


5-1-2017

Posthumous Preaching: James Melville's Ghostly Advice in Ane Dialogue (1619), with an Edition from the Manuscript

Jamie Reid Baxter
University of Glasgow

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl>

 Part of the [History of Religion Commons](#), and the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Reid Baxter, Jamie (2017) "Posthumous Preaching: James Melville's Ghostly Advice in Ane Dialogue (1619), with an Edition from the Manuscript," *Studies in Scottish Literature*: Vol. 43: Iss. 1, 71–101.
Available at: <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol43/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Scottish Literature Collections at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Studies in Scottish Literature by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact SCHOLARC@mailbox.sc.edu.

**POSTHUMOUS PREACHING: JAMES MELVILLE'S
GHOSTLY ADVICE IN *ANE DIALOGUE* (1619),
WITH AN EDITION FROM THE MANUSCRIPT**

Jamie Reid Baxter

Early Modern Scotland possesses a rich repertory of “dialogues,” written works in which two or more speakers debate and discuss an issue or event. Useful to historians, most of these dialogues make for dry reading now, when the controversies or situations which prompted their composition are long dead and may indeed be completely forgotten. Some of these dialogues, however, reveal considerable imagination and a genuine flair for dramatic writing, and are hence of considerable interest to literary scholars. This essay presents one such: *Ane Dialogue betuix Mr James Melville, Mr Walter Balquanquan, Archibald Johnstoune, Johne Smith*, written in 1619 in the wake of the Kirk’s adoption of the Five Articles of Perth (August 1618), and the consequent introduction of changes to Scottish worship.¹

One of the longstanding myths surrounding the Scottish Reformation is that it put an end to all theatrical activity in Scotland. In fact, the records show that plays continued to be performed for several decades in at least some post-Reformation Scottish schools, as well as at the universities.² Moreover, John Durkan has shown that in post-Reformation Scotland, the *Colloquia* (dialogues) of Erasmus and Mathurin Cordier, and the comedies of Terence (and also Plautus, in some cases) were a staple part of the educational curriculum.³ It is nonetheless a hard fact that pitifully few Early Modern Scottish theatrical texts of any kind have survived. The handling of conversational exchange in Scotland’s extant post-Reformation dialogues, and their characterisation of the speakers, mean that these

¹ National Library of Scotland, Wodrow Quarto LXXXIV, ff. 19-25. I should like to thank SSL’s anonymous reader and editor for comments on this article in draft.

² On the slow death of play-acting, see the opening paragraphs to Introduction, in Dana Sutton and J. Reid Baxter, eds., *William Hegate: Gallia Victrix*: <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/gallia/>.

³ John Durkan, *Scottish Schools and Schoolmasters 1560-1633* (Woodbridge: Scottish History Society, 2013), *passim*, and pp. 80, 105 (Erasmus), 104 (Cordier), 134, 140 (Terence and Plautus).

texts—although never intended for staging—can hint both at what has been lost, and even more, at what might have been after 1600. Yet, apart from R. J. Lyall’s edition of William Lambe’s *Ane Resonyng* (1549), modern Scottish literary scholarship seems rather to have neglected the dialogue repertory.⁴

Historians, on the other hand, have paid considerable attention to certain dialogues: George Buchanan’s *De jure regni apud Scotos*, the associated *Discourse Tuiching the Estait Present in October anno Domini 1571* and the *Dialogue of the Twa Wyfeis*.⁵ From the same period, Thomas Maitland’s *Pretendit Conference*, recently dubbed “a brilliant propaganda piece,” has not been entirely overlooked.⁶ Historians have likewise both noted and written about the young poet-pastor John Davidson’s *An dialog or mutual talking betuix a Clerk and ane Courteour concerning four parische kirks till ane minister* (1573), which led to Davidson having to flee for his life.⁷ The Earl of Arran’s “Black Acts” and the resultant Subscription Crisis of 1584 produced two extant dialogues, about which virtually nothing seems to have been written.⁸ As we shall see below,

⁴ William Lambe, *Ane Resonyng of ane Scottis and Inglis merchand betuix Rowand and Lionis &c*, ed. R. J. Lyall (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1985).

⁵ Roger A. Mason and Martin A. Smith, *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship among the Scots* (Abingdon: Ashgate, 2004); Mason, “George Buchanan’s vernacular polemics, 1570-1572,” *Innes Review*, 54:1 (2003): 47-68; Mark Loughlin, “The Dialogue of the Twa Wyfeis,” in A.A. MacDonald, Michael Lynch and Ian B. Cowan, eds, *The Renaissance in Scotland* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 226-45. An edition of the *Twa Wyfeis* will be included in Tricia McElroy, *Scottish Satirical Literature, 1567-1584* (Scottish Text Society, forthcoming).

⁶ Jane Dawson, *John Knox* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), 278-79. Thomas McCrie’s famous *Life of Knox* makes minimal reference to it, but in 1827 two versions of the manuscript, with an admiring introduction by David Laing, appeared in the *Miscellany of the Bannatyne Club*, 31-50. The text was partially reprinted by R.D.S. Jack, in *Scottish Prose 1550-1700* (London: Calder & Boyars, 1971), 63-9, and then in *The Mercat Anthology of Early Scottish Literature, 1375-1707* (Edinburgh: Mercat Press, 1997; rev.ed. 2000).

⁷ It was discussed in detail by R. Moffat Gillon, *John Davidson of Prestonpans* (London: James Clarke, 1937), 42-52, and mentioned by George R. Hewitt, *Scotland under Morton, 1572-80* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 85-86; Frank Bardgett, “Foure Parische Kirkis to Ane Preicheir,” *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 22 (1986): 195-209; Amy Blakeway, *Regency in Sixteenth Century Scotland* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2015), 174; Alastair J. Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade 1500-1720* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000), 115, 141, 151, 171.

⁸ *A Conference betuix twa neibours in Edinburgh tuiching the subscribing of ane letter sent to the congregatioun of Edinburgh be the Kings Majestie, and Zelator, Temporizar, Palemon*. For the text of the latter, see David Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, 8 vols (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842-9), IV: 295-339

historians have also taken note of some dialogues concerned with the Five Articles of Perth.

Historical Background

The (in)famous Five Articles of Perth were adopted on 25 August 1618 by a carefully “packed” General Assembly of the Kirk held in that town. The Articles, devised by King James VI and I, introduced new and alien practices into the life of the Kirk. The two most offensive were (i) the article ordaining the mandatory celebration of “Holy Days” like Christmas and Easter, unobserved since the Reformation of 1559-60, and (ii) the requirement that communicants practise “geniculation,” i.e. kneel to receive the bread and wine, rather than sit round a table as hitherto.⁹ Christmas Day 1618 duly saw a communion service in the High Kirk of Edinburgh. It was thinly attended. The young minister, Mr William Struthers, took great umbrage at this silent protest by Edinburgh’s wealthy merchant classes and municipal establishment, and in a furious sermon on 5 January, he attacked the merchants and their wives in the strongest terms.¹⁰ Struthers’s ill-judged sermon inspired the composition of *Ane Dialogue betuix Mr James Melville, Mr Walter Balquanquan, Archibald Johnstone, Johnne Smith*. The speakers (two of them ghosts) gather in the bedroom of the dying Archibald Johnstone, merchant burges of Edinburgh, and formulate a damning critique of Struthers’s sermon and, by

(cited below as Calderwood, *History*, or Calderwood). Alan R. MacDonald alludes briefly to the much less entertaining first piece in “The Subscription Crisis and church-state relations, 1584-1586,” *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 25 (1994): 222-55 (246). The speakers are two real Edinburgh burgesses, Edward Hope and Henrie Nisbet. Anglicised excerpts are given in Calderwood, *History*, IV: 141-43; the complete text (in Scots) is extant in the longer MS of Calderwood’s *History*, British Library Add. MSS 4736: my thanks to Alan MacDonald for supplying me with a transcript.

⁹ See Alan R. MacDonald, “James VI and I, the Church of Scotland, and British Ecclesiastical Convergence,” *Historical Journal*, 48 (2005): 885-903; Laura A. M. Stewart, “‘Brothers in treuth’: Propaganda, Public Opinion and the Perth Articles Debate in Scotland,” in Ralph Houlbrooke, ed., *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority and Government* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 151-68, and also her “The Political Repercussions of the Five Articles of Perth: A Reassessment of James VI and I’s Religious Policies in Scotland,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 38:4 (2007): 1013-36; Jenny Wormald, “The Headaches of Monarchy: Kingship and the Kirk in the Early Seventeenth Century,” in Julian Goodare and A. A. MacDonald, eds, *Sixteenth Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 365-94.

¹⁰ “Struthers” is the form used in *Ane Dialogue* and in Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae*, 8 vols. (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1915-50), I: 54, 56; III: 460, 482 (cited below as *Fasti*). Modern scholars sometimes call the man “Struther.”

implication, of Crown policy. The recently deceased Walter Balcanquhall (c.1548-1617) had been a much-loved Edinburgh minister for over forty years. Many of the dialogue's original readers (and hearers) would have been at least as well-acquainted with him as they were with Archibald Johnstone. It is impossible to say just how familiar they were with the lively and vituperative John Smyth, minister of Maxton in Teviotdale. But it is striking that the dialogue's main speaker, James Melville (1554-1614), has no link with Edinburgh as such. In addition to having been dead for five years, he had been minister of the rural parish of Kilrennie in the East Neuk of Fife until he was summoned to London in September 1606, and then forbidden ever to return to Scotland.

Melville's prominence in *Ane Dialogue* indicates that his contemporaries saw him as a much more significant figure than posterity has done. He has long been overshadowed by his famous uncle, the academic, poet and presbyterian spokesman Andrew Melville (1545-1622), not least because of the warmth of James's own frequent praise of and admiration for Andrew.¹¹ James, whose extant prose and verse is in fact far more extensive and varied than Andrew's, has consequently been neglected by historians and literary scholars until very recently.¹² Yet his younger contemporary David Calderwood, recording James Melville's death, commented that he had been "one of the wisest directours of Kirk affaires that our Kirk had in his tyme.... He acted his part so gravelie, so wiselie, so calmlie, that the adversarie could get no vantage." Calderwood

¹¹ *The Autobiography and Diary of Mr James Melville*, ed. Robert Pitcairn (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842), *passim* (cited below as *JMAD*).

¹² John R. McCallum has begun the task of exploring James in his own right: "'Sone and Servant': Andrew Melville and his Nephew, James (1556-1614)," in Roger A. Mason and Steven J. Reid, eds., *Andrew Melville, Humanist and Reformer* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014). Louise Yeoman discusses several poems in "James Melville and the Covenant of Grace," in Sally Mapstone, ed., *Older Scots Literature* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2005), 574-83; in his *Reforming the Scottish Parish* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), John R. McCallum makes numerous references to Melville, and analyses *A Spirituall Propine* on pages 101-13; Sarah C. Ross discusses some of Melville's sonnets from *A Morning Vision* in "Elizabeth Melville and the Religious Sonnet Sequence in England and Scotland," in Susan J. Wiseman, ed., *Early Modern and Women and the Poem* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 52-59, and makes numerous references to Melville's poetry in her *Women, Poetry and Politics in Seventeenth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Sally Mapstone touches on several major poems in "James Melville's Revisions to *A Spirituall Propine* and *A Morning Vision*," in David J. Parkinson, ed., *James VI and I, Literature and Scotland: Tides of Change* (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 173-92; and see also J. Reid Baxter, "James Melville and the *Releife of the Longing Soule*: a Scottish presbyterian Song of Songs?," *Medievalia et Humanistica*. 41 (December, 2015): 209-28.

went on to say that the exile from Scotland imposed on James after autumn 1606 reflected King James's concern that Melville's "presence and action could be anie impediment to his designes" and the monarch's "feare of those good parts that were in him." Earlier, Calderwood had noted that Archbishop John Spottiswoode observed in 1609 that "Mr Andrew had but a [*i.e.* one] blast, but Mr James was a crafty, byding man, and more to be feared than his uncle" (Calderwood, *History*, VII: 190, 46). Little did Spottiswoode suspect that ten years later, Mr James would prove so "byding" that his voice would still be resounding from beyond the grave.

***Ane Dialogue* (1619)**

Ane Dialogue is not the only tract attacking the Articles of Perth that was cast as a dialogue, though it is the earliest example currently known. In 1620, John Murray, minister of Dunfermline, published the very readable *Dialogue betwixt Cosmophilus and Theophilus anent the urging of new ceremonies upon the kirke of Scotland*, in Holland.¹³ In 1622, William Scott, minister of Cupar, issued *The Course of Conformitie as it hath proceeded, is concluded, should be refused*, also printed in Holland.¹⁴ In the 80,000 earnest words of this last, the young minister Archippus, seeking advice from the older Epaphras, is given extremely voluminous information about the wickedness of the Five Articles and their passage through Parliament in 1621. Back in 1619, however, *Ane Dialogue* had, somewhat unusually, featured protagonists who (whether spectral or flesh-and-blood) were not archetypes with classical names, but real contemporary figures.¹⁵

Ane Dialogue has hitherto drawn comment only in Laura Stewart's wide-ranging essay on the Perth Articles Debate, "Brothers in Treuth," which investigates "the nature of anti-Articles literature during the final decade of James VI and I's life-time."¹⁶ Stewart extends previous scholarly focus on printed polemic to take in the extensive manuscript productions as well, observing that "considered together, manuscript and print material hint at a more socially complex literate culture in Jacobean Scotland than

¹³ STC (2nd ed.) 4355; it runs to 5,800 words. Quoted by John D. Ford, "Conformity and Conscience: the Structure of the Perth Articles Debate in Scotland, 1618-38," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 46 (1995): 256-277 (271), describing it as "lively" (266), and in Ford, "The lawful bonds of Scottish society: 5 articles of Perth," *Historical Journal*, 37 (1994): 45-65.

¹⁴ STC (2nd ed.) 21874; see Ford, "Conformity and Conscience," 267-68 and 271.

¹⁵ See n. 8 above for a 1584 dialogue that featured two real Edinburgh burgesses.

¹⁶ Laura Stewart, "'Brothers in Treuth': Propaganda, Public Opinion and the Perth Articles Debate in Scotland," in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. Ralph A. Houlbroke (Farnham: Ashgate, 2006), 151-68. I am grateful to Dr Stewart, and *SSL*'s anonymous peer reviewer, for comments on an earlier version of this essay.

the latter source alone would suggest” (Stewart, 154). Stewart begins her article with a brief discussion of Mr John Fergushill, the non-conforming minister of Ochiltree in Ayrshire, since *Ane Dialogue*, like most of the anti-Articles manuscript texts that she reviews and quotes, survives in Fergushill’s hand-writing.¹⁷ Stewart writes of *Ane Dialogue* that

The theme of persecution pervaded anti-Articles propaganda. It linked into the idea that a small band of ‘saints’ would prevail through current adversity to save God’s Kirk from ‘unryteousnes.’ ... This concept was most explicitly expressed in a fascinating dialogue, written in 1619, for Edinburgh’s influential godly community (Stewart, 161).

She returns to *Ane Dialogue* later, saying that:

It targeted Edinburgh-based godly circles, where opposition to the Articles was a given—ceremonies were not actually mentioned, suggesting an attempt to reinforce and confirm existing ideas, not persuade and convince waverers.... The competition to assert a particular interpretation of Edinburgh’s radical credentials was exemplified by claims and counter-claims over the notorious riot of 17 December 1596.... In the pulpits, conformist ministers called this event a ‘blot’ on the Kirk, but for the godly, it became a symbol of their historic struggle against the forces of the Antichrist (*ibid.*, 165).

In his sermon of 5 January 1619, Struthers insisted that the “17 December” was indeed “the blott of Edinburgh, and the blott of the Kirk of Scotland,” thus directly insulting the godly members of the capital’s ruling merchant élite (Calderwood, VII: 343). The depth of local revulsion can be gauged from a manuscript *History* written by an Edinburgh burgess known only as Johnston. It is worth quoting at length from his comments on Struthers’s sermon:

quhilk, be all the holy divynes in Scotland, was judged rather to haif beine a discours of haitfull passion nor a sermon of a charitabill divyn or looving theolog. For the maist pairt of his haill discours consisted in calling Christs flok of Edinburgh a pack of crewell pepill seiking the overthrow of their ministry; calling them also the awthoris of the 17 day of December 1596.... He also alledged the doings of the goode toun at that day till be in all historeis a blot to them for ever. He also in his discourse alledged the pepill were bund to follow him and the rest of his brething the ministers, and to do all things that they bad them do, calling the ministers the heid, and the people the taill, and quhatever the ministers as the heid spak, it was good and savory, and quhatever the taill or the pepill spak was unsavory, adding thairto that the langage of the tail was deir of the heiring. He also alledged that in

¹⁷ Fergushill’s account of the “proceedings of the Hie Commission” against him in March 1620 can be read in Calderwood, *History*, VII: 428-32.

tymis past the pulpits of Edinburgh had bein abused with flattereris and tailtelleris in quhilk pulpits certainly thair had bein many goode men of grit learning and of holy lyf and conversation befor his sermon thair. This sermon my [*sic for maid*] me and all the heirer[s] thereof trembill for feir to behold sic untruith spoken in the schyr [*sic for chyre*] of verity quhilk sould be used only with trew and holy doctrin bot becaus I knaw ye said Mr William thoct evil of it himself I desist.¹⁸

Mr William Struthers (c.1578-1633)

Earlier Scottish political dialogues had attacked such major public figures as the royal Secretary William Maitland of Lethington, the Duke of Châtelhérault, the Regents Moray and Morton and Archbishop Patrick Adamson. *Ane Dialogue's* object of *ad hominem* opprobrium is rather modest: Mr William Struthers. A Glaswegian, he had been transferred to St Giles from the High Kirk of Glasgow not long after 15th June 1614.¹⁹ During the Parliament held as part of James VI's 1617 visit to his native kingdom, a clerical gathering in the capital had appointed Struthers and another Edinburgh minister, Peter Ewart, to draft a Protestation for submission to the king in defence of the liberties of the Kirk. Over fifty ministers, including Struthers, endorsed the Protestation, putting their names on a roll of support (Calderwood, *History*, VII: 252-6). This Protestation had heavy consequences for three of the ministers: Peter Ewart, Archibald Simson of Dalkeith (who had signed the actual document on behalf of the whole body), and David Calderwood, who had played no minor rôle in bringing about the Protestation in the first place (*ibid.*, 251). To Calderwood's disgust, the severe measures taken against these three men led Struthers and two other Edinburgh ministers to recant (Calderwood, VII: 271). Thereafter, Struthers conformed so obsequiously to royal policy that on 15th June 1619, he would be appointed to sit in the Court of High Commission (Calderwood, VII: 385). From 1628 onwards, he published a number of works of divinity, and when Edinburgh was erected into a diocese by Charles I in 1633, Struthers was appointed dean.²⁰

¹⁸ NLS Adv.35.4.2., 2 vols, II: 662 (cited below as Johnston's MS *History*). Johnston's account is invaluable independent corroboration of Calderwood's accuracy (*History*, VII: 344-5), in that it records Struthers's attempts when preaching on 10 and 19 January to distance himself from his own words of 5 January.

¹⁹ Scott, *Fasti* (as in n. 10 above), I: 54, 56; III: 460, 482.

²⁰ Struthers's writings, frequently quoted by David Mullan in *Scottish Puritanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), can be consulted in *Early English Books Online* (EEBO). Struthers also published a handful of occasional poems, e.g. the Greek epigram prefacing Adam King's *Epibaterion* in honour of the royal visit of

He died that same year, on 9 November.²¹ Struthers's move from radical opposition to fervid implementation of Crown policy is somewhat like that of John Spottiswoode, the future Archbishop first of Glasgow and then of St Andrews.²² The reasons adduced by Julian Goodare for Spottiswoode's complete change of heart in 1597 probably resemble those which lay behind Struthers's shift of allegiance.²³

As Laura Stewart indicates, however, *Ane Dialogue* is far from being a mere personal attack on Struthers himself. It is a denunciation of what he symbolised for the hardcore presbyterian resistance, e.g. Archibald Simson and David Calderwood: treacherous acquiescence in the Articles of Perth and the whole Crown policy of altering the nature and identity of the Kirk, by putting an end to presbyterian clerical independence and the parity of ministers. Calderwood's *History* presents a text and critique of Struthers' sermon, after setting the scene by recounting the minister's anger on 25 December 1618, when his congregation failed to attend kirk on Christmas Day, in accordance with the demands of the "Five Articles" and King James's explicit wishes. When Struthers

gott a sufficient audiorie upon the fift of Januar, he burst furth with the effects of great pride and bitternes lurking in his heart.... [He] made so virolent and bitter an invective against the best professors of the toun, and worthiest of the ministry, that the like had never been heard out of anie of the pulpits of Edinburgh. What he could not expresse in words, he expressed by his countenance and gesture (Calderwood, VII: 342).

Struthers's text was Psalm 51:14, "Deliver me from blood, O God, which art the God of my salvation: and my tongue shall sing joyfully of thy righteousness," but as *Ane Dialogue* notes, "quhen the text led him, that his

1617: see the final, unpaginated section of *Nostodia... Academiae Edinburgensis Congratulatio* (Edinburgh: Andreas Hart, 1617); and the Greek epigram (and its English paraphrase) in honour of Charles in 1633, in *Eisodia: Musarum Edinensium in CAROLI Regis, Musarum Tutani, ingressu in SCOTIAM* (Edinburgh: the heirs of Andreas Hart, 1633), 6-7.

²¹ Ninian Campbell's *Treatise of Death* (Edinburgh: R. Y[oung] for I. Wilson, Glasgow, 1635), unpaginated, includes a 32 line epicedion for Struthers, placing him on a par with none less than Robert Boyd of Trochrig (1578-1627) and John Cameron (1579-1625), men with successful careers in the French protestant church who had both returned home to serve (with less success) as principals of Glasgow University.

²² See Calderwood, *History*, VII: 347-8 for an account of Struthers's hostility to episcopacy and subsequent shift, and *ibid.* 356 for an example of his post-1617 attitude.

²³ Julian Goodare, "How Archbishop Spottiswoode Became an Episcopalian," *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, 30:4 (Fall/automne, 2006/2007): 83-103.

tongue sould singe joyfullie of Gods rychteousnes, his tongue hes bene ane instrument to ring all unrychtneousnes doolefullie.”²⁴ The sermon gave many grounds of grievous offence, but the worst was that Struthers, attacking the burgesses for their disobedience of his commands as their minister, said that

if ye will not obey us, your blood be on your owne heads, for we are resolved to obey God, the king, and the kirk.... whosoever they be that has suffered hitherto in these maters, has not suffered in God’s caus, but has unnecessarilie drawne doun a crosse on their owne heads (Calderwood, VII: 343).

This contemptuous remark referred to those who had resisted the Crown’s attempts to impose its will on the once quasi-autonomous Kirk. The line stretched from John Davidson in 1573, via Andrew and James Melville and the other presbyterians who fled the Arran regime and its “Black Acts” in 1584, through the ministers of Edinburgh who had fled in fear after the failure of the 17 December 1596 attempt to bring the Crown to heel, the clergy punished for defending the Aberdeen General Assembly of 1605, right down to the ministers who suffered punishment as a result of the Protestation of 27 June 1617. The king’s response to that last protestation had been to push through his “Five Articles,” which Struthers wholeheartedly embraced—hence his preaching to an empty kirk on Christmas Day, and his furious attack on his parishioners on 5 January.

When Mr Archibald Simson, minister of Dalkeith (and sufferer on account of the 1617 Protestation), learned of the January 5th sermon, he was appalled, and wrote to Struthers, with heavy allusion to Psalm 51 and that psalm’s origins in King David’s guilt over having arranged the death of his loyal, innocent soldier Uriah the Hittite:

Can poyson be drawn out of this honey-comb? David, pressed with the guilt of one blood, yit calls to God to be free from it: and sall you involve you in a guiltiness of so mucche bloode of God’s Uriahs, warriors and worthies, who has faughten and died in his cause? If ye were free of blood, then wold your toung speak joyfullie and confortablie.... Ye wold not not be like the last of Job’s freinds ... swelling in his owne conceatted knowledge (Calderwood, VII: 345).²⁵

Ane Dialogue is clearly part of a widespread reaction to Struthers’s assault on both his own parishioners and the heroes of the presbyterian resistance to royal encroachment on the Kirk’s prerogatives. Calderwood’s *History* makes it clear that the tension between Struthers and his insulted

²⁴ NLS, Adv. Ms. LXXXIV, f. 19. Struther’s text is here quoted from the Geneva Bible, as given in Calderwood’s summary of the sermon; the Authorized or King James version omits the reference to “joyfully” taken up in the *Dialogue*.

²⁵ For Uriah the Hittite, David and Bathsheba, see 2 Samuel, chs. 11 and 12.

parishioners became part of a general stand-off between the citizens of Edinburgh and the four ministers of Edinburgh. At the traditional meeting of the “honest citzens” with their pastors

upon the Tuesday before the first Communion-day ... Sundrie complaints were given in... especially against Mr Patrik Galloway and Mr William Struthers, for their invectives against their flocke... the misbehaviour of the pastors, and their frivolous answeirs, confirmed the people in their former resolution (Calderwood, VII:356-57).²⁶

Yet the ministers remained determined “to celebrate the Communion conforme to the act of Perth, notwithstanding the malcontentment of the people,” with the result that very few at all communicated at Easter, and at the kirk session meeting of 3 April, an outspoken elder, John Mein, engaged in a spectacular verbal confrontation with Struthers and Galloway (Calderwood, VII:357, 361-64).

For four Sunday afternoons in May, “the contention betuixt the ministerie and the people of Edinburgh continuing, there was noe teaching in the Little Kirk, where Mr Struthers taught.” When the elders complained, Patrick Galloway told them on 20 May that the ministers were “so lightlied and disdained, revyled and spoken of, that we can doe nothing.... we have been upbraidit and called apostats.” He repeated his accusation that John Mein was an Anabaptist, because “he is disobedient to the king’s Majestie; he does not acknowledge the kirk, and is disobedient to us heir” (Calderwood, VII:379). On June the 11th, it emerged that the ministers had carried out their threat to write to the king about the attitude of their parishioners, assuring him that “he might gett als great vantage now of the town as he had at the 17th day of December” (Calderwood, VII:381). It was only at the end of July that “the controversie betuixt the toun of Edinburgh and their ministers” was resolved, when it came before the king’s commissioners, the Archbishop of St Andrews and the Lord President, Thomas Hamilton. The latter decreed that the two parties be more friendly to each other, and shake hands. “But the reconciliation was not so hartie as it was formall and ceremonious. The ministers were sharplie rebuked by the two commissioners ... to please the magistrats and the counsel” (Calderwood, VII:390).

The dramatis personae of Ane Dialogue

The speakers in *Ane Dialogue* comprise ‘ane quaternion of Christes persecuted souldiers’, as James Melville observes, using a Roman military

²⁶ Johnston’s *MS History*, II: 663-4, also gives an account of this “convention in the littill east kirk;” Patrick Galloway is criticised, but nothing is said about Struthers.

term for a unit of four men.²⁷ They are an interesting group, representing the Kirk at both urban (Balcanquhall) and rural levels (Melville and Smith), and also geographically: Fife (Melville), Edinburgh (Balcanquhall) and the Borders (Smith). Melville, a former commissioner of the Kirk, also represents the national Kirk. The presence of Archibald Johnstone means that the quaternion also encompasses both clergy and laity. This is an important point, and in what follows, Archibald Johnstone, as the representative of the powerful, presbyterian *édimbourgeoisie*, is considered at greater length than the three clergymen.

1. James Melville (1556-1614)

As stated above, it is no small comment on James Melville's national standing and posthumous reputation that the Edinburgh readers of *Ane Dialogue* were expected to be fully acquainted with him and what he stood for. He grew up near Montrose and studied at St Andrews, and began his professional life as a university lecturer, helping his uncle Andrew first in Glasgow and then in St Andrews. But his desire was always to be a parish minister, although Andrew dissuaded him from accepting Stirling in 1582.²⁸ James finally fulfilled his dream in 1586, by taking on a group of small East Fife coastal parishes. By 1590, he had succeeded in securing individual ministers for the parishes, remaining responsible solely for Kilrennie. Like his uncle, James was an active member of the Presbytery of St Andrews within the Synod of Fife, which was full of committed presbyterians, including two of his own brothers-in-law, the ministers John Dykes and Robert Durie.

Melville was a gifted writer of the vernacular, and wrote much prose and poetry. Among the works attributed to him is the lively and readable three-way anonymous dialogue *Zelator, Temporizar, Palemon*, anent the Black Acts of 1584, church polity and the rôle of Archbishop Adamson.²⁹ Much of Melville's extensive poetic *oeuvre* remains in manuscript, though considerable amounts of verse feature in his *Autobiography and Diary*, not printed until 1842. His two surviving vernacular publications, *Ane fruitfull*

²⁷ Acts 12:4 refers to a detachment of four *quaternions*, i.e. 16 soldiers divided into groups of four.

²⁸ James Melville, *Autobiography and Diary*, 135 (as in n. 11 above; cited hereafter as *JMAD*). The post went to James Anderson of Collace in Perthshire: see J. Reid-Baxter, "James Anderson and his Poem *The Winter Night*," in Luuk Houwen, ed., *Literature and Religion in Late Medieval and Early Modern Scotland: Essays in Honour of Alasdair A. MacDonald* (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 145-65, at 147.

²⁹ Printed in Calderwood, IV: 295-339. Dated 10 February 1585 at Newcastle (when Melville was living there), and running to over 14,000 words, it denounces Adamson as "that blasphemous villane, Metropolitan among the apostats of Scotland," "Holliglasse," "my Lord Archknav," "your great Dagon."

and comfortable exhortatioun anent death (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1597) and *A spirituall propine of a pastour to his people* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1598) also contain much poetry. Melville wrote these books primarily for his own parishioners, but by that time he had already become a senior figure at national level, not least as a permanent member of the General Commission established by James VI at the Dundee General Assembly of May 1597. Melville suffered from chronic ill health, and found this peripatetic charge extremely burdensome, laying it down in March 1601. He would have done so earlier, but he had stayed in post in a vain endeavour to shield his friend and disciple Mr Robert Bruce, minister of Edinburgh, from the king's wrath over Bruce's refusal to implement—unquestioningly and to the letter—the royal instructions as to what was to be preached about the Gowrie Conspiracy of 5 August 1600.³⁰

Melville would play a leading role in encouraging the holding of the “illegal” General Assembly of July 1605 in Aberdeen, and thereafter in defending and supporting the ministers who were imprisoned as a result of their refusal to denounce that Assembly as illegal.³¹ Indeed, so active in this matter were James, his uncle Andrew and six other presbyterian ministers (mostly from Fife), that they were summoned to London by the king in the summer of 1606, and thereafter held under a form of house-arrest until Andrew was sent to the Tower of London in April 1607. He remained there until April 1611, when he departed into exile in mainland Europe. James, for his part, was forbidden to return to his Scottish charge, as were several of his colleagues in the presbytery of St Andrews. He refused to change his mind as to the legality of the Aberdeen Assembly, and turned down the offer of a Scottish bishopric in October 1607. He died in Berwick on 19 January 1614, after seven years of exile, during the first three of which he completed his history of the *Declyneing Aige of the Kirk of Scotland*, which is referred to in *Ane Dialogue*, and is familiar to historians as the second part of the *Autobiography and Diary*.

³⁰ See J. Reid Baxter, “*The Nyne Muses*, an unknown Renaissance sonnet sequence: John Dykes and the Gowrie Conspiracy of 1600,” in K. Dekker and A. A. MacDonald, eds., *Royalty, Rhetoric and Reality* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 197-218.

³¹ See J. Reid Baxter, “Montgomerie's Solsequium and *The Mindes Melodie*,” in J. Derrick McLure and Janet Hadley Williams, eds., *Fresche Fontanis: Proceedings of the 13th Triennial Conference on Mediaeval and Renaissance Scottish Language and Literature* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), 363-77; and “Elizabeth Melville: New Light from Fife,” *Innes Review*, 69:1 (Spring 2017, in press).

2. Walter Balcanquhall (c.1548-1617)

Originally from Strathmiglo in Perthshire, Balcanquhall studied at St Andrews. After a spell as exhorter at Aberdour in Fife, and a year as reader at Haddington, he spent his working life as one of the ministers of Edinburgh. He was at St Giles from 1574 to 1597, when he took over the Trinity College parish.³² In *Ane Dialogue*, however, he speaks above all in his capacity as a former incumbent of St Giles, shocked to think of Struthers preaching from his former pulpit. Like James Melville, Balcanquhall had throughout his career found himself regularly at loggerheads with the Crown over the issue of the Kirk's liberties. In 1584, after the passing of the anti-presbyterian Black Acts, Balcanquhall was one of the distinguished ministers and presbyterian laymen who followed the example recently set by Andrew Melville in fleeing Scotland.³³ Taking refuge in Berwick, he was joined for a month by James Melville; later, in 1585, the two men were fellow-exiles in London with Andrew Melville (*JMAD*, 170-1, 221). They remained close friends and comrades. In August 1600, following the events of the Gowrie Conspiracy in Perth, Balcanquhall, like his Edinburgh colleague Robert Bruce, refused to follow King James's instructions anent what was to be preached from the pulpit about the events of 5 August. Duly banished from the capital, Balcanquhall quickly capitulated and returned to his congregation, unlike Bruce (Calderwood, VI: 57-58). Nonetheless, he publicly protested in 1606 against the sentencing of the ministers imprisoned for attending the July 1605 Aberdeen General Assembly, and in 1610, he was summoned and admonished by the Privy Council for his condemnation of that year's royalist-conformist General Assembly (*JMAD*, 624, 802). Older than Melville, Balcanquhall outlived his friend, and only stopped preaching in 1616 due to ill health, dying the following year (*Fasti*, I:126). Two of his sons became clergymen. Robert (c.1590-1658) was minister of Tranent from 1614, and declined election as minister of Edinburgh in 1620 (*Fasti*, I:396). The second son, Walter (1586-1645) made his career in England. As a Fellow of Pembroke College Oxford, he attended the Synod of Dort in 1618-19, but as the representative of the king and of the Church of England, not of the Scottish Kirk, which was not represented at Dort.³⁴ This second Walter rose to be Dean of Rochester (1624) and then of Durham (1639).

³² Scott, *Fasti* (as in n. 10 above), I: 52, 125; VIII: 24, 95.

³³ Gordon Donaldson, "Scottish Presbyterian Exiles in England 1584-88," *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 14 (1963): 67-80, reprinted in Donaldson, *Scottish Church History* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1985), 178-90.

³⁴ Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism*, as in n. 20 above, 216.

3. Archibald Johnstone (d.1619)

A wealthy merchant burgher of Edinburgh, Archibald Johnstone was the grandfather of the leading Covenanter, Archibald Johnston, Lord Warriston (1611-1663). Readers of the *Dialogue* would have been aware that the merchant's wife was Rachel Arnot, daughter of Sir John Arnot, provost of Edinburgh. She outlived Archibald, dying in 1626. Rachel was famous for her deep commitment to the presbyterian cause. Her grandson Bishop Gilbert Burnet wrote that she was "much engaged" to the Scottish "Puritans" and was "most obsequiously courted by them.... she was counted for many years the chief support of the party."³⁵ The epitaph for Rachel published by Robert Fairlie, schoolmaster of Musselburgh, describes her as *mater Relligionis* (a mother to [true] religion) and a woman whose mind was *enthea* (god-inspired).³⁶ D. C. McNicol claims that it was "probably ... in the house of good Rachel Arnot, that the ministers gathered to those meetings which are repeatedly referred to as taking place in the Sciennes."³⁷ McNicol cites one such meeting in early August 1621, described by James Kirkton: "The bishops hade procured all the dissatisfied ministers to be discharged the town, so diverse of them upon the last day of the parliament went out to Sheens, near Edinburgh, where in a friend's house they spent the day in fasting and prayer."³⁸ Rachel Arnot's name, strangely enough, never appears in Calderwood's *History*, though he has much to say about the 1621 Parliament (Calderwood, VII: 458-507).

In the *Dialogue*, Archibald Johnston's very first words, addressed to the shades of Melville and Balcanquhall, are "Dear pastours I knew you bothe & was all my time weil acquainted with you." Nonetheless, Johnstone's leading status as one of the burgh's wealthiest merchants, rather than his personal spirituality, may be the real reason for his being chosen to represent the laity in the dialogue. Laura Stewart claims that *Ane Dialogue* was written to comfort existing "Edinburgh-based godly circles," rather than to proselytise. But the authorial strategy seems to be to gather fresh support for the presbyterian cause amongst the *édimbourgeoisie* at large,

³⁵ Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, 4 vols (London: A. Millar, 1748), I:18.

³⁶ Robert Fairlie [or Farley], *Neanica* (Edinburgh: John Wreighton, 1628), sig.E1.

³⁷ D. C. McNicol, *Robert Bruce, Minister in the Kirk of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1907), 96.

³⁸ James Kirkton, *Secret and True History of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. C.K. Sharp (Edinburgh: Ballantyne, 1817), 16-17. See also Kirkton's source, namely the more informative John Livingstone, in W.K. Tweedie, ed., *Select Biographies*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1845-7), I: 316-17.

by making the presbyterian ministers' cause one with that of the city of Edinburgh itself, as it had been in the past.

In *Ane Dialogue*, Johnstone is terminally bed-ridden. Almost the first words he speaks are “albeit my body & this external man of myne be lying heir in prison in body in my bed,” and later he says “I will testifie now at my latter end.” His testament indicates that this is no metaphor: it was written as early as 18 October 1618, and Johnstone died on 5 March 1619.³⁹ His testament's opening preamble is formulaic:

In the first and aboue all I hairtlie recommend my selff saule and bodie to the mercifull protexioun of my god almichtie and beleves assuredlie to be saif by the onlie meritis death and passioun of my sweit savior Jesus chryst to qm wt god the father and god the holie spirit vnitie and trinitie be all honor praise glorie and dominioun for evir so be it.

Conventionally pious too is the legacy of 500 merks “to the puir of the hospitall in Edinburgh for ther maintenance and support.” He instructs his youngest son, Joseph, to remain with and obey his mother “and be honestlie intertynit *with* hir in verteous educatioun and learneing at the schoillis in the feir of god.” Rachel Arnot's rôle would clearly be important with regard to the “uther fyve hunderet merkis to the honnest puir within Edinburgh to be peyit and distributit be my spous with advys of ony of the ministeris of Edinburgh,” since almost all those ministers had embraced the Five Articles of Perth, adopted two months before the testament was written.⁴⁰ Likewise, he left “to the colledge of Edinburgh for help and intertenyng of bursaris and studentis in letteris ther ane thowsand merkis to be imployit upoun yeirlie rent provyding that I my aires and successoris have speciall voit and consent in the electioun and placeing of the same bursaris and studentis vacant.” The final legacy with any kind of religious content is “ane hunderet merkis to help the reparing and compleiting the

³⁹ National Records of Scotland, CC8/8/50, pages 424-7, registered 28 Apr 1619. My thanks to Dr John McCallum for providing me with an account of Johnston's testament. Dr Amy Blakeway has suggested to me that Johnstone may have been selected for *Ane Dialogue* precisely because he was known to be terminally ill and in no position to object to being instrumentalised in this way. There is some minimal indication in William Morison, *Johnstone of Warriston* [Famous Scots Series] (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, [1901]), 14-6, that until 1596, at any rate, Archibald's relations with the King were excellent.

⁴⁰ The partial exception was John Hall; he did not retire from his charge until March 1619 (*Fasti*, I: 55-6). Calderwood puts a very negative interpretation on his withdrawal from his Edinburgh charge (VII: 357).

kirk callit kirkpatrick iuxta *quhair* my predicessoris bonis lyis.”⁴¹ Johnstone himself had been born in his ancestral Annandale.⁴²

All these provisions notwithstanding, Johnstone’s main priority was his family, as we see from the scope of certain of his financial provisions: 5000 merks are left to his son-in-law Sir James Skene (admittedly, these were part of the original marriage settlement), Rachel Arnot is obliged to grant young Joseph 5000 merks when he reaches the age of 21, and lavish financial provision is made for the children of Johnstone’s late son James—for example, Archibald, the future Lord Warriston, was given 21,000 merks in life-rent.

4. John Smyth (c.1564-1634)

The fourth speaker in *Ane Dialogue* is the Teviotdale minister John Smyth of Maxton, a hamlet between Jedburgh and Melrose, to which charge he had been appointed in 1593, having previously been at Selkirk and Mertoun. The situation depicted in *Ane Dialogue*, namely that Smyth is paying a quasi-pastoral visit to the sick Johnstone, may well reflect a genuine acquaintance between the two men: in 1602, the Assembly had appointed Smyth to visit the kirks of Nithsdale and of Annandale, Johnstone’s native soil (*Fasti*, II: 184). Smyth had graduated from St Andrews in 1584, where he had studied under Andrew Melville, and hence probably also under James. Like the Melvilles, Smith would be a consistent opponent of royal ecclesiastical policies. In 1607 he was “called before the Privy Council for acting as clerk to the Synod which disregarded the Acts of Assembly 1606 regarding a constant Moderator, and was charged to enter into ward at Blackness.” (*Fasti*, II: 184; cf. Calderwood, VI: 681). Smyth went on to sign the 1617 Protestation drafted by William Struthers and Peter Ewart, and in 1622 Smyth would again be in ecclesiastical trouble, with the Court of High Commission.

The Covenanting minister and memoirist John Livingstone knew Smyth, and has a quaint note about him in his “Memorable Characteristics,” mentioning that Smyth knew all the psalms off by heart and was given to quoting them at length.⁴³ In *Ane Dialogue*, we see him at one point produce an instant quotation from Zechariah. Given that we also see him uttering perfervid denunciations of the double-dealing of Struthers as an apostate presbyterian-turned-conformist, it is curious to note that when Smyth was cited to compare before the High Commission in 1622,

⁴¹ Kirkpatrick-Juxta is six miles south-west of Moffat in Annandale, Dumfriesshire.

⁴² See Sir William Fraser, *The Annandale Family Book of the Johnstones, Earls and Marquises of Annandale*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable at the University Press, 1894), II: xvii-xviii.

⁴³ Tweedie, ed., *Select Biographies*, I: 314.

he was spared “at the intercession of Mr Andro Ramsay.” For though Ramsay, like Struthers and Smyth, had been a signatory to the 1617 Protestation, by 1622 he was one of Struthers’s conformist episcopalian colleagues in Edinburgh (Calderwood, VII:553).

Ane Dialogue as a literary work

The ghostly presence of two heroic defenders of the Kirk, in dialogue with a dying pillar of the Edinburgh mercantile establishment and a living presbyterian militant, was an imaginative stroke which offered many literary possibilities. The *Dialogue*’s unknown author, however, does not really dwell on the fact that its cast are a mixture of the living and the dead. But he does know how to write an effective conversation piece, and he characterises his four speakers rather well. While it is likely that the piece was not only read in private by individuals, but also read out loud for the benefit of groups of people (not all burges wives, for instance, were literate), we will never know whether more than one reader’s voice would have been involved in such a “performance.” Nonetheless, like not a few Renaissance dialogues, *Ane Dialogue* is eminently and enjoyably “theatrical,” and even today, it could be effectively staged, using Calderwood’s text of Struthers’s sermon as a context-providing prologue.

James Melville introduces himself as having “lived so peaceably all my days,” while Balcanquhall’s first speech casts him in the characteristic Scottish ministerial rôle of a prophet—“I sawe & prophesied that thir yong men sould be the wracke of our Kirke.”⁴⁴ Next, Johnstone introduces himself as a friend and follower of the dead ministers and of the Lamb of God. Finally, the choleric John Smyth’s first contribution sets the tone for his every intervention, coloured by a strong personal grudge against Struthers: “Seing he hes proclaimed himself to be ane stithie [*anvil*], ye knowe that I am the blacksmith of Maxtoun, who hopes in God by the hammer of the Scriptures to beat upon him,” concluding that Struthers is “worthy to breaflye to be casten over into the handes of the devil.” To Smyth’s torrent of invective, Melville mildly remonstrates:

let us, I pray you, mutuallie conferre our greaves, & shew *quhairin* we ar offended, & answer I beseeche you with a peaceable spirit, that fleshe meet not with fleshe, but the spirit of modestie & *rychteousnes* may rancounter the carnal corruption of ane yong & fleshlie hart.

Melville then asks Johnstone to speak first, on behalf of the burgeses, the readership to whom, Laura Stewart suggests, the *Dialogue* is addressed. But Johnstone demurs, and echoing Struthers’ sermon, says “ye

⁴⁴ Unreferenced quotations in this and following paragraphs are from the text of *Ane Dialogue* (pp. 92-101 below).

three of the Kirke, who ar our heades & we the taile, sould beginne, for your *pairt* is no les odiouslie persecuted.” To this, Balcanquhall responds “We did nevir call you the taile, but revered you as our own brethren in Christ, & acknowledged us your servants for Christ,” and insists instead that Johnstone begin. The merchant gives a very full account of Struthers’ sermon, interspersed with an effective series of telling comments and interjections from Balcanquhall and Smyth, while Melville listens in silence. Eventually, when it comes to Struthers’s accusation of Edinburgh and the clergy with regard to 17 December 1596, Melville is finally provoked into speaking again: “Is this Christian divinity, to rankel a wound that is cured...?” Johnstone finishes his relation of the sermon and then addresses Melville:

Now sir, I pray you, shew me *quhairin* ye ar greaved, for this is *consolatio miserorum habere pares*,⁴⁵ and this eases me something, that as we ar partakers of ane Gospell, so we are *comparters* of ane tribulatione for the Gospell.

The largest single speech of the dialogue now follows. Since there are none of the interjections which might reasonably have been expected, this well-constructed didactic exposition of the Crown’s persecution of presbyterians is the least “dramatic” part of *Ane Dialogue*. Melville first tackles the question of Struthers’s accusation that people who have suffered for the presbyterian cause wilfully brought an unnecessary cross upon themselves. After comparing Struthers’s attitude to the Kirk to that of a young viper that has cut its way out of its mother’s belly, he says:

But I would wisse he wolde heare patientlie my lamentatioune.... I will shortlie explaine to you his calumny against me whoe am with the Lorde, & many of my brethren, besides uthers whoe ar yit alive.

And he does exactly that, at some length and in some detail, dividing his account into what are effectively the three “heads” of a sermon. His first sort of sufferers under a cross are the “Aberdeen Assembly” ministers held in Blackness Castle in 1605 and 1606 and then banished. Their fate being directly linked with his own, this naturally leads straight into his second sort of sufferers: himself and the seven others, all named, who were summoned to London by King James in mid 1606, and wofully maltreated. The third sort of sufferers are those who have paid the penalty for subscribing the Protestation of July 1617. Archibald Simson of Dalkeith is named (though Peter Ewart is not). Melville points out that Struthers and Patrick Galloway have changed sides, and he blames Struthers for the cross the suffering ministers are under: “Gif this be ane unnecesser crosse, being called be sa monie brethren & speciallie Mr Struthers, who was the author of this business, let all men judge.” Melville concludes with a reference to

⁴⁵ “A trouble shared is a trouble halved,” or “misery seeks a companion.”

another sufferer: “Mr David Calderwood, if he thinke he hes drawn the crosse upon him self, I thinke can answer for himself.”

The dialogue then ends with a series of contributions from the other speakers. Archibald Johnston, who had asked Melville to speak, thanks him and endorses the general condemnation of Struthers, saying “It is easier to men whoe flies the crosse to judge of uthr menis crosses: bot I am sorie they sould be instruments to laye crosses upon *thair* brethren.” John Smyth then breaks in with some more vituperation:

That miserable instrument sayes he *that* our brethren & holie men & fathers who hes put *thair* lives in *thair* handes for Christes cause, hes fetched ane crosse upon themselves? I pray God waken his conscience.

Smyth then turns to Balcanquhall and asks about his preaching, and Balcanquhall’s reply takes us back to the opening of the dialogue, by reminding us that he is a shade: “I tolde before my death that (as I answer to God) I taught nothing to *Edinburgh* but the Lordes trueth.” He offers a kind of prayer for Struthers: “God give him greater dexterity & wisdom himself *that* he wounde not them *quhom* the Lorde hes not greaved.” And then he elegantly returns us to Smyth’s opening words: “Now, Mr Smith, strike upon your stuthie as hardlie as ye may,” reminding us that Struthers had preached on 5 January that for the burgesses

the ministers of Edinburgh must ather be asses, to beare what burdens the people please to lay upon them, or studies [*i.e.* anvils], to hammer upon what they will. As for myself, I am resolved to be a studdie; hammer upon me as ye pleis, I care not (Calderwood, VII: 344).

Smyth’s final speech, satisfyingly enough, begins by explaining his consistently bitter feelings towards Struthers: “He is the man *quhom* I liked verie weil, who hes deceived me beyond all his neighbours.” And then, speaking as one of the “countrey ministers” whom Struthers had attacked for their pastoral interference in *his* parish of Edinburgh, Smyth delivers himself of some home truths about Struthers’s shortcomings as a parish minister. He also comes back to Struthers’s accusation that the country ministers—who behave like popes and “have an anabaptisticall spirit”—are sowing anti-episcopal disaffection in Edinburgh. Smyth says that it is Struthers himself who has received strange teachings from “the Spirit that learnes him to divine sic [*such*] fantasies, *quhair*of I trust he sall be eschamed.” Smyth turns the papal insult back on Struthers, with words originally said of the papal absolutist Boniface VIII and quoted in the 1599 Geneva Bible marginal notes to Revelation: *Intravit ut vulpes, regnavit ut leo, moriturus ut canis* : He came in like a fox, reigned like a lion, and will

die like a dog.⁴⁶ Smyth's final words are, literally, a great clang on the anvil: "And to give the last blowe on the stuthie: *Omnis Apostata est osor sectae suae.*"⁴⁷

The dialogue is rounded off by a "Ane conclusion of the quaternion," in which the four in a single voice first denounce Struthers's lies, then deliver the lapidary message that Truth conquers in the end, and conclude by saying that they serve Christ, but Struthers is the servant of Mammon. The author of *Ane Dialogue* was unquestionably a gifted writer. Though the tract was never designed to be acted out as a stage-play, it reveals an author with a genuinely theatrical flair.

Authorship

Ane Dialogue is anonymous, and its copyist, John Fergushill, makes no suggestion as to its authorship. Robert Wodrow's own contents page for Quarto LXXXIV shows that he was not even sure about the year of composition, and that he had originally assumed that "Archibald Johnstoune" was in fact the Covenanting Clerk Register. The unknown author could have been a presbyterian lawyer, given the way the *Dialogue*'s speakers occasionally drop into Latin. Yet what they say in that language could just as plausibly indicate clerical authorship of the *Dialogue*.⁴⁸ Possible candidates would include the much-persecuted author of the excellent, printed *Dialogue betwixt Cosmophilus and Theophilus* (1620), Mr John Murray (c.1575-1632), minister of Leith until 1609, and Dunfermline from 1620. Murray had been an ardent supporter of the "Aberdeen Assembly" ministers imprisoned in Blackness Castle in 1605-6, and their last night on Scottish soil before they sailed into exile was spent

⁴⁶ See the 1599 Geneva Bible, note (4) to Revelations 11:2. Boniface (reigned 1294-1303) had stated in his bull *Unam Sanctam* (1302), "'it is absolutely necessary for salvation that every human creature be subject to the Roman pontiff."

⁴⁷ "Every apostate is a hater of his own sect." This adage has various formulations (e.g., *contemptor ordinis sui*); Robert MacWard states that "the proverb is become plain Scottish, or English, or both if ye will: *Omnis Apostata sectae suae Osor.*" towards the end of his introduction to *Joshua Redivivus, or, Mr. Rutherford's letters divided into two parts* (s.l. [?Rotterdam]: s.n., 1664), p. [46] (leaf c8 verso).

⁴⁸ Many, but by no means all, Scotland's attributable dialogues are the work of clergymen; in addition to those mentioned in this essay, see *inter alia*, [William Scott], *The Course of Conformitie as it hath proceeded, is concluded, should be refused* ([Amsterdam]: [Giles Thorp], 1622); P. A. [Patrick Forbes], *Eubulus, or A Dialogue, where-in a rugged Romish Ryme (inscribed, A proper Ballad, containing Catholicke Questions to the Protestant) is confuted, and the Questions there-of answered* (Aberdeen: Edward Raban, 1627); [George Gillespie], *A late dialogue betwixt a civilian and a divine concerning the present condition of the Church of England* (London: Robert Bostock, 1644).

at Murray's manse in Leith.⁴⁹ But the style of *Cosmophilus and Theophilus* is so different from that of *Ane Dialogue* that Murray's authorship of the latter can be discounted.

David Calderwood himself is, at first glance, a plausible candidate. His accounts of verbal confrontations, throughout his *Historie*, are dramatic and convincing. His parish of Crailing near Jedburgh lay close to John Smyth's charge of Maxton, and the two men must have been friends, given their geographical proximity and the similarity of their anti-episcopalian views. As *Ane Dialogue* obliquely notes, Calderwood had been suffering at the hands of the Privy Council and the King ever since July 1617 because of his ardent support of the Protestation—his *History* records his tribulations in great detail (Calderwood, VI: 253-83). Deprived of his charge in July 1617, Calderwood remained in Scotland until 27 August 1619 (VII: 382), writing and indeed publishing tracts, including his notorious *Perth Assembly* (Leiden, [1619]) which was printed in Holland and imported.⁵⁰ *Ane Dialogue* even contains what could be circumstantial evidence for Calderwood's authorship, namely John Smyth's comment that Struthers "is the man *quhom* I liked verie weil, who hes deceived me beyond all his neighboures." Not only had Struthers been a vociferous opponent of royal ecclesiastical policy in July 1617, but later that year, when the persecuted Calderwood went to confer with the Scottish bishops, Struthers was one of the three ministers who went with him "to beare witness," going on to make representations to the Bishop of Glasgow in Calderwood's favour (Calderwood, VII: 277, 281).

Against all this circumstantial evidence in favour of Calderwood, however, we must set the fact that Archibald Johnstone and his militantly presbyterian wife Rachel Arnot do not appear in Calderwood's *History* in connection with 1619 or anything else.⁵¹ This is notable, because Calderwood actually has a perfect opportunity to name and commend both of them: when Archibald's son-in-law Sir James Skene of Curriehill, a Lord of Session, was brought before the Privy Council on 22 June 1619 for the crime of not kneeling for communion at Easter, Calderwood comments merely that "some ascribed his not conforming, not to conscience, but to the dissuasion of his mother-in-law, and her daughter, a religious gentlewoman" (Calderwood, VII: 383). These ladies were of course Rachel

⁴⁹ Calderwood, *History*, VI: 690; for Murray's tribulations thereafter, see *JMAD*, 762-5. His sister Nicolas was the dedicatee of Melville's massive paraphrase of the Song of Songs, *The Reliefe of the longing soule* (Edinburgh: 1606); see n. 12 above.

⁵⁰ STC (2nd ed.) 4360

⁵¹ As noted above, Rachel is never named at all, but Archibald is found once, listed as a supporter of the ministers of Edinburgh in 1599: Calderwood, V: 767.

Arnot and Jonet Johnston, as Calderwood must have known. Given that Rachel's religious fervour was such that she is believed to have been a major influence on her grandson Archibald, Calderwood's presumably deliberate omission of her name from his *History* gives good grounds for denying him the authorship of *Ane Dialogue*.

While the identity of the writer must, at least for the time being, remain a mystery, the *Dialogue* should be better known than it is. Its significance lies not only in the way it highlights the national standing enjoyed by the late James Melville, something which strongly underlines the extent to which that remarkable man is truly 'the Great Unknown' of Jacobean Scotland. *Ane Dialogue* also reminds us of the presence of Roman comedies and dialogic teaching texts in post-Reformation Scottish schoolrooms. Had the Kirk taken the positive attitude to drama adopted by French and Dutch presbyterian Calvinism, there is little doubt that theatrical writing could have been successfully cultivated in Jacobean Scotland.

University of Glasgow

About the manuscript and edition

This edition is transcribed from the unique witness, NLS Wodrow Quarto LXXXIV, which appears to be a rather inaccurate transcript of the original; in places it verges on the incomprehensible. In making the transcription, a quasi-diplomatic approach has been taken to a MS abounding in contractions, and which makes much use of yogh and thorn and very little of punctuation. Yogh, thorn, j and i, u, v and w have all been standardised, but the indications of the speakers' names have been transcribed exactly as given. The manuscript's orthography is heavily anglicised, but the underlying language is clearly Scots.

J. R. B.

**ANE DIALOGUE BETUIX MR JAMES MELVILLE, MR WALTER
BALQUANQUAN, ARCHD JOHNSTONE, JOHNE SMITH
(NLS Wodrow Quarto LXXXIV, ff. 19-25)**

[f. 19r] Mr James Melville Why trouble ye my (Manes)?¹ Why am I unquietted now being in sleepe, who lived so peaceably all my dayes, who got the commendatioune of my prince, my brethren & all my people that I sought the peace of Jerusalem and was all to to all so farre as I might have kept Christ[?] And now *quhat* new broyle is this, that out of the watchtoure of *Edinburgh* such voice sould have sounded by Mr *William Struthers*, whoe *quhen* the text² led him, that his tongue sould singe joyfullie of Gods rychteousnes, his tongue hes bene ane instrument to ring [*sic*] all unrychtneousnes doolefullie[?]

Mr W. Bal. Brother, I am amazed & astonished to sie my place,³ *quhilk* sounded Christ, now to sounde ane uther blast. Bot I sawe & prophesied that thir yong men sould be the wracke of *our* Kirke, for they ar brocht fra the blakstone⁴ to the pulpite, *quhen* thay knowe no divinity bot a volubilitie of thir things, & fleshlie philosophie.

Ard Johnstoune Deare pastours I knew you bothe & was all my time weil acquainted with you, & albeit my body & this external man of myne be lying heir in prison in body *sic* in my bed, yit my soule is with yours, goeing & following the Lambe *quhairsoevir* he goes. This greaves me to the heart to heare thir new soundes disgracing all *our* fathers, our honorabill & worthy burgesses of *Edinburgh*, the cheaf maintainars of Christes Kirk & defendars of the Gospell, & of *quhom* I may say that they wolde have plucked out *thair* eyes to have given *thair* pastours, & now to

¹ Latin *manes*: shade or ghost.

² The text was Ps.51:14: "Deliver me from blood, O God, which art the God of my salvation: and my tongue shall sing joyfully of thy righteousness."

³ Balcanquhall had preached in St Giles until 1597, when he moved to Edinburgh's Trinity College Kirk.

⁴ Scottish students were traditionally examined while sitting "on the black stane," which was inserted into a wooden chair; Glasgow University possesses the only surviving example. Balcanquhall means that these men are very recent graduates, and hence inexperienced.

heare thame blasted & vilely [*f.19v*] defamed be ane novice imposed upon us.

Jo. S. When ye worthy fathers ar so cruelly persecuted be ane perverted & abused scripture, as the devil threw the scriptures against Christ, must we not tak this patientlie *quhen* the taile speakes against the heade: bot seing he hes proclaimed himself to be ane stithie [*anvil*], ye knowe that I am the blacksmith of Maxtoun, who hopes in God by the hammer of the scripture to beat upon him & convince him of manifest unrychteousnes against God, against his sancts dead & living, against his flocke, against his brethren, finally unworthie evir to preache the gossell: & if the keyes of the kingdome of heaven be rightlie used by him, who hes pulled them out of Christes handes,⁵ to be worthy breafflie to be casten over into the handes of the devil.

Mr Ja. Mel. Since we ar all mett togidder, ane quaternion⁶ of Christes persecuted souldiers, by his joyfull voice *quhilk* hes sounded this Januar & begunne this new yeir to us 1619, let us, I pray you, mutuallie conferre our greaves, & shew *quhairin* we ar offended, & answer I beseeche you with a peaceable spirit, that fleshe meet not with fleshe, but the spirit of modesty & rychteousnes may rancounter the carnal corruption of ane yong & fleshlie hart. I wold requeist you *shir*, whoe is the burges, & whoe hes the report of that *quhilk* he spak of *your honorabill nychtboures*, gilde brethren and uther religious burgesses, let me hear *quhairin* ye ar offended & *quhat* ye ar able to answer *thairto*.

Ard. Jon. I thinke it wer more *reasonabill* that ye three of the kirke, who ar *our* heades & we the taile, sould beginne, for *your pairt* is no les odiouslie perscuted.

Mr Wal. Bal. We did nevir call you the taile, but revered you as *our* brethren in Christ, & acknowledged us your servants for Christ. Yet *shir*, seing he bigan at you, I wolde requeast you to beginne, so that *quhen* we heare his proude *dominatioune* over [*f.20r*] Christes flocke, we may more patientlie abide the contumelies done to his fellow brethren.

Ard. Jon. Then I must obey you & tell you a legend of rasche speaches *quhilk* I will testifie now at my latter end to be manifest untrueth. He sayes, we sclander *our* ministers at *our* tables, calling them fleshlie & corrupted. My table & the rest of my gilde brethren & holie burgesses & inhabitants of this toun ar free from this *imputatioune* & affirmes it to be a manifest

⁵ On 5th January Struthers had condemned the “countrie ministers in this toun” (such as John Smyth), whom he called “popes, for they have an anabaptistical spirit, who has not received the keyes of heaven, but has thrown out of Christ’s hand the keyes of hell, and sends men thither first by summare excommunication” (Calderwood, *History*, VII: 344).

⁶ A Roman military term for a unit of four soldiers.

sclander, & if he be able to qualifie his alleadgeance by any *particulars*, we sall oblease *our* selves to give him the greatest satisfiounne that evir was, & utherwayes we thinke our selves greatlie defamed in the chyre of trueth.⁷ I protest we honored & reverenced our pastours as the angels of God, & thought us greatlie bounde to them *quhen* they honored *our* tables be their *presence*. Fye upon who wolde mak *thair* tables a snaire to Gods servantes. Mr W. B. I have sene, I speake before God, the ministrie of *Edinburgh* alsmekil esteemed & regairded (as this *honorabill* burges sayes) as gif they had bene angels from heaven. I knewe it xl yeeres. I knowe not hou they call them corrupt men, unles *thair* misbehaviour procured the samyn, *quhilk* I wolde be sorie to heare.

Jo.Sm. Sir be not be *sic* discouraged that he speakes so of you, for (to answer him in his owne tearmes) I thinke he is liker the taile nor the head, for as they saye in the common proverbe (*Dirten arse dreads aye*)⁸ & if he wer ane honest man, he wolde nevir thinke the *toune* of *Edinburgh* woulde call him fleshly or corrupt.

Archd Johnstone He calles us prophane *persones*, foolishlie zealous, politik as the devil, who cannot blame his doctrine bot calumniats his *persones*. He speaks *thair* in the plural number, associating his brethren with him, of *quhom* I thinke none can speak so, *nether* has sclandered us.⁹ [f:20v]

⁷ Johnston, *MS History* (as n. 18, p. 76 above), employs the phrase “in the schyr *sic* of veritie” when reporting Struthers’ sermon.

⁸ “Dirten ars dreads ay”: see Erskine Beveridge, ed., *Fergusson’s Scottish Proverbs* (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1924), 29, and cf. James Kelly, *A complete collection of Scottish Proverbs, explained and made intelligible* (London: 1818), 53: “When people are sensible that they have done amiss, they are still apprehensive of discovery.”

⁹ This deliberately focuses opprobrium on Struthers, for Calderwood records that in December 1618 “all the ministers of Edinburgh, excepted Mr Johne Hall, consented” when commanded by letters from the king to “preach upon Christ’s Nativitie upon Yule-day,” but that there were only two sermons preached, because the ministers realised that it would be very difficult to get any reasonable number of listeners. Calderwood records that Patrick Galloway, “a man of vaine-glorious humour, fretting becaus he was not followed in his corrupt course, and countenanced by the people, denounced judgements that day, and the Sabbath-day following; the famine of the Word, deafnes, blindnes, lamenes, inabilityie to come to the kirk to heare and see, to fall upon these who came not to his Christmas sermon.” At Holyrood, the Bishop of Galloway, William Cowper, preached, and “was so impertinent, and his arguments so frivolous, that the meanest in judgment made a mock at him” (Calderwood, VII: 341).

Jo.Sm. Knowe ye not that he is of a masculein & manlie spirit,¹⁰ as he termes himself, yea of a princelie spiritt by imaginatioune, for he speaks of himself in the plural number, we?

Mr W. B. The wisdom of [men *deleted*] God is counted for foolishnes to men, & I feare his wisdom, for all his coynd eloquence, turne in foolishnes. Lorde confound the wisdom of Achitophel.¹¹

A. J. Bot I lament most that we ar sclandered that we desire *our* pastours to be imprisoned, banished or silenced; we would brek the backes of *our* pastours, we cast thornes in *our* owne wayes, pitiles people. Where be the contrair, it is notorious to all the worlde that we have suffered with thame, & wer nevir ashamed of *thair* troubles: and if we ar as we wer, praised be God, we would not be so reproached that we would adde to *thair* tribulatioune.

M. W.Bal. Ye wer nevir ashamed of *our* bondes from the beginning to this *hour*. Ye ar a merciefull people & comfortable to all the sancts *quhair*evir they be, & *thairfore* the Lord hes blessed you & confortd you in *your* tribulatiounes. Bot I see that efter *our* departure, *thair* must come in greavous wolves, not spareing the flocke.

Jo. Smith Sie ye not the foxe complaine that the lambe wolde wirrie him?

A.Jon. He was [*sic for* has] casten up to us the xvii of December¹² as a blote to *Edinburgh* & to the kirke of Scotland, *quhair*of we wer purged by a law; & diligent examinatioune being had be judges depute be his Majestie, with all strait tryall, they founde nothing in the toune of *Edinburgh* bot loyaltie to the kinges majestie, as we have his majesties approbatioune & testimonie *thair*of, so that we have no blote, nor the kirke by us. I woulde some of them wer als free themselves.

Mr Ja. Mel. Is this Christian divinity, to rankel a wound that is cured, to a pastour to kindle up the heart of a prince against his owne flocke, & to impute wrong to his people, that ar not tryed by ane law?

Mr Wal. Bal. I preached that day, bot I had no purpose against the king, as his Majestie was sufficientlie informed. Bot I wold speare how he being a boye at the schooles, & knew not [*f.21r*] the proceiding of that errand, sould speak so abruptlie & rashlie of it, as though he had bene *present*, for

¹⁰ Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism*, 144 (as in n. 20, p. 76 above), dates Struthers's assertion to 1610, based on Calderwood, VII: 343.

¹¹ Achitophel was the treacherous counsellor of King David who sided with the rebellious Absalom; see 2 Samuel 15, 16 and 17. In 2 Sam.15:31, David prays "turn the counsel of Achitophel into foolishness," and in 2 Sam.17:14, Achitophel's good counsel is ignored by Absalom.

¹² On the "Edinburgh riot" of 1596, see Julian Goodare, "The Attempted Scottish Coup of 1596," in *Sixteenth-Century Scotland*, 311-226 (as in n. 9, p. 72 above).

the most learned, wise & godly of the ministry of Scotland wer then present & wer justified to be free of all purpose to offend his Majestie.

Jo. Sm. Zach.3.2, Lorde rebuke thee, O Sathan, even the Lorde that hes chosen Jerusalem reprove thee, O Sathan. Is not this a brande taken out of the fire,¹³ & is yon kindeling a new fire against it?

Ard. Jon. He calles us abusers of our pastours eares with our clatters, like new wine or barmy aile;¹⁴ our bloode be upon our owne head, the talke of the taile is not worthe the hearing, laying burdings on our ministers as asses, but because thir ar bot *congeries verborum*,¹⁵ I thinke them worthie of na answer.

Jo. Smith: That man delites to heare himselfe talke, for I have bene a hearer in Edinburgh thir 40 yeeres manie times, & I heard nevir so mony clatters as this man brings.

A. Jon. Now shir, I pray you, shew me quhairin ye ar greaved, for this is *consolatio miserorum habere pares*,¹⁶ and this eases me something, that as we ar partakers of ane gospell, so we are compartners of ane tribulatioune for the gospell.

Mr Ja. Mel. Sir, I have heard ane rapsodie of idle speaches & yit verie reproachfull against that holie kirk & congregation of Edinburgh, quhairof I beare witnes I have sein the ensenzie displayed with great majesty & glorie to the lorde our god & Christ our saviour, & am sorie that evir anie posteritie sould have broght out suche a viper as sould quicken herself by cutting her mothers bellie. But I would wisse he wolde heare patientlie my lamentatioune & one of the lordes sufferers for His cause, & who finished my course in the same; and I will shortlie explaine to you his calumny against me whoe am with the Lorde, & many of my brethren, besides uthers whoe ar [f.21v] yit alive, of quhom I sall speak to answer Shimei, not by silence as David did,¹⁷ least he sould reproache the hoste of Israel, bot by a faithfull & shorte reporte of our sufferings. He sayes in his sermon, he sies no occasioun yit quhairwith he sould be [offended *deleted*] troubled, & quhatevir he be [that] hes suffered in this cause, he hes drawn the crosse upon himself, & God hes not layed it on him. Thir ar the wordes. In the quhilk he first affirms that he sies no cause of suffering, quhair be the contrair, in that protestatioune given in to his Majestie at the Parliament 1617, quhilk he himself wrote, dyted and subscriyvit, was moderator of that convention in the musik schoole of Edinburgh, & that same day in publict pulpe [*sic*] steired up all the brethren, strangers &

¹³ The wording is that of the Geneva Bible, not the Authorised Version (KJV).

¹⁴ This alcoholic image is not found in Calderwood's account of the sermon.

¹⁵ A piling up of words.

¹⁶ "Misery seeks a companion," a common Latin tag.

¹⁷ 2 Samuel 16:5-13.

uthers, to subscribe it. He promised to undertak *quhatsoevir* hazarde or daunger that can be imposed, rather or he sould admitte sik *impositiounes* of uther kirkes *quhilk* does not agree with the soundnes of the gospell & weil reformed discipline in the Kirke of Scotland. It is a mervell, I say, that he sould then have offered himself to ane unnecesser crosse, & cause his brethren subscribe the samyn, and now, *quhen* these same things ar urged, he sies no cause *quhairfore* to tak ane crosse, unles he hes gotten some new light & creishie pension to cause his candle burne more cleare. But seing I am ane actor of this tragedy, & from the beginning am acquainted with ye estate of our decayed Kirke, albeit my body be dead, yit I have left the monuments be my awin handwrite,¹⁸ *quhilk* I have no caus to dissavowe, to testifie the falshode of these bloodie alleadgings of Mr Wm Struthers, that we have taken that crosse upon our owne deservings & it has not bene layde upon us necessarlie. And *thairfore* I will qualifie bothe for myself & my brethren [f.22r] also, als shortlie as I can, *quhat* we have done in that mater, & *quhat* we have suffered.

The sufferers for this cause, that is for the maintenance of the discipline of the Kirke of Scotland, ar of 3 rankes. The first ar the holy worthies whoe wer 37 in number, quho went to Aberdene the 2 of Julie 1605 at the kings commandement & warranted be the lawes of the countrey, be *particular* commission of *thair* presbytries; and albeitt Louriestoun¹⁹ that lowrie lyed of thame that they contravened the kings law & made false indorsatioune against thame, altho he had discharged them in the kings name to conveyne, yit God be praised, his *Majestie* knowes that they wer innocent & falselie traduced: yit these holy men drew not the crosse upon them, but standing to the equity of Gods cause, suffered violence be the erle of Dunbar & his

¹⁸ i.e. *Ane true narratioune of the declyneing agie of the Kirk of Scotland*, the second part of *The Autobiography and Diary of Mr James Melville*, ed. Robert Pitcairn (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842), cited below as *JMAD*.

¹⁹ Sir Alexander Stratoun of Laureston (in Angus), the King's Commissioner at the abortive Aberdeen General Assembly, who allowed the ministers gathered to constitute themselves an Assembly, and only then read out a letter from the Privy Council discharging the Assembly, which duly dissolved itself. His subsequent creativity with the chronological facts proved decisive for the fate of the ministers concerned, since his version of events reached the King in London before that of any of the ministers: see A. R. MacDonald, *The Jacobean Kirk* (Abingdon: Ashgate, 1998), 111; or, for a firsthand account, John Forbes, *Certaine Records touching the Estate of the Kirk*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society 1846), 389-403. For James Melville's account of the Aberdeen Assembly and its immediate aftermath see *JMAD*, 570-5.

humane assyse, albeit sevin of the assise justified them²⁰ & uthers (the poore gentlemen whose liveings ar wracked who voted against them, as Craigyhall chancellor of the assyse & the lairde of Broksmouth,²¹ who lamentable mourned for the same)²² & these honest men *quhairvir* they ar beares true witnes to Gods cause. And I mervell that this libertine soule impute anie thing to thir holie men who suffers in this cause; & of thir brethren (besides these who wer banished aff the countrey) wer a number prisoned, some in Dumbartan, some in the castell of Doun, some in *Edinburgh* castell, beside the former brethren whoe ar *sic* in Blaknes, of *quhom* sundrie contracted deadlie diseases, of *quhom* was Mr Charles Ferholme, *quha* wer fearfullie persecuted, in povertie, in prisonement, & drawn from shirefdome to shirefdome as spectacles to mercat croces, *quhilk* is notoriouslie known in all the *partes* of Scotland. Holy Mr Struthers, drew thir men crosses upon themselves? And if ye denie it, *thair* ar 10 000 witnesses yit alive who ar able to prove it. Bot I thinke you wer bot a boye at the schoole *quhen* sik maters wer in brewing, as ye was in the 17 of December.

[f.22v] The 2 sorte of sufferers that suffered in this cause ar the number of 8 brethren whose names ar thir:

Mr Andrew Melvile Mr Wm Watstone

²⁰ John Forbes, one of the ministers on trial at Linlithgow on 10 January 1606, lists only six in *Certaine Records*, 495, and James Melville repeats this figure (*JMAD*, 625).

²¹ Henry Stewart of Craigyhall, “a dissolute man, and at the horn,” and Sir George Hume of Broxmouth, near Dunbar, one of the many Hume kinsmen of the Earl of Dunbar with whom the jury was packed (William Scott, *Apologetical Narration of the State and Government of the Kirk of Scotland Since the Reformation*, ed. David Laing [Edinburgh: Wodrow Society 1846], 152-53). See also Forbes, *Certaine Records*, 476. On page 495, Forbes names Broxmouth and Craigyhall amongst the nine jurymen, “almost atheists, and men without God, or weake minded, and too simple and credulous,” who voted to convict the accused ministers.

²² The meaning here is not entirely clear. It could mean that Craigyhall and Broxburn later repented and mourned for the way they had voted. The passage may be corrupted; certainly, the brackets in the MS are misleading, and the passage would better read: “albeit sevin of the assise justified them, & uthers (the poore gentlemen whose liveings ar wracked), voted against them, as Craigyhall chancellor of the assyse & the lairde of Broksmouth, who lamentable mourned for the same.” However, Forbes, *Certaine Records*, 494, says that Craigyhall was playing a double game. James Melville, (*JMAD*, 623), names two of the nine as having “suitis at Court,” and all the accounts of the trial make it clear that the jurymen were subjected to threats. As for men who “mourned,” Forbes states that when the ministers were found guilty, “the Clerk-Deputy, who was with the Assyse” was “not able to refraine from teares” and “could not abstaine from mourning oppenlie before the whole assemblie” (495).

Mr James Melvile	Mr Jon Carmichael
Mr Rot Wallace	Mr Wm Scotte
Mr James Balfour	Mr Adam Colt

It is true his *Majestie* sent for us *particular* missive *letters*, desiring us to attend his *Majestie* at his palace at London, to conferre anent these things *quhilk* might mak for the peace of *our* Kirke.²³ Upon whose *particular* missives we came with great hazarde of *our* lives, being aged & waikie *persones*. We delivered *our* mindes with uniform consent & staicke be the discipline of the Kirke of Scotland, & justified *our* brethren at Lithgow, & we thank God none of England could blame us of anie misbehaviour in worde or dead: yit notwithstanding us *praeter ius gentium*²⁴ (gif my Manes durste say it) being sent for by freindlie *letters*, committed, prisoned, warded & confined, & by this way I say that Mr Struthers loudlie lyes, if he says that these men who maintained this cause hes drawn ane crosse upon themselves. Bot agane I say, my Manes sayes, these bene imposed on them be kirke men most injuriouslie.

The 3 sorte that my Manes heares of is at this last *parliament* 1617, in the *quhilk* Mr Struthers was moderator & Mr Archibald Sympson was clerke by the advice of 54 brethren *quhairin* Mr Struthers stirred up all the brethren to the *consideratioune* of the great ruine of [the *deleted*]oure Kirke, & he himself, as he cannot denie, did mantaine the liberties of Christes kingdome be his owne handwrite, *quhilk* is extant & yit to the fore. And we hear that Mr Archibald Sympsoune who was troubled for this cause *subscrivit* the Protestatione in name of all [f.24r]²⁵ the brethren & was thought to be some*quhat* temerarious & overzealous *quhen* the learnedest and worthiest in the Kirk *subscrivit* for themselves, yit he be *thair persuasions* *subscrivit* for them all, Mr Patrik Galloway the first *subscrivear* saying that he wolde seale it with his bloode. Gif this be ane unnecesser crosse, being called be sa monie brethren & speciallie Mr Struthers who was the author of this bussines, let all men judge. We heare say that he wrote ane *letter* to the B[ishop] of St Androes in Latine, [in] *quhilk* is to be understode he wrote not one worde *quhair*of Beza, Calvine & the olde ministers of Scotland ar not his authors. For Mr David Calderwood, if he thinke he hes drawn the crosse upon him self, I thinke can answer for himself, *aetatem habet*,²⁶ and I thinke *quhen* Mr Struthers

²³ The whole story is set out in *JMAD*, 634-711.

²⁴ *praeter ius gentium*: “against the law of nations.” Cf. Buchanan’s *Historia*., Bk. X: <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/scothist/10eng.html#36>.

²⁵ Folio 23 is wrongly interpolated; it belongs to a different document.

²⁶ literally “he has the age,” i.e. “he’s old enough.”

conferred with him, he got no advantage, & sayde he spak purposelike & honestlie.

Ard. Jon. Good Mr James Melvile, ye speake as if ye wer alive, & I consent to all *your* speaches. It is easier to men whoe flies the crosse to judge of uther menis crosses: bot I am sorie they sould *sic* be instruments to laye crosses upon *thair* brethren, whoe knowes nothing bot wantounnes themselves.

Jo. S. That miserable instrument sayes he *that our* brethren & holie men & fathers who hes put *thair* lives in *thair* handes for Christes cause, hes fetched ane crosse upon themselves? I pray God waken his conscience, that as he afflictes the innocent & layes burdings vpon Gods saincts, that he nevir get ease to his conscience, bot *nicht* & day be tormented till he repent that bloodie vehement & cruel & merciles imputation. So be it. Bot brother Mr Walter, say for *your* self, *quhat* was your forme of preaching in *Edinburgh* & if ye was led be women & uthers who taught at *your* pleasour.

Mr W. B. I tolde before my death that (as I answer to God) I taught nothing to *Edinburgh* but the lordes trueth, & *quhen* I fand the [*f.24v*] turbulent estate of *our* Kirke in the Kings minoritie & after in his greater age, in hazarde of papistes, Jesuites & uther enemies to the religion, I inveyed against them nether for hatred of the enemies persones but being reversary *sic* to *thair* factiones courses, nether for [the] *particular* of any man in *Edinburgh*, as I have deponed in my testament;²⁷ & I wished that this new brother Mr Struthers doe no utherwayes himself, altho he call us sufferers; and God give him greater dexterity & wisdome himself *that* he wounde not them *quhom* the Lorde hes not greaved. Now, Mr Smith, strike upon your stuthie as hardlie as ye may.

J. S. He is the man *quhom* I liked verie weil, who hes deceived me beyond all his neighbours, yit hes not deceived me altogidder, for I founde him in all his ceremonies full of fleshlie pride, affecting ane eloquence, & rather seeking his own commendatioune than the honour of God. For us who are cuntry ministers, who comes verie rarelie to *Edinburgh* bot upon great necessities, being urged throw seeking of our moyans, we greatlie complaine that Mr Struthers sould *sic* alledge we steill the hearts of the people from him & goes from house to house seduceing them. Bot if he went from house *domatim*²⁸ to teache them, he wolde not so [complaine *deleted*] lie upon us. Next, that we sould speak against B.B. [*i.e.* bishops], desireing to be Popes *ourselves*, he lies: because if we refuse Bishopries,

²⁷ This may be a metaphorical reference to Balcanquhall's last sermon or other such public address, perhaps to the presbytery; his actual testament is not extant.

²⁸ Late Latin term defined by Ducange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinatis*, as "*per singulos domos*," i.e. from house to house.

we wolde be loathe to be popes. [As] For Anabaptistrie (God be praised),
*our Kirke nevir knew it.*²⁹ Bot he leaneth to some secret suggestion of the
 Spirit that learns him to divine sic fantasies, *quhairof* I trust he sall be
 eschamed, & hes went afeild to get some new light.

*Intravit ut vulpes, regnavit ut leo, moriturus ut canis.*³⁰

And to give the last blowe on the stuthie:

*Omnis Apostata est osor sectae suae.*³¹

[f:25r]

Ane conclusione of the quaternion
 Lye, slannder, blaspheme & traduce as thou
 pleasest, we ar that we ar, *et tandem*
*vincit veritas.*³² We ar Christes servants
 & hes not served Mam
 mon³³ as thou hes done.

Finis

²⁹ See Struthers's accusation in n. 5 above, p. 93, from Calderwood, VII: 344.

³⁰ "He came in like a fox, reigned like a lion, and will die like a dog." Cf. n. 46, p. 89 above.

³¹ 'Every apostate is a hater of his own sect.' See n. 47, p. 89 above.

³² "Truth conquers at the last."

³³ Cf. "No man can serve two masters.... ye cannot serve God and mammon" (Matt. 6:26).