeed, the enlarged English version published in 1659, entitled Panacea; Or The Universal Medicine, and again attributed to Giles Everard, cites the remarks of 'Everartus' in the 1644 De Herba with approval.⁴²

The references in the 1659 work to Amsterdam may indicate that the editors included English or Scottish subjects exiled in the Netherlands for religious reasons.⁴³ Many versions of works by James were printed in the Netherlands, often with partisan political intentions. Indeed, at one point in the 1644 'Misocapnus', the text in the Opera is interestingly changed. In the 1604 English version of the relevant passage, James denounces the weed in the following terms:

And if it could by the smoke thereof chace out devils, as the smoke of Tobias fish did (which I am sure could smel no stronglier) it would serve for precious Relicke, both for the supersitious Priests, and the insolent Puritanes, to cast out devils withall.⁴⁴

Although there are no other substantive differences between texts in the Opera and in De Herba Panacea, in the latter, the word 'Puritanis' is omitted:

Quod si ut olim putore Tobiani piscis, sic Tobacci nidore (nam nihilo mitius olet) Diabolus posset in fugam conjici, nihil Papistis miraculorum mangonibus ad exorcismos natura rerum creasset valentius.⁴⁵

This change may reflect an awareness that the Latin publication of 1619 was intended to have an impact in political and religious spheres, and in fact the 'Misocapnus' in the Opera had provoked a hostile reply by a Polish Jesuit entitled Antimisocapnus.⁴⁶ It would be interesting to know more about the intended readership of this volume: did 'Everartus' fear that James's terminology would be offensive to the Calvinists of the Low Countries, and did this have any connection with the increasingly active Covenanted government of Scotland, whose agents like Robert Baillie wrote regularly to correspondents in the Netherlands?

The orientation towards the Puritan movement is not, however, a dominant feature of this publication. Just as the collections of table-talk appeal to royalist culture without insisting that the reader take a contemporary political stance, so editions of A Covnter-Blaste invoke the interest in medicine, ethical behaviour and social improvement characteristic of much 'Puritan' culture without using James's work as a vehicle for propaganda. This can be seen in a later edition of 1672, Two Broad-Sides Against Tobacco.⁴⁷ This publication contains an accurate reproduction of the English text of A Covnter-Blaste, either from the 1604 or 1617 editions, as well as extracts from writings by James's doctor, Everard Maynwaring, Dr. George Thompson, a sermon by the Puritan Samuel Ward, preached in 1622, and poems by Josuah Sylvester.⁴⁸ There are indications of a religious bias, as shown by the inclusion of Ward's sermon Woe to Drvnkards, which denounces various addictions with considerable hyperbole, concluding with an appeal to the authority of James's writings.⁴⁹ However, the editor seems more concerned to provide his readers with interesting material than to indoctrinate them, as his concluding 'Postscript by Way of Apology' makes clear.⁵⁰ The editor sets the collection firmly in the context of the

334

tense 1670s, and suggests that decadent behaviour explains the plague and Great Fire. However, praise is equally meted out to Prynne for his stand against drinking toasts, and Charles II for the Act of Oblivion. The editor's focus is on the works he has collected, and he praises writers like Maynwaring for their 'pertinent, sutable, and profitable' words.⁵¹

The introduction to James's text is witty and informative:

It it [*sic*] here verbatim faithfully transcribed out of the large and learned Volume of His other Works in Folio, which are rare and scarce to be had for money, and of too great a price for the common sort of Tobacco-smokers to purchase⁵²

Smoking excludes people from the literary traditions being celebrated here. The editor goes on to emphasise the importance of A Covnter-Blaste using the familiar verse from Ecclesiastes 8: 4:

And as King Solomon, who was the wisest of Kings, saith in his Book of Ecclesiastes, That where the word of a King is, there is power; so I say, If what our famous King James hath written, be not of Power sufficient to divert all English men, &c. from this evil and hurtful custom; It is here seconded, and backed home, by the words and advice of an able and learned Doctor of Physick now living⁵³

The writer is happy to use the verse which had been repeated in the royalist pamphlets of the 1640s, but does not seem to think that it gives James's texts much special authority, and suggests that if James does not convince, Maynwaring may be more successful. James's writings are seen as a part of a body of texts which those inclined to Puritanism could read for profit and diversion.

Two Broad-Sides seems to have been a popular publication. There was another issue in 1672 with a different title page, King James His Counterblast to Tobacco.⁵⁴ In 1676, the work was reissued as The Touchstone Or, Trial of Tobacco.⁵⁵ Some copies of King James His Counterblast to Tobacco (1672) include

a 'Broadside against Coffee', and the title-page of The Touchstone (1676) emphasises the importance of this newer addiction in doggerel verse. Just as James had condemned tobacco as an unnecessary foreign custom, so this last work denounces coffee as 'a kind of Turkish Renegade'. These works seem to belong to reading communities descended from those which had used James's works during the Spanish Match crisis; their nationalism and Puritanism had survived, but they are no longer using James's words in such an overtly polemical and manipulative way. In such broad-minded and culturally-aware traditions, there was hope for the future of James's writings yet.

¹Wittie Obseruations Gathered from our late Sovereign King James in his ordinarie Discourse, [London: 1643], Wing J149, Thomason E. 75 (12)

²Number 15, sig. A1^v

³Number 24, sig. A2^v

⁴sig. [A4^v]

⁵B[enjamin]. A[gar]., King James his Apopthegmes; Or, Table-Talke: as they were by Him delivered Occasionally, London: b. B. W., 1643, Wing J127

⁶An interesting response to this work is found in a manuscript note on sig. [B4^v] of the copy in the National Library of Scotland, shelfmark 6.769 (6), which begins 'If gleamings out of dust produce such fleeces:' - if the page had not been cropped, it might be possible to say something about a Scottish response to this depiction of James's visit to his home country.

⁷sig. [A1^v]

⁸sig. [A1^v]

⁹sig. [A1^v]

¹⁰Regales Aphorismi, London: b. B. A., 1650, Wing J143, Thomason E. 1408 (1), title-page.

¹¹sig. *3^{r-v}

¹²sig. [*4^{r-v}]

¹³sig. [*5^{r-v}]

¹⁴sig. [*6^r]

¹⁵Number 262, sig. [F6^v-7^r]

¹⁶Apophthegmata Aurea, Regia, Carolina, London: b. William Du-gard f. Francis Eglesfield, 1649, Wing A3560A, Thomason E. 1217 (1), received by Thomason 6 October 1649.

¹⁷Number 1, sig. A1^{r-v}

¹⁸Number 1, sig. A1^r

¹⁹Number 108, sig. C4^r

²⁰Number 16, sig. B1^v-2^v. It is interesting that Agar's work is punctuated with '&c', as if he were using a more complete written text.

²¹Number 10, sig. A5^v

²²Number 316, sig. [G11^v]; in Flores Regij (1627), number 119, sig. [G6^{r-v}]. See Cobbett (1806), 1396.

²³If these sayings are as genuine as they appear, then they could be highly useful for research into James's changing opinions during his later years. It seems quite possible that there is much information about the 1620s which has not been studied because it is only available in works printed in the 1640s or even later.

²⁴See Tho[mas]. Baylie, Certamen Religiosum, [London]: b. H. Hils s. b. George Whittington, 1649, Wing B1506, Thomason E. 1355 (1), dated by Thomason 31 September 1649; see Madan (1950), 72.

²⁵T[homas]. B[ayly]., Worcesters Apophthegmes, London: b. J. Clowes f. Edward Blackmore, 1650, Wing W3535, Thomason E. 1350 (2), received by Thomason 19 June 1650.

²⁶Witty Apophthegms, London: f. & s. b. Edward Farnham, 1658, Wing W3236, Thomason E. 1892 (1). For Bayly, see DNB.

²⁷sig. A3^{r-v}

²⁸For the growing tendency to print James's apothegms with those of others, see Wilson (1940), 41; for the difficulty of proving that a particular witty observation was really said by the person to whom it is ascribed, see Richard A. Filloy, 'Deciding the Authorship of a Doubtful Text: the Case of John Selden's Table-talk', Quarterly Journal of Speech 70 (1984), 41-52.

²⁹sig. D1^{r-v}

³⁰Flores Regij, number 38, sig. C1^v-2^r, Regales Aphorismi, number 38, sig. [A12^v]

³¹The aphorisms attributed to Bacon in this collection are discussed in Spedding (1870), Vol. 7, 113-86, esp. p. 114; the editor is clearly drawing on Francis Bacon, Apophthegms New and Old (1625).

³²Tho[mas]. Bayly, The Golden Apophthegms of His Royall Maiesty King Charles, London: b. John Clowes, 1660, Wing G1012, Thomason E. 184 (3). DNB suggests that this was extracted from Witty Apophthegms (1658).

³³Number 15, sig. [A4^v], See Basilicon Doron, in Craigie (1944), 68-9, Sommerville (1994), 24; in Flores Regij (1627), number 71, sig. E2^{r-v}; in Regales Aphorismi, (1650), number 86, sig. [B11^r]; in Witty Apophthegms (1658), number 47, sig. [B10^v-11^r]. For another saying found in other collections besides The Golden Apophthegms, see number 16, sig. [A4^v]; in Flores Regij (1627), number 67, sig. [D8^{r-v}]; in Regales Aphorismi (1650), number 82, sig. [B10^v]; Witty Apophthegms (1658), number 45, sig. [B10^v].

³⁴The Princes's Cabala: or Mysteries of State, London: f. R. Smith & G. Strahan, J. Brown, J. Graves, s. b. R. Burleigh, 1715, sig. [A5^v]

³⁵sig. B1^r - [B9^v]

³⁶Opera (1619), sig. R3^r. For an introduction to the various forms of the Opera, see James Craigie, 'The Latin Folio of King James's Prose Works', Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions 3 (1948), 17-30. It is curious that Craigie does not mention the fact that Opera contains texts not found in the English Workes, such as the speech James delivered to the Parliament of Scotland on 28 June 1617 (sig. [3A6^r-3B5^r]).

³⁷See Craigie (1982), 209

³⁸Sandra J. Bell has an essay on the political nature of A Covnter-Blaste in the forthcoming volume of essays on the writings of King James edited by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier.

³⁹Ægidius Everartus (ed.), De Herba Panacea, Vltrajecti: pro Davide ab Hoogenvysen, 1644. I am using the Edinburgh University Library copy, shelfmark *I.33.23. In the Opera the 'Misocapnus' is sig. R3^r-S2^r, in De Herba Panacea it is sig. [I3^v]-K4^r.

⁴⁰For another work bearing witness to continuing interest in James as a writer on matters of health and hygiene, see Medicines against the Pest (Edinburgh: b. James Lindesay, 1645, Wing M1609), which consists of various instructions to prevent the spread of the plague, supposedly originally delivered 'By King James His speciall command, in Anno 1603'.

⁴¹Arber (1869), 91; see BLC, 'Ægidius Everardus'.

⁴²Giles Everard, Panacea; Or The Universal Medicine, London: f. Simon Miller, 1659, Wing E3530, Thomason E. 1907 (2), sig. [B5^v], [C6^v]

⁴³sig. A4^{r-v}

⁴⁴A Covnter-Blaste (1604), sig. C3^r; Craigie (1982), 95

⁴⁵Opera, sig. S1^r; De Herba Panacea, sig. [I12^r]

⁴⁶Arber (1869), 120

⁴⁷Two Broad-Sides Against Tobacco, London: f. John Hancock, 1672, Wing J147

⁴⁸The text of A Covnter-Blaste can be found on sig. [π3^r]-C2^v.

⁴⁹sig. [G3^v]; see Samuel Ward, Woe to Drvnkards, London: b. A. Math f. Iohn Marriott & Iohn Grismaud, 1622, STC 25055.

⁵⁰sig. K1^r-[K4^v]

⁵¹sig. [K3^v]

⁵²sig. [π2^r]

⁵³sig. [π2^v]

⁵⁴King James His Counterblast to Tobacco, London: f. John Hancock, 1672, Wing J131

⁵⁵The Touchstone Or, Trial of Tobacco, London: printed, 1676, Wing J144A