Scène
Européenne

Regards croisés
sur la Scène européenne

Divertir, instruire, célébrer

Études sur le théâtre et la théâtralité dans l'Europe prémoderne à la mémoire d'André Lascombes

To entertain, instruct and celebrate

Studies in early modern theatre and theatricality in memory of André Lascombes

---

Textes réunis par
Jean-Pierre Bordier, Juan Carlos Garrot Zambrana,
Richard Hillman, Pierre Pasquier

Référence électronique

[En ligne], John J. McGavin, « “Things Indifferent”? Performativity and Calderwood’s History of the Kirk of Scotland », dans *Divertir, instruire, célébrer: études sur le théâtre et la théâtralité dans l’Europe prémoderne à la mémoire d’André Lascombes - To entertain, instruct and celebrate: studies in early modern theatre and theatricality in memory of André Lascombes,* éd. par J.-P. Bordier, J. C. Garrot Zambrana, R. Hillman, P. Pasquier, “Scène européenne, Regards croisés sur la scène européenne”, 2023,
mis en ligne le 10-02-2023,

URL: https://sceneeuropeenne.univ-tours.fr/regards/hommage-lascombes

La collection

Regards croisés
sur la Scène européenne

est publiée par le Centre d’Études Supérieures de la Renaissance,
(Université de Tours, CNRS/UMR 7323)
dirigé par Elena Pierazzo & Marion Boudon-Machuel

Responsable scientifique
Juan Carlos Garrot Zambrana

ISSN
2107-6820

Mentions légales
Copyright © 2023—CESR.
Tous droits réservés.
Les utilisateurs peuvent télécharger et imprimer,
pour un usage strictement privé, cette unité documentaire.
Reproduction soumise à autorisation.

Contact: alice.nue@univ-tours.fr

"Things Indifferent"?
Performativity and Calderwood's *History of the Kirk of Scotland*[*]

John J. McGavin
University of Southampton

The Rev. David Calderwood's eight-volume *History of the Kirk of Scotland* is a major historical witness to the Scottish Reformation, and a repository of many important texts from the period. One of its most striking features is the coherent vision which emerges in the later volumes, when Calderwood dealt with king James I's episcopal project in Scotland—a vision linking the public scene, the historian's and others' scrutiny of that scene, issues of identity, memory, and moral responsibility, and the functions of writing history. The text has its paradoxes and no one could claim it as a clear-glass window on the world. However, its focus on performativity as the intersection of diverse political forces provides an extended, coherent insight into how Scotland could be viewed—both literally and metaphorically—by those who were living through a time of cultural conflict.

As regards the *History* itself: the massed collection of Calderwood's sources, much of which has been lost, supplied a second version, written in the second half of the 1620s and early 1630s, and this then led to a shorter third version, published posthumously. Calderwood evidently envisaged his *History* as appropriate for successive distillation (rather than dilution), the original spirit remaining as the quantity was successively reduced in order to make it more cogent, more able to be disseminated, and more manageable for the reader, whom he expected to go to it for use and benefit, as he said himself (Calderwood, 1842: 1, vi-vii). The Wodrow Society edition is based on the second version with an Appendix collating material from the third. The editor, Thomas Thomson, argued that Calderwood placed a "higher importance"

---

* I am grateful to Greg Walker, the Rev. Paul MacLean, and Richard Hillman for their advice on this study, and to the late André Lascombes for his friendship and for giving me the privilege of meeting new European colleagues.

on the second version and regarded it with "affection" (Calderwood, 1842: 1, vii). The Wodrow text is the one I am using here. For the earlier years of the Reformation Calderwood necessarily relied on earlier reformers' narratives for substance, and he drew on their tradition of interpreting the public scene against the grain of official explanations. A number of reformed literary *topoi* around performative action also show how his eye was educated by earlier writers: for example, one finds the death-bed attestations of the saintly or how the disruptive behaviour of a madman can show greater wisdom than those he interrupts, both of which events feature in other reformist narratives. Sometimes he knew personally the authors of the complete documents he inserted; he also surely received information from the family of his patron, Lord Cranston. For the years of his exile he must have learned much from others. There are parts where he could have had access to published or eye-witness materials, for example, on James's ceremonial life in England, but chose not to include the details, restricting himself instead to comment—for example, that James's funeral was magnificent in content "but withoute forme and order" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 634)—a judgement by which far more was implied than aesthetic failings. But he was personally involved in counteracting James's episcopalian insurgency, and the *History* records, up to twenty-five years later, events which he directly experienced. At one point, he even appears as an actor in his text, though narrated in the third person. And he also occasionally speaks to the reader *in propria persona*, in one instance drawing his readers even closer, to ensure that they will recreate in their own minds the suspicions he had in his, by directly addressing them, "consider, good reader" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 281-282). Despite the many voices which inhabit the *History* as a consequence of its aggregating key original documents, it gives a very homogeneous impression to the reader; and although its narrative follows the chronology of events, its selection clearly promotes a historicist agenda. It will be the contention of this paper that in the later volumes, it coheres around what we now call performativity.

I was originally prompted to read the *History* because, written between the mid-1620s and the early 1640s, it constitutes a primary source for the *Records of Early Drama: Scotland* (*RED:S*) project. It is rich in references to the drama, secular music, and other communal entertainment and performances which *RED:S* collects, although on many occasions, it offers borrowed rather than eye-witness testimony. We find, for example, in the first five volumes (Calderwood, 1842-44) references to popular revels such as the Abbot of Unreason; Kings of May and May games; the King of the Bean; the play of Robin Hood; clerk plays and profane plays; Friar Killour's play on Christ's Passion; and Wedderburn's "diverse comedeis and tragedeis" (Calderwood, 1842: 1, 141-142); royal plays, spectacles, triumphs, and entries; and baptismal pageantry which included royal masquing gear; courtly jousting, banqueting, dancing; a rare occurrence of public commercial drama in the visit of the English comedians in 1599. He also mentions musi-

cal entertainment and instruments: fiddles, the tabret (a small tabor), whistle, trumpets, pipes, and the trump (or 'Jew's Harp'). There are various hybrid activities such as staged skirmishes and pretended alarms; funambulism on the top of a church steeple; public celebrations such as bonfires; and superstitious folk customs, not to mention turns of phrase or allusions which use metaphors from drama. However, it is *ceremony* which dominates the later volumes, and references to actual playing as we would understand it fall away almost entirely. For Calderwood, the focus falls upon proper interpretation of those ceremonial events which authority harnessed to project power. He insists that reading beyond the appearances of the events reveals deeper truths about society and politics, and about governmental pretence. In addition, ceremony, in its ritualistic form, lay at the very heart of the presbyterian opposition to episcopalianism, and these currents run together in his work.

Although it could not have been anticipated in 1975, the founding decision of the *Records of Early English Drama* project to include ceremony in its ambit meant that it would eventually embrace both performance and what has become known as performativity, since ceremony sits in the overlap between these kinds of action. The term *performativity* has moved beyond its narrow mid-twentieth century philosophical origins in the work of J. L. Austin to cover any public behaviour through which people assert the nature of reality, either by their own volition or asserted for them by others, in matters such as identity, subjectivity, gender, status, power, and so on. Consequently, as it has grown in application and in the diversity of events or public statements which constitute the performative realm, the term has also become harder to distinguish from performance (and is sometimes erroneously employed as a kind of synonym). Everywhere one looks there seems to be overlap. Performative actions do tend to include a large measure of performance and like the latter are intentionally directed towards spectators or even carried out to represent a version of oneself to oneself as well as to others. They also have to use those genres of language and action which the spectator will comprehend, just as a play has to do. Of course, there are differences between performative acts and dramatic performances. Things can happen in the course of performative acts that would never be countenanced during a play—for example, a public execution is a performative act by which authority asserts its ultimate power, but such an event could not take place in a performance, however much it might seek to arouse strong feelings in the spectators. Similarly, the spectator of a dramatic performance has the option to remember that what is seen is not real, it is mimetic; whereas the spectator of a performative act does not have that choice, judging instead only whether the event's performative claims about reality are true or not. (For example, does this execution show the authority of those who carry it out or does it not rather reveal their moral failure?) But the overlap between the performative act and a performance, in the centre of which "ceremony" is situated, means

that the boundaries of what an early drama records project might include are constantly under review. The contestability of performative claims means that even the terminology used for actions which are performative in function or effect can become part of the dispute. In those volumes which deal with the episcopalian controversy, Calderwood's *History* is heavily focussed on performativity in all its aspects; is dedicated to exposing the true meaning of such actions; to recording contemporary disputes over its terminology, and to promoting a counter performativity, of which his own text is the central instance. Performed plays are less important to Calderwood than the follies of authority which are revealed by their public acts.

My first examples take us into territory familiar to anyone who has encountered medieval guild disputes about precedence in Corpus Christi processions. Calderwood regarded the regular ceremonial procession to parliament of noblemen on horseback as especially revealing—a view shared by the participants, as is evident from Calderwood's account of the Perth parliament of 9 July 1606, when bishops were to be established, against the wishes of the presbyterian kirk, by order of King James. The text is a vivid interpretative "reading" of the details:

> The first day of the parliament, ten bishops did ryde betuixt the erles and the lords, two and two, clothed in silke and velvet, with their foote mantles. [Calderwood lists the processional order, omitted here] Mr Peter Blekburne, Bishop of Aberdeene, thought it not | beseeming the simplicitie of a minister to ryde that way in pompe; therefore, he went on foote to the parliament hous. The rest of the bishops caused the chanceller remove him out of the parliament hous, because he would not ryde as the rest did. Mr Arthure Futhie, a minister in Angus, a man of big stature, walked along the street, with his cap at his knee, at the great metropolitan, Mr George Gladestains' stirrup. But at the last day, the bishops would not ryde, because they got not their old place, that is, before the erles, and nixt after the marquises, but went quietlie on foote to the parliament hous. This made the noble men to take up [take offence at] their presuming humours, and to mislyke them, als soone as they had sett them up, fearing they [the bishops] were sett up to cast them [the nobility] doun. (Calderwood, 1845: 6, 493-494)

Calderwood does not miss the sensuality of the clergy's vestments—a sensuality that presbyterians thought was always lying on the edge of ceremony; the bishops' ready aspiration to noble status, as shown in their use of "footmantles", which were the ceremonial trappings which hung over the flanks of a horse under the saddle; their anger because one bishop's humility had publicly revealed fault-lines in the clerical agenda; the visual commentary on aspiration provided by an upright minister walking beside a mounted bishop; rivalry between the estates over precedence and its implications; and the humil-

ity of walking finally adopted by the bishops to disguise their political sulking and the appearance of their having been demoted.

Calderwood is especially at home when reading the fragility of government, and its lack of moral resilience, from such ceremonial failures intensely observed and recorded. Public events designed to obscure the truth instead reveal it under his scrutiny. Thus, while his account of the 17 June 1617 parliament, which James held in Edinburgh on his return north, starts with the expected detail about who carried the crown, the sword, and the sceptre in the parliamentary procession (or "Riding"), nevertheless, after a disputatious six-hour evening session between some nobility and the king and bishops, Calderwood concludes, "The king and the estates came out of the Tolbuith after ten houres at night, and went doun to the palace in great confusion, some rydyng in their robes, others walking on foote, and the honours not carried as before" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 250). They were evidently too tired to pretend, and took advantage of the fact that the late hour would mean less public scrutiny of their disorder.

Visible trappings and ceremonial actions as the language of power might also become the instruments of intrigue and defence in a public game all were playing. The episcopalian sympathiser, the marquis of Hamilton, tried to prevent Sir John Hamilton, laird [lord] of Preston, from voting against the episcopal articles in parliament by manoeuvring first to deny him the requisite footmantle to ride with, and then to trip him up over his position in the procession itself, which would have led to his being imprisoned for bringing disgrace on the ceremony. The laird frustrated this plot by riding instead with the meanest rather than presuming on his family connections. John Hamilton himself had described voting against the episcopal articles in Parliament as "bearing witness" to the truth (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 493), and so this episode is, in some ways, the ultimate performative event: Hamilton had intended to attest his faith through voting, and in the end achieved his aim by an overt act of humility. It is highly likely that the image of Christ the King entering Jerusalem on an ass was somewhere in the protagonist's mind and Calderwood expects it to be in ours. But Hamilton's decision was more than defensive, for he evidently realised that, for the spectator, ceremony is a dialogue between what is seen and what is known. Sir John Hamilton knew that those who watched the Riding would spot his abnormal physical separation from his kin group, question it, and so would learn an important lesson—that spiritual divisions should be more respected than family affinities, and that one performed one's status first before the eye of God.

For Calderwood and his contemporaries of either spiritual persuasion, even small modifications in symbols, public conventions, and the like were means of naturalising larger shifts of outlook and belief. He points out, for example, that archbishop Gladstains was never without the status sign of the footmantle when he went to preach or to meetings; and he charts episcopal ascendancy through its colours, its locations

(especially when they implied change to tradition), stage furniture, and *mise en scène*. Of the synod of Fife (9 October 1610), which took place in the aisle of the kirk rather than, as traditionally, in St Leonards, he writes: "The seates were covered with greene cloths; and on the eist side was a table sett, covered with greene, and a greene velvet cushioun; theron a chaire, and a cushioun beside the same; and a stoole for the clerke" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 119-120). An insurgency of colour, fabrics and new "stagey" verticals into the kirk's world proclaimed the new order. Calderwood understood that James's sumptuary legislation was aimed at giving a hierarchical, episcopal, and anglicised colour to Scottish public life, and so his *History* reports on the appearance of the bishops and lords in public on 15 February 1610, and the spectacle that they provided for the people (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 54-55):

> the Lords of the Sessioun and the bishops putt on their gownes, and came doun from the chanceller's lodging, with their robs, to the Tolbuith. All their robs, except the chanceller's, were of Londoun cloath purple coloured, with the fashioun of an heckled cloke from the shoulder to the middle, with a long side hood on the backe, the gowne and hood lynned with reid satine. The people flocked together to behold them. The bishops were ordeaned to have their gownes with lumbard sleaves, according to the forme of England, with tippets and craips about their craigs [necks]; which was performed.

But Calderwood's interest was evidently aesthetic as well as forensically political: this detail may have served his argument, but the extent of it was surely not necessary to his case. For a man so dedicated to the preservation of historical documents, he had a singularly visual turn of mind, and this makes his *History* a powerful combination of the two kinds of evidence. It rests on texts but also on mental images, which he supplied so that the reader could scrutinise the public scene in the mind's eye, learning not just about the past but about the present and possible future. Calderwood's agenda differs from that of the literary satirist, as is evidenced by his desire to collect original documents, and his work has a distinctive consolatory affect which is not a common dimension of satire, but a satirical tone is present at times, nonetheless, and he does share the satirist's fascination with that which he abhors.

The *History* shows how, during the episcopalian period, the physical environment was altered with varying degrees of obviousness to perform the growing power of the bishops. This becomes explicit at the parliament of Perth, 25 August 1618—a parliament which began, incidentally, with the Archbishop of St Andrews giving a two-hour discourse in defence of religious ceremonies in general, and then of the Five Acts of Perth in particular. Here a meeting was carefully arranged down to the disposition of tables, and choice of chairs or benches, so that the ministers would be staged as spectators rather than participants: "The ministers were left to stand behind, as if their place

and part had beene onlie to behold […] this was apparentlie done of policie, that they [the bishops] might carie some majestie upon their part, to dashe simple ministers" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 307).

More subtly, performative events aimed at a wider public sought to integrate innovation with tradition in order to make the new feel like a natural development of what was long established. For example, James employed the ministers' own performative traditions to attest to his truths. When he was trying to promote his version of what had happened in the so-called Gowrie conspiracy (a claimed assassination attempt on him) against the deep suspicions and foot-dragging of the kirk men, who considered his claim an unevidenced political diversion, he insisted that those ministers who did not follow his instructions about celebrating his "escape", should repent publicly, each in his own church, thus making, as the Rev Robert Bruce said and Calderwood reported, "a triumphe and spectacle of their ministrie" (Calderwood, 1845: 6, 86). This possibly offered some satisfaction to those parishioners who customarily received similar public humiliation at their hands! One instruction seems not to have caught on, however: "that everie Tuisday hereafter sall be a day of ordinarie preaching, within everie burgh within the bounds of the synods", because James's supposed escape from the Gowrie Conspiracy was on a Tuesday. But the 5 August King's Night, which celebrated his escape from the Gunpowder plot, did survive and, although James's representatives had to enforce observance around the Fife home of Gowrie, in Edinburgh they were more subtly hijacking for this purpose the old tradition that the Mercat (Market) Cross was the station on a royal progress where the harmonious relationship of the king and people was specifically performed:

> The fyft of August [1607] was solemnelie keeped in Edinburgh. The king's skoll [toast] was drunkin by the duke, his commissioner, and some other noblemen, at the Croce of Edinburgh, which was covered for the greater solemnitie. Bacchus was sett up, and muche wine drunkin, and sweete meats cast abroad; muche vanitie and pastyme, beside ringing of bells and setting on of balefires [bonfires]. (Calderwood, 1846: 6, 672)

This event would have evoked in some memories of similar displays at the Cross—not least that twenty years earlier, in 1587, when James re-staged a Holyrood banquet with his nobles at the Cross to make any subsequent aristocratic feuding constitute the breaking of a public vow which had been made to the king under the eye of the watching people (McGavin and Stiùbhart, 2018: 225-227). This was the place where the ordinary spectator-participant bore witness to, and by implication applauded, authority's conception of the realm. The covering of the Cross (probably by tapestries), the casting of sweetmeats, the setting up of Bacchus (which seems to have been a visual depiction of the myth), the sharing of wine, and the use of celebratory noise and fire were all familiar features of royal celebrations. In the case of the King's Night just quoted, however, in

James's absence, and with the tensions caused by his episcopal project running high in Edinburgh, the nobility were wheeling on traditional ceremonial devices to inaugurate a novel and contested cause of celebration, by hiding a new figuration of the realm behind unobjectionable devotion to the health of the monarch.

Alice Hunt's study of the coronation ceremony of James (Hunt, 2015) shows that the status of ceremony had already been a major issue for the anglican church, which struggled with whether anointing had an efficacious or symbolic value. They had decided on the symbolic. However, the Scottish presbyterians evidently felt the pressure of the catholic tradition of efficacious signs too strongly to admit the possibility of any ceremonies being innocently symbolic. One way of naturalising innovation was for the bishops to argue that changes to church governance and ceremony were "indifferent" matters, i.e., not of doctrinal importance. For example, when it was complained that the synod of Fife had not been properly convened under a moderator chosen by the ministers (the bishop having taken it on himself to be the moderator), the bishop's response, presumably through gritted teeth, was: "It is a strange mater, brethrein, that ye are so troubled about such an indifferent mater. What mater who be moderator, if nothing be seene but to the contentment of you all?" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 121).

This approach was taken both in respect of church governance and the matter of the Five Acts of Perth, which were: (1) observance of holy days (such as Christmas and Easter); (2) kneeling at communion; (3) episcopal confirmation; (4) private baptism; and (5) private communion. The first two of these ritual observances were the most publicly performative, and it is on these that Calderwood concentrates in his *History*, though he wrote against them all in other works. They were the principal areas in which people of either ecclesiastical persuasion would be showing their faith publicly; they were, as the kirk said, *testes religionis*, and so a supposedly "indifferent" (trivial) matter was really an issue of public attestation, of bearing witness—in effect, of performativity. Calderwood recalls an exchange between bishop Galloway and the minister John Meine about the episcopal "kneeling communion" which puts the case clearly: "[Galloway:] There is nothing altered in substance, but onlie in rituall things; [Meine:] All that is inclosed in the institution is substantial to me; I know noe rituall thing in it" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 359). The *History's* account of the debate begins (Calderwood 1845: 6, 693-694) with action taken against Mr John Murrey for a sermon of his printed in England in which he made a distinction between things which were indifferent in themselves and the use of such things, which might not be indifferent: "the use of the thing indifferent is and abideth not always and at all tymes indifferent in respect of the accidents that accompanie the same: sometimes offence, uncomelinesse, disorder following theron, which taketh away the indifferencie of the use" (Murrey, 1607: n.p.). June 1607 saw the arrival of two learned Anglican doctors, who, Calderwood claimed,

> seemed to have no other directioun, but to perswade the Scots that there was no substantiall difference in religioun betuixt the two realms, but onelie in things indifferent, concerning government and ceremonies, which might stand weill eneugh, without anie danger of faith or salvatioun. (Calderwood, 1845: 6, 735)

For presbyterians, action could not be separated from context (the most obvious of which was the history of the reformation itself) or from consequences. The performative could never include "things indifferent".

Such claims for "indifference" on the part of the episcopalians were probably disingenuous, but some genuine conflict of understanding may also have existed. For example, the second examination of Rev. Thomas Hogg of Dysart turned on a distinction in the definition of ceremony: Hogg had rejected the ceremony of kneeling at communion, and was asked whether he took his hat off at communion. He said yes, and then there followed a dispute over whether these actions constituted the same kind of ceremony (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 75-77). In the end, Hogg showed that the distinction was between an outward sign of reverence (taking your hat off) and an act of adoration (kneeling), which could only be properly offered to God, but which, if performed before the sacrament, idolatrously divided that adoration between God and the sacramental elements (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 376). James Law, the archbishop of Glasgow, who had asked for a simple explanation of the distinction, replied, "Now I understand your meaning", and one senses that this was indeed a distinction he could acknowledge, even if he could not tolerate it as a defence. Calderwood includes the detail that Hogg signed the account as correct so that the *History* should itself provide *exempla* by which future reformed readers could conduct themselves. The *History* was in this respect intended as a performance script for Calderwood's readers.

Both groups of antagonists understood that ceremonial meaning is tied to the passage of time and memory, and nuanced this to their own advantage. The episcopalians acknowledged that kneeling for communion had been done away with by the early reformed church because of its prominence in idolatrous Roman catholic worship. But they claimed that now, sixty years after the founding of the reformed kirk, "all memorie of past superstition is blotted out of the hearts of the people" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 353) and so it could be reverently reintroduced for communion. They must have known that this claim was untrue, since they were at the very same time engaged in indicting a minister who rejected the practice, who still regarded it as superstitious, and whose congregation must have been aware of his views, as were the many Edinburgh citizens who rejected the Perth Articles. Indeed, part of the opposition to the Five Articles came from people who could not understand why they were being asked to change what they had been taught for the previous sixty years. Calderwood's *History* was designed to strengthen that resistance, so that the innovative practices of men could not become

naturalised for a new generation, changing their value through simply being used over the years. One thinks of the way the word "reform" was in our own times in the United Kingdom systematically divested of its earlier radical associations in order to transfer its moral colouring to market economics.

Calderwood's detailed account of the Edinburgh Easter communion of 1621 shows how public contest over the performative act of kneeling at communion and observing Holy Days such as Easter led to disorder in the rite itself, and powerful displays of resistance. But perhaps more revealing is the way in which his description develops. He first makes it clear that many Edinburgh worshippers preferred to take communion at the customary time (8 April and 6 May) in the nearby parishes of East Lothian, where the episcopal demand was not made. But he segues into a different objection to the rite:

> manie of the profainner sort of the toun were drawn out upon the sixt of May, to May games in Gilmertoun and Rosseline; so profanitie began to accompany superstitioun and idolatrie, as it hath done in former times. Upon the first of May, the weavers in St Pauls Worke, Englishe and Dutch, set up a highe May pole, with their garlants and bells hanging at them, whereat was great concourse of people. (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 458).

For Calderwood and his colleagues, the performative attestation demanded by episcopalian observance was on a continuum with sensuality and playing. Rather than being "things indifferent", such ceremonies were actually to do with fleshly things, fleshly appetites—so one of the kirk's arguments against ritual innovation was that it would import "sensuall observation [...] guysing, gluttonie, carrells" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 324-331). The superstitious observance of Holy Days would lead inexorably to scandalous practices of the kind that will one day appear in the *Records of Early Drama: Scotland*! Ceremony leads to play, and performativity to performances—such ceremonies were therefore to be feared as the spiders' webs of catholicism.

Calderwood's account implies that on the 6 May 1621 on the roads south-east out of Edinburgh you could have encountered two groups of people: the faithful, sticking to the customary times and forms of their communion; and the profaner sort, no doubt blindly skipping along in a separate group, heading off to celebrate viler activities. It is a clear separation which, however unlikely it might seem to us as a depiction of reality, Calderwood felt compelled to make, and it bespeaks his anxiety to control the public scene in his own mind and in the imagination of his reader: for him status, nuanced by class, wealth, region, and gender, inevitably intersected with public performativity, because who does what affects how much credence can be given to a performative action. Calderwood's obsession with visible signs, with ceremonies, and with training his readers to understand what such behaviour implies, derived in part from the kirk's belief, no doubt shared by the episcopal clergy, that the common people were swayed by externals rather than doc-

trinal substance. Ceremonies were "a preparative in the hearts of the commontie (who measure religion more by externall maske of ceremonies, than by substantial points of doctrine), to the receiving againe of whole Poperie" (Calderwood 1845: 7, 480). So it is that part of his excoriating attack on the Easter Communion in Edinburgh, 21 April 1621, depended on making class distinctions: "Amang all the two hundredth and fiftie [attending the communion] there was not a man of honest countenance but [he names some of the higher status people] [...] plaids, gray clocks, and blew bonnets, made the greatest show." He was a man of his class in that respect—blue bonnets and plaid would later be specifically banned in Stirling in anticipation of King Charles's visit in 1633 to avoid damaging the impression of civic modernity and wealth.

Paradoxically, when the episcopal clergy tried to assert that their innovations were "indifferent", they ensured instead that the whole of society became more intensely performative, both in practice and perception, especially at key times, such as Holy Days, communion, and on any occasion when the contending parties were brought physically together. On such febrile occasions either acting *or* refraining from action publicly attested one's acceptance of episcopal observances or bore witness to their superstition and idolatry. Calderwood therefore portrays for us the visible conflicts in the public scene: when Patrick Galloway preached on Christmas Day, "there were betwixt the Strait Bow and the Nether Bow a hundredth booth doors open; eight merchant booths, the rest booksellers, skinners, hatmakers, apothecaries, bakers and sellers of sweetmeats" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 454-455), thus showing that the good citizens of Edinburgh regarded Christmas Day as an ordinary working day not set apart for superstitious observance. Even being seen to walk in company with ministers who opposed episcopalianism became significant and was regarded as either politically complicit or a moral duty.

The later volumes of the *History* are thus a record of tension between different kinds of performativity—sometimes between the clerics themselves, or between them and the people; always between episcopalians and Calderwood's own text, it being a performative act by which he attested his own fidelity to presbyterianism; but also a conflict of performativity between those in power and God, who works through nature to comment on human activity. For example, God's anger at James's attempt to join the kingdoms of England and Scotland under one spiritual practice frustrated symbolic demonstration of that link, a divinely sent flood preventing the erection of James's keystone on a new bridge in Berwick. This was to be done on the Sabbath, and the memorial text was to be "*Hoc uno ponte duo regna conjunxi: / Deus diu conjuncta servet*" (I have joined two kingdoms by this one bridge; may God always protect the joined kingdoms), but, Calderwood says, "the Lord prevented the day" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 513). Text, monument and ceremonial action are thus brought together in this record of human failure.

Calderwood's God frequently curbs the performative practices of the king : we hear that James's London coronation with all its attendant ceremony on 25 July (because it was *Saint* James's day) was seriously affected by plague "and pageants almost without spectators to gaze upon them". While accurate, this account is also astonishingly reductive of the event, missing out many of the sources of information about the event which Alice Hunt has deployed in her study (Hunt, 2015). That last point, in which Calderwood rejoices in the failure of performed power to draw spectators, is revealing and typical of his interest in what can be seen and who watches it. Perhaps the most explicit instance is in the passage before James's death, when God prevents, through an outbreak of plague, James's attempt to enforce kneeling communion in Edinburgh on Christmas Day 1624: "the Lord sendeth an impediment to the execution unlooked for" and "The Lord would have had his hand in the business, to let the world know that he can overrule kings" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 627 and 629). The world should take note that when it comes to performativity, God is better than kings.

More often, however, Calderwood makes the point through a silent collocation of events. This is not the silence of the subaltern but of the tendentious. Thus, for example, James's re-interment of his mother in a "magnificke tombe" jostles with a particularly destructive tempest. The death of prince Henry Frederick, mourned by all who hoped for reformation, is contrasted with the death of the bishop of Argyll from cancer of the face—the unsightly details of which Calderwood does not hesitate to record, as he does not spare us the death of the unfortunate archbishop Gladstanes of St Andrews, whose "flesh fell off him in lumps" (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 197), and whose expensive state funeral, appropriately enough for someone whose ceremonies were empty of spiritual value in Calderwood's judgement, was conducted using an empty coffin, he having been buried shortly after his death for reasons of hygiene. What is interesting is Calderwood's frequent reluctance to state the connection *explicitly* in a text which is otherwise manifestly polemic and self-justifying. There is a gap between the textual prompting and an authorial one: the text demands that they be read together, but the author does not make the connection with an authorial voice. Why, one wonders?

Not being explicit in contexts where one could be confident of one's audience seems to have been a technique of the reformers. We know this because Calderwood mentions that episcopalians objected to ministers using words which they knew would be given a loaded application by the people. The presbyterians replied with gross *fausse naïveté* that they had no control over how the people chose to apply their words. Inexplicitness, with the implied duty that readers of the *History* make inferences, is part of this same tactical approach: the style of someone who knows how he will be taken; has perhaps received the key details from sympathetic fellow-observers of the public scene; wishes to ensure that the reader develops and shares the responsibility of making inferences; and whose

professional approach, faced with inquisition, may have been to speak in this way until pushed to the point where speech *had* to be direct—one senses that habit also from the *History*. But the tactic leaves us as modern readers with a problem: can we be sure where Calderwood is simply reporting like a chronicler and where he wants a deeper point to be taken? The *History* is multi-functional: recording, bearing witness, justifying, proving, contesting alternative accounts, reassuring, confirming, empowering—all of these seem important for its author and his future readers; but it also seeks to develop readers' skills, teaching them to identify truths obscured by assertive public performativity, and supplying them with a script to guide their own future performative actions. How can our textual interpretation be integrated with such diversity of function?

A case in point is Calderwood's account of the preparations made in Edinburgh for James's return in 1617. Calderwood makes it clear that James had no intention of returning until his commissioners felt that episcopal governance of the kirk and observance of the Five Articles had bedded in. As part of the preparations, the Mercat Cross was moved. Calderwood gives no explanation for this, though that suggested by James Drummond in the nineteenth century may well be correct and is still cited: that it was done to widen the processional route (Drummond, 1860-2: 101). This is Calderwood's description:

> Upon the 26th of Februar, the Crosse of Edinburgh was taken doun; the old long stone, about fortie foots or thereby in length, was translated, by the devise of certane mariners in Leith, from the place where it stoode past memorie of man, to a place beneath the high Streete, without anie harme to the stone; and the bodie of the old Crosse was demolished and another buildit, whereupon the long stone or obelisk was erected and sett upon the 25th of Marche. (Calderwood, 1845: 7, 243-244)

Whatever the actual reason for the move, however, the *History's* account of episcopal performativity makes it hard to read this as anything other than Calderwood implying that, by changing the location, James symbolically proclaimed a new "relationship" between king and people—a relationship in which continuity and change were both asserted. In other words, this was an example of his nuancing traditional ceremonial practice to establish innovation. The point on the old processional route for monarchs had changed, the base of the cross had changed, but the upright was still carefully preserved. So it was still the "old Crosse"—except that it wasn't. Calderwood as author doesn't say this, but his text seems to do so. And is it going too far to wonder if Calderwood saw, or thought the reader might see, Marian significance in the date of the re-erection, which he includes?

The life of the faithful for Calderwood was inevitably a public and performative life because it was lived as part of a spiritual analogy—one's actions were always already given meaning by the exemplary witness of others recorded in the Bible. These

demanded emulation or suggested exemplars for one's sufferings. For example, the lives of Mordechai and Daniel demanded that faith be maintained by the presbyterian ministers "not onlie in substance but in the meanest show or appearance" (CALDERWOOD, 1845: 6, 455). Calderwood employs the reformist genre of the courtroom drama established in martyr narratives for his own experience, but that very genre is drawn from the example of the Passion story. He gives a dramatic account of his arraignment before the king, including his and everyone's speeches, emotions, and behaviour, and presents himself, in *imitatio Christi*, as the victim of aggressive clerics—an analogy made more acceptable because he speaks at this point in the third person, and thus, rather than comparing himself to Christ, presents the reader with an example of what to expect should they find themselves in this position. He suggests analogies between his episcopal inquisitors, reviling, pushing, and thumping him, and the Jews and Roman soldiers of the Passion narrative, and links them with devilish tempters: "These that were standing about putt upon him and buzzed in his eare" (a verb which one recognises as the tempter verb from Marlowe's *Dr Faustus*). Underlying such acts of witness, however, is the deeper performativity of the Holy Spirit, which publicly demonstrates its own power through the enhanced capacities of the believer.

Despite its many functions and voices, the *History* feels driven by the personal needs and desires of its author. I'd like to finish this account, therefore, by briefly placing it in a theoretical framework which could show the *History's* distinctiveness in this regard. Social theorists have identified change as forcing individuals and societies to move from an earlier, more predictable state, sometimes called *societas*, through a liminal phase, towards acceptance of change and a condition of re-orientation (TURNER, 1974). Whatever period Calderwood was writing about, the *History* certainly seems a product of that liminal stage when societies, groups or individuals are struggling with the challenges of the present, and grasping at a sense of identity as the past seems to be eroded. The liminality forced on Calderwood by James's episcopalian project was then compounded by a further liminality consequent on James's death in 1625 and Charles's succession, when Calderwood was putting the second version of the *History* together.

Imposition of episcopalianism from England was an attempted act of acculturation, defined by the applied cultural anthropologist Gerald Arbuckle as "the acquisition by one society of the cultural values and customs of another society" (ARBUCKLE, 1991: 122). This aimed ultimately at "inculturation", the "replacement of the structures/institutions or the visible expressions/customs of a culture", whereby "the inner values and feelings of people" are changed (ARBUCKLE, 1991: 113). Arbuckle suggests that people go through "a process or ritual of mourning" as they let go of whatever is not conducive to these new goals and values. I suspect that such shifts are always underway for someone and at some level—change is always happening, and painful adjustments are always

being made or resisted. But Calderwood's is a powerful and distinctive example because, if it is true that he wrote out of liminality, it is also true that he was writing specifically against any final acceptance of change and resistance against re-orientation. One feels in the *History* an anger driving his forensic enquiry so as to manage grief over a loss which has been incurred, and which threatens to be complete. And Calderwood offers a further twist to the theory, for the sensed loss fell in the very field of human activity in which theorists argue that people compensate for loss, and manage it—that is, ritual or ceremony. Arbuckle cites the example of Gallipoli victims whose suffering was long unacknowledged by public ritual in Australia because it derived from a military disaster that the state was anxious to forget, and we have a more recent example from Vietnam veterans. Their anger was the consequence of grief that had not been managed by rituals of acknowledgement and emotional purgation (Arbuckle, 1991: 16). Far from being allowed to manage the loss of presbyterian power through grief rituals, it was the very replacement of presbyterian practice by episcopalian rituals (such as those set out in the Acts of Perth) which constituted the loss. I would suggest that the forensic nature of Calderwood's approach can be understood in part as his own "rituals of grief", allowing him to feel textually in control of what he had little control over otherwise, but which, at a time of disorientation, enabled him to hold fast to his established spiritual identity without seeking to acquire a new one. Calderwood's *History* engaged with the threatened loss of a history, but, as a ritual of grief, it was also an instrument of resistance.

Calderwood had no way of knowing how things would turn out in the end: that James's episcopalian project would not culminate in total inculturation; and that, except for some people, liminality would not lead in Scotland to a general re-orientation based on a new performative language. He may not have known this, but the possibility of a faithful reformed presbyterian future is nevertheless implicit in every aspect of his practice, most obviously so in his exposure of the "alternative facts" promoted by the authorities through scenes of public performativity.

Bibliography

ARBUCKLE, Gerald A., *Change, Grief, and Renewal in the Church: A Spirituality for a New Era*, Westminster: Christian Classics, Inc., 1991.

AUSTIN, J. L., *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

CALDERWOOD, David, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. Thomas Thomson, 8 vols, Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842-49.

DILLISTONE, F. W., *The Power of Symbols*, London: SCM, 1986.

DRUMMOND, James, "Notice of some Stone Crosses, with especial reference to the Market-Crosses of Scotland", *Transactions of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 4 (1860-62), pp. 86-115.

HUNT, Alice, "'The Bright Star of the North': James I and his English Coronation", *Medieval English Theatre*, 37 (2015), pp. 90-105.

MCGAVIN, John J., and STIÙBHART, Domnall Uilliam, "Performance", in *The International Companion to Scottish Literature 1400-1650*, ed. Nicola Royan, Glasgow: Scottish Literature International, 2018, pp. 217-236.

MURREY, John, *A godly and fruitfull sermon preached at Lieth in Scotland by a faithfull minister of Gods holy Gospell*, [London: W. Jones' secret press, 1607].

TURNER, Victor, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974.