ST ANDREWS STUDIES IN
REFORMATION HISTORY

The British Union

*A Critical Edition and Translation of David Hume
of Godscroft's De Unione Insulae Britannicae*

Orbis habet, nec magnum usquam cemerace Leonem.

גור אריה יהודה
TO ΕΣΩΘΕΝ, ΒΑΕΤΤΕΡΟΝ.

Edited by
Paul J. McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson

The British Union

For Betty, Liz... and Monica

The British Union

A critical edition and translation of David Hume of
Godscroft's *De Unione Insulae Britannicae*

Edited and translated by

PAUL J. McGINNIS AND
ARTHUR H. WILLIAMSON

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2002 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © Paul J. McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson, 2002

The authors have asserted their moral right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Hume, David, 1560?–1630?

The British union

(St Andrews studies in Reformation history)

1. Federal government–Great Britain–Early works to 1800

2. Great Britain–Politics and government–1485–1603–

Early works to 1800

I. Title II. McGinnis, Paul J. III. Williamson, Arthur H.

321'.04'0941'09031

US Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hume David, 1560?–1630?

[De Unione Insulae Britannicae. English & Latin]

The British Union: a critical edition and translation of

David Hume of Godscroft's De unione Insulae Britannicae /

edited by Paul J. McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson.

p. cm. – (St. Andrews studies in Reformation history)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Text in Latin and English with introduction and notes in English.

1. Great Britain–Politics and government–Early works to 1800.

2. Scotland–Politics and government–Early works to 1800.

3. Political science–Early works to 1800.

I. McGinnis, Paul J. II. Williamson, Arthur H. III. Title. IV. Series.

DA385 .H86 2002

941.06'1–dc21

2002018208

ISBN 13: 978-0-7546-0340-5 (hbk)

Contents

Acknowledgements	xi
Format of the Text and Translation	xii
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Introduction	1
a. The Scottish Commonwealth: From George Buchanan to David Hume	1
b. Britain's Lost Renaissance: From Citizen to Subject	24
c. David Hume and Radical Britain	35
d. The <i>De unione</i> and its Fate	47
Tractatus Primus	55
Tractatus Secundus	135
Andreas Melvinus Davidi Humio/Andrew Melville to David Hume	136
Ad Lectorem/To the Reader	140
Chapter 1: Argumentum/The Argument: The Bonds of Union	142
Chapter 2, Title 1: Nomen/The Name: Britannia	154
Chapter 3, Title 2: Symbolum et Insignia/Emblems and Insignia	162
Chapter 4, Title 3: Foedera et Edicta/Treaties and Ordinances	172
Chapter 5, Title 4: Concilia/The Councils	176
Chapter 6, Title 5: Comititia/Parliament	184
Chapter 7, Title 6: Officia/Offices	192
Chapter 8, Title 7: Moneta/Currency	196
Chapter 9, Title 8: commercium/Commerce	198
Chapter 10, Title 9: Judicia et Leges/Laws and the Courts	200
Chapter 11, Title 10: Immunitates et Privilegia/ Immunities and Privileges	206
Chapter 12, Title 11: Conversatio/Association	208

Chapter 12, Title 12: Exhortatio/Exhortation	210
Chapter 12, Title 13: Connubia ac Matrimonia/Marriage	212
Chapter 12, Title 14: Liberatorum Educatio, et Scholae/Education	214
Chapter 12, Title 15: Coloniae/Colonies	216
Chapter 13, Title 16: Relligio/Religion	224
Chapter 14, Title 17: Sacramentum/The Oath	250
Chapter 15, Title 18: Equites/A British Order of Knighthood	252
Chapter 16, Title 19: Visitatio Triennalis/Triennial Visitations	256
Chapter 17, Title 20: Societas/Society	260
Chapter 18, Title 21: Preces/Prayers for Britain	278
Chapter 19: Argumentum: Totius Tractatus Summa/ The Summary of the Argument	284
Chapter 20: Argumentum: Excusatio omissorum./ The Argument: An apologia for the omissions and faults, and for matters on which the author has spent too little time	304
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	319
<i>Index</i>	329

St Andrews Studies in Reformation History

Editorial Board: Bruce Gordon, Andrew Pettegree and John Guy,
St Andrews Reformation Studies Institute,
Amy Nelson Burnett, University of Nebraska at Lincoln,
Euan Cameron, University of Newcastle upon Tyne and
Kaspar von Greyerz, University of Basel

*The Shaping of a Community: The Rise and Reformation of the
English Parish c. 1400–1560*
Beat Kümin

*Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and
Reformed Higher Education, 1560–1620*
Karin Maag

Marian Protestantism: Six Studies
Andrew Pettegree

Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe
(2 volumes) edited by Bruce Gordon

*Antifraternalism and Anticlericalism in the German Reformation:
Johann Eberlin von Günzburg and the Campaign against the Friars*
Geoffrey Dipple

*Reformations Old and New: Essays on the Socio-Economic
Impact of Religious Change c. 1470–1630*
edited by Beat Kümin

Piety and the People: Religious Printing in French, 1511–1551
Francis M. Higman

The Reformation in Eastern and Central Europe
edited by Karin Maag

John Foxe and the English Reformation
edited by David Loades

The Reformation and the Book
Jean-François Gilmont, edited and translated by Karin Maag

The Magnificent Ride: The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia
Thomas A. Fudge

Kepler's Tübingen: Stimulus to a Theological Mathematics
Charlotte Methuen

'Practical Divinity': The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham
Kenneth L. Parker and Eric J. Carlson

*Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to
Patrick Collinson by his Students*
edited by Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger

*Frontiers of the Reformation: Dissidence and Orthodoxy
in Sixteenth-Century Europe*
Auke Jelsma

*The Jacobean Kirk, 1567–1625:
Sovereignty, Polity and Liturgy*
Alan R. MacDonald

John Knox and the British Reformations
edited by Roger A. Mason

*The Education of a Christian Society:
Humanism and the Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands*
edited by N. Scott Amos, Andrew Pettegree and Henk van Nierop

Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530–83
Thomas Betteridge

*Poor Relief and Protestantism:
The Evolution of Social Welfare in Sixteenth-Century Emden*
Timothy G. Fehler

*Radical Reformation Studies:
Essays presented to James M. Stayer*
edited by Werner O. Packull and Geoffrey L. Dipple

*Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation:
Precedent Policy and Practice*
Helen L. Parish

Penitence in the Age of Reformations
edited by Katharine Jackson Lualdi and Anne T. Thayer

The Faith and Fortunes of France's Huguenots, 1600–85
Philip Benedict

Christianity and Community in the West:
Essays for John Bossy
edited by Simon Ditchfield

Reformation, Politics and Polemics:
The Growth of Protestantism in East Anglian Market Towns, 1500–1610
John Craig

The Sixteenth-Century French Religious Book
edited by Andrew Pettegree, Paul Nelles and Philip Conner

Music as Propaganda in the German Reformation
Rebecca Wagner Oettinger

John Foxe and his World
edited by Christopher Highley and John N. King

Confessional Identity in East-Central Europe
edited by Maria Crăciun, Ovidiu Ghitta and Graeme Murdock

The Bible in the Renaissance:
Essays on Biblical Commentary and Translation
in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries
edited by Richard Griffiths

Obedient Heretics: Mennonite Identities in Lutheran Hamburg
and Altona during the Confessional Age
Michael D. Driedger

The Construction of Martyrdom in the
English Catholic Community, 1535–1603
Anne Dillon

Baptism and Spiritual Kinship in Early Modern England
Will Coster

SERIES LIST

Usury, Interest and the Reformation
Eric Kerridge

The Correspondence of Reginald Pole:
1. A Calendar, 1518–1546: Beginnings to Legate of Viterbo
Thomas F. Mayer

Self-Defence and Religious Strife in Early Modern Europe:
England and Germany, 1530–1680
Robert von Friedeburg

Hatred in Print: Catholic Propaganda and Protestant Identity
during the French Wars of Religion
Luc Racaut

Acknowledgements

David Hume of Godscroft (1558-1630?) was one of the giants of the Scottish Renaissance, the publicly recognized successor to George Buchanan and Andrew Melville. One of his most important writings is the *De unione insulae Britannicae*. By making this intellectually and linguistically challenging work readily accessible, we hope to make British civic culture and the Atlantic republican tradition more intelligible and approachable.

The *De unione* is comprised of two sections. The first, the tractatus primus, deals with the underlying principles of union through which a civic Britain might emerge. It was published at London in 1605 and reprinted at Paris in 1639. The tractatus secundus concerns the specific political and institutional arrangements whereby these principles would be realized. It exists today in about half a dozen manuscript copies. The most consistently accurate copy appears to be Advocates MSS, 31.6.12 in the National Library of Scotland. We are exceedingly grateful to Dr. Iain F. Maciver, Head of the Manuscript Division, and to the trustees of the Library for graciously allowing us to use this manuscript as our text. In addition, we are also grateful to the British Library and Edinburgh University Library for allowing us to examine copies of the tractatus secundus in their collections.

We have also been assisted by a number of colleagues both at home and abroad. Outstanding among these are Dr. Paulina Kewes at the University of Aberystwyth, Dr. Roger Mason at the University of St. Andrews, and Professor Raymond B. Waddington at the University of California, Davis, all of whom read and commented on sections of our text. We were also assisted by Dr. Jane Ohlmeyer and her colleagues at the University of Aberdeen, as well as by Professor Peter Schaeffer at the University of California, Davis.

Finally, we wish to thank Vanessa Williamson who undertook the mind-numbing task of transcribing large sections of Latin text, Betty McGinnis for her unfailing good cheer and support, and Liz Williamson who enabled us to turn the typescript into camera-ready copy.

We end on a somber note. During the course of preparing this volume Arthur Williamson found cause also to be indebted to Dr. Rebecca Zulim, Dr. David Evans, and especially Dr. Monica Lawry - without whom neither this project nor any other would have been possible. We dedicate our book to Betty, Liz.. and Monica.

Sacramento, 30 June 2001

PJM
AHW

Format of the Text and Translation

It has been our practice to leave spelling, capitalization, and punctuation the way we found it. Emendations are very rare. One example might be cited from the *tractatus primus* where both seventeenth-century editions read “per se vere” when it is clear that David Hume must certainly have written “perseveret.” As for the translation, our intention throughout has been to produce a careful and complete rendering of Hume’s thinking. The translation will also provide a sense of his language and passion, though we have not always given an absolutely literal rendition of his sometimes idiosyncratic Latin style. He has a special fondness for the future active and future passive participle. He likes rhetorical questions, and despite his promise at the outset to write unadorned prose he indulges himself in flowery metaphors and oratorical exuberance when he warms to his subject - something contemporaries noted at the time.

We think it important to convey Hume’s passion to create a truly united Britain. After reading our translation of the *tractatus primus*, Paulina Kewes suggested that Hume saw the regnal union as a Machiavellian “*occasione*,” a nearly unique moment allowing for large-scale innovation and creativity. We think she may well be right. It would not have been possible to capture this energy or recreate the intensity of Hume’s expectations without allowing ourselves to deviate from a word for word rendering of his sometimes complicated and unwieldy Latin. At times Hume’s wording is vague, but the thrust of his thinking remains unmistakable. He likes to say “*haec*” (these things) when we would prefer specifications. At moments we have deemed it worthwhile to supply them. We wish that we could have made the English translation more nearly equal in length to the Latin original, but this would not have been possible without falsifying the spirit and integrity of Hume’s argument.

Scottish cultural history is replete with significant people named David Hume. Individuals of that name, other than David Hume of Godscroft, will always be identified geographically, such as David Hume of Duras or David Hume of Ninewells.

We have keyed our text of the *tractatus primus* to the pagination of the 1605 edition.

List of Abbreviations

Buchanan, *Genethliacon*

George Buchanan, *Genethliacon Jacobi Sexti Regis Scotorum* (1566), reprinted in McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 154-62.

Buchanan, *Historia*

George Buchanan, *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*, Edinburgh, 1582.

Cald.

David Calderwood, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. T. Thomson, 8 volumes, Edinburgh, 1842-49.

Craigie (ed.), *Basilikon Doron*

James VI and I, *The Basilikon Doron of King James VI*, James Craigie (ed.), 2 volumes, Edinburgh, 1944-50.

CSP Scot.

J. Bain et al. (eds.), *Calendar of Scottish Papers Relating to Scotland...*, 13 volumes, Edinburgh, 1898-1969.

EHR

English Historical Review

Galloway, *Union*

Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608*, Edinburgh 1986.

Hume, *De familia Humia*

David Hume, *De familia Humia* (c.1611), Abbotsford Club, No. 15, Edinburgh, 1839.

Hume, *History*

David Hume, *History of the House of Douglas*, Edinburgh, 1644; David Reid (ed.), variorum edition, Edinburgh, 1996.

Knox, *First Blast*

John Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, Geneva, 1558; reprinted in R.A. Mason (ed.), *John Knox: On Rebellion*, Cambridge, 1994.

Knox, *History*

John Knox, *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, ed. W.C. Dickinson, 2 volumes, Edinburgh, 1949.

Mair, *Historia*

Mair (Major), John, *Historia Maioris Britanniae tam Anglicae quam Scotiae* (Paris, 1521); translated by A. Constable and A. Mackay (eds.), *History of Greater Britain*, Edinburgh, 1892.

McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*

P.J. McGinnis and A.H. Williamson (eds.), *George Buchanan The Political Poetry*, Edinburgh, 2000.

Melville, *Gathelus*

Andrew Melville, *Gathelus*, in John Johnston, *Inscriptiones Historicae Regnum Scotorum, continuata annorum serie a Fergusio primo Regni Conditore ad nostra tempora* (Amsterdam, 1602), sigs. *4^r-*5^v, and Leicester Bradner, *Musae Anglicanae: A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry* (New York and London, 1940), pp. 153-4; reprinted in McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 284-97.

Melville, *Natalia*

Andrew Melville, *Principis Scoti-Britannorum natalia*, Edinburgh, 1594, reprinted in McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 276-81.

SHR

Scottish Historical Review

Somerset, *Epistle*

Seymour, Edward, Duke of Somerset, *An Epistle Exhortatorie*, London, 1548, reprinted in *The Complaynt of Scotlande*, J.A.H. Murray (ed.), London, 1872, appendix III.

Williamson, "Number and national consciousness"

A.H. Williamson, "Number and national consciousness: the Edinburgh mathematicians and Scottish political culture at the union of Crowns," in R.A. Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons: Scottish political thought and the union of 1603*, Cambridge, 1994, pp. 187-212.

Williamson, "A Patriot Nobility?"

A.H. Williamson, "A Patriot Nobility? Calvinism, Kin-Ties, and Civic Humanism," in *Scottish Historical Review* 72.1 (1993): 1-21.

Williamson, "Scotland, Antichrist, and the Invention of Great Britain"

A.H. Williamson, "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, 1982, pp. 34-58.

Williamson, "Scots, Indians, and Empire"

A.H. Williamson, "Scots, Indians, and Empire: the Scottish Politics of Civilization, 1519-1609," in *Past and Present*, 150, February 1996, 46-83.

Williamson, SNC

A.H. Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI*, Edinburgh, 1979.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

a. The Scottish Commonwealth: From George Buchanan to David Hume

*Thus story writers leave the causes out,
Or so rehears them as they wer in dout.*

- *The Mirror for Magistrates*, 1559¹

No two individuals more fully defined the values of the Scottish Renaissance than did George Buchanan (1506-1582) and Andrew Melville (1545-1622). Both elaborated humanist traditions that had been prominent in Scottish intellectual life since the 1520s. But both also inhabited (and worked to create) the revolutionary world of the British and French Reformations after 1560. In that highly volatile environment, where government authority was twice successfully overthrown, as in Scotland, or was radically contested, as in France, or was drastically de-stabilized, as in England, direct action became all but inescapable, and legitimacy needed to be imagined anew, indeed self-generated. In such a context, classical political thought, whether articulated through the literature of antiquity or of the quattrocento, assumed an immediacy unimaginable earlier in the century. The ideal of the Aristotelian citizen, who at once ruled and was ruled by the *res publica* and who created himself as he created his political society, now acquired compelling cogency. Public life, as visualized by Niccolò Machiavelli no less than by Marcus Tullius Cicero and Titus Livy, penetrated the tissues of Scottish, French, and English political cultures as never before. What for many had previously been no more than abstracted ideals, moral exemplars, and even rhetorical postures, now became practical imperatives of the utmost urgency.

Nor was that all. Traditional political authority became still further qualified through the fortuitous emergence of female rulers. One needed to be neither a male nor a bigot in the sixteenth century to recognize the potential for catastrophe inherent in any woman's governance and to feel deep anxiety as a result: the recent experience of the two kingdoms with Mary Tudor and Mary Stewart during the 1550s had made its grave dangers all too manifest. In a profound way the world had indeed become acephalous, and the implications amounted to a sea-change. It was no longer possible to imagine

¹ Lily Campbell (ed.), *The Mirror for Magistrates*, *Edited from Original texts in the Huntington Library* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 198 (ll. 27-8).

civic society as a conciliarist conclave operating within the protection of larger political authority. Instead, it became essential to speak within an at least broadly republican vocabulary and to face the daunting task of imagining large agrarian kingdoms - held together by massive structures of feudal and ecclesiastical law as well as by powerful dynastic traditions - as autonomous city-states and free-floating poleis. Further, the grim prospect of one larger structure was always at hand. The signal geo-political realities in the sixteenth century were the global Iberian empires, empires that became united after 1580. With the best armies, the best generals, and seemingly limitless wealth, this Hapsburg colossus made a plausible bid to be the prophesied last world empire - and never more so than in conjunction with the papal monarchy. It took considerable courage to confront so formidable an adversary, but confronting this challenge also required an alternate vision of Europe and the world.

Buchanan spent the last two decades of his life - as court poet, as political theorist in the service of the revolution, as university professor and historian - promoting Scotland as a civic commonwealth where selfless aristocrats identified and pursued the public good, while they repressed and contained private interests, self-serving passions, narrow ambition. In so doing, they constructed the highest form of human association and realized their full humanity - and not only in themselves but in the Scottish people generally. As Buchanan declared in his famous "Genethliacon" of 1566 for the newly born James, legitimate law could only be self-imposed law.

When the prince keeps the reins loose, the people strive to keep them tight.

The people ask for the yoke which, with force and fear compelling them, they would reject.²

Passions had to be self-bridled. There could be no sovereignty but popular sovereignty. The great anti-types to the Scottish commonwealth were the gigantic and grotesque Iberian empires, where clerics, commerce, and imperial authority precluded civic life and thus human purpose. As Scotland was the heir to the great republics of antiquity, so the Iberian states provided the modern counterparts to the Roman republic's degenerate successor. Still other prominent antique analogues could be found in the empires of Alexander and Xerxes, distinguished notoriously by their boundless rapacity and their hostility to the polis. The contrasts, Buchanan insisted, were devastatingly sharp: civil

² McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 156-7.

society versus blood-thirsty conquest, legitimacy versus raw power, genuine piety versus sacrilegious idolatry.

The descendants of Romulus saw Numa offering sacrifice, fostering peace
and tranquility,
The palms of the Euphrates saw mighty Solomon.
Neither the deadly sword nor the snorting warhorse strengthened those
kingdoms,
Nor did the two-edged axe, nor the legions in densely packed columns,
But the love of piety and virtue injurious to no one,
And majesty supported by the power of unarmed law.
But the conqueror who made his way to the riches of India,
The Macedonian general, and those kings whose arrogant imperium
prevailed in Ausonia [i.e., the Roman emperors],
They died by the sword, they died by poison, and their blood paid for the
blood they had shed.³

For Buchanan the legitimate king served the public interest by providing a mirror for citizens, by embodying the public spirit. Such a king possessed vastly less power, yet vastly more authority - and enduring significance. The legendary Athenian king Codrus who sacrificed his life to save the city provides the classical exemplar. Julius Caesar, the great subverter of the republic, is his anti-type.

On his country's behalf Codrus hurls himself on the foe's drawn swords.
Against his country's peace Caesar brought flames and the weapons of
war.
Codrus strengthened his country's laws by shedding his own blood.
Caesar made himself rich by spilling the blood of his countrymen.
Today there's not a king who vaunts himself in the name of Codrus.
One and all want to be called Caesar.
What's the reason? The common wisdom of those who hold the scepter,
Is to hate the acts of Codrus, and approve the acts of Caesar.⁴

³ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 158-9 (*Genethliacon*). Cf. Niccolò Machiavelli, *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Livy*, 1.11. Buchanan occasionally associates the Hebrew commonwealth with the classical republics. Typically, however, he insists that ancient Israel was ruled directly by God and therefore irrelevant to politics.

⁴ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 84-5.

Buchanan's thinking achieved its fullest expression in the extraordinary political dialogue, *De jure regni apud Scotos: dialogus* (composed 1567-68, printed 1579). Written to justify the revolution of that year and one of the most radical tracts of the sixteenth century, the *dialogus* resolutely insists on popular sovereignty, on the continuous participation of the citizenry in formulating and evaluating law, and on the equally continuous right of revolution. It makes claims so emphatic as to deny the crown any independent legislative or judicial power whatever.⁵

But who in fact were citizens of Scotland? Like most sixteenth-century writers Buchanan evinced serious distrust of the "imperita multitudo" who "struggled laboriously for the bare necessities of life" and were more concerned about survival than society. Yet, significantly, his distrust arose not from their unbridled radicalism but from their blinkered conservatism. To turn clients into citizens or to make peasants political was no easy matter, and Buchanan, a true revolutionary, was acutely conscious of the tyranny of custom. Even so, with astonishing confidence, Buchanan could add that such people "because they are not influenced by malice, envy, or self-interest, generally allow themselves to be taught, to be turned away from error; in most cases they give in when they have been persuaded by the force of reason."⁶ The Scottish commonwealth was clearly an aristocratic polity, but it was also something more. Scotland's natural aristocrats would formulate policy, and, no less, they would articulate it so as to bring the nation with them. Politics was natural to mankind, and thus all Scots had the responsibility to participate in public life. The Aristotelian polis, and Athens in particular, deeply informed Buchanan's vision, and that highly classicist vision required not simply a popular element but popular direct action. In the end the majority, quite literally, did rule.

Popular direct action for Buchanan might even extend to regicide. In a passage of the *dialogus*, no less distressing to the late twentieth century than

⁵ The point has been made most recently and cogently by Roger A. Mason, "People Power? George Buchanan on Resistance and the Common Man," in Robert von Friedeberg (ed.), *Widerstandsrecht in der frühen Neuzeit: ... Forschung im deutsch-britischen Vergleich, 1488-1688* (Berlin, 2001), pp. 163-81. Our thanks to Dr. Mason for sharing this essay with us in advance of publication.

⁶ Cf. Machiavelli, *Discourses*, 1.58. The discussion in this paragraph derives from: Williamson, SNC, pp. 113-4; R.W. Bushnell, "George Buchanan, James VI and neo-classicism," in R.A. Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 91-111, esp. 97; Mason, "People Power?"; J. Goodare, "The Estates in the Scottish Parliament, 1286-1707," in *Parliamentary History*, 15 (1996): 11-32, esp. 17-9.

to the late sixteenth, Buchanan declared the right of every citizen personally to strike down a tyrant. That right was unconditional. Caesar's assassination provided the model. As Buchanan made clear in liminary verses to Marc-Antoine de Muret's Latin tragedy, *Julius Caesar*, Brutus was a republican hero.

Such great virtue as there was deep-seated in the heroic soul of Brutus,
 When the pious daggers were given him on behalf of his country,
 A virtue, equaling his, inspired your lofty voice, Muret,
 When you sang of his pious deeds.
 And even though Fortune, oftentimes envious of bright beginnings,
 Scattered his bones on Philippi's field,
 He comes to life again, greater after death, by you.
 And his honor restored grows by your artistry,
 And rejoices more enshrined in the glorious monument [of your drama]
 Than if the labor of the pyramids were covering his bones.⁷

It is as a citizen rather than as a senator, an office-holder, or a patrician that Brutus has brought down Caesar. The assassination is an act of "virtue," indeed civic virtue, and so his action - even his daggers - are "pious." If Buchanan is one of the great figures of the Atlantic republican tradition which would culminate in the French and American democratic revolutions, he could still never be other than a man of the sixteenth century. Politics for him is a deeply spiritual - even soteriological - undertaking. We would make a serious mistake to discount Buchanan's religious commitments simply because his religion was a civil religion. Classical "pietas" and Christian piety became coterminous, but this circumstance in no way qualified his commitment or sincerity. The concern for "discipline" and for an austere morality could obviously link Stoic and Christian, Cato and Calvin. The restoration of a lost religion could become one and the same with the reconstruction of a lost civilization. But at a much deeper level both Calvinist providentialism and classical politics validated this world and insisted that any fulfillment of human potential could only occur and be judged by action within this world. Unlike its great rival, Protestantism was predicated on public space, and within

⁷ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 86-7. Cf. Machiavelli, *Discourses*, 1.10. Muret (1526-86) is a good deal more ambivalent about the assassination than Buchanan's verses would suggest. In the end Buchanan's and Muret's careers diverged dramatically, the latter embodying in a great many ways what Buchanan regarded as profoundly wrong. See McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, p. 306; I.D. McFarlane, *Buchanan* (London, 1981), p. 163.

it the saint and the citizen could converge, just like the reform of religion and the reform of society.⁸ Buchanan's Protestantism was no conversion of convenience, his association with Andrew Melville far more than fortuitous. Buchanan sincerely admired John Calvin, and his elegy on the death of the great reformer in 1564 was a profound and eloquent tribute.⁹

If by the end of the 1560s Buchanan had emerged as by far the most radical political theorist anywhere in the three kingdoms, many of his sentiments were very much public property and clearly reached into vernacular and even popular culture. In 1559-60 and again in 1567 people from all over Scotland did indeed behave as though they were citizens pursuing the public good. Gordon Donaldson long ago suggested that Mary Stewart's deposition was a real possibility in 1560, while in 1568 Buchanan himself may well have been urging that a Scottish Brutus should dispatch the tyrant.¹⁰ It is also in this context that we need to consider Buchanan's much disputed comment about taking common decisions which affect the public good:

I have never thought this task should be left to the judgement of the

⁸ Cf. G. Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge, 1960), pp. 82-3, 180; A. Hadfield, *Literature, Politics, and National Identity* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 98. For the importance of one aspect of such politicized spirituality within the Anglophone world, see N.O. Hatch *The Sacred Cause of Liberty* (New Haven, 1977), esp. pp. 21-54.

⁹ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 112-3, and also the Introduction. See also Williamson, "Patterns of British Identity," in G. Burgess (ed.), *The New British History: Founding a Modern State, 1603-1715* (London, 1999), pp. 138-73.

¹⁰ See, for example, Williamson, SNC, pp. 114-5; M.H.B. Sanderson, *Ayrshire and the Reformation* (East Linton, 1997), pp. 99-104, 143; Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation*, p. 138. It is thought that Elizabeth came to believe it better for Mary to be assassinated than put on trial. For Philip II it became the characteristic and normally successful procedure for dealing with powerful political enemies. Even in manuscript the *Dialogus* had an immediate impact in all three kingdoms. The author of the erudite *Discours politiques des diverses puissances* (1574) justifies his doctrine of tyrannicide in part by an appeal to Hector Boece's *Scotorum Historia* (1527) and to Scottish practice, but he manifestly has Buchanan in mind (Boece never addresses this issue). Unlike Buchanan, the author does have a highly articulated, though un-named body (emphatically not the Estates General) that will determine whether the king is in fact a tyrant. See Sarah Hanley, "The French Constitution Revised: Representative Assemblies and Resistance Right in the Sixteenth Century," in M. Holt (ed.), *Society and Institutions in Early Modern France* (Athens, GA, 1991), pp. 36-50, esp. note 38. Our thanks to Professor Hanley for bringing this article to our attention.

people as a whole (*universus populus*). Rather, as is roughly our own practice, selected men from all the Estates should meet with the king in council; then once a “preliminary resolution” has been drawn up by them, it should be referred to the judgement of the people (*sed ut prope ad consuetudinem nostram ex omnibus ordinibus selecti ad regem in consilium coirent. Deinde, ubi apud eos προβουλευμα factum esset, id ad populi iudicium deferretur*).¹¹

Despite his extensive knowledge of civil law, Buchanan consistently thinks in terms of public morality rather than constitutionalism, virtue rather than institutional mechanisms, direct action rather than legal procedure. What he has in mind is surely neither the modern plebiscite nor the workings of the Scottish parliament nor yet some other unspecified body. In 1567-68 his gaze, like that of most Scots, was on the last successful revolution at the outset of the decade. Then citizens had gathered in public assemblies - in the shires, with the Lords of the Congregation, at the Reformation Parliament. These public assemblies were always somewhat ad hoc, yet they were always “legal,” for here were nothing less than the citizens of Scotland. Roger Mason has rightly proposed that in this passage Buchanan is thinking of the classical *ekklēsia*, the assembly of adult male citizens which had the ultimate decision-making power in the Greek state. Buchanan looked at the 1559-60 revolution and found Scotland to be a *polis*. In the end citizens were, quite simply, those who behaved like citizens.¹²

Probably no Scottish leader bought more completely into the ideas that Buchanan eventually developed in such radical ways, than did James Stewart, earl of Moray, the illegitimate son of James V. Both Moray and Buchanan made determined efforts to convert Mary into a citizen-monarch - Buchanan famously so by reading her selections from Livy after dinner. If they failed, it was not for want of trying. Nor did they regard their failure as resulting from any inherent predisposition of character or even gender. Despite the disabilities inherent in women rulers, disabilities founded on cultural assumptions that no one of either sex seriously contested, neither Moray nor Buchanan thought

¹¹ *De iure regni apud Scotos: dialogus* (Edinburgh, 1579), p. 32. William MacNeill (trans.), *The Art and Science of Government among the Scots* ([Glasgow], 1964), p. 41; Mason, “People Power?”.

¹² For the reasons why Buchanan cannot mean the operation of the Scottish parliament and its Lords of the Articles, see Williamson, SNC, p. 116. Hume provides a good illustration of the easy identity of parliament with the Scottish nobility in his *History* at p. 423.

Mary Stewart's governance need prove a disaster. Good humanists that they were, both believed that Mary had been corrupted (irremediably as it turned out) through the dreadful upbringing she had received from the House of Guise. Mary the little girl who had left Scotland at age six, Buchanan insisted, was a wonderful creature who improved her mind to such an extent that she made even nature seem crude and even art unskillful. But Mary the adult who returned to Scotland at age nineteen was a very different kind of person indeed. As he had her lament in his verses,

If my uncle had not been so dangerous to me and so dishonorable,
I, Mary, should have been the leading lady of my age.
But he disgraced both his own repute and mine as well
By those wrongs which turn whole kingdoms upside down.¹³

The education of her son, the infant James VI, offered far brighter prospects. The suggestion has been made that the regent Moray himself would have undertaken it, and that the responsibility fell to Buchanan only in the wake of Moray's assassination.

Moray's untimely death in 1570 triggered a *légitimiste* reaction in both realms and shook the whole of British politics. It was a catastrophe for Scotland and for Buchanan personally, and certainly the cruelest backfiring of his doctrine of tyrannicide. Buchanan's statement that "Never was one death so great a sorrow for so many people," needs to be taken at face value. An English agent in Scotland later reported that Buchanan "hath not rejoiced since the regent's death."¹⁴ In the course of the civil war that dragged on till 1573, Buchanan now perceived a world of corruption and greed, where leaders changed sides with the shifting fortunes of battle, where the nation's ablest leaders like William Maitland of Lethington (1525?-1573) had turned into self-promoting "chameleons." Most disturbing of all was the way that people from all social orders had rallied to the cause of the tyrant Mary. Buchanan's

¹³ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 122-3. Empirical experience far more than a priori principles of gender difference consistently shaped the outlook of Buchanan and his contemporaries. More generally, see, for example, Richard Pace, *De fructu qui ex doctrina percipitur* (The Benefit of a Liberal Education), edited and translated by Frank Manley and Richard S. Sylvester (New York, 1967), pp. 113-5, 125. Modern feminist *Leidensgeschichte* will collapse on inspection.

¹⁴ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 162-3; *CSP Scot.*, 1:279. The matter is discussed by Roger A. Mason, "George Buchanan and Mary Queen of Scots," in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 30 (2000): 1-27, at pp. 23-4.

radicalism faded, and his *Rerum Scoticarum Historia* (1582) would be more in line with contemporary French monarchomach theory. Now the Scottish people would not be represented directly in ad hoc assemblies, but “virtually” through aristocratic councils like the Scottish parliament. And yet, even so, popular sovereignty would be modified only in practice rather than in theory. Scotland remained a more cautious commonwealth but still unmistakably a civic society. The ideal of self-realization through politics retained both its validity and vitality.

Andrew Melville and George Buchanan are unexpectedly similar figures. Both university professors and highly trained humanists, Melville (together with his associates) fully endorsed Buchanan’s civic ideal and his theory of revolution. The two had become personally close, and Melville saw Buchanan’s great *Historia* through the press during the closing year of the elderly scholar’s life.¹⁵ Yet before anything else, Melville was Buchanan’s successor as the leading court poet. As such, again like Buchanan as well as his still earlier predecessor Sir David Lindsay (1486?-1555) and perhaps other poets even before them, Melville could be expected to comment on politics and the commonwealth with a freedom rarely extended to other members of Scottish society.

There also existed significant differences. Melville confronted radically changed circumstances, at once hopeful and yet also terrifying. During the 1580s England, effectively Britain, had become locked in a life-and-death struggle with the Iberian global empire, undoubtedly the most dangerous war to confront the British Isles between the Norman conquest and 1939. At the same time Scotland now had a king, and no ordinary one but potentially the ruler imagined by Buchanan and Moray. If the ascendancy of Esmé Stewart, duke of Lennox, 1579-82, and that of James Stewart, earl of Arran, 1583-85, had proven near fatal disasters, periods of reaction whose repercussions continued to be deeply worrisome, still events at the end of the decade appeared to be taking an encouraging turn. After 1588 the chancellor John

¹⁵ Mason has most recently observed the connection in his *Kingship and Commonweal: Political Thought in Renaissance and Reformation Scotland* (East Linton, 1998), pp. 183-4, 189. Scottish history commonly disassociates the two, in part because Buchanan is deemed to be “secular,” while Melville is typically portrayed as a bigoted religious fanatic. In fact both need to be seen, among other things, as deeply moralistic poets of a kind to be found in all three kingdoms. Since the 1970s modern revisionist conservatism, both secular and Catholic, has consistently and fiercely belittled their achievements and their persons.

Maitland of Thirlestane seemed to be leading the king and the realm into a new era of cooperation with leaders of what by this point can only be called the Scottish civic tradition.¹⁶ Moreover, the Scottish king had a powerful claim to the southern crown. Where Buchanan could look to no more than some sort of Achaean League between the two “goddesses” Mary and Elizabeth, or, subsequently, between Elizabeth and the Scottish regents, Melville could anticipate the creation of a British state.

Further, for all of their shared perceptions and personal connections, more than simple circumstance divided Melville and Buchanan. Buchanan was heavily involved in the English and French Reformations, and was passionately committed to the struggle against “the sacrilegious Judas” at Rome no less than against the latter’s Hapsburg promoter. Yet, apparently from an early age, the great scholar had discounted all forms of prophecy, and most notably the Judeo-Christian apocalypse as an organizing principle for understanding contemporary human experience.¹⁷ Melville’s mind, in contrast, was deeply informed by eschatological expectations. A united Britain would manifestly strengthen the war effort, its creation perhaps proving the decisive event in the great struggle. Its potential implications for the continent might be no less significant. For a great many Scots, to think of Britain was to recall the extraordinary but tragically short reign of Edward VI (1547-53). Then for a brief moment emerged the promise of a reformed Britain, and a reformed

¹⁶ Maitland of Thirlestane (1543-95). Maurice Lee, Jr. described his career in traditional terms long ago in *John Maitland of Thirlestane and the Foundations of Stewart Despotism in Scotland* (Princeton, 1959). Maitland’s wife, Janet Fleming, seems to have played a role in forming James’s alliance with the Presbyterians, with the reformers and the “patriots.” See Lee, pp. 169n, 203n; Cald. 5:86; David Hume’s poem to her in the *Poemata omnia* (Paris, 1639), Part Three, Epigrams (separately paginated), “Johanna Flaminia Cassilissa comitissa loh. Metellani Scotiae cancellarii uxor” (p. 104) and also “De eodem [Maitland] et Flaminia coniuge” (p. 68); cf. “A Io. Matellamum cancellarium” (pp. 67-8). The role of women in Calvinist politics in all three kingdoms was huge, a phenomenon that runs directly counter to the assumptions of most late twentieth-century feminist historiography. See Nancy L. Roelker, “The Appeal of Calvinism to French Noblewomen in the Sixteenth Century,” in *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 2.4 (spring, 1972): 391-417; Roelker, “The Role of Noblewomen in the French Reformation,” in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 63 (1972): 168-95; N.Z. Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge, MA, 1983).

¹⁷ Much of Buchanan’s poetry would see French translation during the sixteenth century, well before any of it appeared in English. His bitter “Satire against Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine” appears to have been written after his 1565 visit to Paris. See McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 92-101, also 122-3, 184-5, and Introduction.

Britain that was about to assume the leadership of the Protestant world. That promise might yet be redeemed in the succession of James Stewart, and through events initiated in Scotland. Thereby the British would precipitate many of the major achievements prophesied for the latter days of the world and enact central elements from the sacred drama of human salvation. Here indeed was the realization of human purpose, not simply in the creation of civic culture but also in the culmination of human history, the fulfillment of human destiny. Melville adopted Buchanan's ideas, but then endowed them with eschatological significance and located their realization within the linear process of the apocalypse.

Thus James's marriage to Anne of Denmark occurred at (and was part of) "this great turning point" - as Melville proclaimed aloud in Latin verses at her Scottish coronation in 1590.¹⁸ Not only would James, "offspring of the north," prove the scourge of Roman power and the promoter of virtue in its fullest range of meanings. Not only would James reject the doctrine from hell: that the king's will is law ("Don't let it prevail here."). Now he would secure the cause by the progeny begotten through "the holy embraces of Anne."¹⁹ And so it happened. In February 1594 Anne gave birth to James's son and heir, Henry. Melville responded to the occasion with a most remarkable pastoral, the *Principis Scoti-Britannorum natalia*, the counterpart to Buchanan's *Genethliacon* written nearly thirty years earlier. As its title suggested, James and Henry would succeed to the English crown, joining the two countries into a united commonwealth composed of "a single body of Scoto-Britannic people." So empowered by its "Scoto-Britannic champions," the new realm would turn the struggle against Spain and the Counter-Reformation. With Henry, Yahweh's "right hand," leading the new Britain, the overthrow of both the Iberian and papal empires might lie just over the horizon: "Dear to heaven and dear to his fellow citizens, under God,/ Who rejoices to have buried the

¹⁸ "hoc cardine rerum"; Melville, *ΣΤΗΦΑΝΙΣΚΙΟΝ. Ad Scotiae Regem, habitum in coronatione reginae* (Edinburgh, 1590), sig. A2'. Cf. D. Stevenson, *Scotland's Last Royal Wedding: The Marriage of James VI and Anne of Denmark* (Edinburgh, 1997), pp. 106, 143; A.R. MacDonald, *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625* (Brookfield, VT, 1998), p. 42; Cald. 5: 97-8. Williamson, "Patterns of British Identity," in Burgess (ed.), *The New British History*, pp. 138-52.

¹⁹ "...in optatae sanctis amplexibus Annae." Melville, *Ad Scotiae Regem*, sigs. A2^v, A3^v, A4^v. The notice of James's northern origins (*poli certissima proles*) is probably an oblique reference to Paul Grebner's widely circulated contemporary prophecy about a lion of the north striking down the papacy. Concerning Grebner and his enduring influence in the seventeenth century, see p. 41.

insolent spirit of empire in its tomb."²⁰ Henry's civic Britain would realize the Protestant apocalypse and inaugurate a final era of liberty and justice.

But what would the British era actually look like? The poem seems uncertain. "This farthest land of the world" would lead the struggle against the legions of Antichrist "in company with" the reformed communities of Scandinavia, Switzerland, France. Melville projected a great anti-empire, a grand confederation of free states. Calvinism provided an increasingly rich vocabulary for imagining sacralized confederation, ways of thinking that became especially prominent during the 1590s and in which Melville participated notably. Such confederations would become a commonplace within Calvinist political thinking throughout the next century in both eastern and western Europe, as well as Anglophone North America.²¹

At other moments the *Natalia* seems to project a boundless counter-empire. Adopting an unmistakably Virgilian voice, the poem asks: "To what great heights will Scoto-Britannic glory now rise/ With no limits set by space and time?"²² "Rust blunts the edge of the sword Aeneas wielded." The overthrow of Rome might lead to a *translatio imperii*, a new empire rather than the end of empire. And yet for all that, there was no conceivable way in which a British empire could ever be simply an Anglophone version of its Hispanic rival. For Melville and his associates, like Buchanan before them, the Roman Empire, whether Augustan or Constantinian, inescapably embodied the greatest human catastrophe: the overthrow of man's political persona and thereafter the launching of Antichrist. At most, apocalyptic Britain might inspire (or dominate) an Athenian empire of near equals. It might liberate the world but could never own it.

At about this time Melville also went beyond Protestant pastorals and undertook to outline the conflict between empire and anti-empire in a Scottish

²⁰ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 276-82 (C.1).

²¹ Williamson, SNC, pp. 75-6; A.I. Macinnes, "Covenanting ideology in seventeenth-century Scotland," in J. Ohlmeyer (ed.), *Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland: Kingdom or Colony* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 191-220; G. Schramm, "Arms Conflict in East Central Europe: Protestant Noble Opposition and Catholic Royalist Factions, 1604-20" and I. Auerbach, "The Bohemian Opposition, Poland-Lithuania, and the Outbreak of the Thirty Years War," successively in R.J.W. Evans and T.V. Thomas (eds.), *Crown, Church, and Estates: Central European Politics in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1991), pp. 176-225.

²² ll. 34-6; cf. *Aeneid* 1.278.

national epic, known today as the *Gathelus*. Here was a genre that never inspired Buchanan. Nor were its themes typical of Buchanan. But Melville's project did have much in common with the contemporaneous poetry of Edmund Spenser. Both Melville and Spenser conceived a national vision from a distinctly British perspective and with distinctly British conclusions. Both poets wrote in a language different from the common vernacular. Both shared a reform agenda incompatible with the aspirations of James VI and I. Neither would complete his most significant poem. Both may also have sensed deep tension between their objectives and the values inherent within epic poetry, between chivalric ideals and civic purposes, between heroism and civility. Above all, both were centrally concerned with the apocalyptic struggle against the Iberian world order, and they saw their poems as integral to the British effort in that great conflict.²³ If Spenser's *Faerie Queene* is an enormous poem and one of the most important in the English-speaking world, while Melville's exists today only in tiny (and unread) Latin fragments, their astonishingly common objectives and perceptions remain to illuminate each other.

Drawing on medieval Scottish origin myths as well as Scottish humanist historiography that culminated in Buchanan, Melville's *Gathelus* would trace Scotland's vast history from its roots in Greece and Egypt through the migrations to Iberia and Ireland, to the founding of the Scottish kingdom, to the creation of Britain, and end in the projected confrontation with Spain and the papacy. As with the *Natalia*, as with so much Scottish writing in the period, Scottish patriotism encouraged British integration. At least from the 1520s Scottish identity had increasingly stimulated British consciousness, while by the century's end Scottish political triumph would be seen as generating a British state.

The story Melville told would be completely familiar to all Scots. Gathelus, son of the Athenian king Cecrops, was so high-spirited that his heroic ambition could not find expression within the confines of Attica. Migrating to Egypt with his aristocratic friends, he entered the pharaoh's service. There he won a major victory against the invading Nubians, and was rewarded with the hand of the pharaoh's daughter, Scotsa. All presumably would have been well but for the succeeding pharaoh's persecution of the Israelites: the resulting plagues sent the Jews to the East, while Gathelus and

²³ For a more detailed discussion of the mental world Melville and Spenser shared, see Paul McGinnis and Arthur Williamson, "Britain, Race, and the Iberian World Empire," in A.I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *The Stewart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century*, forthcoming.

his Graeco-Egyptian followers departed for the west. Settling in what subsequently became Galicia, Gathelus founded a powerful kingdom based eventually at the city of Brigantium. Later still Gathelus's two sons Hiber and Hemecus discovered Hibernia where the second son Hemecus would establish an independent kingdom.

By the late sixteenth century learned society recognized these preposterous eponymous figures to be fabrications - though the Celtic migration from Iberia was accepted and had received formidable linguistic support in Buchanan's *Historia*. Melville's purpose in the poem therefore was to provide what Philip Sidney recently had called "an imaginative ground-plot": the figures were archetypal, capturing the spirit if not the literal reality of the past. Melville's poem "The True Praise of History" called it "the touchstone of every age," yet he wrote no history at all. He helped secure the publication of Buchanan's *Historia*, and Melville's own heavily annotated copy of it is still extant in the St. Andrews University library, yet he turned to the mythic.²⁴ There were a number of reasons for doing so. The claims of the vastly ancient Scottish past were difficult to document.²⁵ But the problem went further. For all of its important lessons and worthy examples, no Scot simply wanted to restore an idealized past. Even at its best, the past was ambivalent, and virtually all Scots sought some sort of reform. Scottish intellectuals, like the highly influential minister-lawyer Robert Pont and the mathematician-biblical exegete John Napier of Merchiston, anticipated their Enlightenment successors and found little either to admire or preserve in the Scottish past.²⁶ Yet something else still

²⁴ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 282-3; University of St. Andrews Library: Buchanan DA775 B8 B82. Roger Mason has commented on the Melville annotations in *Kingship and the Commonweal*, p. 184.

²⁵ The minister John Davidson tried to construct a "Catalogus Martyrum Scotiae," apparently intended as the Scottish equivalent of John Foxe's great martyrology, the *Acts and Monuments...*, but was forced to lay the project aside for want of material. Earlier, John Knox had also gathered such materials in the manner of John Foxe. See Williamson, SNC, p. 73; P. Collinson, "Knox, the Church and the Women of England," in R.A. Mason (ed.), *John Knox and the British Reformations* (Brookfield, VT, 1998), p. 87; as Collinson has put it, "he offered in effect to change his name from Knox to Foxe." Nearly all Scottish intellectuals at this time lamented Edward I's pillaging the Scottish public records in the thirteenth century. Whether these materials would have helped them construct the Livy-inspired histories so many of them wanted to write is another matter altogether.

²⁶ See Williamson, "A Patriot Nobility? Calvinism, Kin-Ties, and Civic Humanism," in *SHR* 72.1 (1993):1-21.

more basic proved decisive: narrative history as the sixteenth century understood it could never reach effectively into the heart of the matter. As the popular *A Mirror for Magistrates* had put it, to get at the underlying meaning of the contemporary moment and the past through which it arose required a different kind of intelligence, a different order of insight.

Accordingly, at this juncture Melville departed from the commonplace and introduced something altogether novel and unprecedented. The two sons, Hiber and Hemecus, now possessed two contrasting characters. The elder Hiber, ruler of the Iberian Scots, is ruthlessly aggressive and blood-thirsty, striving "to extend his fame and his father's kingdom by whatever force, by whatever power." He sweeps through the Iberian peninsula. He anticipates the American conquests.

And now dire Hiber thirsting for gold,
And hungrier than Orcus, seizes all things by waging unbridled war.
He slaughters great numbers of people and overturns kingdoms,
More savage than all others.

Believing himself exalted through divine favor, he seeks "to mount up to the high heavens."²⁷ In contrast, the younger Hemecus, ruler of the Hibernian Scots, wins praise for his modesty, seeking to preserve his father's laws and the practice of shared governance. He does not conquer nations, but, Melville intimates, provides a model for nations. Hiber the Exalted, Hemecus the Good, "the two fateful fountains born of the pharaonic virgin," clearly emerge as the western counterparts to Ishmael and Isaac, the children of an Abramic Gathelus.²⁸ The first would be realized in the gigantic, expanding Spanish Empire, the second in the self-contained, virtuous Scottish commonwealth.

²⁷ Melville may well have been aware of the medal Philip had struck in 1580 whose reverse bore a picture of the terrestrial globe and the fulsome legend: NON SUFFICIT ORBIS (the world is not enough). The motto seems to have been widely disseminated throughout the empire. See G. Parker, "David or Goliath? Philip II and his world in the 1580s," in R.L. Kagan and G. Parker (eds.), *Spain, Europe, and the Atlantic World* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 254. Spenser certainly was familiar with it. See René Graziani, "Philip II's *Impresa* and Spenser's Souldan," in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 27 (1964): 322-4. Our thanks to Raymond Waddington for drawing the Graziani article to our attention.

²⁸ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 282-95. Melville's account of the motivation for empire has something of the flavor of the comments in Buchanan's greatest anti-imperial poem, the *De Sphæra*. See McGinnis and Williamson, pp. 64-5.

Still, these contrasting spirits, developing in such different directions, nevertheless shared in some sense a common fate, for in the latter days of the world Britain and Iberia would confront one another to determine the destiny of mankind. Yet Melville's British era remains as undefined in the *Gathelus* fragments as it does in the *Natalia*. Henry, "the unconquered offspring of unconquered Frederick [of Denmark] and Fergus [founder of the Scottish dynasty]," soon "will do battle against the degenerate Iberians and the triple monster by the Tiber's waters."²⁹ In lines like these the prince begins to sound more like a reforming emperor than a republican hero. Melville's British order certainly would be temperate, in stark contrast to that of the Hapsburgs, but is otherwise disappointingly unarticulated. In the 1590s it could only exist in the imagination - and perhaps could be expressed, if at all, only in poetry.

Learned individuals in all three kingdoms during the later sixteenth century were much concerned to show that they were civilized people inhabiting civilized societies. At the back of many minds lurked a haunting specter of past, recent, or even present barbarism.³⁰ None found themselves more exercised by this concern than did the Scots. Culture, or at least signs of it, had to be identified in the past; mechanisms for its construction and development had to be located for the future. In his Epithalamium celebrating the marriage of Mary Stewart to Francis II, Buchanan went on at considerable length to show that the ancient Scots had not only shown consistent courage and determined military virtue, they had also brought learning to Charlemagne's court. His *Historia* noticed in passing at several points that the Cultores Dei or Culdees, early medieval Irish monks, had preserved learning and piety during the dark ages. In the end, however, the Culdees could serve only a limited purpose for Buchanan because the culture they ostensibly preserved did not speak to classical political values that interested the Renaissance. In the end the dark ages turned out to be genuinely dark, and "the extinction of the elegant arts" had taken place in all nations as well as in remote Britain.³¹ Yet the Culdees did indicate Britain's cultural autonomy and

²⁹ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, p. 282.

³⁰ Williamson, "Patterns of British Identity," in G. Burgess (ed.), *The New British History*, pp. 156-62; M. Wintroub, "Civilizing the Savage and Making a King: The Royal Entry Festival of Henri II (Rouen, 1550)," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29.2 (1998): 465-94; D. Shuger, "Irishmen, Aristocrats, and Other White Barbarians," *Renaissance Quarterly* 50 (1994): 494-525.

³¹ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 138-9; Buchanan, *History of Scotland*, trans. by James Aikman (Edinburgh and Glasgow, 1827-30), 1:203, 209-10, 213, 226, 281, 294, 317.

potential significance, hinting at the state of the world before the arrival of papal corruption, and thereby they provided a sign of what might happen in an age of true enlightenment. They did not anchor a coherent continuous past from earliest times, and efforts to create such a history would not occur for another generation.³² The historical tradition, like the Scottish past itself, always remained problematic, and hence the imperative of poetry.

In what was surely intended as part of the first book of his great epic Melville strongly emphasized the vast learning - Greek, Egyptian, Hebrew - that Gathelus had brought with him to Spain:

In Greek letters or in Egyptian hieroglyphs,
Everyone accustomed himself to receive from the mouth of Gathelus
All of the master's teachings howsoever much there might be,
Or to commit them to memory,
Whatever he learned in his native country from the patriarchs of Athens,
Whatever secret wisdom he took from the sacred books of Memphis,
Whatever he learned when he sat at the feet of Moses.³³

"And Hemecus took these teachings with him.../ When he went forth into his own kingdom" in Ireland and eventually from there they traveled to Scotland - where they survived as "the wisdom in the mouths of the Caledonian Druids." It seems Gathelus was, in fact, nothing less than the prototypical Druid, founding not only his rule and law in Spain, but the ancient religion as well.³⁴

³² In David Buchanan's lengthy preface to the 1644 edition of John Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland*. Yet even as late as 1637 the minister John Row (1568-1646) could begin his *History of the Kirk of Scotland* in the year 1558 (Edinburgh, 1842). S.A. Burrell rightly noted long ago that such a historical vision only became "fully articulated" after the Restoration with James Kirkton (1620?-99), *Secret and True History of the Kirk of Scotland* (written in the 1670s and circulated in manuscript, though only printed in the nineteenth century) and Alexander Shields (1660?-1700), *The Hind Let Loose* (1687). Burrell, "The Apocalyptic Vision of the Early Covenanters," in *SHR* 43 (1964): 9. In a world of covenants and Sinaitic self-creation, such traditions always faced marginalization. A contrasting reading of the early modern use of the Culdee materials, one informed by post-romantic nationalism, appears in C. Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past* (Cambridge, 1993).

³³ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 296-7 (ll. 145-52).

³⁴ McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 284-5 (ll. 3-5): "Carried by his fleet over the waves of the ocean, [Gathelus] came to Hesperia [Spain],/ Where he founded his rule, his law, and the rites of the Druids."

Accordingly, he habitually visited a sacred grove of lofty oaks and in the grove were two mysterious fountains. There he received a vision of his two unborn sons and their conflicting futures. The fountains had been discovered by shepherds, that is, presumably, by poets like Melville himself. Melville's description of Gathelus's wife, the Egyptian princess Scota, serves much the same purpose. She is not described as a rare beauty, as we might expect, but rather as a woman unrivaled in her character and accomplishments. No damsel requiring rescue, Melville's Scota is a Renaissance woman, a woman truly of the Reformation. No wonder she too visits the grove, or that Gathelus shares his mystical experience there with her.

It was not uncommon for British and French humanists earlier in the century to look to the culture of the Druids as evidence of native pre-classical civilization or for reformers to find a proto-Protestantism in them. Hector Boece, Scotland's most influential historian, insisted on the wisdom of the Druids as providing the cultural link between Egypt, Greece, and Scotland. Origen's comment about their monotheism smoothing their conversion to Christianity was well known, and no less a figure than John Bale came to see them as the spiritual forerunners of reformed Britain. Poets like Michael Drayton would later make them "sacred bards."³⁵ But Buchanan's hostility to Druid "superstition" and to the Celtic bards with their empty songs of praise and genealogy ensured that, for Melville, the Druids, just like their Egyptian founders and their Egyptian *prisca theologica*, were emblematic and poetic rather than literal and historic. Freemasonry in fact arose in Scotland during this decade, and perhaps the most striking thing about the phenomenon was the remarkable toleration accorded it. Melville's sympathy for Renaissance symbolism may provide part of the explanation. In the *Natalia* he referred to

³⁵ Boece (1465?-1536), *Scotorum Historia* (Paris, 1527), translated by John Belleden (1490?-1550) as *The Hystory and Chroniklis of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1540?; reprinted Edinburgh, 1821; itself subsequently "translated" into English in 1569), pp. xxv, 54; Graham Parry, *Trophies of Time: English Antiquaries of the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1995), pp. 31, 34-5; Stuart Piggott, *Celts, Saxons, and the Early Antiquaries* (Edinburgh, 1967), p. 19; A.L. Owen, *The Famous Druids* (Oxford, 1962), pp. 28-51, 60-3; Stuart Piggott, *The Druids* (London, 1975), pp. 131-6. See Buchanan, *History of Scotland*, 1:77, 95. John Bale (1495-1563), *Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brytanniae Catalogus* (Wesel, 1549), sig. A2^r, A2^v, B2^v. Bale cites Boece twice in connection with the Druids, though, as we might expect, does not consider the Gathelus story. Origen's remark was in fact misconstrued. See also A.H. Williamson, "Number and national consciousness: the Edinburgh mathematicians and Scottish political culture at the union of crowns," in R.A. Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons: Scottish political thought and the union of 1603* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 187-212.

James as Anne's "rosy" husband, sounding almost as though he had adopted a Rosicrucian vocabulary.³⁶ We may never know Melville's purpose for certain when he noted and numbered in his copy of the *Historia* Buchanan's occasional comments on religion. Yet it is at least reasonable to think that he intended to incorporate this material into later books of the *Gathelus*. Melville's Culdees naturally would emerge as proto-Presbyterians. But like their Druid and Greco-Egyptian predecessors they would flow rather from the imagination than from documentation. They would speak more powerfully as a result.

Melville's *Gathelus*, both epic and anti-epic, at once anti-imperial and yet boundlessly expansive, spoke to a rich Renaissance culture of classically conceived politics, piety, and learning. With the prospect of Britain and thorough-going reform lying ahead, Scotland by 1596 seemed indeed to have reached a turning point.

David Hume of Godscroft (1558-1630?) was the self-conscious successor to Buchanan and Melville, and, as it would turn out, the culmination of the civic humanist tradition in Renaissance Scotland. Something of a prodigy, the young Hume produced Latin poetry that earned praise from no less than Buchanan himself.³⁷ Closely associated with Melville by the 1580s (if not earlier) and experiencing exile together with him in 1584-85, Hume impressed the older man as an intellect of formidable promise. And not only Melville, Hume became highly regarded by the Presbyterian leadership generally, and

³⁶ Williamson, "Number and national consciousness," in Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons*, esp. pp. 191-3, 206-9; cf. David Stevenson, *The Origins of Freemasonry: Scotland's Century, 1590-1710* (Cambridge, 1988); McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 276-7.

³⁷ Like all the Presbyterian leaders Hume thoroughly absorbed Buchanan's outlook and values - and probably more so than anyone else. Yet, later, he spoke harshly of Buchanan when he described his elegy for his grammar school teacher Andrew Simson as fulfilling the predictions of the great humanist poet: "Huc tua spes, Buchananani ergo huc praesagia magni/ Magni, audire licet liuor, et ira crepens..." (With this poem your hopes, and thereby the prophecy of the great Buchanan/ (Great, it is fair to say, in malice and croaking anger) ... [will be fulfilled]). We may never know confidently what Hume had in mind. But he probably refers to Buchanan's treatment of the fifteenth century House of Douglas in the *Historia* rather than the aging scholar's irritability: Hume strove manfully to defend or at least exculpate the brutal Douglasses, while Buchanan trashed them as baronial gangsters. *Lusus poetici, in tres partes distincti* (London, 1605), reprinted in the *Poemata omnia*, first part (separately paginated), p. 16. See also Williamson, "Scots, Indians, and Empire," pp. 72-3.

seemingly attracted the attention of such English figures as Philip Sidney and Francis Walsingham.

Hume was the second son of David Hume of Wedderburn, a laird from the Merse district in the east Borders, a region notoriously violent and yet also famous for its grammar schools. His father was a Catholic, of a traditional sort apparently without strong commitment. His mother, however, was a determined Calvinist who had Hume along with his three brothers and four sisters raised in the new faith. They all received unusually good educations. Hume attended the Dunbar grammar school where his ability at Latin verse first attracted attention. Subsequently he went on to the University of St. Andrews graduating, probably, at some point during the 1570s. In 1578 he departed for study in France. By June 1579 he had matriculated at the Geneva academy to study civil law and where he may well have attended the lectures of Theodore Beza.³⁸ By autumn, however, his studies were cut short and a projected trip to Italy (probably Padua) aborted, when the needs of his elder brother forced his return to Scotland. Like Buchanan and Melville before him, Hume would continue to maintain connections with French Calvinism throughout his life.

Even as a very young man, Hume supported the 1567 revolution and then the king's party in the subsequent civil war. Both by kin ties and through developed personal relations, Hume and his elder brother became firm adherents of the Douglas connection and were particularly close to its leaders Archibald Douglas, subsequently the eighth earl of Angus (1555-88), and James Douglas, the earl of Morton (1516?-1581) and Scotland's powerful regent 1572-78. More than affinity and blood defined the Douglas alliance. The brothers fully shared the Douglas's resolute commitment to the Protestant cause and their pro-English policies. During that decade Hume's views emerge clearly in his poem, "De Iacobo Sexto Scotorum Rege adhuc puero" (Anticipation concerning James VI, king of the Scots though still a child). James would bring Scotland - otherwise "buried in shameful darkness" (a play on the traditional derivation of "Scot" from the Greek σκοτος, meaning "dark"

³⁸ S. Stelling-Michaud (ed.), *Le Livre de Recteur de l'Academie de Genève, 1559-1878* (Geneva, 1959), 1:103 (#595). Theodore de Bèze (1519-1605): his reference to "my Beza" in the *Lusus Poetici* (London, 1605), V.309 (p. 36) suggests a personal connection: "Beza meus siquid lapsus deliquerit olim/ Sectatus seclī deuia facta sui." (My Beza, if having fallen, he failed back then, /Having followed the bad examples of his age), an ironic reference to the ferocious Catholic calumnies against the reformer. Specifically, Hume means the ways Counter-Reformers twisted Beza's early poems.

or “obscure”) - “into the light of day,/ Now more brightly shining than all other shores.” And how would James achieve this much-sought return of the golden age? It would be accomplished by nothing less than the creation of British public space.

At nunc perpetuam spondent tibi sydera pacem,
Et locant regno medium Britanno.
[And now the stars promise you lasting peace,
Finding the public good in the British kingdom.]³⁹

The creation of a civic Britain had emerged as his central purpose from a very early date. Reform, the creation of political citizens (in the next decade he would call them “patriots”), “pietas” in the fullest range of its meanings, and the defeat of the Counter-Reformation together with its Hapsburg mainstay had effectively defined his life.

Accordingly, both Hume and his older brother took part in the 1582 coup d'état that overthrew the government of the Counter-Reformation agent Esmé Stewart. Nor is it surprising that Hume fled into exile in England when a counter-coup took place ten months later that led to the ascendancy of James Stewart, earl of Arran. His experience in England proved extremely important. Already the secretary and confidant of Archibald Douglas, the most committed and potentially the most powerful of the great Protestant lords, he immediately became immersed in assembling documents and drafting statements that articulated and promoted the exiles' cause. No less significant, he came to know the intellectual and political leaders of the English “patriots”: Sidney, Walsingham, and Leicester.⁴⁰ By 1584 a wave of clerical exiles also fled the

³⁹ David Hume of Godscroft, *Poemata omnia* (Paris, 1639), “Lusus poetici,” p. 59 (separately paginated). Regarding the alleged etymology of “Scot,” see A.H. Williamson, “The Jewish Dimension of the Scottish Apocalypse: Climate, Covenant, and World Renewal,” in Y. Kaplan et al. (eds.), *Menasseh Ben Israel and his World* (Leiden, 1989), p. 30, n.59, and *passim*.

⁴⁰ There is no doubt that the exiles had close connections with Sidney, Walsingham, and Leicester, though we can now discern only a few of the details. See “Letters and Papers of Mr. James Carmichael, Minister of Haddington, 1584-1586” in D. Laing (ed.), *Wodrow Society Miscellany* (Edinburgh, 1844), 1:425; J. Bain (ed.), *The Hamilton Papers, 1543-1590*, (Edinburgh, 1892), 2:694-7; also see Hume's two poems to Walsingham, written between 1585 and 1590, *Poemata omnia*, pp. 72-3. The first of these speaks repeatedly of the “refuge, haven, and sweet protection [or perhaps patronage]” (praesidium, portus, dulce patrociniūm) provided by Walsingham and, presumably, his son-in-law Sidney. On 4 September 1585 Walsingham lamented that

Arran regime into England, Andrew Melville notably among them, and they became quickly involved in England's subscription struggle, probably the most formidable challenge the reform movement ever mounted during the Elizabethan period.⁴¹ Hume thus found himself at age twenty-six completely absorbed in radical politics that were distinctly British. This program carried not only far-reaching policy implications but was also linked to a cultural agenda of the greatest significance.

Hume returned to Scotland with most of the exiles in November 1585 as part of yet another coup. This time they had broader backing, and the Arran government crumbled before them. Yet personal restoration within Scottish society did not bring with it a return to political power and the situation that had existed in 1582. In the following year Hume wrote a dialogue whose participants were Angus and himself, undoubtedly derived from a conversation that had actually taken place. In it he characteristically urged political activism against private interest and personal security. Dismissing such theorists as Jean Bodin and Adam Blackwood, whose ideas by now had gained significant audiences among the Scottish political elites, Hume insisted that "the good patriot" would always appear to the tyrant as "a seditious fellow." "The publicke cause," the civic ideal, remained decisive. Authoritarian arguments from nature derived from bad analogies, and, as everyone knew, all analogies "are ever lame and doe halt in some way."⁴²

Angus and his fellow exile the earl of Mar "receyved here lyttle comfort, otherwyse then from poor" Sir Philip Sidney (following Joseph Bain's interpretation of Walsingham's cypher). Angus had already met Walsingham, Leicester, and Sidney during his earlier 1581 exile and at that time also encountered the old "Arcadia" (Hume, *History*, pp. 361-2).

⁴¹ See Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London, 1967), part five, pp. 243-88; Gordon Donaldson, "The Presbyterian Exiles in England, 1584-8," in Donaldson, *Scottish Church History* (Edinburgh, 1985), pp. 178-90. The subscription struggle in England and the efforts to enforce the "Black Acts" in Scotland not only occurred at the same time but need to be seen as elements within a pan-British conflict.

⁴² Hume, *History*, pp. 414-28, at 417 (cf. variant in Cald. 4:469: regarding similes, "All men know how these crooke"). Regarding Bodin (1530-96), Hume references his *Six Books of the Commonwealth* (1576) and, perhaps surprisingly, his *Démonomanie* (1580) which he seems to treat ironically. The civic values of the exiles were stated in highly practical terms in 1584 by James Melville (1556-1614), Andrew's nephew and confidant. Cald. 4:150-57. Regarding Adam Blackwood (1539-1613), Hume cites his critique of Buchanan, *Adversus Georgii Buchanani dialogum, de iure regni apud Scotos pro regibus apologia* (Poitiers, 1581), chapter 34 (*History*, p. 419).

Angus's unexpected death in 1588 was a disaster for the Presbyterian cause and for Hume personally. The Presbyterians would never find another lord so powerful and so committed, and Hume would never find another patron. But in the wake of the Armada crisis things moved haltingly toward reform and what seemed to be better times. During that period Hume's writings had been widely circulated, and yet not a line would see print before 1599. His career as a writer and public figure only began in the context of regnal union and of political reaction.

Regarding Blackwood, see J.H. Burns, "George Buchanan and the anti-monarchomachs," in Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons*, pp. 138-58.

b. Britain's Lost Renaissance: From Citizen to Subject

*How might they under such a captain raise
 The great designs kept for the latter days!
 But mad with reason (so miscalled) of state
 They know them not, and what they know not, hate.*⁴³

- Andrew Marvell, 1655

If Buchanan had faced the challenge of imagining Scotland as a classical republic, Hume faced the far more daunting project of turning Britain into a plausible polis. Mythologies, iconography, images, history, the greatly enhanced and now clearly pivotal person of the king, the very idea of a British crown embracing multiple realms, all pointed more to an Augustan empire than to a Ciceronian republic.

Still other developments worked against Hume's purposes. By the 1590s the Counter-Reformation and its neo-scholastic preoccupation with headship, hierarchy, and classification had begun to bite deeply into European culture. Political changes in France, England, and Scotland also made radical programs less attainable and less plausible. In the 1560s notions of civic responsibility, the public good, and direct action had assumed compelling importance in all three kingdoms from the de-stabilizing effects of the Reformation, of female rulers, of weak rulers, of rulers who were minors. But in the 1590s the political environment began to change rapidly.

In France, as Charlotte Wells has explained, the unspeakable violence of religious civil war compelled Frenchmen in increasing numbers to imagine their country as "one great city," and to insist that under all the vast, intricate patchwork of hierarchies, orders, ranks, and privileges that comprised the French kingdom, there lay a common civic identity. The neologisms "citizen" and "patriot" entered the French language at about the same time as their Anglophone counterparts. As early as 1562 the chancellor Michel de L'Hôpital declared, "many can be citizens who are not Christians; even the excommunicant does not cease to be a citizen." Appeals to the "public good" and to the duties "of good patriots and fellow citizens" became ever more prominent in the language of the Huguenots and the Politiques (though not

⁴³ "The First Anniversary of the Government under His Highness the Lord Protector, 1655," ll. 109-12. The captain is of course Oliver Cromwell.

that of the Ligueurs), peaking in the 1580s.⁴⁴ Even at the community level there appeared analogous appeals. In Lyons, the printers' society, the Society of the Giffarins, was overwhelmingly Protestant, but invented a classically-derived mythology for their trade based on Minerva, "the mother of printing and the goddess of knowledge" in part to accommodate the small Catholic minority.⁴⁵ But use of the term "citoyen" dropped off precipitously after 1589 as Henri IV consolidated royal authority, security, and "absolutism," especially after his conversion in 1593. The idea of a civic society faded with the end of the wars of religion. When the term citizen was used, it became increasingly synonymous with subject. In effect, the crown cooped and transvalued the civic vocabulary: the king was active, the citizen passive. As Wells has phrased it, "France ceased to appear as a community, like a city; it was now held to be embodied in the person of the monarch."⁴⁶ On the one hand, lawyers like Charles Loyseau re-articulated, delineated and clarified the structure of hierarchy and subjection in his *Treatise of Orders* (1610), a work that became an authoritative text for well over a century. On the other, Antoine de Montchrétien looked to commercial Carthage rather than civic Rome, and to economic policies enacted for "reason of state," policies involving the big picture that only the crown could hope to comprehend.⁴⁷ "Reason of state" had

⁴⁴ Charlotte Wells, "The Language of Citizenship in the French Religious Wars," in *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 30.2 (1999): 441-56; Wells, *Law and Citizenship in Early Modern France* (Baltimore, 1995), esp. Introduction. Also see Hanley, "The French Constitution Revised," pp. 36-7. The French Counter-Reformers all but never adopted the language of citizenship and the civil religion that inevitably accompanied it. How could they, when, by definition, to be French was to be Catholic?

⁴⁵ N.Z. Davis, "Strikes and Salvation at Lyon," in *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, 1965), pp. 1-16.

⁴⁶ Wells, *Law and Citizenship*, p. xvii. For the preceding see Wells, "The Language of Citizenship," pp. 453ff.

⁴⁷ Loyseau (1564-1627): his *Traité des ordres et simple dignitez* would be cited by the parlement de Paris as late as 1776. Montchrétien (1576?-1621): his *Traicté de l'oeconomie politique* (1615) was an early mercantilist classic that emphasized the activist role of the crown in stimulating productivity, the foundation of true wealth, power, and glory. The crown or state would undertake this activity literally for its own reasons that could not be publicly discernable and should not be public matters. See Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 89-90; Wells, "The Language of Citizenship," pp. 454-5; more generally, Maurizio Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State* (Cambridge, 1992), Introduction. Montchrétien's attitude toward commerce contrasts strikingly with that of George Buchanan. See McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, Introduction.

supplanted politics. Frenchmen now concerned themselves with private right rather than public virtue, with local privilege rather than community decision, with hoary tradition rather than self-constructed society. The citizen had become privatized into the subject, and could do no more than cling to tradition.⁴⁸

An unexpectedly comparable picture emerges in later sixteenth-century England. In 1559 John Aylmer insisted that, *pace* John Knox, female rulers need not inevitably turn out to be catastrophes like Mary Tudor. If Englishmen had stood by their laws and taken an active part in protecting their society, no calamity would have occurred. Aylmer's assumptions subsequently played out in practical politics on the council, in parliament, in the streets - manifesting themselves perhaps most dramatically in the Bond of Association. Patrick Collinson's description of England in the Elizabethan period as a "monarchical republic" turns out to be surprisingly apt, and "the Elizabethan Exclusion Crisis," as he terms it, may make Knox more relevant to both realms than conservative historians have ever allowed.⁴⁹ Civic vocabularies could even turn up at the popular level. Local communities like Exeter and Tewkesbury would be portrayed as classical poleis, while Richard Beacon would help inaugurate a long tradition of trying to imagine the four peoples of Ireland as a single polity that might pursue a common good.⁵⁰ By the 1590s things had changed. At court corruption seemed to supplant *civisme*, and by the outset of the next century parliament and much of English political life became increasingly gripped by highly articulated notions of immemorial

⁴⁸ Sarah Hanley examines the growing French concern with law practice and right, arguing that the idea of public space would actually re-emerge from this pre-occupation later on in the century. See Hanley, "Social Sites of Political Practice in France: Lawsuits, Civil Rights, and the Separation of Powers in Domestic and State Government, 1500-1800," in *American Historical Review* 102.1 (1997): 27-52; Hanley, "The Pursuit of Legal Knowledge and the Genesis of Civil Society in Early Modern France," in A. Grafton and J.H.M. Salmon (eds.), *Historians and Ideologies* (Rochester, 2001), pp. 71-86.

⁴⁹ John Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithful and Trewe Subiectes...* ([Strasbourg], 1559); Williamson, SNC, pp. 9-10, 15-6; Patrick Collinson, "The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I," in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 69 (1986-7): 394-424, esp. 407-8; cf. Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation*, p. 138; Stephen Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity* (Cambridge, 1998), esp. Introduction.

⁵⁰ Discussed by Markku Peltonen, *Classical Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 58-73, 76-102. Cf. Collinson, "The Monarchical Republic," p. 398.

custom, and by what John Pocock has enduringly termed “the common law mind.”⁵¹ One indication of changed attitudes arises with a landmark legal case of exceptional prominence known as the “post-nati.” In 1607-8 the government engineered a test case to determine whether Scots born after the 1603 union could inherit property in England. The trial exercised people at the time and long thereafter because it raised basic questions about the relation of the king’s person to the fabric of English law, and did so largely within the idiom of the common law itself. But, inescapably, the meaning of citizenship lay at the heart of the issue, and here the judges were emphatic. Whether they stressed the immemorial nature of the common law with Sir Edward Coke, or, instead, stressed royal authority and prerogative with Sir Thomas Egerton, Lord Ellesmere, citizenship was defined by subjection to the crown. Ellesmere’s comments are instructive, for he twice goes out of his way to blast the *De jure regni apud Scotos*, that “seditious Dialogue or Libell made by George Buchanan.”⁵² As well he might, for the entire burden of his decision is to subvert the classical citizen.

The attack on civic Scotland came precipitously in December 1596. In what is now recognized as having been a concerted plan, James moved to control the church, to introduce traditional episcopal hierarchy, to eliminate parity among the clergy, and in the process to isolate Andrew Melville and those who thought like him. In June 1597 James deprived Melville of the rectorship at the University of St. Andrews. In 1598 he forced Melville to withdraw from the meeting of the General Assembly of the Scottish church. The two men had come to despise one another, and their confrontations were so memorably explosive as to find their way permanently into popular history. Melville surely laid aside the great epic in these years. His posture inevitably became defensive rather than visionary. It became a matter of defeating the king’s policies rather than building the future. His surviving correspondence reveals a deep sense of discouragement.⁵³ A fragment from the *Gathelus* would

⁵¹ J.G.A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law* (Cambridge, 1957), chapters two and three.

⁵² Printed in Louis A. Knafla, *Law and Politics in Jacobean England: The Tracts of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere* (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 221, 245. Ellesmere does mention other British radicals like John Knox and John Penry in passing. But his real target is Buchanan, the *Dialogus* twice cited along with its great critic Adam Blackwood. The others are barely named.

⁵³ Melville’s letter prefacing the tractatus secundus indicates his mood: “you are not striving to please the high and mighty ones of this world who judge of counsels by the event. But God...also rules the secondary results, the things to come next, the

eventually be published in 1602, but as a preface to John Johnston's potted verse summaries of the careers of the Scottish kings. Effectively yet one more redaction of Boece's hugely popular *Scotorum Historia*, Johnston's *Inscriptiones Historicae Regum Scotorum* offered exemplars enabling its readers, and especially Prince Henry, to distinguish "inter Imperium et Tyrannidem," but it proposed no grand British future. We hear much about Scottish patriotism, but also much about decline. We live, Johnston claimed, in the worst of times, for we either ignore or condemn the achievements of our forbears, careless both of ourselves and our posterity. Among those forbears Johnston ranked the religious leaders of the previous generation who fought for religious liberty and their country's - and who had inspired him in his youth. They too provided the exemplar for the troubled times.⁵⁴

Yet the literature that gripped the public imagination in these years was not Presbyterian Latin poetry, but royalist vernacular prose, prose written by none other than the king himself. In rapid succession James produced a series of works - the *Daemonologie* (1597), *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* (1598), and the *Basilikon Doron* (1599) - designed to show that headship and

intermediate times, the currents that run deepest. ... Comfort yourself, sustain yourself, with this promise." Melville places hope in the long haul, not in the prospects that lie immediately ahead. In other letters also written in 1604 that commented on Hume's most significant poem, the *Daphn' Amaryllis*, Melville claimed to be long unpracticed in these arts. In fact Melville would continue to write short poems, but surely his point is that the great project, the *Gathelus*, had long since been laid aside. He concludes one letter "plus fellis, quam mellis" (more bitter than honied, a play on his own name), another with, "te moestis praesidium reis" (Be you a guardian in these difficult times). *Poemata omnia* (Paris, 1639), pp. 4-9 (sig. A2^v-B1^r, first section separately paginated).

⁵⁴ John Johnston, *Inscriptiones Historicae Regum Scotorum, continuata annorum serie a Fergusio primo Regni Conditore ad nostra tempora...* (Amsterdam, 1602) sigs. *2, A2^r-A4^r ("Ad Illustres Proceres et Cives Regni Scotticani"). A poem of Buchanan's old friend Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558) prefaced the volume and set its tone. "Si cui Simplicitas et priscae secula vitae,/ Sors sine dissidiis, mens sine fraude placet;/ Ne Scotiae dexteras, hirsutaque pectora spernat./ Haud bene junguntur luxus et arma simul./ Nimbiferoque Ioves, et iniquas vicinus auras:/ Corporaque horrendis sunt potiora malis./ Jacta Aegypte solum. potius sit sortis iniquae,/ Sollicita vitae ducere ab arte dies." [If simplicity and an old-fashioned way of life,/ A lot without discords, a mind unblemished from fraud is what you want,/ Don't spurn the right hands and the hairy chests of Scotland;/ Not well do luxury and warfare go together./ We have overcome rain in skies and inclement air./ Our bodies are more strong than daunting evils./ Let Egypt abandoned be the ground of a hurtful lot/ To live out their days by a troubled art of life.] We could hardly imagine a clearer indication that this book looked to the past.

hierarchy were inherent in the structure of nature and prescribed by God. There existed an underlying order to the universe that withstood all mutability, all instability, all contingency, all flux, and certainly the chaos of the past thirty years. Even the damned and the demonic were subject to reason and nature's logic; indeed they parodied it. Most emphatically, he was king through his blood, by nature and right, and not the creation of Scotland's political revolutions and her citizens. Quite the contrary, kings made law, not the other way around. Arguments to the contrary verged on the blasphemous. Augustus, Constantine, the godly emperors, and imperial Rome provided the model, and, although he did not mention it in this series of tracts, James also liked to see himself as a latter-day Julius Caesar.⁵⁵ Before anything else, his problem with clergymen like Andrew Melville, as he explained in the *Basilikon Doron*, was their commitment to "parity" among ministers: here arose the true origin of their arrogance, their disobedience, their disorder and all the social confusion that flowed from it.

The *Basilikon Doron* is particularly important. Although initially privately printed, it soon became an international best-seller, completely outstripping his earlier apocalyptic writings at the time of the Armada crisis that had also attracted a continental audience. Probably more than any of his other works the *Basilikon Doron* reveals his acute obsession with his own legitimacy as king. His preoccupation with the Stewart blood, his fear of its being discredited or, through his mother, attainted, manifests itself everywhere, just as it did so often in his conversation during the 1590s. So exercised was he by the concern with legitimacy that in preparing the *Basilikon Doron*, he had the poet William Fowler translate Machiavelli's *Prince* for him. His purpose was in part to distinguish himself from Machiavelli's new prince, an uncouth and usurping tyrant, a Francesco Sforza or Cesare Borgia; in every sense of the word James was an old prince. Yet the work also does more, for like contemporary royalist publications in France, it adopts at times a civic vocabulary for distinctly anti-civic purposes. Thus James' tyrant-new prince will invert "all good lawes to serve only his private affections." He will "frame the common-weale euer to advance his particular." He "will make vp his own hande vpon the ruines of the Republicke." His son's life, on the contrary, should "shine" forth virtue to the country "as was seene by the vertuous liues

⁵⁵ Paulina Kewes has noticed this in her forthcoming essay, "Julius Caesar in Jacobean England." Our thanks to Dr. Kewes for sharing her essay with us in advance of publication. James' self identification with Caesar is highly telling because in so doing he challenged, no doubt quite consciously, the bedrock of the Scottish civic tradition. Hume's comments on Caesar need to be seen as a response to the king.

of the olde Romaines.”⁵⁶ Buchanan promoted the Machiavelli of the *Discourses*, James the Machiavelli of the *Prince*. There would inevitably be moments when their language seemed to overlap. The Scottish face of Machiavelli was variously manifested, but in the king’s version, Scotland possessed but one citizen.

Overlap existed in other ways, ways considerably more important. As he also indicated in the *Basilikon Doron*, James completely shared Melville’s and Hume’s passion to create a British state. Obtaining the southern crown was his consuming project, and its success in 1603 was undoubtedly James’ greatest moment of triumph. But James’ Britain would be a state very different from the one Melville and Hume had hoped for, as the king’s policies and especially his writings made absolutely unmistakable. Melville had some acid comments about the *Basilikon Doron*, and he identified no fewer than eighteen propositions from it that he asked the Fife synod to censure.⁵⁷ But he never wrote a reply. Yet there would eventually be a reply, and only one: Hume’s *De unione insulae Britannicae*. The *De unione* is the republican riposte to *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies*, the civic counter-piece to the *Basilikon Doron*.⁵⁸ It seeks to re-claim the classical vocabulary. It proposes an alternative Britain.

Like virtually all European countries, Scotland had its “ancient” usages and traditions. Scots often spoke of them as “lovable custom,” while the English spoke typically of “laudable custom,” the French of “louable coutume.” Like their neighbors, Scots would resist royal policy in the name of custom, as they all had done since the emergence of feudal monarchy in the middle ages. Appeals to custom formed part of the resistance to the regent Mary of Guise and French domination during the 1550s. Appeals to custom, however, were basically conservative and could also be used to bolster royal conservative causes. In 1584 the Arran government validated its legislation - legislation known to its enemies as “the Black Acts” - by stressing “the auctoritie of [the] supreme court of parliament continewit past all memorie of man unto thir dayis.” Robert Pont, a government opponent soon to be exiled, would respond

⁵⁶ James Craigie (ed.), *The Basilikon Doron of King James VI* (London and Edinburgh, 1944), 1:56-7, 160-1.

⁵⁷ Summarized in Craigie, *The Basilikon Doron of James VI*, 2:9-12.

⁵⁸ Robert Pont effectively replied to the *Daemonologie* with his *A newe treatise of the right reckoning of years and ages of the world...* (Edinburgh, 1599). See Williamson, “Number and national consciousness,” esp. pp. 210-12.

in part by noticing that in practice parliamentary statutes frequently never went into effect.⁵⁹ But as, in France and England, appeals to custom, usage, and even to “fundamental law” occurred much more frequently in Scotland with the new authoritarianism of the later 1590s. By the next decade this vocabulary became still more important with the prospect of some sort of Anglo-Scottish union.

The shift from civic duty to private right becomes evident in the differing responses of Andrew and James Melville to royal authority in 1606. In that year they and six other Presbyterian ministers found themselves detained indefinitely in London, and their response to this act of government intimidation is illuminating. At an important juncture they were questioned individually by the Scottish council. Andrew responded in the familiar way by telling the assembled aristocrats “flattly that they...wer generate from the antient nobilities of Scotland, quho wer wont to give their landis and liffes for the fridom of the kingdome and the Gospel.” Here was the well-established language of revolution, language made internationally famous (or, to some, infamous) by George Buchanan. James Melville by contrast claimed that “he wes a frie subject of the kingdome of Scotland, quhilk had lawis and priveledges of its awin, as any in the world.” Here was a largely new voice that looked to subjects’ privileges rather than civic engagement, protections rather than responsibilities. If this reorientation helped stimulate a rich legal culture associated today with such figures as John Skene of Curriehill (1543?-1617) and Thomas Craig of Riccarton (1538-1608), it also unmistakably underscored the place and power of monarchy.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ T. Thomson (ed.), *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland* (London, 1814), 3:293.3, cited by Goodare, “Estates in the Scottish Parliament,” p. 22; Williamson, “Patterns of British Identity,” pp. 150-2. The 1599 edition of the *Basilikon Doron* refers to “the lowable custome of England”; the more anglicized 1603 edition has it the “the laudable custome of England.” Craigie, *Basilikon Doron*, 1: 88, 89.

⁶⁰ Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law*, p. 82. Nevertheless, by the early seventeenth century Buchanan had acquired a near iconic status within Scotland as a scholar and poet - despite the embarrassment of his politics. More than any other writer, even Hector Boece, he validated Scottish civility and historical integrity. Craig could therefore never assail him the way Ellesmere would. For Craig, Buchanan remained “a man of wide renown” (*vir maximi nominis Buchananus*); “and in the matter of learning, who is there of their own nation [i.e., England] whom our neighbors can compare to our George Buchanan, a man who stands alone?” (*q^d si de literatis questio est, quem possunt vicini nostri cum Geo: Buchanano nostrate conferre, qui super omnes unus excessit*). Craig, *De unione regnorum Britanniae tractatus*, translated by C.S. Terry (Edinburgh, 1909), pp. 358, 113, 383, 132. Buchanan

The fading of republican and civic ideals before the new political realities accompanied a cultural shift of the first magnitude. The other side of authority would be a new world of private life, of doubt, of introspection. In the last decades of the century there emerged what Richard Tuck has called "a new humanism," an intellectual environment where one survived the flux of time rather than participating in the course of history, where one endured events rather than enacting them. Its key figures included Francesco Guicciardini (1483-1540), Michel de Montaigne (1533-92), and Justus Lipsius (1547-1606), who variously supplanted or reinterpreted Machiavelli and the values of the Quattrocento.⁶¹ After all, one could hardly reform and, still less, create a world whose watchword was, "que sais-je?" Among writers from antiquity the imperial historian Tacitus spoke more cogently than the republican historian Livy, while Seneca and the Stoics (now seen as restraining passion for the public good, no less than for the goods of this world) seemed more relevant moralists than Cicero or Aristotle. If there were no shared reason but instead reason of state, no common purpose or common sense of it, then political manipulation became inescapable. It would be hard for many to distinguish manipulation from cynicism and corruption, and the term "politician" acquired a double, conflicted meaning.

By the 1603 regnal union Hume's political aspirations then confronted two great, interlocking challenges. On the one hand, an impulse to hierarchy informed almost everything: all politics, all institutions, all iconography. Its imagery became all but unavoidable, suffusing virtually all public statements, all discourse. Even expostulations against "absolut powar" sought not to diminish royal "majesty" and were cast within the conservative language of custom.⁶² As James had made clear in the *Basilikon Doron*, the greatest evil

prompted similar reactions among conservative Scots a century later. See Douglas Duncan, *Thomas Ruddiman: A Study in Scottish Scholarship of the Early Eighteenth Century* (Edinburgh and London, 1965), pp. 62-71.

⁶¹ Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge, 1993), preface, chapters one through three; J.H.M. Salmon, "Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England," in L. Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 169-88; Wells, *Law and Citizenship*, p. 30.

⁶² See Williamson, SNC, p. 84. When discussing the new monarchical bishops, James Melville spoke of "the royall prerogative and absolut powar to use thair bodies and guidis of ... subjectis at pleasure, without forme or proces of the commoun law, even than quhen the bodie of the realme of England wes in thair Parliament compleineing of the justice [i.e., injustice] and injurie thairoff, and seiking redresse." R. Pitcairn (ed.), *Autobiography and Diary of Mr. James Melville* (Edinburgh, 1842),

of Presbyterianism had been “parity” among the clergy; the cure would be the introduction of hierarchy, bishops, “order.” For Hume, this intrusion of episcopacy compared with Augustus’ subversion of the Roman republic - “when Julius monarchie re-entred.” Yet even Hume adopted multiple voices in the *tractatus primus*. He had little choice when appealing, initially, to the king and court. Authority now seemed instinctive to many among Hume’s various audiences; an alternative had ceased to be obvious or even familiar.⁶³ Thus in his printed treatise we encounter independent-minded *civisme* interleaved with the now fashionably obsequious deference, the citizen co-existing uneasily with the subject. Moments of daring mingled with moments of reassurance. The *tractatus secundus* in which he outlined his specific proposals for the new Britain, however, inevitably proved much more emphatic, and it would be stopped in the press - even in France.

But here was only the first part of Hume’s double challenge. He had also to contend with the retreat from politics. Hume the writer was self-consciously a citizen. “I don’t want to avoid an opportunity for contributing to the public good.”

Neither should I worry too much about who I am or, as a private citizen with no official function in the commonwealth, what I can reasonably contribute... Nor does our country despise any citizen’s service. And this is a shared responsibility and a rare thing in the annals of history.⁶⁴

The kind of society he imagined palpably required a level of openness and public transparency that went well beyond the common attitudes of the period. For any agreement with England had to be a public document; the entire treatise breathes the doctrine, open covenants openly arrived at. More than that, any such agreement required public ratification. His argument for Britain is at once an argument for civic life. But he seems well aware that these values were far from universal. The fashionable withdrawal to private life, intimacy,

p. 792; Cald. 7:62.

⁶³ See Williamson, “A Patriot Nobility? Calvinism, Kin-Ties, and Civic Humanism,” in *SHR* 72.1 (1993): esp. pp. 14-5.

⁶⁴ *Tractatus primus*, dedication. The previous line comes from the opening of the *tractatus primus*. This “shared responsibility” is historically rare because societies like the Scottish commonwealth rarely occurred in history. Significantly his Latin phrase echoes Livy.

friendship, and what people today like to call meaningful personal relations, met with Hume's severe disapproval.

Without a community of interests there's no such thing as brotherly love or even friendship between one person and another. In my opinion this [the public connection] seems to be the most important bond among human beings. Without it friendship cannot exist and probably cannot last where it already exists, which is clearly because it intermingles itself in everything. But there's no need to belabor the point. It's only necessary to take care that we engage ourselves in a common cause, an achievement towards which a community of interests is properly directed. Nothing else will suffice. Nor will we settle for something less noble and significant.⁶⁵

Yet even those who rejected politics and followed Montaigne and Lipsius into "a leisurely way of life...far off from the hurly-burly" - even those for whom the public good had no meaning - even they, he insisted, would find advantages in the Britain he proposed. "The common good is a good thing for individuals also." As we might expect, his concern about "the cynicism of the present age," about power and manipulation, is never far from the surface, and by the final chapter of his treatise he found himself constrained to enter briefly and awkwardly upon the subject of politics and economics.

In the end only a truly British society could solve Scottish (and English) problems. Only a truly British society could protect Scottish interests. Britain would lead to a great intellectual flowering. Britain would allow all its citizens to realize their potential. Britain would play a decisive role in the liberation of mankind and in the fulfillment of human destiny. And that Britain could only be a civic world, a public culture.

⁶⁵ Tractatus secundus, Chapter 17, Title 20 ("Societas"). It is hard to avoid the conclusion that Hume consciously seeks to confront writers like Montaigne. In the widely-regarded "Of Custom," Montaigne had insisted "that the wise man should withdraw his soul within, out of the crowd...Society in general can do without our thoughts." "Private reason has only a private jurisdiction." D. Frame, editor and translator, *The Complete Essays of Montaigne* (Stanford, 1965), pp. 86, 88; see Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, pp. 50-2.

c. David Hume and Radical Britain

To the extent that our public feelings weaken, our feelings for things immediately around us grow stronger; under the most extreme despotism, therefore, friendships are more lasting, and domestic virtues, always of a low order, are the most common, or, rather the only ones.

- Cesare Beccaria,
On Crimes and Punishments, 1764⁶⁶

It was probably easier to get at Hume's thought thirty years ago than it is today, for then civic ideals carried more conviction. Even so, Hume's humanist Calvinism and quasi-republicanism require us not only to see past contemporary romantic nationalism, but also to look beyond the devastation of the Oxford Movement, the anti-democratic reaction of the late eighteenth century, the great counter-revolution of 1660. His politicized piety can only rest uncomfortably with the conservative sensibility that eventually triumphed so completely in the British Isles.

Hume is one of the earliest to use the neologism, "patriot." He believed that the imposition of bishops on Scotland would lead to English "tyranny." He delighted in speaking "Scottish," Scotland's Anglophone tongue, and regarded the southern speech as a dialect, and perhaps an inferior one at that. He dismissed efforts to learn "English" as mere affectation. He seems to have believed - astonishingly - that no form of English existed in Scotland prior to Edward I's invasion at the end of the thirteenth century. And still he was no nationalist, a concept that neither he nor any contemporary could have understood.⁶⁷ Quite the contrary, his passion was Britain, and he described himself as a "Scoto-Britannus." He was not alone. Other Scots described themselves in this way, not least Andrew Melville. The poet David Murray declared, "I am a trew Scottisman unchangable ... to my lyves end," but that did not prevent him from being yet another "Scoto-Britaine."⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Translated by Henry Paolucci (Indianapolis, 1963).

⁶⁷ See Williamson, "Patterns of British Identity," in *The New British History*, esp. pp. 138-43.

⁶⁸ Sir David Murray of Gorthy (1567-1629), cited by Keith Brown, "Seducing the Scottish Clio," in *The New British History*, p. 250. Murray is best known for his "The Tragical Death of Sophonisba" (cf. McGinnis and Williamson, *Buchanan*, pp. 90-1).

What makes Hume virtually unique is the kind of Britain he wanted and how highly articulated his vision of it was. There would be a complete fusion of the two peoples, a common British identity that would be neither English nor Scottish. That fusion could only come about, he believed, through the construction of what we would today call a civil society. Dynastic loyalties could never achieve it. Only a sense of community and shared purpose could create such a Britain. Naturally there would be a British Council of State and a British Parliament whose membership would initially be drawn from north and south in equal numbers - though as Scottish and English identities faded so too would this necessity. But clearly more important was the creation of powerful regional councils based in Lancaster, at York, London, Edinburgh, and possibly Aberdeen. Quite unlike late twentieth-century devolution, these regional governments would be simultaneously local and British. A fifth of the membership in each would come from the other country. The new provinces governed from Edinburgh and York would straddle the old border. Hume imagined the regions as highly activist, and they begin to resemble Buchanan's Athenian *ekkēsia*.⁶⁹

Hume insisted that all duly constituted British agencies (*officia et munia*) would be jointly administered by two individuals drawn from each side of the old border, apparently in a way resembling the consuls of antique Rome. It was essential that such offices be "shared equally from every part of Britain." These agencies would also be double staffed in this way. All these many officials did not trouble Hume because "it is also advantageous for a greater number to be involved in the business of government." What did exercise him was the venality of office. Office during the period was typically regarded as property, often heritable property, and this inherently posed a serious problem. In part, office as property conflicted with civic ideals. "It never seemed right to me for men to forsake their official duties, or to hold office and then put it up for sale. No, I consider such men to be injurious to their country and ungrateful to their king." But Hume's Britain in itself also enjoined such values because, otherwise, wealthy Englishmen could simply buy up all the offices. It would be specifically prohibited for officials to transfer or sell their offices "except to someone of their own stock." Even then, any such transfer would require consultation with the king and his permission.⁷⁰ It became altogether

⁶⁹ *Tractatus secundus*, Chapter 5, Title 4; Chapter 6, Title 5. Hume's proposals bear an uncanny resemblance to the regionalized Britain urged by Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun almost exactly a century later.

⁷⁰ *Tractatus secundus*, Chapter 7, Title 6.

impossible to imagine Britain and a true fusion of the two peoples without an underlying notion of the public interest.

As we would expect, Hume wanted to encourage intermarriage, and he wanted Englishmen educated at Scottish universities and Scots at English universities. But Hume's vision of "association" (*conversatio*) extended far beyond these proposals. There would be *English* settlements established in the Western Isles and at Lochaber whose purpose would not be to overawe the local inhabitants but to civilize them in the sense of making them political. All countries, including England, had their primitive regions and their "mountain-men" (*montani*), Hume insisted, but his point here was to get Englishmen to regard these remote areas as their responsibility, part of their *politeia*. Only later would lowland Scots join them, at which time intermarriage would appear prominently on the agenda. There would also be a new British order of knighthood, in fact the Order of the Garter now transformed into a British organization for British purposes. Its membership would be drawn from those whose commitment to Britain and specifically British public service had proven outstanding. Members of the British Council of State would be excluded, thereby encouraging local elites. These guardians of the new Britain clearly received their recognition for efforts on behalf of the community rather than simply or even mainly on behalf of the ruling dynasty. These would be public knights, and hence altogether atypical ones, whose title derived manifestly from merit. Further, Hume wanted to establish a set of British prayers, but these would be civil prayers, a kind of social liturgy that sounds something like the modern pledge of allegiance. Less happily, Hume also sought to institute a system of fines for ethnic slurs, an arrangement that, distressingly, seems to anticipate today's politically correct speech codes.⁷¹

Probably the most arresting feature of the *De unione* for us today, certainly the most contentious for contemporaries, and by far the longest chapter of the *tractatus secundus* is Hume's discussion of religion. To be sure, Hume's treatise differed in many ways, often profound ones, from all the considerable literature about Anglo-Scottish union that appeared during these years. But nowhere does its uniqueness stand out more prominently than in its proposal to create a British Presbyterian church. Naturally enough, the creation of such a church itself needed to be a British undertaking. A great council would convene to decide the British church polity through "frank, friendly, and unrestricted" discussions, and where serious disagreements arose, "the best

⁷¹ *Tractatus secundus*, Chapter 12, Title 15; Chapter 15, Title 18; Chapter 18, Title 21; Chapter 12, Title 11.

foreign churches shall be consulted” - a striking anticipation of the 1640s Westminster Assembly. Once agreement was reached, the “great Council of Britannia” (it is not clear whether the “consilium” is the British Council of State or the British Parliament) would make the final decision. But Hume had no doubt that honest consideration would lead to a church of councils rather than of bishops, one with fully reformed liturgy, ceremonies, vestments. The British church would therefore be something like what already existed in Scotland, what he at one point calls, significantly, “the early Jewish church.”⁷²

Why in the world would the English adopt the Scottish church polity and liturgy? Hume offered a number of reasons. There was the obvious evangelical success of the Scottish church. For the past fifty years the gospel had been propagated in Scotland far more successfully than in England. Moreover, the Scots were bound by their great oath of 1581 which abjured antichristian hierarchy, while the English saw the organization of their church as a matter of custom and convenience, an adiaphoric matter “indifferent” that did not preclude other forms. The Scots could not change their church discipline even if they wanted to do so, without violating their oath. In contrast, the English were “free to change.” Yet more than church government was at issue. Steeped in the wisdom literature of the Old Testament, Hume looked to “that pure radiance” within the spirit rather than the burden of images - in language that almost hints at Jewish mysticism, the Zohar and Kabbalah.⁷³

But, for all that, the thrust of Hume’s argument was decidedly political and rooted in Buchanan. The Scots all but unanimously endorsed reform and opposed “retreat” to the past. Many in England, “and not just among the puritans,” felt that way too.

There are by no means few conscientious and faithful English churchmen who think as we do, and more will do so if they are allowed to speak freely. Now they tolerate their own discipline to a greater extent than they approve it, even some of the highest rank.

The English population in general was far from enthusiastic for the southern ceremonies. “Given their freedom by the king to say what they really believe, how many [Englishmen], do you think would wish to make use of them?”

⁷² Tractatus secundus, Chapter 13, Title 16, for this paragraph and the following three.

⁷³ Also cf. John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book 12, lines 585-7: “...[thou] shalt possess/ A paradise within thee, happier far.”

Hume's question answered itself. "So it seems sufficiently clear that these rituals derive their standing not from popular choice and common consent, but rather simply on the basis of royal authority." Ultimately, Hume insisted, "the large majority of the people living on this island" endorsed a truly reformed church. The great obstacle not only to a British church but also to a united Britain turned out to be nothing other than the obstinacy of James Stewart himself. Here lay no small irony. In a remarkable change of tone and moment of candor, Hume declared that these mistaken ceremonies were things "which he [James] may insist on regardless of the disturbance to the church, even to the point of popular indignation, which he wishes to keep even to the hindering of the union." It became a stark case of popular will versus royal decree. Speaking directly to the *Basilikon Doron*, he went on:

So, like a good parent, give way to the people. Be an indulgent prince and truly a leader, and make the best of things even if you think them epidemic diseases. The lesser evil, if it be so, is yielding to what most people want. And so don't hesitate to favor the people's feelings. ... Isn't this better than swimming against the tide or contending against popular opposition? ... It's a discreet course in public affairs to contend for one's own cause only to the extent of trying to persuade one's fellow citizens. And isn't this one of the rules of prudence as well?

For most people the issue would resolve itself if only the king would "slacken his resolve" for hierarchy and ceremonies and give his "nod" to open discussion. True, James undoubtedly could compel obedience, Hume admitted, but wouldn't that defeat his very objective of union? In the end, Hume intimated (though did not say), unpopular policies upheld through compulsion would subvert royal authority. Government required consent simply to be effective, as Buchanan would surely have agreed. What other "reasons of state" (*rationes politicae*) could there be? Would "a statesman-like ruler" insist on anything else?

Hume even addressed the English bishops. Giving up their rights and ecclesiastical prerogatives would not cost them their dignity. Rather the reverse, they would gain public esteem and be remembered in times to come for what they achieved for God, church, and king. Hume comes perilously close to suggesting that as good citizens they really ought to consider stepping down - an argument he would subsequently develop in his struggle against the Scottish bishops that James later introduced. Hume frequently denounced "atheism" and "worldliness," and yet, despite his undoubted spirituality and

passionate commitment to the Scottish church, these terms appear to mean little more than the absence of the public spirit.

This new, reformed Britain might be a civic society and bear a republican or quasi-republican character, but it would also be an expansive and even crusading state. His model will not surprise us: "Let us rise up then, raise ourselves, and fashion ourselves souls equal to our circumstances and capable of such great thoughts as the Romans had." Unfortunately, the British peoples were all too often "creeping on the ground" and unwilling to "extend hand or mind beyond the island or even beyond this or that county." In fact the new Britain now had an opportunity to establish an empire that "may at some point equal the earlier one in antiquity." Hume was completely clear as to which Rome (and which Romans) he had in mind. The great republic had arisen because of the selfless patriotism of its leading families, like the Fabii and the Scipiones. Their counterparts in Scotland and Britain, most notably (of course) the House of Douglas, shared the virtue and values of antiquity. If the Douglasses seemed obscure, that was simply because they had acted on a narrower stage located in a remote corner of the world.⁷⁴ Now all of that would change. In a voice unmistakably deriving from Machiavelli's *Discourses*, Hume insisted that the new Britain would be more secure as an expanding state, one that acted rather than one that sat back and refrained from acting.

Like all modern imperialisms, Britain's had a Judaic base no less than a classical one, and Hume, following Melville, saw Britain leading all Europe against the papacy and into an era of freedom, virtue, and righteousness. In the end there would be "peace, the glory of empire, magnificent [cultural] accomplishments, the establishment of justice, Astraea brought down from heaven into this our British kingdom and the whole world besides."⁷⁵ James, and perhaps more especially Prince Henry, needed to remember that throughout Europe there were "those ready to fight on your behalf whom you do not even know about."⁷⁶ Hume was too immersed in Buchanan's thought not to be suspicious of prophecy and the hyperbolic enthusiasms of foolish speakers.

Still, there is a divinity in things. The human mind is capable of foreseeing good and evil. Hope and fear precede events, and these are

⁷⁴ *Tractatus primus*, pp. 73, 75, 77, 127 below. See Williamson, "A Patriot Nobility?", esp. pp. 4-5.

⁷⁵ *Tractatus secundus*, Chapter 19 ("Totius Tractatus Summa").

⁷⁶ *Tractatus secundus*, Chapter 13, Title 16 ("Religio").

not always based on clear and transparent reasoning. All the same, they are supported by reason when they are, as it were, universal and have taken hold in the minds of all men.⁷⁷

Reformed Europe would also move against that other prophesied, latter-day agency of evil, the Turkish tyrant. The Balkans would be recovered and, possibly, the Ottomans would be overthrown altogether. But that project did not preoccupy him. Quite unlike such fellow Scottish poets as the militant Anglican James Maxwell and even the resolutely low church Sir William Alexander, Hume did not seek a restoration of Constantine's eastern empire.⁷⁸ The Rome of the emperors and of Constantine in particular comprised one of the greatest tragedies in human experience. Britain entered world history to organize it on an utterly different basis.

The emblems and insignia that Hume proposed for Britain indicate its expansive character through a distinctly Hebrew rather than Roman iconography. The British coat of arms would be the Scottish lion rampant, but the Scottish lion conflated with the prophetic lion of the north,⁷⁹ and conflated in turn with the lion of Judah. Its form was simple enough: Hume would merely remove the double tressure that always surrounded the Scottish lion. Unenclosed and thus unbounded, Hume's emblem was intended to speak

⁷⁷ Tractatus primus, p. 75 below.

⁷⁸ See Williamson, "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, 1982), pp. 34-58; Williamson, "The Jewish Dimension of the Scottish Apocalypse: Climate, Covenant, and World Renewal," in Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoul, and Richard Popkin (eds.), *Menasseh Ben Israel and his World*, pp. 7-30; Williamson, "Latter-Day Judah, Latter-Day Israel: The Millennium, the Jews, and the British Future," in Klaus Deppermann (ed.), *Chiliasmus in Deutschland und England im 17. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1988), pp. 149-65.

⁷⁹ At the Elizabethan court Paul Grebner promoted the prophecy of a northern lion that would destroy the papacy. It would have a long life through much of the seventeenth century. See Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London, 1971), pp. 468, 488; Susanna Åkerman, *Rose Cross over the Baltic: The Spread of Rosicrucianism in Northern Europe* (Leiden, 1998); Frances A. Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London, 1972). See also Hume's Scottish contemporary, James Maxwell, *Admirable and Notable Prophecies* (London, 1615), pp. 87-8. Maxwell is discussed in Williamson, "Number and National Consciousness," in Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons*, esp. pp. 200-3.

unambiguously of expansion and mission. The device itself had originated in the later fifteenth century at a particularly aggressive moment during the reign of James III.⁸⁰ Although the new lion did not outlast that king's eventually disastrous reign, the emblem and variants of it were produced in some number, and Hume undoubtedly saw one of the latter still extant even today in the Cranshaws church at Duns. But where James III's unencumbered lion symbolized the pursuit of a commonplace dynastic empire, Hume's Judaic-British lion articulated a very different project, at once eschatological and reforming. Hume's British motto would be "Lesser than Judah" (meaning, only lesser to Judah) or "Serving Judah, Ruling the Rest," and its implications were unmistakable: Britain would fulfill the promise of the Hebrew commonwealth, effectively the promise of the Old Testament.

Hume developed these themes of union and British triumph in contemporaneous poetry, most notably the highly intricate *Daphn-Amaryllis* (London, 1605). With an unbounded lion emblazoned on a shield as its frontispiece and reference, appropriately, to *Genesis* 49, the *Daphn-Amaryllis* is a Protestant pastoral that celebrates and promotes the Anglo-Scottish union. Divided into four eclogues (the Philomena, the Alpheisiboeus, the Moeris "sive officium," and the Moelibaeus "sive unio"), the poem develops complex allegories, dialogues, and even an uncommon sort of chorus. There is the obvious conjoining of James/ Scotland/ Daphnis with Elizabeth/ England/ Amaryllis, but still other events and figures, past and present, form elements within its dense verses. Inevitably it bears various connections with Virgil's "Bucolica" (or "Eclogues") and still other classical poetry. But it also draws on a surprising range of British sources, from John Mair's *Historia Maioris Britanniae* (1521), which, Hume tells us, he read as a boy, to the late fifteenth-century chronicle, the *Liber Pluscardensis* (c. 1460), to contemporary literature including Buchanan (poëtarum princeps) and Melville (proximus principe).⁸¹ In fact, Melville (Moelibaeus) and Hume himself (Menalcas) seem to be the

⁸⁰ See *Tractatus secundus*, Chapter 3, Title 2. The years were 1469-73. Annexing the Shetland and Orkney islands in the north, laying claim to territories in France, with the realm now larger than at any time in its history, and perhaps even dreaming of eventually being elected the German emperor, James III (1452-88) and his parliaments declared Scotland itself an empire, adopted a closed imperial crown, and in February 1472 abolished the tressure. It also led to architectural innovation. Only the new emblem failed to survive James' ill-fated reign.

⁸¹ *Daphn-Amaryllis*, p. 7; cf. A. Constable and A. Mackay (eds.), *History of Greater Britain* (Edinburgh, 1892), p. 184; F.J.H. Skene (ed.), *Liber Pluscardensis*, 2 vols., (Edinburgh, 1877, 1880), 1:80, 2:55.

figures conducting the poetic dialogue in the fourth eclogue. A chorus derives from the last word of each line, reading downwards as a kind of commentary and counterpoint, an “echo” as Hume terms it.

... O, viveret Agrius! aut tu
Mellee, sume tubas, magnumque inferre **per orbem**,
Incipe Fergusidum deductam ab origine **gentem**.
Incipe; ne quis sit tantorum e sanguine **Regum**,
Regem quem plus Phoebus amet. ...

[O would that the shepherd (Buchanan) were living, or that you the honied one (Melville) might sound the pipe (i.e., complete the *Gathelus*) and start leading the blood of Fergus through the great world. Begin - lest there not be one from the blood of so many kings (James/Henry) - a (different) king whom Phoebus may love more.]

Tu, per orbem egentem regum.⁸²

[You through the world needful of kings (of the right sort).]

The poem offers a great many messages, and an expansive Britain appears prominently among them: “See how the lion rears up roaring, / How he darts his fiery eyes till all acknowledge him,/ Confessing his sole supremacy.”⁸³ World leadership and mission lay at the heart of the new British state.

If Hume saw himself as the heir and promoter of the politics and poetry of Melville and Buchanan, all three participated in a still broader British political and cultural context. Buchanan, Melville, and Hume were active within a loosely interconnected network of intellectuals and ardent reformers throughout the British Isles, of whom Edmund Spenser and Philip Sidney appeared most prominently. All wrote or promoted pastoral poetry that was militantly Protestant. All saw themselves deeply engaged in a European struggle for liberty and reform. With the exception of Buchanan, all of them

⁸² *Daphn-Amaryllyis*, p. 13. Cf. *Poenata omnia*, p. 8, where Melville signs himself in a letter to Hume as Moelibaeus. Hume’s lines seem to contain the distinctly subversive suggestion that poets make kings rather than the other way around. Buchanan had died in 1582. Fergus was the (fabulous) founder of the Scottish dynasty (c. 330 BC).

⁸³ *Daphn-Amaryllyis*, p. 12. See *Tractatus secundus*, Chapter 3, Title 2 where Hume cites this passage from the poem in the *De unione*.

interpreted human history through apocalyptic categories, categories that informed their poetry in important ways. They all specifically portrayed themselves (or, in the case of Buchanan, were portrayed) as shepherds who piped the songs that imagined the future. Hume integrated a guide for reading the *Daphn-Amaryllis* into the work, where he spoke of his poem as a “contiuam allegoriam,” phrasing arrestingly suggestive of Spenser’s description of the *Faerie Queene* as “being a continued allegory, or dark conceit.” While it would be refreshingly subversive and daringly anglocentric to think of Melville and Hume as Scottish Spenserians, it would also be wrong. Nevertheless, literary scholars who have sought the “shepeards’ nation” may have been searching in the wrong place and at the wrong time - and, as it happens, in the wrong language. It might make sense to look less to Spenser’s heirs and successors and more to his contemporaries and fellow visionaries. Conversely, while it is hugely fashionable at the moment, it simply will not do to construct Spenser as a satisfyingly blood-thirsty imperialist preoccupied with Ireland.⁸⁴ Rather, all of these figures comprise an important and determinedly reformist political-cultural configuration within the later Renaissance of the British Isles. Their world was Britain, and Britain acting within an eschatological European framework. That world spoke to the poetic imagination. But however engaging and in whatever genre, the political environment meant that their British vision could only remain incomplete and but partially resolved.

Perhaps surprisingly, Protestant militancy did not mean militarism. Quite the contrary, leading the nations of Europe would mean peace and economic productivity at home. Such a peace, combined apparently with the vision of a new era, would create a great cultural flowering everywhere in the British Isles. If in the past Scotland had produced “fewer able scholars, fewer productive talents, or at any rate not as many as we might have,” now all that would change. The earlier sixteenth century, Hume added in his *De familia Humia*, had been “an age of foolishness” (*ineptum seculum*) preoccupied with fighting and security, “an age of soldiers, not philosophers,” one more

⁸⁴ *Daphn-Amaryllis*, p. 1; Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, edited by R. Kellogg and O. Steele (Indianapolis, 1965), p. 74. See D. Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London, 1984), chapter eight; Michelle O’Callaghan, *The Shepheards’ Nation: Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612-1625* (Oxford, 2000); D. Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1945), chapter three. For Spenser and Ireland see Williamson, “Patterns of British Identity,” in Burgess (ed.), *The New British History*, pp. 163-7; McGinnis and Williamson, “Britain, Race, and the Iberian World Empire,” forthcoming.

concerned with “honor and glory” rather than with “what was right and just.”⁸⁵ To be sure, Hume was utterly emphatic that the Scots were never barbaric primitives, but, clearly, nations other than Scotland had become synonymous with civilization. Yet once there began “the cultivation of both fields and talents, and in consequence learning and civilization as well,” Scotland and all the British Isles would become transformed.

Hume was no less emphatic that culture and virtue were conterminous, and not in the least contradictory. Britons would go over “to the delightful camp of the Muses...not as baseborn knaves, nor as cowards unwilling to answer the call, but as soldiers ready to do battle on a different ground, and at a different expense.” The public good as well as British leadership required scholars no less than soldiers - and perhaps even more so. Learning necessarily comprised a civic activity. The importance of education and learning for Hume is all but impossible to over-estimate. At more than one point he adopts a voice that reminds us of Buchanan’s radicalism and seems to anticipate none other than John Milton. When considering “learning and letters ... we don’t want men of this kind to be as rare as in former times, but to be numerous, indeed to be the entirety of the population.” The reverse was equally true. “Nor will there be any person complaining that his native land will stand in the way of his virtue which, if I am not mistaken, was the excuse we used to hear from people born in Scotland.”⁸⁶

Hume had no patience whatsoever for anti-intellectualism - and, particularly, anti-intellectualism among the aristocracy who were by definition public people. In the *De familia* he blasted the “opinion” that letters were unbecoming to aristocrats, and he went on to lament his older brother’s at first promising and then truncated education. In his great *History of the House of Douglas* he denounced “the perverse and pernicious tenent” that learning might be an impediment to “politick activeness,” and then recounted the eighth earl’s bitter regret that he had not been seriously educated. The situation was not unique to Scotland, but was, in what may be an oblique reference to Montaigne, “especially” a problem in France. In the *De unione* Hume went one

⁸⁵ Tractatus primus, p. 87 below; *De familia Humia*, pp. iii-iv. Hume was acutely conscious of the instability in his own border region, the Merse, an area of soldiers (inter viros militares). Consequently his younger brother’s Master of Arts was quite a rarity there in the sixteenth century (*Familia*, p. 14). Hume modestly neglects to mention his own degree.

⁸⁶ Tractatus primus, pp. 87, 89, 125 below. See Williamson, “Scots, Indians, and Empire,” pp. 47-56.

better, subversively suggesting at one point that in time of war, savagery comes to be regarded as military virtue.⁸⁷ In the end, Hume concluded that military virtue had also to become transformed into political virtue, that action and speech could never be dissociated, that the chivalric melded with the civic.

The self-liberating European nations - or kindreds, to use the Judaic imagery - required Britain, and that Britain could only have a republican character.

⁸⁷ *De familia Humia*, p. 61; *History of the House of Douglas* (London, 1644), part 2, pp. 360-1.

d. The *De unione* and its Fate

*Septima iam Tamesim propter me, luna recurrens
 Adspicit ingratas ire, redire vias,
 Dum tua totas fundo praeconia terras,
 Et doceo nomen saxa sonare tuum,
 Aut voco iungendas aeterna in foedera gentes
 Sedulus, ingenio foedera digna tuo.*

- David Hume, "Ad Regem"⁸⁸

[The seventh moon coming up over the Thames/ Sees me going back, a hard journey,/ While I pour forth your praises through the whole country,/ And teach the rocks to echo your name,/ Or zealously call upon the two peoples to be joined in everlasting compacts,/ Compacts worthy of your genius.]

By about mid April 1604 Hume had completed a draft of the first tractatus. Andrew Melville's comments on this early version imply that Hume may have also drafted some of the remarks on religion which eventually appeared in the second tractatus. Hume had moved quickly. The bulk of the literature on union would be written between May and October of that year, largely in response to the spring session of the English parliament and in anticipation of the Anglo-Scottish Commission on Union that fall.⁸⁹ That Hume took up his subject early on is hardly surprising. The union and the form it would assume comprised a matter of the greatest urgency. Both the Scottish civic tradition and Protestant prospects in the deepening struggle with the Counter-Reformation faced a dark future before James' stated policies. An alternative vision, a statement that competed with court orthodoxy and offered another way of imagining the future had become crucial. Hume's tract, as Melville noted, was a dangerous undertaking, but one greatly needed in the present circumstances.

At the same time, more practical, narrowly patriotic concerns also informed Hume's thinking and hastened his writing. The union, the creation of a truly British society, was manifestly in Scotland's best interests. The king

⁸⁸ *Poemata omnia*, pp. 44-5 (Jacobea).

⁸⁹ Melville's letter to Hume prefaces most Scottish manuscripts of the second tractatus and is included in this volume. Regarding the literature on union, see Galloway, *Union*, p. 30.

had removed to London; that simply was never an issue. And if Scots wanted to influence the king's policies they too needed to go to London "because, like it or not, that's where he lives." It would obviously be far better to go through one's own country to get there than through a foreign one. It would obviously be far better to develop a common British outlook than to be subjected to a monarchy where specifically English attitudes and interests would likely prevail.

For the English will go to the king, just as we did, and he will be no less able to make use of their advice: and if he adopts their advice, then it will surely have to be obeyed. And the more separated they are from us, will they not then be the more hostile, the more contentious, the more intent on oppressing the Scots and the more likely to do so? To avoid these things, the union may be the only really effective prescription we have.⁹⁰

If the Scots wanted to avoid provincialization, they had better create Britain. Local interest, as Hume never tired of pointing out, was best served by public interest. Ideological imperatives and global expectations merged with the most immediate Scottish pre-occupations, reinforcing one another, unexpectedly, powerfully, completely.

If Hume's tractatus had an early beginning, probably earlier than we will ever know, it was part of a project which he simultaneously promoted with the highly complex poem *Daphn-Amaryllis*. The poem's third eclogue (identified as such) would be published in Edinburgh that year. He apparently continued working on the tractatus, adjusting the manuscript as late as October-November, for it refers to the Commission as "now working on" the union. In fact, his dedication noted that "this great work" may have already come to pass. At just this point in late autumn he turned his attention to what would become the second tractatus, which at two junctures also speaks of the Commission as though it were still in session. Further, at about the same time he decided to pursue the British cause where the decisions were actually being made and set off on a journey to London, probably arriving in January. During the next six months he saw to publication the first tractatus and the complete *Daphn-Amaryllis*, as well as a set of elegies for his grammar school teacher, Andrew Simson. All the while he worked away on the second tractatus. His chapter on the name Britannia refers to a "comoedia" that made fun of the Scots, surely a reference to *Eastward Ho!* whose prominent authors were

⁹⁰ Tractatus primus, pp. 129, 131 below.

arrested in early 1605. The section on laws and the courts references John Cowell's *Institutiones Juris Anglicani* (Cambridge, 1605) which can only have just appeared. His chapter on "society" refers to the pope as Leo, and the only pope of that name during the period, Leo XI, briefly reigned between the first and the twenty-seventh of April 1605. The manuscript copy in the British Library indicates that he completed the second tractatus on 2 August 1605, and that date is almost certainly correct.

By the end of August he was back in Scotland in time to witness disaster: the beginning of James' five-year and ultimately successful campaign to re-introduce episcopacy into Scotland. Hume threw himself into the struggle and began a widely-disseminated correspondence with the new bishops - effectively a pamphlet war. Inevitably his appeal sprang in large part from the Scottish civic tradition, and he spoke to the bishops "as a Scottishman to you as a Scottishman, and I trust not without some regarde unto your native countrie." Hierarchy was tyranny, indeed English tyranny. Inevitably he would enjoin such civic acts as the 1581 oath, now increasingly referred to as a covenant. He would draw analogies with the subversion of the Roman republic. He would also argue from what he saw (probably rightly) as the clear intentions of the Scottish Reformation, now being undermined by the intrusion of bishops. He could dispute with the best about the early Christian - or perhaps Judeo-Christian - church. In this context his thought had to be defensive and reactive, protecting the past rather than projecting the future. Still, to the extent that they have survived, these writings remain surprisingly interesting. The Scottish bishops frequently looked to the writings of the Anglo-Dutch conservative Hadrian Saravia (1532?-1613) for the justification of their newly acquired office and powers. It became Hume's task to demolish the basis of that office and thus the foundations of Saravia's thought. In the process he raised challenging questions about the epistemological bases of authority and the nature of language. In that process he also became the terror of the Scottish clerical establishment.⁹¹

⁹¹ See Williamson, SNC, chapter four; J.P. Sommerville, "Richard Hooker, Hadrian Saravia, and the Advent of the Divine Right of Kings," in *History of Political Thought* 4 (1983): 229-45; W. Nijenhuis, *Adrianus Saravia* (Leiden, 1980). Appropriately as Scotland's court poet, albeit held unwillingly at the court of St. James, Melville responded to Saravia with an epigram: "Siccine seratos stringis Sarravia dentes,/ Tigna vorans Solymae iam recidiva novae?" [Do you thus bare your filed teeth, Saravia, devouring the rebuilt beams of the New Jerusalem?] Speaking becomes sawing: Saravia's mouth (writings) works to saw through the structure of the restored faith. "In Saraviam Pseudoepiscoporum patronum" (To Saravia, defender of the pseudo-bishops), in *Viri clarissimi A. Melvini Musea...* (np, 1620), p. 23.

Yet only a few of Hume's many letters have in fact survived, and the reasons for this are distinctly Scottish. From the later middle ages into modern times Scotland has produced more soldiers, more merchants, more peddlers, more philosophers, more clergy, more professors, more poets, more intellectuals - and more books - than Scottish society could ever hope to absorb. Prior to the eighteenth century this circumstance had meant a limited local press and large-scale publication abroad (as well as long-lived Scottish Latinity). In the struggle during the first decade following the regnal union, it also meant a huge handicap for the Presbyterians. As the contemporary Presbyterian controversialist David Calderwood put it: "I confes I have only pointit at mony thingis quhilk I would have writt more fullie...if the prese war also fre to us as to our opposits." Calderwood would also note that the episcopal response to Hume had barely touched his argument, and, from the evidence we have, he was surely right. Just like Calderwood, Hume too "wanted the commoditie of the presse."⁹² There is no small irony that Hume found himself in trouble with the Scottish Privy Council in 1608 for allegedly being linked to a secret press in Edinburgh that printed one minister's anti-episcopal sermon.⁹³ None of his own controversial writing would see print, and its loss almost certainly has cost us some of the most creative political thinking of the Scottish Renaissance.

That the second tractatus survived owes much to the fact that it was a formal Latin treatise, for it surely is an indication of contemporary Scottish values and priorities that none of Hume's vernacular writings were published within his lifetime.⁹⁴ In 1610, during what proved to be the final stages of the conflict with the king, he sought to have the tractatus published anonymously at Bordeaux, possibly even traveling there for this purpose. But it was not to be. David Hume of Duras, a Scots minister and author long resident in France, entered the print shop and "par accident" came across the tractatus. Distressed by what he encountered, he immediately drew "the booke out of the printers handis," stayed its printing, and wrote off to advise both Robert Cecil and the king himself. In part what troubled Duras was the tractatus' insistence on

⁹² National Library of Scotland: Wodrow Manuscripts, 4to, 84, No. 23, f. 174 ("Reply of a Dotatyst..."); Cald. 7:180.

⁹³ John Murray, *A godly and fruitfull sermon preached at Lieth* [sic] ([Edinburgh], 1607); David Masson (ed.), *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1887), 8:84, 499-500. The proceedings were initiated from London by no less than King James himself who believed that Hume had probably been one of the perpetrators. Cf. Cald. 6:628, 689-702.

⁹⁴ See Williamson, "Number and National Consciousness," esp. pp. 192-212.

parity and full integration of the realms, views that differed radically from the way most early modern Europeans thought about society. Hume's argument struck Duras as completely favoring Scotland. As he said to Cecil, "the booke...hes no urther end then to make Scotland equal to ingland in al and superior in sume pointis," or, as he said to James, the obviously Scottish author was "trop affectioné...à mon avis à son pais escosse." Simply adopting the Scottish lion rampant as the British coat of arms went completely against "la vray union des maisons des provinces et des royaumes." A single council of state posed no problem, but the idea of an equal number of councillors from each realm "ou il range une monarchie à la proportion arithmetique" was unacceptable - "à laquelle les democracies mesmes ne s'assubiettissent pas tousiours" (to which even democracies do not always submit themselves). Neither did the idea of majority vote sit well with Duras. The prince in his wisdom (enlightened by God) made the decisions. It was he who advanced the kingdom of heaven and promoted well-being on earth. If he wanted, he could take the advice of six or seven Scottish councillors against twenty English ones. It simply would not do to make the king a "president" of the council. Even so, "l'angleterre estant deux fois plus grande que l'escosse," it ought to have twice the councillors by any mathematics. Hume's other proposals, Duras explained, were variously but similarly absurd, and could only lead to distrust and disunion. When Duras thought of union, he instinctively thought of dynastic union, "quand deux familles s'unissent par mariage." When he thought of government, he thought of monarchy and protection - and never more so than in the immediate wake of Henri IV's assassination.⁹⁵ Hume's civil society was altogether inconceivable, and his arguments for it unacceptable. It is the last we hear of the *De unione insulae Britannicae*.

Hume's views never changed. In 1608 he had written a lengthy defense of Buchanan's *Historia* against the criticism of it in William Camden's *Britannia*. His patriotic objections to Camden's "mockery" were widely shared in Scotland. But more than simple patriotism was at issue, for to defend the *Historia* was also to defend the kind of Scotland Buchanan had imagined. It

⁹⁵ Public Record Office: SP 14/57/228-33 and 244. Hume of Duras (*fl.* 1604-34), the author of *Le Contr' Assassin, ou response à l'apologie des iesuites...* (Geneva?, 1612) and *L'assassinat du roy, ou maximes de Vieil de la Montagne Vaticane...* (n.p., 1614, reprinted 1615), could only have despised the *De jure regni apud Scotos: dialogus*. The blood-thirsty Catholic, François Ravallac (1578-1610), certainly did not seek to promote civic ideals or see himself as a French Brutus, but his action does lend weight to the view that, historically, assassination has served conservative interests rather than radical ones.

will not surprise us that this work too could not be printed. Only one other tract would be: the *Apologia Basilica, seu Machiavelli ingenium, examinatum in libro quem inscripsit PRINCIPEM* (Paris, 1626).⁹⁶ In it Hume did far more than blast Machiavelli's "atheism," at least in the usual sense. Its point was to defend and promote the civic ideals and Ciceronian values that *The Prince* had come to subvert so effectively. It appeared, however, within a drastically changed political landscape, one in which the radicalism of the later sixteenth century seemed very remote indeed. Hume ended his days, some time between August 1629 and May 1631, seeking desperately to publish his great history of the Douglases, in what was doubtless his final effort to restore the vanishing world of the "patriot."

If many thought that Hume had won the argument, there could be little doubt as to who had won the war. Or had they? Civic Scotland turned out to have a long history before it, resurfacing dramatically in 1638 and continuing to flicker within Scottish political life perhaps even as late as the 1840s. So too did Britain. It is altogether manifest that Britain was vastly more than merely James' pipe-dream and the objective of sycophantic Scottish courtiers in London.⁹⁷ If the British project failed politically - and Hume may well have rightly suggested that its failure was in fact James' own doing - we now also know that this did not prevent its entering prominently and often positively into English literary and popular culture. Xenophobia and Scotophobia flourished abundantly and brutally in Stewart England, but this, it now emerges, is far from the complete picture.⁹⁸ Melville and Hume shared a

⁹⁶ Hume continued to publish poetry, first at Prince Henry's death and then at James' visit to Scotland in 1617. In the latter he continued to promote the notion of Judaic Britain much as he had proposed it in the tractatus secundus. Perhaps surprisingly, he also continued to agitate in it for Andrew Melville's restoration to favor.

⁹⁷ See Williamson, "Scotland, Antichrist, and the Invention of Great Britain"; Williamson, "The Jewish Dimension of the Scottish Apocalypse"; Cf. R.A. Mason, "The Reformation and Anglo-British Imperialism," in R.A. Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603* (Cambridge, 1994), esp. p. 184.

⁹⁸ T. Marshall, *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages under James VI and I* (Manchester, 2000); D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England* (Toronto, 1990), pp. 55-64. The image of both Scots and Jews followed a common and often linked trajectory within English literature, presented favorably by progressives and trashed by reactionaries. See Williamson, "'A Pill for Pork-Eaters': Ethnic Identity, Apocalyptic Promise, and the Strange Creation of the Judeo-Scots," in

passion for Britain, and they were by no means isolated figures within either Scotland or the British Isles generally. It was less a matter of interconnection than of common manifestation. Britain truly was a British phenomenon. The real issue was the kind of Britain people wanted to construct. The Britain promoted at the king's court differed considerably from the one imagined at Prince Henry's. Still further options were also available. Perhaps today as well as then, Hume may have been right, and there could be no united Britain other than one that was civic, integrated, republican.

R.B. Waddington and A.H. Williamson (eds.), *The Expulsion of the Jews: 1492 and After* (New York, 1994), pp. 237-58.

This page intentionally left blank