



James K. Cameron symposium 4

Cold War Theology: A controversial religious image of King James VI & I in England and on the Continent in 1603

Ian Hazlett

Preliminary

While a student at St Mary's College in St Andrews, a revelation for me in James Cameron's church history lectures was that King James VI had actively participated in theological debates 'within the bounds of this very university, indeed.' All of a sudden, then, it was impressed on the class that even in the early modern era, 'theology' (apart from the 'church') was still something that engaged not just vocational theologians and churchmen, but also some of the high and mighty in the land plus other non-clerics. That was initially surprising for our handicapped twentieth-century minds preconditioned to believe vaguely that 'theology' after the Middle Ages was in recession with diminishing public profile, culturally somehow stigmatized and therefore increasingly nudged into a quarantined area. The mystery was compounded by the fact that in the fullness of time the said James (through no fault of his own) came to be the only secular ruler in Christian history, I think, to have a Bible translation named after him. The designation, 'King James Bible', only came into vogue in the eighteenth century, in the Enlightenment era no less. That peculiar usage represented a remarkably unenlightened confusion of the two kingdoms, heavenly and earthly, of two words, divine and human, or of throne and altar, as it were.

Such things aside, the rest of this paper intends simply to exemplify that in James's lifetime, his evolving religious views had palpable

consequences in still-existing ‘Christendom’ at home and abroad. Some of these effects were intended, others unintended. This could elicit plaudits, but also controversy. In addition, expressions of belief from his Scottish period that he had long since moderated were also recycled in some quarters to create illusions provoking some religio-political and diplomatic bother, often beyond the king’s control. The bulk of the essay will focus on a select group of sources and their contexts that do not seem to have been examined before, individually or severally.



Introduction

When the King of Scots, James Stewart (1566–1625), was proclaimed King of England in March 1603, two sectors of public opinion were greatly relieved. The first was monarchical legitimists. Legally, the status of James’s predecessor on the English throne, Elizabeth I, had been precarious. Her father, Henry VIII, was a divorcee, and her mother, Anne Boleyn, had been executed. Accordingly, Elizabeth’s accession to the throne and rule had been tainted by a past of illegitimacy and a family criminal record. In addition, her excommunication by the Pope in 1570 (renewed in 1580) undermined her and the kingdom’s standing at home and abroad. Her cousin Mary, Queen of Scots, had had a better claim to the English throne through her grandmother, Margaret, sister of Henry VIII. However, Mary’s indiscreet third marriage with the suspected murderer of her second husband, Henry Darnley (James’s father), her committed Catholicism and closeness to her mighty relations, the anti-Reformation Guise family in France, did not commend her claim. To resolve the problem she was executed in 1587 for being involved in treasonous plot. While never a foregone conclusion,¹ and despite the handicap of being in English eyes ‘a foreigner’, the ultimate outcome was that in 1603 Elizabeth was succeeded by Mary’s largely untainted son, James. This restored virtually immaculate legitimacy to the monarch of England, even if diplomatically useful papal endorsement (or at least non-excommunication) was conditional on the provision of a degree of Catholic relief in the country.

The other sector that was initially happy with the new situation was the guardians of the Reformation settlement, since a Protestant succession was now secured. James was a committed Protestant, broadly Reformed with a Calvinist slant, schooled in humanism, Bible and theology, and a scholar-king of literary talent. The range of his writings included religious and theological tracts as modes of addressing contemporary concerns.² In Scotland, influential on his basic doctrinal perspectives had been the moderate Heidelberg Catechism (1563) and the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), both highly rated in the general Reformed world. Yet while his orientation was that of the broad Reformed consensus, he also subscribed to disputed beliefs like double predestination and had preferences in church government and liturgy on which there was no consensus, like episcopacy and prescribed orders of service, so that he was relatively independent minded. Nonetheless, to most Protestant observers all was more or less well. The Reformation in the British nations (if not the polity of their churches) was now much more stable – or so it seemed. This situation was understandably perceived by general European Protestantism as a welcome boost. A high status, pro-Reformation monarch was hailed politically at a time when the Protestant cause was being subverted and threatened by the Counter-Reformation and by Catholic superpowers.

There was, however, a shadow of doubt in this euphoria. In 1603, England was still technically at war with Spain, whose nearest base was in the Netherlands. And ‘Spain’, of course, was a code word for Counter-Reformation by the sword. In England, Protestant patriots in particular hoped that James would resume hostilities in this respect. However, in the important domain of psychological warfare, Catholic publicists at home and abroad were fanning rumours that James’s Protestantism was superficial and that he might revert to Catholicism.³ In addition, while consistently dismissive of the Roman Catholicism of his day, he was averse to religious persecution in the *causa fidei*. He had stated that ‘I will never allow in my conscience that the blood of any man shall be shed for the diversity of opinions in religion [...] I did ever hold persecution as one of the infallible notes of a false church.’⁴ As previously in Scotland, in England (more controversially)

he was lenient to Catholic gentry and harboured crypto-Catholics in government and at the royal court – all to the dismay of the church and Protestant public opinion.

Moreover, his maiden speech to the English parliament in 1604 caused religious alarm bells to ring in some circles, since his tones were conciliatory. His reference to being open to a ‘mid-way’ in the area of religion referred primarily to a conceivable rapprochement between (ancient, early church) Catholicism and soft Protestantism, a concord notion that already had a long, submerged pedigree in various countries going back to the 1530s,⁵ and so was not just an English or ‘Anglican’ invention: ‘I could wish from my heart, that it would please God to make me one of the members of such a generall Christian union in Religion, as [that] wee might meete in the midst, which is the Center and perfection of all things.’⁶ After all, not only had James a fair number of new subjects in England who were still Catholic, but also most of Ireland, whose monarch he now was as well, was firmly Catholic – even if he manifestly wished that it were otherwise. However, Catholic rumours, disinformation, optimism and expectations that James might ‘return’ to what he even called the ‘Mother Church’⁷ were unfounded. Aided by the apparent conversion of his wife, Anne, to Catholicism, such whispers derived mostly from his ambiguous overtures (or misrepresentations by his envoys) when courting papal consent for his claim to the English Crown, or when advocating religious peace talks.⁸ Anyway, subscribing to contemporary papalist or ultramontane Catholicism was never on James’s agenda, although at the back of his mind, accommodation to a reformed or new Rome was. This also was unsettling for advanced Protestants.



The obverse image: James post-1603

Apart from some notable exceptions, historiography and so the general portrayal of James relates predominantly to his reign after 1603, and so effectively as ‘King of England’. Much of this highlights his role as a peace seeker, the *Rex pacificus* [Peace-making King or ‘Prince of Peace’],⁹ preferring diplomacy to war,

and relatively tolerant and conciliatory in religion – while remaining resolutely committed to the substance of Reformed theology and to the Reformation settlements. In international relations, one of his first acts was to end the long Anglo-Spanish war in 1604, somewhat to the dismay of hard-line Protestant and patriotic opinion. Apart from the constraint of severe budget deficit in England due to Elizabethan war efforts against Spain and Gaelic Ulster, James was no warmonger, and certainly not in the name of religion. Like his mother at one stage, he did not (as mentioned above¹⁰) share the traditional and Augustinian view that religious conscience can be legitimately coerced, especially by physical persecution.¹¹ The popish scare of the ‘Gunpowder Plot’ of 1605 also failed to induce him to embark on anti-Catholic repression. He went no further than expelling Jesuits and other missionary priests from England, as well as the occasional execution of treasonous Catholics (about one per annum).

In the 1610s, one notable indicator of James’s inclusive instincts was his active participation in initiatives for more solidarity and concord among all churches of Reformation provenance. The basic idea had emanated from Germany and Poland (Sendomir Concordat) in the 1570s. It had resurfaced at the Huguenot National Synod of Gap (Provence) in 1603, and was subsequently advocated by French irenicists of humanist and Calvinist background like Isaac Casaubon,¹² and moderate Huguenot and church leaders like Philippe Duplessis-Mornay and Pierre du Moulin, all of whom had associations with James.¹³ They succeeded in enrolling him as the chief patron of a concrete plan for inter-church confessional union, envisaging a two-phase process. First: an agreed confession of faith involving all Reformed churches including the Church of England. Secondly: a mechanism by which Lutheran churches could associate with the agreement. The plan was adopted eventually by the French National Synod of Tonneins (Lower Aquitaine) in 1614.¹⁴ The synod consequently declared James to be ‘l’Étoile brillante dans le Ciel de l’Église de Dieu.’ However, the ‘Heroïque Dessein’ and ‘Sainte Oeuvre’ was to run into the sand. This was due ultimately to Lutheran scepticism, the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War in 1618, the orthodox Calvinist exclusivism of the 1618 Synod of Dort, at which

the Church of England also had delegates (bearing in mind that James too had published an anti-Arminian book), and then the resumption of religious persecution in France from 1620.

It was natural that general Protestant public opinion everywhere aspired to greater unity among Reformation churches, if only for stronger mutual defence against the Counter-Reformation. Yet with James's promotion in 1614 of the French scheme of pan-Protestant union, one should not overlook its small print, as it were. This was an item tagged on at the end of the project, as article 21. It represented the condition of James's engagement. For the proposed 'General Union of all Christians' included the hope of ultimate reconciliation with the Church of Rome.¹⁵ The synod endorsed this, if with hesitation. The idea may have been prudential on James's part. However tantalizing, it did reflect his preferred religious strategy – the reunion of all churches. In fact, tapping into the old conciliarist tradition that had a long history of support in pre-1560 Scotland, and echoing the religious policy of Emperor Constantine in antiquity, James floated in 1603 the idea of a general church council via a messenger to the Venetian Ambassador, and again in a communiqué to Pope Clement VIII.¹⁶ While the papacy soon dismissed such a prospect, permanent 'confessionalization' or immovable denominational fencing was not part of James's personal vision in view of such concord aspirations.

Whether James was intrinsically enigmatic, or just diplomatic, or genuinely irenical beyond pious aspiration depends to an extent on the stance of the observer. He had been baptized in Stirling according to the Catholic rite, but was brought up in the Reformed faith. His wife, Anne, was a Danish Lutheran who later developed Catholic tendencies with no marital consequences. He married his daughter, Elizabeth, to the Calvinist Elector Palatine in Heidelberg, Frederick V, leader of the Protestant Union in Germany and with which Britain was also to be in alliance from 1612, if only temporarily. And after an abortive attempt to marry his son Charles to the Spanish Infanta, he succeeded, equally controversially, in marrying him to Henriette Marie, the Catholic daughter of the late Henry IV of France. In thought and in action James seemed to send confusing messages. It was more than diplomatic pragmatism. For his ecumenism arguably fits into an elusive, almost underground, stream of religious concord thinking

going back to the 1530s and which transcended the dichotomies of Protestant and Catholic reform. It was often associated with those of a Christian humanist stamp who were uncomfortable with formalized and divisive dogmatic orthodoxies, especially not transparently biblical ones. Between 1530 and about 1615, confessional development did not completely eradicate such third-way thinking, generally repudiated on the grounds of ambiguity or of minimalism, so that it remained on the sidelines.¹⁷ Thereafter, as the seventeenth century evolved, comprehensive mutual rapprochement, sustainable ambivalence, or institutional reunion became virtually unimaginable.



The reverse image: James pre-1603

Others saw and had seen James quite differently. The source of this lies in the now somewhat eclipsed, pre-1603 picture of the king. It has been recently recalled that when as King of Scots only and closely monitored by the firmly Reformed Kirk, James's public image at home and abroad was anything but a magnanimous *Rex pacificus* prepared to meet Catholicism half way.¹⁸ Rather it was that of the lion rampant of Scotland, the Lion of Judah and Protestant crusader helping defend the European Israel of true believers against the axis of evil, namely the papacy and Islam (Ottoman Turks). James's own religious writings in 1588–89 at the height of the Spanish danger to the British Isles nourished the notion. These publications reflect an awareness of an imminent apocalyptic day of reckoning. One was a meditation on Revelation 20, and the other a meditation on I Chronicles 15 (focussing on King David).¹⁹ Both were reprinted at London in 1603. Of particular relevance is the first, *Ane Fruitfull Meditatioun* (1588), which was influenced (among other sources) by a book in James's library, Henry Bullinger's *100 Sermons on the Apocalypse* and declared Rome as the 'whore of Babylon' and so the Antichrist. James appeals to 'warriors in one camp and citizens in one beloved city' (Biv^v) to prepare for the final battle for Christian truth. In 1603 this sanguinary tract was translated into Latin (reprinted twice), French, and Dutch.²⁰ It thereby corroborated James's early profile in the Reformation world outside Scotland as a kind of Protestant champion, 'the chief defender of the truth' (as stated on the title page),

and the most godly monarch in Europe or (as claimed in a preface by his sub-editor, a church minister, Patrick Galloway) ‘the most Christian king above all kings in the earth.’ One of the preliminary guest Latin epigrams voices the opinion that ‘Soon may the Spanish squeal, the French wail, and any other enemy as well.’²¹

To go back even earlier, to 1581: in Scotland that year, a more explicitly anti-Catholic supplement to the Scots Confession of 1560 was promulgated in the king’s name and published initially as a broadsheet. Its own title was *Ane Shorte and Generall Confession*.²² It is usually called either the ‘King’s Confession’ (mostly in Protestant circles), or the ‘Negative Confession’ (mostly in both Catholic and secularist circles).²³ It arose out of anxieties over perceived Catholic subversion and infiltration in Scotland manipulated by foreign interests. There was also a belief that the Pope had granted closet or crypto-Catholics a dispensation to dissimulate, and thus conform externally to the Reformed Kirk as a temporary expedient. Furthermore, there was awareness that although the Scottish Reformation had been in place for twenty years, the ‘alteration of religion’ and evangelization were not wholly effective, as Catholicism was surviving at the popular level, among some of the gentry and aristocracy, and in nooks of the Scottish universities.

The catalyst for the crisis in 1581 was the influence in royal circles and government of a recent incomer, a French cousin of the king, Esmé Stuart (1542–83), seigneur d’Aubigny. The teenager James was so captivated by him that Esmé was promoted as Scotland’s only duke, the Duke of Lennox. And he was a Catholic. His eventual prudential conversion to Protestantism did not dispel suspicions that the charming and influential Frenchman was really an agent of the papacy, the Jesuits, the king’s exiled mother, and the French cousins (the influential Guise family), all scheming to turn the impressionable young James to Rome as part of an international Catholic plot to reverse the Reformation in Britain. The presence of some known crypto-Catholics in high circles of the Scottish court and administration did not help either.²⁴ Abroad, correspondence at the time between Geneva and Zurich shows Protestant concern about the activity of ‘d’Aubigny’ or ‘Albinus’.²⁵

Voices urged that the monarch and the government should clear the air by issuing a declaration reaffirming the Reformation faith and specifying in detail all rejected Catholic beliefs and practices – something generally absent in the Scots Confession of 1560. The task apparently fell to the Edinburgh minister and royal chaplain, John Craig, a former Dominican in Italy. It was promulgated in the king’s name in 1581, signed by him and thirty-eight others at Holyrood Palace in Edinburgh, including Esmé Stuart. It was formatted also as an oath (or covenant), swearing to take physical action to defend religious and political liberty from Rome and foreign powers. In a later generation and in mutated circumstance, this confession famously formed the first part of the Scottish National Covenant (1638).

The relatively short text (just over 1000 words) bears no resemblance to the conventional, confessional format of expository articles or heads. More of an anti-Catholic manifesto (in respect of beliefs and practices, that is), it is a single block of text, although various internal sections can be identified. Section 2 is the largest – a detailed catalogue of blacklisted Catholic doctrines and usages. There are about forty-two items, ranging from the Mass, the papacy and the cult of the Virgin Mary on the one hand, to the use of images, making the sign of the cross and church bells on the other – all features of Catholicism regarded as non-biblical or anti-biblical. The tone is certainly dismissive, uncompromising and pungent, but not especially abusive by sixteenth-century standards. There is one use of the word ‘papisty’, a couple of mentions of the ‘Roman Antichrist’, several occurrences of the verb ‘detest’, and a few applications of the adjectives ‘blasphemous’, ‘profane’, ‘superstitious’, and ‘devilish’. Coming from a ‘monarch’, however, some could see it as indecently inflammatory. Yet while obviously the text-lengths are not comparable, the confession does not approach the almost 300 occurrences of ‘anathema’ and twenty-four references to ‘the heretics’ in the decrees of the Council of Trent. Still, it is an Identikit of robustly Protestant piety and culture. Since universal subscription to it was foreseen, it was designed to purge the nation of all traces of residual Catholicism and ‘false religion’, as well as to provide a prophylactic against relapse. Yet, while the subsequent General Assembly at Glasgow

in 1581 acknowledged the confession ‘to be ane true and Christian Confession’ and urged that it be acted upon, its part in that Assembly was minor with no trumpeting of it.²⁶

Before 1603, the confession was published five times in Scotland, but seven times in England and there mostly along with “Craig’s Catechism” that had appeared originally in 1581 as well. A Scottish reprint of the confession only and as a broadside (a medium signalling urgency) was published at Edinburgh in 1596.²⁷ This was symptomatic of firstly, a reaction to James’s upping of the ante that year with his episcopal policy for the Kirk; secondly, his promotion of more Catholics to high positions in the Scottish administration;²⁸ and thirdly, the threat of a second Spanish Armada in that year. Although there was nothing remotely ‘presbyterian’ about the Negative Confession, some presbyterian advocates had often interpreted the confession’s denunciation of the papal ‘wicked hierarchy’ as a repudiation of any form of episcopacy, seen as a gateway to papistry. This tied in with the general ‘popish scare’ in that year.



Reception of the Confession outside Scotland and abroad

1. The intermittent republication of the King’s Confession in England as well meant that it was kept in public and royal awareness. A likely motive behind the regular English editions was to highlight the authentic Protestant credentials of the Scottish king as anticipated inheritor of the English Crown. For majority English public opinion and its religio-political parameters, a soundly Protestant monarch was a *sine qua non* if the kingdom was to retain its independence from, for example, Spanish dominance, and if its state church was to maintain its freedom from papal subjection. Indeed, in 1603, when James was crowned King of England, the confession was again published as a broadside with its original title in London to reconfirm this, as it were.²⁹ The precise circumstances of this manoeuvre and who was behind it are still obscure (to me). One can surmise that it was intended as a ‘statement’, conceivably encouraged by militant Protestants to invoke James’s pre-1603 religious past and thereby dispel Catholic rumours at home and abroad of a Romeward trend in the king. Or maybe it was floated by uncompromising puritans in view of his planned meeting

with Church of England clergy at Hampton Court in order to recall ‘the King’s’ earlier official rejection of all Catholic usages and practices. At all events, however, this London 1603 re-edition was important. For it caused an immediate impact and stir on the Continent, due to the quick appearance of several foreign language editions. These were in sharply Protestant milieus. However, even before them there were a couple of translations of note.

2. The first was a private French translation dated just over two months after the confession’s original appearance.³⁰ The manuscript is in Paris.³¹ Where it was done, who did it, whom it was intended for and so on is still a matter of speculation. It was among the papers deposited in Paris of the French ambassador to England at the time, Michel de Castelnau-Mauvissière. It is possible that the translation came to him in London via the French Strangers’ Church in the city, and with which the Kirk’s General Assembly had been in touch at the time over the matter of hiring a French pastor to give religious instruction to Esmé Stuart after his ‘conversion’. The text was published in a nineteenth-century documents collection, but with little comment.³² At any rate, in 1581 it presumably conveyed to the French authorities the apparent religious temper of the Scottish monarch and his regime.

3. The first published translation (1601) was in Latin and emanated from Catholic circles for the sake of refutation.³³ It was by William Chisholm III (c. 1547–1629), a Scottish non-conforming Catholic bishop of Dunblane and doctor of theology (Rome) now exiled in the south of France as bishop of Vaison.³⁴ Accompanied with an extensive refutation of the 1581 confession, amounting to over 300 pages, the work was dedicated pointedly to James VI. Chisholm presents the vernacular text of the confession along with an accurate Latin translation. Ironically, his personal relations with James were amicable, and in 1599 the king even had a reference sent to Rome in support of a move for Chisholm’s (abortive) promotion in the hierarchy as cardinal.³⁵ Coming at a time when James’s religious views were a matter of discussion, and when Catholics entertained hopes of his conversion, the intention of Chisholm’s book was to exploit the fact that the 1581 confession was not so much the work of the adolescent

James as of Scottish ‘Calvinian’ churchmen. More substantively, Chisholm’s opus has the polemical form of a line-by-line refutation of what ‘the Scottish minister’ (= John Craig) says by ‘the Catholic doctor’. The latter marshals an extensive array of patristic witnesses intended to refute Craig’s argument (in the editions published by him with his Catechism) that the confession’s stance was compatible with patristic testimony: Scripture is the sole norm of doctrine and practice, thereby invalidating all ‘human’ and so specifically Roman Catholic Tradition and traditions.

This was an old debate, but the understandable aim of Chisholm was to persuade James and his advisers of Catholic truth. He was most likely aware that the king was open to the less controversial, early Catholicism of the patristic era in the interest of concord; also that he was uncomfortable with the Negative Confession – as he was later supposed to have remarked at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604.³⁶ Chisholm, like others, was to underestimate James’s commitment to essential Reformation theology. For the moment, however, his Latin version of the contentious Negative Confession actually gave it wider Continental publicity among the learned classes, especially in France under the toleration Edict of Nantes (1598).

4. The speedy, subsequent export of the King’s Confession as a signal confession to the Continent can be gauged with the new translations by anxious but determined Protestant interests. In 1603, a new French translation was published in France, and in two versions. This was not from Chisholm’s bilingual text of 1601, but from the broadsheet published in London in 1603. The two printings (almost certainly by the same publisher) have different titles and other minor variations. The title of one version is: *Confession generale de la vraye Foy & Religion Chrestienne selon la parole de Dieu & les actes de nostre Parlement, signée par le Roy & ceux de son Conseil & Maison, & plusieurs autres, à la gloire de Dieu & edification de tous. Imprimée nouvellement à Londres par commandement du Roy le premier de Iuin.*³⁷ 1603. [s.l., s.n.].³⁸ The other version with a considerably variant title cites a publisher and place of publication: *Confession générale de la vraye foy et religion chrestienne selon la Parole de Dieu. Receve[e] et ratiffee par les Actes de Parlement du Royaume*

*d'Angleterre, iuree solennellement par le Roy, ceux de son Conseil & Maison, & plusieurs autres, à la gloire de Dieu & edification de tous. Traducte de l'Anglois, iouxte la copie imprimée à Londres. Imprimée à la Rochelle, pour Daniel Vignier Libraire. MDCIII.*³⁹

Being essentially the same text, this is an especially interesting translation, since the anonymous translator, editor, or publisher took liberties with it to deceive, and so manipulate it in the interest of pious misrepresentation. In the first version, the title is framed, albeit clumsily, to make it appear that the recent 1603 London edition of the confession was published by 'royal command' (*par commandement du Roy*), which it was not. Secondly: deleted from the original title has been every indication of the original context that appears in all English versions including that of 1603, namely 'Edinburgh', the year '1580' and the reference to 'the 14th year of His Majesty's reign' [in Scotland]. These original identity marks are also absent in the second version. Also in the latter, instead of the original's 'according to God's Word and acts of our [Scottish] Parliament' there is substituted 'Receve[e] et ratiffee par les Actes de Parlement du Royaume d'Angleterre'. This is sheer fiction, as the English parliament certainly did not legislate in this sense. In the body of the text, the two mentions of the 'Church of Scotland' are missing. One is simply deleted, and the other replaced by 'les Eglises qui sont sous nostre protection' – but this adjustment was already made in the 1603 London version. Both French versions, especially the second, give the impression that the aggressively Protestant Scottish confession of 1581 was a recent production of the new English king and parliament. This can surely only have been counter propaganda against general Catholic whispering that James was about to convert to Catholicism.

The apparent 'La Rochelle' source stated in the second version is not surprising. The town was a bastion of French Protestantism and a centre of associated publishing houses closely linked to England, Scotland, and The Netherlands.⁴⁰ Close marine relations with Protestant England helped protect the town's Reformation. Also, a La Rochelle publisher of the Confession seems very plausible, since there was a 'Vignier' family of printers in the town at the time, even if 'Nicolas' rather than 'Daniel' Vignier.⁴¹ However, possibly even more intriguing is that there were some Scots in the region who

served as ministers or as teachers in the Reformed College there (as well as at the Saumur Academy). Notable among the former was the strict Calvinist and zealously presbyterian exile, George Thomson, preacher, controversialist, and translator of English language works into French for La Rochelle publishers and others elsewhere.⁴² Like Nicolas Vignier, he also wrote against the papacy in apocalyptic terms. Did he by any chance translate the King's Confession, and if so, was he a party to the dissimulation? It is also surely no coincidence that a French translation of James apocalyptic anti-papacy tract of 1588 also appeared in 1603 at La Rochelle.

Soon, in the same year and again in 1604 the misleading claim made by the French edition of the confession was exposed from the Catholic side. This was by a Paris Dominican, Nicolas Coeffeteau (1574–1623), who with the specific imprimatur of the Sorbonne published a French translation of the William Chisholm's entire Latin confutation.⁴³ Coeffeteau announces the ruse on the first page of his book:

Some time ago [1581] Scottish ministers published a confession of faith – or rather, a statement against the faith, which is the same as that mischievously published by the French Huguenots in the name of the King of England.⁴⁴

Accordingly, the French text of the confession that he includes is not a translation of Chisholm's English original or Latin, but the first of the two French 1603 editions. And of course like Chisholm, he stresses that the king was not at all the original author. Republishing the French text of the confession in this way must also have reached a wider readership.

It is uncertain if James knew about these developments, but it is likely. For in 1603, Henri IV conveyed to the French ambassador in London, Christophe de Harlay, his protest about the dissemination in France of a 'confession of faith' by 'the king' that was 'full of nasty language against the Pope and the Mass' (*pleine de mots injurieux contre le pape et la messe*), and that this had inflamed French Catholic views of the new King of England.⁴⁵ If James was embarrassed, one can surmise that he, or others on his behalf, soon intervened and

communicated a different picture of his current stance on religion to counteract the disinformation. For in 1604, William Barlow's account of the Hampton Court Conference and its conclusions,⁴⁶ at which James mediated between progressive Protestant and conservative reform-Catholic points on the spectrum, was published at London in French translation by the royal printer, Robert Barker.⁴⁷ This edition has been rarely noticed in the literature, but it is surely a form of riposte aiming to set the record straight and to salvage James's reputation in Catholic France. The publication's veracity and authenticity are further emphasized on the title page with: '*Publiez par l'autorité du Roy d'Angleterre et d'Escosse [...] sous la grand sceau d'Angleterre*', so that the message is clear.

5. The next translation was into Dutch, published in 1603 and appended boldly to the Dutch version of James's famous book on good kingship, *Basilicon Doron*. The translator of the confession was Vincent Meusevoet (c. 1560–1624),⁴⁸ a Fleming and now a Reformed minister in North Holland. He had had grown up in Norwich as part of the community of religious refugees from the Netherlands there. A truly exilic Calvinist, he was a prolific translator of English theological writings including earlier works by James, working closely with the like-minded Amsterdam publishers, Claeszsoon and Jakobszoon. The title page of the appendix has a Dutch short title, translated as: "A Short Confession of Faith Subscribed by the Royal Majesty and His Household, etc."⁴⁹

There has been some indication that the confession was already translated into Dutch in 1581⁵⁰ (although it is not clear if it was actually been published at that time). Anyway, Meusevoet's 1603 edition is indisputably based on the London broadside of 1603, since on the inside page it provides an honest, literal Dutch translation of the latter's title. The references in it to '*Edinburgh*', '*1580*', etc. are retained, and (decisively) the error in that source-text to '*June*' instead of January is replicated.⁵¹ This is in contrast to the French versions, which used the same original but edited the titles to make the text look more recent. There is, therefore, no attempt by Meusevoet to commit a pious deceit. As in the French version and in the German version (as we shall see below) the original confession's two references to the

‘Church of Scotland’ are also changed to read: ‘The Churches now under his authority’ (embracing the ‘Church of England’). However, that change was already in the London 1603 text.

The Negative Confession had obvious resonance in the Netherlands, now in the throes of the ‘Dutch Revolt’ and freedom struggle against the Catholic Spanish rulers. Support from Protestant Scotland and England was eagerly sought, and in 1581 William of Orange had contacted James after the declaration of independence that year. For the ‘Calvinist’ Dutch resistance, the Scottish confession’s appeal to both religious and national liberty was an added inspiration.⁵² Furthermore, the confession’s statement towards the end that subscribers to it would defend the godly prince ‘with our possessions, bodies, and lives in the defence of Christ’s Gospel’ helped encourage and legitimize the spirit of rebellion and its long armed struggle. And again, it is no accident that in 1603 a Dutch translation, also by Meusevoet, of James’s 1588 warlike anti-Catholic tract was also published.⁵³

6. The last translation was a German one, the work of the Zurich linguist and theologian, Caspar Waser (1565–1625), and published apparently in 1603. Its title, here translated, was:

*General Confession of the True Faith and the Christian Religion According to the Sole Word of God’s Holy Prophets and Apostolic Scripture, as it was Accepted and Ratified by Acts of Parliament of the English Crown after it had been Publicly Avowed by His Royal Majesty, James the First by Name, as well as by his Council, Household and Many Others: Most Faithfully Translated into German from the Copy in English Printed at London, in the Year 1603.*⁵⁴

Waser was a typical, cosmopolitan scholar and churchman who had studied in Zurich, Altdorf (near Nuremberg), Heidelberg, Geneva, and Basel. As travel companion and tutor to a young Swiss aristocrat, he then toured the British Isles, including St Andrews, and even got a distant view of James VI in Edinburgh.⁵⁵ I was originally led to his connection with the 1581 confession by allusions to a German translation of it in James Cameron’s landmark edition of the letters

of two Scottish theologians at the time, John Johnston and Robert Howie.⁵⁶ Zurich was alert to political and Counter-Reformation dangers to Swiss Protestantism, and is likely to have shared the Protestant anxiety about James's religious profile as new King of England in view of ominous Catholic telegraphing on the matter.⁵⁷ Understandably, English versions of the King's Confession do not seem to have been known in Switzerland. However, a merchant in Lyon named Pestalozzi (probably Swiss) sent a copy of the La Rochelle French edition to a Zurich councillor, Gabriel Kippenhan. The outcome was that activist elements in the elite guild or lodge of Zurich patricians, *Die Gesellschaft der Schildner zum Schneggen* [Society of the Shield Bearers at the Snail], pressed Waser to provide a German translation for publication, done apparently in August 1603.

Many months later, he contacted a Scottish student friend he had had in Heidelberg, John Johnston (c. 1565–1611), now professor of divinity at St Andrews. In Spring 1604 he sent Johnston a copy of the German translation for an opinion. Waser also asked for an 'authentic' copy of the original, and inquired if the king had reaffirmed the confession in London in 1603. Johnston replied in July 1604 that he did not know if the king had reaffirmed the confession, but he was aware that it had been recently reissued in London. He praised the overall German translation, and said he would do a Latin translation of the confession to help authenticate its accuracy. He would send this Latin version and a copy of the 1581 original 'free of interpolations' via a friend in London, who would forward them along with the London 1603 printing.⁵⁸ It is not known if these texts were delivered, as in February of the following year (1605), Johnston wrote to Waser wondering about the latter's silence on the matter and outlines what he had undertaken earlier.

If the texts were delivered, Waser might well have been a bit embarrassed. For the German text that he had published was a translation of the French La Rochelle version, that is, not 'free of interpolations', more especially the title (which also copies the '1603' date in the French titles – see n. 37 below). The common ultimate English source, the London 1603 edition, is reflected in the German text's changes from 'Church of Scotland' to 'Churches now under his authority', as in all three translations. Waser was perhaps precipitous,

and even if he did not receive Johnston's texts, it may have been subsequently pointed out to him at a later stage that neither the new King of England nor his parliament had revalidated the confession in the way the German title also claims (hence his requests to Johnston for information on this and an 'authentic' copy).⁵⁹ In addition, the title gave the misleading impression that the German version was '*most faithfully translated from the English from the copy printed at London, 1603*' – that essentially replicates what is already in the otherwise phoney title of the La Rochelle French version.⁶⁰

Moreover, since a Zurich bookseller had provocatively sold the German version of the confession at Zurzach in the Catholic canton of Aargau, this incident gave other Catholic cantons like Lucerne and Zug the pretext to intensify bellicosity towards Zurich. Waser gives an account of the entire episode in an unpublished memorandum.⁶¹ To that extent, therefore, the German translation of the confession exacerbated confrontations and fomented troubles in the Swiss religious geography, even if seen by some as a welcome injection to stiffen Protestant resolve.



Conclusion

When James became King of England in 1603, his religious attitudes came immediately on to the wider European agenda and activated various networks. The battle for his soul and that of Britain, as it were, was intensified. Roman Catholic interests projected him as almost one of theirs and as someone who earlier had been imposed upon by Scottish Calvinists (thus William Chisholm and others); hard-line Protestant interests at home and abroad profiled him as a combative defender of the Reformation faith by appealing to the 1581 Scottish confession in his name as well as his anti-papal apocalyptic tract of 1588. However, James's own position had in the meantime evolved towards the elusive centre ground due to his irenic interests and vision of general Christian reunion based on a mediating synthesis of Reformation basics and the early Catholicism of the patristic era. In 1603–04, the enhanced dissemination and startling international migration and translation of the Negative or King's Confession of 1581 helped crystallize the debate Europe-wide. Yet while reissues

of the confession had helped to satisfy the general English need to have a monarch committed to the Reformation settlement, the more specific message that avant-garde English and avant-garde Continental Protestantism thereby perceived about James's religious predisposition was out of date. For, although remaining essentially Calvinist in theology, he had had outgrown his image as pugnaciously anti-Catholic and as a potential Protestant crusader and liberator from tyranny. The picture was soon rectified by James after 1603, engendering a degree of cognitive dissonance among those who fancied him as the deposer of the Antichrist or as a military ally in armed struggles against Catholic powers.

Lastly, the retrieval of what until then was still a relatively obscure and ephemeral Scottish theological statement and its insertion into the wider European religious rapids in the early seventeenth century was a novelty. For the relationship between the Reformations in Scotland (and Britain) and the Continent is normally understood as one-way only. In this instance, however, the provocative shots across the religious bows of Western Europe derived from Edinburgh. And the reality was that as the seventeenth century progressed, they and not James's peaceable approach were more significant as signs of the times.

Notes

- ¹ For some public discussion on the matter at the time, see Rebecca J. Emmett, "Anglo-Scottish Succession Tracts During the Late Elizabethan Period, 1595–1603" (unprinted MPhil thesis, University of Birmingham, 2010), online at: http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/1392/1/Emmett_11_MPhil.pdf (accessed 13 December 2011).
- ² Cf. Jane Rickard, *Authorship and Authority: The Writings of James VI and I* (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2007), chapter: "The Word of God and the Word of the King: The Early Scriptural Exegeses", 69–95; Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, eds., *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI*

- and I* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), Section III: “Writing and Religion”, 371–512; Andreas Pečar, “Der König – Theologe und Prophet? Biblizistische Selbstdarstellung Jakobs VI./I. im Spiegel seiner Schriften”, *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 35 (2008): 207–34; idem, *Macht der Schrift: politischer Biblizismus in Schottland und England zwischen Reformation und Bürgerkrieg (1534–1642)* (Publications of the German Historical Institute London, 69; Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 2011); Astrid Stilma, “King James VI and I as a religious writer”, in *Literature and the Scottish Reformation* (ed. Crawford Gribben and David G. Mullan; Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 127–41.
- ³ In 1603, the Venetian Secretary in England, G. C. Scaramelli, affirmed that there were ‘expectations reposed in the King, which had already reached the ears of various Princes, that his Majesty sooner or later would restore the Kingdom of England to the Roman cult’. See *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, vol. 10: 1603–1607* (ed. H. F. Brown; London: Longmans, 1900), 22.
- ⁴ In a letter of March 1603 to the English Secretary of State, Robert Cecil. See G. P. V. Akrigg, ed., *Letters of James VI and I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 204 f.
- ⁵ For some studies and literature on this topic, see for example, James Cameron, “The Cologne Reform and the Church of Scotland”, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 30 (1979): 39–64; Thierry Wanegffelen, *Ni Rome ni Genève: des fidèles entre deux chaires en France au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: H. Champion, 1997); Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000); Nicholas Thompson, “The Long Reach of Reformation Irenicism: The *Considerationes Modestae et Pacificae* of William Forbes (1585–1634)”, in *Reforming the Reformation: Essays in Honour of Principal Peter Matheson* (ed. Ian Breward; Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2004), 125–47; idem, “Three Versions of *Syllabus aliquot synodorum et colloquiorum*: An Early Modern Reading List of Irenical Literature”, *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 9 (2007): 303–40; idem, “Martin Bucer and Early Seventeenth-Century Scottish

- Irenicism”, in *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain* (ed. Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson; *Proceedings of the British Academy* 164; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 167–91.
- ⁶ “Speech to the Parliament, March 1603 [NS 1604]”, in *King James VI and I: Selected Writings* (ed. Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards and Joseph Marshall; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 301.
- ⁷ Akrigg, *Letters of James VI and I*, 205.
- ⁸ See Arnold O. Meyer, “Clemens VIII. und Jakob I. von England”, *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* VII (1904): 268–308; James Mackie, “The Secret Diplomacy of James VI in Italy Prior to his Accession to the English Throne”, *Scottish Historical Review* 21 (1924): 271–77; Albert J. Loomie, S.J., “King James I’s Catholic Consort”, *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 34 (1971): 303–16; W. Brown Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 50–75.
- ⁹ Cf. Malcolm Smuts, “The Making of *Rex Pacificus*: James VI and I and the Problem of Peace in an Age of Religious War”, in Fischlin and Fortier, *Royal Subjects*, 371–87. However, James’s policy of international peace long pre-dated his accession to the English throne, going back to 1590; see Patterson, *King James and the Reunion of Christendom*, 29.
- ¹⁰ See n. 4.
- ¹¹ Cf. Ian Hazlett, “Prophecy and Politics: The Exchanges Between John Knox and Mary, Queen of Scots, on Religious Freedom of Conscience”, in *Histoire et Herméneutique: Mélanges offerts à Gottfried Hammann* (ed. Martin Rose; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2002), 184–96.
- ¹² From 1610 he was domiciled in England as an intellectual and theological confidant of James.
- ¹³ See W. Brown Patterson, “James I and the Huguenot Synod of Tonneins of 1614”, *Harvard Theological Review* 65 (1972): 241–70; idem, *James and the Reunion of Christendom*, 155–95; Brian G. Armstrong, “Pierre du Moulin and James I: The Anglo-French Programme”, in *De l’humanisme aux lumières: Bayle et le protestantisme* (ed. Michelle Magdelaine, Maria Cristinà

- Pitassi, Ruth Whelan and Anthony McKenna; Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1996), 17–29. Duplessis-Mornay had a long history of engagement for a French national church council to resolve religious differences; see Nicolas Fornerod, “Duplessis-Mornay et l’idée de concile”, in *Servir Dieu, le roi et l’état: Philippe Duplessis-Mornay (1549–1623)* (ed. H. Daussy and V. Ferrer; *Albineana* 18; Geneva: Droz; Paris: H. Champion, 2006), 357–80.
- ¹⁴ See *Tous les Synodes Nationaux des Églises Réformées de France* (ed. Jean Aymon; La Haye, 1710), vol. 2, 57–62, 64; *Actes authentiques des églises réformées [...] touchant la paix et charité fraternelle* (ed. David Blondel; Amsterdam: J. Blaeu, 1655), 72–76; *Synodicon in Gallia reformata: or, the Acts, Decisions, Decrees, and Canons of Those Famous National Councils of the Reformed Churches in France* (ed. John Quick; London, 1692), vol. 1, 434–37. Cf. Mark Greengrass, “Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, Jacques VI et Ier, et la réunion du Christianisme, 1603–1619”, *Albineana* 18 (see previous note), 423–61.
- ¹⁵ Quick, *Synodicon*, vol. 1, 437; Aymon, *Tous les Synodes*, vol. 2, 62.
- ¹⁶ See Patterson, *James and the Reunion of Christendom*, 40 f., 54 f.; idem, “James I’s Call for an Ecumenical Council”, in *Councils and Assemblies* (ed. G. J. Cuming and Derek Baker; *Studies in Church History* 7; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 267–76.
- ¹⁷ Cf. to n. 5 above. See also Andreas Pietsch and Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, *Konfessionelle Ambiguität: Uneindeutigkeit und Verstellung als religiöse Praxis in der Frühen Neuzeit (Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 2012)*, forthcoming.
- ¹⁸ See Astrid J. Stilma, “‘As Warriouris in Ane Camp’: The Image of King James VI as a Protestant Crusader”, in *The Apparrelling of Truth: Literature and Literary Culture in the Reign of James VI. A Festschrift for Roderick Lyall* (ed. Kevin J. McGinley and Nicola Royan; Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), 241–51; Smuts, “The Making of *Rex Pacificus*”, 373 f.
- ¹⁹ Cf. *James and the Reunion of Christendom*, 17.
- ²⁰ See Stilma, “King James as a Religious Writer”, 135.

- ²¹ ‘Iam fremat Hispanus, Gallus gemat, hostis et omnis.’
- ²² Cf. STC (2nd edn), 22019.5. Accessible in *Early English Books Online*.
- ²³ Text-critical edition (in English) by Ian Hazlett in *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften, vol. 3/1: 1570–1595* (gen. eds. Andreas Mühling and Peter Opitz; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2012), 185–228. For an earlier text presentation, see G. D. Henderson, *Scots Confession 1560 (Confessio Scoticana) and Negative Confession, 1581 (Confessio Negativa)* (Edinburgh: Church of Scotland Publications Committee, 1937), 101–11 (Scoto-English and Latin). For the sole modernized English version see Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie Hotchkiss, eds., *Creeds and Confessions in the Christian Tradition, vol. 2, Part Four: Creeds and Confessions of the Reformation Era* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), 542–44.
- ²⁴ Cf. Patterson, *James and the Reunion of Christendom*, 19 f.; Gordon Donaldson, *Scotland: James V to James VII (Edinburgh History of Scotland)*; Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1971), 189.
- ²⁵ See Théodore de Bèze, *Correspondance* (Geneva: Droz, 1960–), vol. XXI, 172, 229; vol. XXII, 12, 18, 96, 118, 176.
- ²⁶ *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland, Part II: 1578–1592* (ed. Thomas Thomson; Edinburgh: The Bannatyne Club, 1840), 512.
- ²⁷ *A Schort and general Confessioun [...]* The publisher was Henry Charteris. Cf. STC (2nd edn), 22024. See also *Early English Books Online*.
- ²⁸ For background on this see Maurice Lee, “James VI and the Revival of Episcopacy in Scotland: 1596–1600”, *Church History* 43 (1974): 50–64.
- ²⁹ *A short and generall confession of the true Christian faith and religion, according to Gods word, and acts of our Parliament: subscribed by the Kings Majestie and his houshold, with sundrie others, to the glorie of God, and good example of all men. At Edenburgh the twentieth of Iune [sic!], 1580. And in the 14. yeere of his Majesties raigne* (London: [T. East] for Thomas Man, 1603). STC (2nd edn) 22024.3 / ESTC S95138. A reported copy at Hereford Cathedral Library cannot currently be traced; the only

other extant copy is in the Pierpoint Morgan Library, New York, call no.: Broadside box 17c 013068. This edition was reissued without date, but apparently around 1615. See STC (2nd edn), 22024.7 / ESTC S123719. James's broad ecumenical stance in connection with the 1614 French Synod of Tonneins (see above, p. 39) may have been a factor engendering protest.

³⁰ “Une briesve et générale confession de la vraie foy et religion chrestienne [...] faicte à Édimbourg le 20e janvier 1581 [...] traduit d’escossois en françois le dernier de mars”.

³¹ Bibliothèque nationale, Dupuy Collection, vol. 844, f. 342.

³² Alexandre Teulet, ed., *Papiers d'état, pièces et documents inédits ou peu connus relatifs à l'histoire de l'Ecosse au XVIe siècle tirés des bibliothèques et des archives de France [...] tome second* (Paris: The Bannatyne Club, [c. 1852]), 436–40.

³³ *Examen confessionis fidei Calvinianae quam Scotis omnibus ministri Calviniani subscribendam et iurandam proponunt. An rectius, propter innumeras vera[e] fidei detestationes Catholicæ fidei conf[ess]ionem vocemus* (Avignon: J. Bramereau, 1601). I have used one of the two copies in Glasgow University Library, and it is accessible on *Early English Books Online*.

³⁴ On him, see James Hogg, entry: “Chisholm, William”, in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 31 (2010), cols. 261–64; Mark Dilworth, entry: “Chisholm, William”, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online edn; Oxford, 2004–).

³⁵ See Patterson, *James and the Reunion of Christendom*, 87.

³⁶ James was reported by an anti-puritan clergyman, Barlow, as having disparaged the author of the 1581 Scottish confession in his name, John Craig: the expression of religious belief should abandon the vocabulary of negativity, ‘abhorrence’, ‘denunciation’, and ‘detestation’. See William Barlow, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference [...] at Hampton Court. January 14. 1603* [NS: 1604] (London: J. Windet, 1604), 39.

³⁷ In the 1603 London broadsheet, ‘June’ is an error for ‘January’ and is evidence that the French translator used that London edition; see n. 28 above. ‘*du Roy le premier de juin 1603*’ cannot mean ‘of the

- king on the first of June, 1603’, rather ‘of King [James] the First. June, 1603.’ The German edition (see below) adjusts this a bit.
- ³⁸ STC (2nd edn): 22030.7. Copies extant are in the National Library of Scotland, the London Library, Paris: Sorbonne-BIU, and Paris: Bibliothèque de la Société de l’Histoire du Protestantisme français. It is available on *Early English Books Online*.
- ³⁹ Extant is the unique copy in the Bibliothèque municipale, Auxerre, a copy of which was kindly sent to me by its curator, Carine Bardeaux. I have published this particular text with a few notes as an appendix to the edition of the King’s Confession in *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften*, vol. 3/1 (see n. 23 above), 225–28.
- ⁴⁰ Cf. Kevin C. Robbins, *City on the Ocean Sea: La Rochelle, 1530–1650: Urban Society, Religion, and Politics on the French Atlantic Frontier* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 108. See also pp. 173–82 there.
- ⁴¹ Cf. Louis Desgraves, *L’Imprimerie à La Rochelle, vol. 2: Les Haultin 1571–1623* (Geneva: Droz, 1960), 126, 129, 139. There was also a ‘Nicolas Vignier’ at the time who was minister of Blois, a leading figure in the French synods, author and polemicist – especially against the papacy. See Eugène and Emile Haag, *La France Protestante* (Joël Cherbuliez: Paris, 1859), vol. 9, 494–96.
- ⁴² Cf. Haag, *La France Protestante*, entry: “Thomson, George”, vol. 9, 381 f.; Quick, *Synodicon*, vol. 1, 253, 381, 424; Francisque-Xavier Michel, *Les Écossais en France / Les Français en Écosse*, vol. 1 (London: Trübner & Co., 1862), 183 f.; Etienne Trocmé, “L’Église Réformée de La Rochelle jusqu’en 1628”, *Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 98 (1952): 162 and n. 194; Desgraves, *L’Imprimerie*, entry: “George Thomson” in Index; idem, “Thomas Portau, imprimeur à Saumur (1601–1623)”, *Bibliothèque de l’école des chartes* 126 (1968): 69; Robbins, *City on the Ocean Sea*, 131 f., 182.
- ⁴³ William Cheisholme, *Examen d’une Confession de Foy: Publiée n’aguères en France sous le nom du Roy d’Angleterre, & de son Parlement. Fait [...] en français [...] par F. N. Coeffeteau, Professeur en Theologie, Prieur du Convent des Freres Prescheurs* (Paris: I. Gesselin, 1603). It was dedicated to the Duke of Guise, a cousin of James. Copies of this in Scotland are at the National

Library and Innerpeffray Library, Perthshire. A few years later, Coeffeteau was engaged in direct polemical controversy with James.

- ⁴⁴ ‘Il y a quelque temps que les ministres d’Escosse mirent en lumière une confession de foy: ains plutost une declaration contre la foy, qui est celle là mesme que les huguenots de France riches en artifices ont publiée sous le nom du Roy d’Angleterre.’
- ⁴⁵ Cf. Smuts, “The Making of *Rex Pacificus*”, 374. Henri’s letter is in the British Library, King’s MSS. 124, ff. 40v–41.
- ⁴⁶ See n. 36 above.
- ⁴⁷ *La Conference tenuë à Hamptoncour entre les Evesques Anglois & les Puritains [...] en la presence du Roy [...]*. STC (2nd edn): 1459.5. See *Early English Books Online*. It was republished in 1605 in both Rouen (J. Osmont) and Paris (J. Richer). Significantly, a Dutch version appeared at Leiden in 1612 (Govert Basson).
- ⁴⁸ Cf. *Biografisch Lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme* (ed. D. Nauta et al.; Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1978–), vol. 1, 179 f.; Willem Frijhoff, *Fulfilling God’s Mission: The Two Worlds of Dominie Everardus Bogardus, 1607–1647* (trans. Myra H. Scholz; *The Atlantic World* 14; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 84–92.
- ⁴⁹ *Eene corte Belijdenisse des Gheloofs, onderschreven bij de Conincklijke Majesteyt ende zijn huysghesin, etc.* In *Basilicon Doron* (Amsterdam: C. Claesz. and L. Jacobsz [1603]), Kiv^r.
- ⁵⁰ See reference to this at: <http://www.let.uu.nl/ogc/William/stilma.htm> (accessed 29 November 2011). Any bibliographical details of a printing are not yet to hand.
- ⁵¹ See n. 29 above.
- ⁵² Cf. Astrid J. Stilma, “Justifying War: Dutch Translations of Scottish Books Around 1600”, in *Mighty Europe 1400–1700: Writing an Early Modern Continent* (ed. Andrew Hiscock; Berne: Peter Lang, 2007), 67.
- ⁵³ Cf. Stilma, “King James as a Religious Writer”, 135.
- ⁵⁴ *Gemeine Bekannntnuß deß wahren Glaubens vnd der Christlichen Religion nach dem einigen wort Gottes Heyliger Prophetischer vnd Apostolischer Schriff: Wie die durch die Acten deß Parlaments der Kron Engelland angenommen und ratificiert folgens durch*

jhr Königl. May. IACOBVM diß nammens den I. sowol auch durch sein Raht vnd Hauß vnd vil ander öffentlich ist geschworen worden: Auß dem Engelländischen zu Londen getruckten Exemplar auffß treuwlichste verteütchet. Anno M.DC III. [Zurich: Johannes Wolf, 1603?]. See VD17 12:124142E. Known of so far are two copies in the Zurich Zentralbibliothek, one in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (Munich), one in the Herzog-August-Bibliothek (Wolfenbüttel), and one in Staats- und Staatbibliothek, Augsburg. The full text is not yet available in the *e-rara.ch* project digitizing Swiss prints of that era, as work on seventeenth century editions will not commence until 2012. I have used one of the two Zurich copies, Signature 17.168/1.

- ⁵⁵ See the text-critical edition by James K. Cameron of “The British Itinerary of Johann Peter Hainzel von Degerstein by Caspar Waser”, *Zwingliana* 15.3–4 (1980/81): 259–95. This contains the only sketch in English of Waser’s career (261 f.). Cf. the entries: “Waser, Kaspar” in *Historisch-Biographisches Lexikon der Schweiz* (Neuenburg: Administration d. hist.-biogr.Lexikons d. Schweiz, 1921–34), vol. 7, and *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 41 (1896): 227 f.
- ⁵⁶ James K. Cameron, ed., *Letters of John Johnston, c. 1565–1611 and Robert Howie, c. 1565–c. 1645* (St Andrews University Publications, LIV; Edinburgh; London: published for the University Court of the University of St Andrews by Oliver & Boyd, 1963), 191, n. 3. Cameron refers to the only other known allusion to the translation in the literature, namely a short memorial biography of Waser by Jodocus [Jody] von Kuosen, *De vita et obitu [...] Casperi Waseri [...] Oratio historica* (Basel: J. Schraeter, 1626). This was published the year after Waser’s death. In the bibliography of Waser’s works in this, listed (p. 17) among the ‘theological writings’ is *Confessionem fidei Jacobi I. Regis Magnae Britanniae, ex Anglico in Germanicum sermonem translatum*. See also Cameron, “The British Itinerary”, 271, n. 90.
- ⁵⁷ Cf. Cameron, *Letters*, 192.
- ⁵⁸ See Cameron, *Letters*, nos. L and LIII.

- ⁵⁹ It is possible, for example, that in the meantime Waser had come across the French text published by Nicolas Coeffeteau in 1603 and 1604, exposing it as something of a Huguenot ruse. See at notes 43 and 44 above.
- ⁶⁰ Compare the end of the respective titles at notes 39 and 54 above.
- ⁶¹ For many of the further details about the reception of the King's Confession in Zurich at this time, I am indebted to my friends Dr. habil. Reinhard Bodenmann, Institute for Swiss Reformation History, University of Zurich, and Christian Scheidegger, Zentralbibliothek Zurich.