
Article:
Milton, A. orcid.org/0000-0003-0696-1905 (2023) Contesting the Church of England 1640-70: the European dimension. The Seventeenth Century, 38 (6). pp. 1079-1102. ISSN 0268-117X

https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2023.2266300

The Seventeenth Century

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rsev20

Contesting the Church of England 1640-70: the European Dimension

Anthony Milton

To cite this article: Anthony Milton (2023) Contesting the Church of England 1640-70: the European Dimension, The Seventeenth Century, 38:6, 1079-1102, DOI: 10.1080/0268117X.2023.2266300

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2023.2266300

Published online: 14 Dec 2023.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY
2023, VOL. 38, NO. 6, 1079–1102
https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2023.2266300

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Contesting the Church of England 1640-70: the European Dimension

Anthony Milton

Department of History, University of Sheffield, UK

ABSTRACT

The contest over the identity of the Church of England in the mid-seventeenth century is often conceived from a purely English perspective. This article suggests that considering its neglected European dimension offers a new and fruitful angle on events. It goes on to offer some indicative snapshots of moments when foreign Reformed perspectives and contributions were important. The Covenanter rebellion and arguments over English church reform in 1638-42 were moments when invoking the support of existing European religious authorities formed an important part of both sides' legitimization. In the civil war, competition for continental religious endorsement was avidly pursued by both sides, with mixed results, while royalists also toyed with foreign divines' redefinitions of episcopacy. Complex ways in which foreign Reformed authorities were manipulated into seeming to support the Restoration settlement are flagged. It is noted that Continental divines' own perspectives on English events were notably autonomous and conflicted.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 20 September 2023
Accepted 28 September 2023

KEYWORDS
Church of England; foreign Reformed churches; Huguenots; Covenanters; episcopacy; Westminster Assembly; Restoration church; Dutch church

Studying the mid-seventeenth-century contest for the Church of England necessarily forces us to cast our conceptual net wide. A tract published in 1661 entitled *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae* offers a useful reminder of this. For this 'vindication of the English Church' was the work not of an episcopalian, or even of a moderate puritan, but of the Independent-supporting and recently-unseated Camden professor of history in Oxford, Lewis du Moulin. The 'Ecclesia Anglicana' which Du Moulin defended in this work was specifically not a church founded on an episcopal hierarchy, but a church that was constituted solely by the English people reformed from 'Papism', professing the orthodox faith under legitimate pastors. This was how he perceived the Church of England under Edward VI, and now under Charles II, whom Du Moulin was happy to salute as supreme governor of the Church.[1]

CONTACT Anthony Milton a.milton@sheffield.ac.uk Department of History, University of Sheffield, Jessop West, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield S3 7RA, UK

[1]Lewis du Moulin, *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae ad . . . Johannem Cosinum* ([Leiden], 1661), esp. pp.9, 34. Other works which share the title of du Moulin's work but with very different meanings attached to the Church of England are Francis Mason's posthumously-published expansion of his defence of the church's episcopal succession (1625), John Geree's anti-separatist defence of a moderate reform of the church (1644), and the presbyterian Walter Travers' anti-Laudian attack on Catholic errors (1630) (on the latter of which see P. Ha, ' "Genevan Jesuits": crypto-Presbyterianism in England' in R. Armstrong and T. Ó hAnnracháin (eds.), *Insular Christianity* (Manchester, 2013), pp.54-5). Du Moulin's work is missed by ESTC and EEBO, but a copy survives in Cambridge University Library (shelfmark: F.12.157). Note also the discussion of definitions of the Church of England in session 94 of the Westminster Assembly: *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly*, ed. C. van Dixhoorn (5 vols., Oxford, 2012) [MPWA], II, pp.305-11.

Not only was Du Moulin a supporter of Cromwell and the Independents (and two years earlier had proposed a religious settlement with 'all Ecclesiasticall Iurisdiction [to] be abolished & be buried'),[2] but he was also a naturalized Frenchman, one of the sons of the distinguished Huguenot theologian Pierre du Moulin (who had himself held a prebendal stall in the pre-war Church of England). And these European credentials should give us further reason to pause. 'Contesting the Church of England' necessarily involves a focus that is initially Anglo-centric. Key debates and arguments at the time inevitably concentrated in particular on different readings of the ambiguous nature of the Church of England and her earlier reformations, with the various protagonists invoking a range of statutes, canons, homilies, doctrinal statements and liturgies in support of their own readings of the Church's true identity.[3] Beyond such precedents, debate was of course joined on pertinent biblical and patristic testimonies.

But it would be wrong to neglect the European dimension of these conflicts. That there was such a dimension should not surprise us. After all, this struggle over English religious identities was conducted in the context of civil wars, continental wars and political struggles in which European powers had a very direct interest. Throughout the 1640s and 1650s, the attitudes and activities of European powers were a major concern of England's warring protagonists. Royalists and parliamentarians alike sought to instruct foreign powers on how to read English events, and in the process they painted their opponents and their ideas as dangerously subversive. Thus, in the case of the Dutch Republic in particular, significant energies were ploughed by both sides in the English Civil War into securing a constant flow of Dutch translations of English news pamphlets and political treatises. As Helmers has argued, this was a contest in which royalists would (perhaps surprisingly) emerge victorious, not least in helping to nourish a popular Dutch sympathy for the royal martyr in the 1650s.[4]

More generally, though, there has always been a danger of presenting English religion and the English church as *sui generis*. Histories of the European Reformation still unfortunately insist on using a separate colour to denote 'Anglicanism' in their maps of confessional divisions.[5] Yet English Protestantism was located firmly in the Reformed field for most of the pre-war period. European Protestant thinking was not only influential in the Edwardian church, but in the Elizabethan church we can trace successive waves of continental Protestant influence which played a decisive role in shaping the doctrinal character of the English church. First came Zürich, and most prominently Heinrich Bullinger, whose *Decades* were officially promoted.[6] Then came the influence of Geneva, essentially of John Calvin and his disciple and successor Theodore Beza, whose works went through more editions in English than in any

[2]Lewis du Moulin, *Proposals and reasons* (1659), pp.4, 5-6, 16 and *passim*.
[3]See A. Milton, *England's Second Reformation* (Cambridge, 2021), chs.4-5.
[4]H.J. Helmers, *The Royalist Republic* (Cambridge, 2015), chs.1, 3 and 4.
[5]E.g. C.M.N. Eire, *Reformations: The Early Modern World, 1450-1650* (New Haven, 2016), p.755; T.A. Brady, H.A. Oberman, and J.D. Tracy, eds., *Handbook of European History* (2 vols., Leiden, 1995), II, back cover; R. Mackenney, *Sixteenth-century Europe* (1993), p.196; S. Ozment, *The Age of Reform* (1980), pp.373, 417.
[6]D. MacCulloch, 'Heinrich Bullinger and the English-Speaking World' in E. Campi (ed.), *Heinrich Bullinger (1505–1575): Leben, Denken, Wirkung*, 2 vols. (Zwingliana 32, 2005), I, pp.891–934; idem, 'Sixteenth century English Protestantism and the Continent' in D. Wendebourg (ed.), *Sister Reformations* (Tübingen, 2010), pp.7-9; idem, 'The Church of England and international Protestantism, 1530-1570' in A. Milton (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism I: Reformation and Identity c.1520-1662* (0xford, 2017), pp.328-32.

other European vernacular language.[7] From the late 1580s onwards, however, it was Heidelberg, in the shape of its famous catechism and its exposition by Zacharias Ursinus, which took the lead in shaping English theological education.[8] The English Protestantism taught in the universities and in doctrinal treatises was drenched in Reformed divinity, despite its different emphases in church government and worship in particular. This was a Reformed identity that was reflected in the personal and religious ties that were fostered between England and the Rhineland Palatinate in the wake of the Palatine marriage in 1613, and which culminated in the prominent attendance of English divines at the international Synod of Dordt, which met in 1618-19 to agree on the collective anathematization of Dutch Arminianism and the creation of a set of canons to clarify the details of orthodox Reformed predestinarian doctrine.[9]

These acknowledged links with foreign Reformed Protestantism made it inevitable that continental Protestant practices and testimonials would be invoked by English activists in defence or criticism of the structures and formularies of the Church of England, especially as they offered such tempting examples of alternative forms of church government and worship. Under Queen Elizabeth, Calvin, Zanchius and Beza were repeatedly invoked by puritans to support their attacks upon episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer. In response, while conformists were keen to invoke other authorities, they nevertheless seized every opportunity to cite continental churches and divines in apparent defence of the Church of England's liturgy and government whenever they could – whether they be Reformed, or Lutheran authors.[10]

Internal English religious politics in the aftermath of the outbreak of the Thirty Years War had served to weaken this instinctive English identification of the Church of England with the foreign Reformed churches, and the Laudians in particular had benefitted from and promoted this sense of distance from European Protestantism.[11] However, with the downfall of Laud and his policies in 1640, the alignment of the English Church with the forces of continental Protestantism was firmly reasserted. And with discussion of church reform high up the political agenda, the invoking of foreign Protestant testimonials became once more a key feature of the arguments marshalled by those both attacking and defending the existing Church of England. The religious conflicts of the following two decades surrounding the fortunes and identity of the English church provided an arena in which European opinion and participation was actively sought by both royalists and parliamentarians. In the process of seeking out and priming sympathetic foreign commentary, protagonists also necessarily found themselves declaring and explaining specific readings of the Church of England and the conflicts that were engulfing it, and of the reforms and concessions which might restore religious peace. Addressing a European audience could thus prompt English protagonists to provide broader and sometimes startling accounts of their religious identities, while

[7]A. Pettegree, 'The spread of Calvin's thought' in D. McKim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.210-11.
[8]A. Milton, 'A Missing Dimension of European Influence on English Protestantism: the Heidelberg Catechism and the Church of England 1563-1663', *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 20:3 (2018).
[9]A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge, 1995), pp.377-404; idem, 'The Church of England and the Palatinate 1566-1642' in P. Collinson and P. Ha (eds.), *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain* (Oxford, 2010), pp.137-65.
[10]A. Milton, 'Puritanism and the continental reformed churches', in J. Coffey and P.C.H. Lim (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), pp.114-15; idem, *Catholic and Reformed*, p.394n.
[11]Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, chs.8 and 9.

European commentators in their turn could express fascinating and unexpected readings of English events. These exchanges therefore provide us with an important additional angle on what might often appear exclusively English concerns. The full examination of Anglo-European religious contacts in these years requires much more space than is available here.[12] In the context of this special issue of *The Seventeenth Century*, my intention is merely to flag some examples that may indicate the importance of this dimension to our understandings of the contests over the Church of England's identity in these years.

I

With the two Bishops' Wars and the calling of the Long Parliament, the invoking of foreign endorsement for the competing proposals for church reform became an important part of the political struggle. Already the Scottish Covenant had appealed to the example of the 'best reformed churches', and following this, anti-episcopalians regularly cited foreign reformed churches in order to vindicate Presbyterianism's claims and to refute charges that it inevitably bred disorder. For their part, anti-Covenanters such as the Aberdeen Doctors had seized with alacrity upon Reformed authorities who had opposed rebellion.[13] In England, de-Laudianized advocates of an episcopalian settlement similarly sought to revive conventional appeals (spurned by Laudians) to foreign churches as supporting episcopacy and the liturgy, against the usual complaints that statements of the *iure divino* status of episcopacy necessarily unchurched foreign reformed churches. Defences of episcopacy also sought to maintain its Protestant credentials by trying to detect forms of pseudo- or nascent episcopacy in the existing practices of continental churches. This can be observed most directly in a short paper on 'The severall formes of government, received in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas' composed by the international irenicist John Dury for a collection of *Certain briefe treatises* in favour of episcopacy (Oxford, 1641). In the process, Dury – unwisely, as we shall see – described Dutch churches as having recently erected a form of ministerial superiority in the shape of 'Deputies of the Synode' who met separately to plan synodal business, sat in 'a peculiar place by themselves', and delivered their judgements first.[14]

Appeals to continental Protestantism did not simply invoke time-honoured church formularies or the opinions of Calvin (although these were certainly invoked whenever they could be of assistance). Rather than distant abstract entities, or dusty tomes where authorial intention could be endlessly debated, many foreign authorities were living, breathing individuals, whose daily comments could be reported, and who could also choose to intervene directly when they thought that they or their churches were being misrepresented. Many of these contemporary foreign divines are still relatively unfamiliar to historians of English church history, but two continental theologians should be

[12] I am currently completing a monograph provisionally entitled *Troubled Friendships and Disturbing Ideas: England and European Protestantism in the Seventeenth Century*.

[13] *Generall demands concerning the late covenant* (1638), p.20; *Duplyes of the Ministers & professors of Aberdene* (Aberdeen, 1638), pp.25-6, 32, 33.

[14] *Certain briefe treatises* (Oxford, 1641), pp.123-7; Joseph Hall, *An humble remonstrance* (1641), pp.32-3; Hall, *A defence of the humble remonstrance* (1641), pp.165-88; William Prynne, *Canterburies doome* (1646), pp.231-5; [Peter du Moulin], *The letter of a French Protestant* (1640), pp.5-27; Thomas Morton, *The presentment of a schismaticke* (1642), pp.9-11; John Prideaux, *De Episcopatu* (1660), sig.A2v.

flagged who were particularly bound up with developments in England in these years. Both were based in the Dutch Republic. One was Gisbertus Voetius, professor of theology for nearly forty years at the University of Utrecht. One of the most important Reformed theologians of the seventeenth century, he also had important contacts with England. Not only had he met the English delegates at the Synod of Dordt and renewed his acquaintance with them when he travelled to England in 1637, visiting both universities and establishing friendships with many English divines, but he also knew the English language and read English divinity voraciously, while enjoying close relations with the English community based in Utrecht. Indeed, so closely did Voetius follow English-language publications that he managed to surprise Dury by sending him a stern reproof for his misleading account of Dutch church practice in the *Certain briefe treatises*.[15] The second divine of note was another renowned and influential Reformed churchman, the Huguenot theologian André Rivet. Appointed in 1620 as professor of theology at the University of Leiden, Rivet was also chosen in 1632 as tutor to the future William II of Orange. Rivet too had close links with England. Taught Greek by Adam Newton (afterwards tutor to Henry Prince of Wales) and initially destined for study at St Andrews, Rivet visited England on a number of occasions (marrying his second wife – Pierre du Moulin's sister – in London in 1620) and was well known to many English divines.[16] These were not distant authorities, then, but people who had visited England and had formed important links with divines and politicians there.

As early as 1638, the Covenanters' advocate Robert Baillie was anxiously urging his cousin William Spang to contact Voetius and Rivet to supply their (positive) judgements concerning the legitimacy of holding a national church assembly without the state's approval. He commented the following year that 'Rivett is much cast up against us' by anti-Covenanters, who listed him among the ranks of Protestant divines opposing Knox's and Buchanan's defence of rebellion. Baillie was keen to obtain Rivet's specific opinion in support of the Covenanters, although he urged Spang to seek this secretly 'so that ye be not found out'.[17] The response, however, was initially disappointing – on such delicate political issues, and under obvious political pressure, the divines displayed what would be a persistent and understandable reluctance to become directly involved without specific endorsement by the Dutch authorities.

Nevertheless, and regardless of their own wishes, Voetius and Rivet were soon also being invoked in English pamphlet debates over church reform, most notably in the high-profile Smectymnuan controversy. Voetius had already been singled out in the anti-episcopalian pamphlet *The petition for the prelates briefly examined* (1641) to speak for the current views of the divines of the Reformed churches against the claim of a pro-episcopacy petition that the most learned Protestants in foreign non-episcopal churches not only held episcopacy to be lawful but wished that they had it. The pamphlet not only

[15] A.C. Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius* (3 vols., Leiden, 1897-1914), II, pp.231-3; Gisbertus Voetius, *Politicae Ecclesiasticae Pars Tertia & Ultima* (4 vols., Amsterdam, 1676), II, p.422; idem, *Selectarum disputationum theologicarum* (5 vols., Utrecht, 1648-69), II, p.408; K.L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism* (Leiden, 1982), pp.361-2; Sheffield University Library [SUL], Hartlib MS 5/17/1 (Dury to Voetius, 31 Jan 1642).

[16] Rivet's British correspondents included Thomas Morton, Meric Casaubon, Isaac Basire, James Ussher and Griffin Higgs: see P. Dibon (ed.), *Inventaire de la correspondence d'André Rivet* (The Hague, 1971). He also exchanged compliments with John Prideaux: Universiteit Bibliotheek, Leiden, MS BPL 285B, fol.79 (J.F. Gronovius to Rivet, 6 Sept 1639).

[17] *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, ed. D. Laing (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1842) [Baillie, *LJ*], I, pp.92-3, 117; Henry Leslie, *A full confutation of the covenant* (1639), p.15; *Duplyes of the Ministers*, pp.25-6, 32, 33. See also *The Answeres of some Brethren of the Ministerie* (Aberdeen, 1638), sig.C2r.

cited Voetius' treatise *De desperata causa papatus* (1635) to the contrary, but also his reported words when Joseph Hall's defence of episcopacy was published: 'what will this poore fellow doe? … [I have] of late read many Lectures against the superiority and jurisdiction of the bishops'. This report was regarded as sufficiently damaging to the episcopalian cause that an enquiry was launched and Voetius himself was cross-examined in Utrecht, with the result that the English ambassador in the Netherlands William Boswell sent a testimony under his hand that Voetius had formally disavowed having made such slighting remarks about Hall.[18]

Voetius was not the only foreign divine to become reluctantly entangled with English debates on the basis of unguarded verbal comments. While the presbyterian Smectymnuans looked to Voetius' theses for the justification of lay elders, they also cited 'learned Rivet'. In this case, Rivet's reported speech concerned Joseph Hall's citation of extracts from the deceased Palatine theologian Abraham Scultetus in which Scultetus denied scriptural authority for the institution of lay elders and defended the institution of episcopacy as apostolic. Hall had met Scultetus during the latter's lengthy sojourn in England in 1612-13 and had renewed their acquaintance at the Synod of Dordt. Passages from Scultetus in defence of episcopacy would also be invoked by Thomas Morton, and by the king himself in his exchanges with parliament's delegates in 1648.[19] It was therefore important to anti-episcopalians that these citations should be discredited by other foreign Reformed authorities. The Smectymnuans claimed that William Twisse (who had briefly served as Elizabeth of Bohemia's chaplain in the Palatinate after her wedding to Frederick) had reported that Rivet had told him that when 'a great Prelate' showed him the passages which Hall had cited and asked for his judgement, Rivet replied that 'all these have been long since overworne and beaten out and baffled'. Hall in reply complained that they had misapplied what 'my much reverenced friend, learned Rivetus' had said – he was actually talking about the works of the Laudian Richard Montagu, and Hall claimed that Rivet would shortly explain this.[20]

Why was Rivet's approval so energetically sought? He was physically present for some of this time in England in connection with the Anglo-Dutch marriage of 1641 (in his capacity as the groom's tutor but also to report back to the Prince of Orange). Rivet by his own attestation was seeking to play a role in mediating discussions over reduced episcopacy. He himself knew England well, having visited it several times, and he counted several bishops among his correspondents. Rivet's links were thus of a very different sort to those of Voetius, whose contacts were almost exclusively with the regime's puritan critics. In letters to the Prince of Orange in the first half of 1641, Rivet describes discussions that he had with Archbishop Ussher, the Bishop Williams committee for church reform, Bishop Juxon, and others. Rivet claims that, while consulted by all, he tried to be impartial, although he argued that bishops were not superior to other

[18] *The petition for the prelates briefly examined* (1641), pp.27-8; Hall, *Defence*, p.165.

[19] Hall, *Defence*, pp.181-8; *Die Selbstbiographie der Heidelberger theologen und hofspredigers Abraham Scultetus (1566-1624)*, ed. G.A. Benrath (Karlsruhe, 1966), pp.60-1; Thomas Morton, *Confessions and proofes of Protestant divines of reformed churches* (1662), pp.7, 18, 20, 25, 27, 29, 47, 48, 53; *Reliquiae Sacrae Carolinae* (The Hague, 1658), ii. pp.266, 345.

[20] Smectymnuus, *A vindication of the answer to the Humble Remonstrance* (1641), p.219; Joseph Hall, *A short answer to the tedious vindication of Smectymnuus* (1641), p.100. Rivet was certainly aware of Montagu's work, and identified him as an enemy of the stranger churches: Universiteit Bibliotheek, Leiden, MS BPL 285B, fol.172 (Griffin Higgs to Rivet, 4 July 1639); G. Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives ou correspondence inédite de la maison d'Orange-Nassau*, 2nd series, vol.III (Utrecht, 1859), pp.438-41. See also André Rivet, *Apologeticus* (Leiden, 1643), p.238 (and note his defences of Hall in the same volume: pp.26-7, 29).

ministers *iure divino*.[21] One suspects that Rivet was often telling people what they wanted to hear. Certainly, the Scottish minister Robert Baillie claimed in early May 1641, after he and his colleagues had had several lengthy meetings with Rivet, that 'he is one fullie in our minds, and against Bishops'.[22] Perhaps most revealing is a letter that Rivet wrote to his friend Constantijn Huygens in the same month, in which he reported that he felt he could do much good if both sides were capable of moderation. He described the bishops as chastened, and anxious to distance themselves from recent Laudian excesses ('Ilz confessent qu'il y a eu de la tyrannie, et maudissent le miserable Laud'). They feared losing all their powers and would be content to only lose half of them. While their opponents wished to reduce bishops 'au simple ministere', Rivet felt that necessity could reduce them to 'quelque accommodement moderé'. Rivet's key concern, however, was to remain 'le plus couvert que je puis, pour ne donner jalousie a personne.'[23] Rivet's nephew Lewis Du Moulin had other ideas, proposing to Parliament in 1641 that his uncle (as well as his father) should be a member of a convocation of English, Scottish, and foreign divines to determine the reform of 'the present corrupt state of the Church'.[24] This would not be the last time that Rivet would be drawn in to play a mediating role between episcopacy and presbyterianism, as we shall see.

II

With the outbreak of war, foreign support was seen by both sides as vital. As well as appeals to *raison d'état*, the invoking of the principle of shared religious identity was seen as key to securing the support of the Dutch and Scandinavian countries in particular. It was incumbent upon both sides in the war to present themselves as the natural religious allies of the foreign Protestant churches, and this inevitably shaped features of the official, public representation of their religious identity.

Parliamentarians were systematic in seeking formal expressions of foreign churches' support for their programme of religious reform and opposition to Laudian policies. Here they seem partly to have been following Scottish initiatives. Dutch support for religious change was systematically mobilized by the Scots, specifically the Covenanter Robert Baillie. The Scots had always enjoyed closer links to the international Reformed community than had the English, and they now played a prominent role in drawing the Dutch into English events. It should be noted that throughout the 1640s the Scots made repeated efforts to persuade the Dutch to sign the National Covenant as the basis for an international Reformed alliance (they were not just aiming at union with England).[25] Baillie worked in close consultation with his cousin William Spang, the minister at the Scottish staple at Veere on the island of Walcheren in Zeeland, whose church had just formally been united to the Church of Scotland on the grounds that 'it seemed expedient for correspondencie that might be had from forraigne parts, for the weal of this Kirk'.[26] At the prompting of Baillie and Spang, the classes of Zeeland, led by the classis of

[21]Prinsterer, *Archives*, pp.440, 452, 453. On Rivet's reception see also Dr Williams Library, Quick MS 34.37, pp.618-20.
[22]Baillie, *LJ*, I, p.351.
[23]*De Briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens* (6 vols., The Hague, 1911-17), III, pp.170-71.
[24]Lewis du Moulin, *Vox populi expressed in XXXV motions* (1641), p.2.
[25]W. Nijenhuis, *Ecclesia Reformata* (Leiden, 1994), p.266.
[26]*A true copy of the whole printed acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland beginning at the assembly holden at Glasgow the 27 day of November 1638* (1682), p.110.

Walcheren, sent letters to the Scottish and English churches in 1643. The letter addressed to the Scots did not specifically urge the armed intervention on parliament's side that they would launch later that year, but came very close to it, and Baillie reported with satisfaction that Scottish divines were much encouraged by 'the verie tymeous letter' of the Zeeland divines (and urged similar statements by other Dutch provincial synods).[27] The letter to the English was more outspoken: it launched an extended and vituperative attack upon episcopacy and the English liturgy's idolatrous ceremonies as the poisonous harbingers of all England's troubles, and urged sweeping reforms to bring the English church closer to those of the continent (although ending with pious exhortations to peace and unity).[28]

This Zeeland letter to 'the English churches' (which unlike the letter to the Scots was not translated into English but was published only in Latin) was perhaps one of the things that prompted the English Parliament in November 1643 to instruct the Westminster Assembly to write to 'some Divines or Churches of Zealand and Holland, and to the protestant Churches in France, Switzerland, and other Reformed Churches'. They were to inform these divines and churches ('against the great Artifices of his Majesty's Agents in those parts') of the 'true' state of English affairs, the intentions of the 'malignant faction' to introduce popery, and their condemning of other Protestant churches as 'unsound because not prelatical'.[29] The Assembly's letter was written as instructed (drafted by Stephen Marshall, with the passages relating to Scotland put in by Alexander Henderson), and dispatched in January 1644.[30] The letter presents the war in the starkest possible terms: parliamentarians are engaged in a battle with an anti-christian faction which is threatening to lay waste the true religion in England, having already had a hand in the defeat of the Palatinate and La Rochelle. Almost all points of popery had been preached and enforced by popishly-affected prelates and ministers, and their evil faction had now stirred up rebellion in Ireland with the massacre of 100,000 Protestants. Amid these calamities Parliament had called together the Assembly to give counsel for the reformation of the church, and to essay the nearest conformity to the best reformed churches, and if they failed then all the reformed churches of Europe would be endangered. Enclosing the Solemn League and Covenant, the Assembly asked the foreign churches to 'make their Apologie for us in all their churches' as suffering for the same cause in which they had themselves been oppressed, and to embrace the English parliamentarians' condition as their common cause. They ended with the coy reservation that they left to their addressee to choose the way and manner in which they would embrace their English brethren's cause, but craved their fervent prayers both public and private, that they might press on with a settlement of nearest conformity with the best reformed churches.[31]

[27] Baillie, *LJ*, II, p.75; W. Nijenhuis, 'A Disputed Letter: Relations between the Church of Scotland and the Reformed Church in the Province of Zealand in the year of the Solemn League and Covenant', *Studies in Church History Subsidia, vol.8: Humanism and Reform: the Church in Europe, England and Scotland 1400-1643* (1991), pp.237-51; *A Letter from the Synod of Zeland to the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1643).

[28] *Prosphonesis Classium et Ecclesiarum Zelandicarum ad Ecclesias Anglicanas intestine bello perturbates* (1643), esp. pp.7-10.

[29] *Commons Journals*, III, p.317 (22 Nov. 1643).

[30] Baillie, *LJ*, II, p.123; *MPWA*, V, pp.30-43. As well as two printed versions (Wing W1443 and W1444 –*pace* Nijenhuis, 'Disputed Letter', p.249), it was also published in Lewis du Moulin, *Declaratio Regnorum Angliae et Scotiae* (1645), pp.15-24.

[31] *A letter from the assembly of divines in England* (1644); *MPWA*, V, pp.34-41.

The letter was addressed to seventeen churches (of which eight were Dutch and four Swiss) which were clearly the ones whose opinions were most desired by the Westminster Assembly. A later apologetic copy was sent to the forgotten Bremen (after the Assembly had been told that 'they take not very well' having been missed from the initial mailing list), while in April the Assembly also agreed (when prompted) to give copies of the letter to merchants travelling to Sweden, Transylvania, Poland 'and other places' which they could 'disperse among those churches'.[32]

One result of the Assembly's letter may have been the King's decision to make his own address to the foreign Reformed churches. So deep-seated is our assumption that the 1640s and 1650s witnessed the retrenchment and re-establishment of a more exclusive 'Anglicanism' that historians easily miss the degree to which royalists forcefully and repeatedly asserted the Church of England's identity with the foreign Reformed churches in these decades. King Charles's *Declaration* (issued in 1644) partly sought to reassure foreign Protestants of his firm Protestant faith, against 'many false Rumours and scandalous Letters, [that] are spread up and down amongst the Reformed Churches in foreign parts'. He also emphasized that 'this most holy Religion of the Anglican Church' which he practised had been approved and applauded by the most eminent Dutch, German, French, Swiss, Danish and Swedish Protestant authors, and recalled the presence of an English bishop at the Synod of Dordt.[33]

A still more determined royalist pitch for foreign Protestant support was made in 1645, when the king drew two of the Dutch ambassadors into the offer made at Uxbridge for the calling of a national synod to resolve religious differences which representatives from the foreign Reformed churches might attend.[34] This was not an entirely new offer. The King had been proposing the calling of a national synod to resolve religious differences since December 1641 (and repeated it in his *Answer to the 19 Propositions*).[35] Given that the Westminster Assembly was notably lacking in delegates from foreign churches, this could seem to indicate a superior commitment to international Protestantism on the part of the king. This was followed by a determined affirmation of the King's religious orthodoxy by the same Dutch ambassadors in an address to the States General.[36] In 1646, Charles similarly told the French ambassador that he was prepared to propose the calling of a national synod with other divines 'as the English divines were at the Council of Dort, not excluding the like assistance of the divines of any other reformed churches, if it shall be thought fitt'.[37]

Charles may also have been encouraged to make his offer by the decidedly mixed foreign response to the Westminster Assembly's letter. So lukewarm were the replies,

[32] *The Whole Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot*, ed. J.R. Pitman (13 vols., 1822-25), XIII, pp.235, 287; *MPWA*, II, p.659, III, pp.158, 166.

[33] *His Majesties declaration, directed to all persons of what degree and qualitie soever, in the Christian world* (1644), sigs. A1v-A2r. See also *Declaratio Serenissimi Potentissimique Principis Caroli … ultramarinis Protestantium Ecclesiis transmissa Verklaringe des doorluchtigen ende seer Machtigen Prince Carel … aen de over-Zeesche Protestantsche Kercken over gesonden* (The Hague, 1644).

[34] L. van Aitzema, *Saken van Staet en Oorlogh* (6 vols., The Hague, 1669-74), III, pp.35-6 (cf. II, pp.988-91).

[35] Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, pp.137, 182, 194, 198.

[36] BL, Add MS 72435, fols.70-74v, 79r, 119v-120r. This requires more detailed analysis than is possible here. For a helpful discussion of the context see L. Luiten, 'The Dutch Republic and the English Civil War: consensus or conflict?', *Dutch Crossing* 42:2 (2018). For Parliament's response see BL, Add MS 72435, fols.112-19, 123-24; J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers* (Abingdon, 2004), pp.59-60.

[37] *State papers collected by Edward, earl of Clarendon* (3 vols., Oxford, 1767-86) [*ClarSP*], II, p.210.

indeed, that they would prompt the royalist civil lawyer Sir Edward Peirce to exclaim later in mock bafflement that the exchanges had been played down so much that 'it is scarce at all known whether there were ever any such thing or not'.[38] While Walcheren and Zeeland gave predictably positive responses, others were less enthusiastic. The French churches felt too politically vulnerable even to open the Assembly's letter, 'and so the letters still lie, and the churches not acquainted with them'. The reply from Hesse-Cassel was particularly unwelcome as, while they commended the Covenant, they gave the Assembly 'unseasonable and very unsavoury counsel, not to meddle with the Bishops' (their church had superintendants, after all).[39] Geneva presented a decidedly mixed response. The divines there were clearly seriously divided, and they composed two very different responses. While one of the letters echoed the Assembly's sentiments, the second did nothing of the sort. Calmly ignoring the Assembly's depiction of a simple struggle between the forces of good and those of the Antichrist, this second letter deplores the failure of earlier hopes for church reform and the desolation of what had been a flourishing church, stresses that there is good on both sides, that not much separates them and urges them to seek unity through the work of a panel composed of the most discreet divines from both sides. [40] This was a letter that Parliament did its best to hush up, but it came into the hands of royalists who not surprisingly made the most of it. It was described as being from the universally respected Jean Deodati – a man with close links to England who had been a delegate at the Synod of Dordt, whose Annotations on the bible (some 900 folio pages) had recently been published in translation by order of the House of Commons, and whom Lewis du Moulin had suggested in 1641 should be a member of a 'Committee or convocation' to reform the Church of England.[41] The Deodati *Answer* went through three editions in translation with royalist annotations in 1646 and 1647, and became a mainstay of royalist polemic right through to the Restoration and beyond. It also provoked a parliamentarian pamphlet's false claim that Deodati's letter was 'a notorious fiction' which would scandalize 'the good old man'. The pamphlet sought to further discredit the authenticity of the Deodati letter by reproducing a certificate from one of the Westminster Assembly scribes which claimed that they had only received the letter signed by the other two Genevan ministers, and not this other one.[42] Deodati's letter can only have reassured the king that, in a worst-case scenario where foreign protestants might indeed be involved in debates over the reform of the English church, they would not necessarily side with the more hardline Presbyterians. Once again, then, the royalists were firmly aligning the episcopalian Church of England

[38]Edward Peirce, *The English Episcopacy and liturgy asserted* (1660), p.7.
[39]Baillie, *LJ*, II, p.165; Lightfoot, *Works*, XIII, pp.207, 245; *MPWA*, II, pp.604-5.
[40]Bibliothèque de Genève [BG], Archives Tronchin 14/22, fols.63r-64v (copy, no author given – by contrast, the letter sent by Tronchin and Sartorius bears both their signatures: 14/24, fols.68r-69r); *MPWA*, V, p.32.
[41]BG, Archives Tronchin 14/22, fols.63r-64v; *An answer sent to the ecclesiasticall assembly at London by the reverend, noble and learned man, John Deodate* ('Geneva' 1646, Newcastle 1647). Like Voetius and Rivet, Deodati had had his reported speech invoked in English pamphlet debates in the past. Richard Montagu had claimed that Deodati 'being lately with me at *Eaton*, professed there unto me his owne opinion in some points contrary to the conclusions of *Dort;* as also the dissension of their Church at *Geneva*, from the PRIVATE *opinions* (as he called them) of CALVIN and BEZA' (Richard Montagu, *Appello Caesarem* (1625), p.71). For an incredulous response see *A brief censure upon an appeale to Caesar* (Oxford, 1625), p.34.
[42][Henry Walker], *A Reply to a letter printed at Newcastle* (1646); *An answer sent to the ecclesiasticall assembly at London* ('Geneva' [i.e. Newcastle], 1646, 1647). It is clear from Baillie that Assembly members were in fact aware of Deodati's letter (Baillie, *LJ*, II, p.239). For citations see e.g. Isaac Basire, *Deo et ecclesiae sacrum* (Oxford, 1646), sig.A2v.

with prominent Reformed churches and divines.[43] Parliamentarian anxieties that foreign Protestants might act as advocates for royalist episcopalianism are also demonstrated by Baillie's response to the news (received around the same time as the disappointing Hesse letter) that the Protestant irenicist John Dury wished to attend the Westminster Assembly. Baillie warned sourly that if Dury should come from the royalist court at Oxford 'with the least tincture of Episcopacie, or liturgick learning' he would be regarded as a malignant.[44]

III

International religious support was also being sought, not just in parliament's struggle with royalism, but in the internecine strife between Presbyterians and Independents. Baillie here tried to hi-jack foreign responses to the Assembly's January 1644 letter so that they would explicitly attack Independency and would urge the British churches 'to eschew that democratick anarchy and independence of particular congregations, which they know to be opposite to the word of God'. It would be 'a great dashe' to the Independents, Baillie declared, if foreign churches could be cited against them, and he hoped that Rivet and Friedrich Spanheim (late of Geneva and now of the University of Leiden) would help ensure that this happened.[45] As well as seeking to shape these church responses, Baillie in addition solicited private letters of admonition (via the Paris-based Scottish divine David Buchanan) and support from divines such as Pierre du Moulin in Sedan and Spanheim in Leiden, hoping that the letters would be 'conceived in the greatest names they could procure' in the names of their churches, classes and universities. Baillie instructed that the letters should congratulate the Assembly for 'the abolition of Episcopacie and Popish ceremonies' but also promote the 'golden occasion in hand … to get England conforme in worship and government to the rest of the Reformed'.[46]

For all Baillie's efforts to direct the content of these responses, however, the results were mixed. Treatise-length letters were secured from Spanheim and from the minister of the church of Middelburg in Zeeland, Willem Apollonius (with the formal approval or their university and classis respectively) and were published. Apollonius' *Consideratio* – which engaged systematically with each of the topics in debate between Presbyterians and Independents – was formally presented to the Westminster Assembly on 4th December 1644 (every member received a copy) and in 1646 the Assembly held a special session at which Apollonius was received and personally thanked for his work.[47] The *Consideratio* was published in Latin and in English translation, and had

[43]Note also the use of the Wallachrian classis's defence of set liturgies in its letter to the Westminster Assembly in Henry Hammond, *A view of the new directorie* (Oxford, 1646), pp.89-90. (Baillie had noted that 'some few' had thought the Walcheren letter 'not so opposit to the English Government and ceremonies as the tymes required': Baillie, *LJ*, II, 75).
[44]Baillie, *LJ*, II, p.166. Baillie's fears were groundless. Dury had turned against episcopacy in 1642, and it is clear from his correspondence with Hartlib and others at this time that he was more preoccupied with devising a reconciliation between Presbyterians and Independents, which would have been equally objectionable to Baillie: see e.g. SUL, Hartlib MS 3/2/19B-20A; John Dury, *An Epistolary Discourse* (1644). Dury was aware of the rumours that 'it is giuen out that I am going ouer by the Kings appointment to betraye & undermine the Counsells of the Parliament & Assembly' (Hartlib MS 3/2/2B).
[45]Baillie, *LJ*, II, pp.115, 128, 170, 179-80.
[46]Baillie, *LJ*, II, pp.170,180. For Buchanan's exchanges with Swiss divines see Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, MS S.173, items 48-9. Sprunger (*Dutch Puritanism*, p.366) is incorrect to claim that the Assembly sent formal appeals for collective resolutions from the theology faculties of Utrecht and Leiden (it would not have dared to venture such an approach).
[47]*MPWA*, III, pp.473n, 657, 661.

a significant impact on the emerging polemical exchanges between Presbyterians and Independents. There was also a trickle of expressions of Dutch support at the level of provincial synods.[48]

But Baillie was often despairing at the lack of action from Rivet and Voetius ('Will neither Rivett not Voetius follow the example of brave Apollonius?', he exclaimed (in vain) in May 1644).[49] Not only did neither Voetius nor the University of Utrecht respond, but the Synod of Utrecht's reply to the Assembly 'had not one word either of Episcopacie or Independencie'. 'We would have expected other things from Voetius', Baillie commented, although in June 1643 he was already aware of the problems with Voetius' position and had confessed to Spang that he was 'verie evill satisfied' with Voetius' 1641 published theses on presbyteries and synods (although imploring Spang not to reveal his dissatisfaction– 'this to yow onlie'). In their manner (he complained) the theses were obscure 'with a multitude of needless distractions and long involved discourses'. He reflected that Voetius, under the influence of the writings of Robert Parker (the ecclesiologically ambiguous nonconformist exile who had died in 1614), 'dissents from us, giving excommunication, and, which is more, ordination, to our *sessions* (rather than classes or synods) in all ordinarie cases'.[50] Not only were Voetius' writings and an incautious clause in the letter from the classis of Walcheren (investing 'the entire power of government in the hands of congregational presbyteries') causing 'great harm' and being used 'publicly against us' by the Independents, but (Baillie complained) as a result prominent presbyterians such as Lazarus Seaman were being forced to reject the authority of Dutch divines, 'saying, that Voetius was bot one man', and citing the Harmony of Confessions against Voetius and the Walcheren classis.[51] As for Rivet, he had appended his name with those of the other Leiden professors to their approval of Spanheim's anti-Independent answer to Buchanan, but he had problematic political considerations of his own, and there were undoubtedly unscrupulous attempts to scare him off from direct involvement: Rivet was apparently told (falsely) that copies of his books were being burned in England.[52] Voetius' lack of compliance is perhaps the more telling and reflects the fact that foreign Reformed perspectives on church government did not necessarily fit into the rigid presbyterian model that British presbyterians had assumed (and in Voetius' case these perspectives were arguably shaped in part by alternative traditions among English Protestant exiles with whom he was acquainted).[53]

[48]For the South Holland response see W.P.C. Knuttel (ed.), *Acta der Particuliere Synoden van Zuid-Holland 1621-1700* (The Hague, 1909), II, pp.476-9. The 1644 Walcheren letter condemned the *Apologetical Narration* as desired and was delivered to the Westminster Assembly, but Baillie complained that the Independents worked (successfully) through parliament to suppress it and the letter from the synod of Zeeland (although Baillie tried to persuade the latter to publish their letter themselves: Baillie, *LJ*, II, pp.143, 146-7, 175, 180).

[49]Baillie, *LJ*, II, p.89.

[50]Baillie, *LJ*, II, pp.65, 165, 239.

[51]Baillie, *LJ*, II, pp.165, 205. See also Seaman's remark in another context when confronted with testimonies from Voetius, William Ames and Ludovicus Crocius as spokesmen for the 'Calvinist' position: 'though each of them be Reverend, yet they are but *of yesterday*, either living, or lately dead; too few to make up *a full verdict*' (Lazarus Seaman, *The diatribe proved to be a paradiatribe* (1647), pp.59-60). Cf. Smectymnuus on Spanheim: 'As for the learned Spanhemius . . . though wee give him the deserved honour of a worthy man: yet wee think it too much to speake of him, as if the judgement of the whole Church of Geneva were incorporated into him' (Smectymnuus, *An answer to a book entituled An humble remonstrance* (1641), pp.74-5).

[52]Friedrich Spanheim, *Epistola ad . . . Davidem Buchananum, super controversiis quibusdam quae in ecclesiis Anglicanis agitantur* (1645), p.7; Baillie, *LJ*, II, p.197.

[53]See on this H. Powell, *The crisis of British Protestantism* (Manchester, 2015), pp.159-73; M. Bouwman, *Voetius over het gezag der synoden* (Amsterdam, 1937).

IV

As well as noting how often European religious testimonials were sought by the various protagonists in the struggles to reform the Church of England in these decades, it is also important to retain a sense of how arguments contesting the Church of England were often also played out by English protagonists on foreign soil. One example among many is how the English struggle over the reform of the liturgy was fought out in various chapels in the Netherlands. The Protestant irenicist John Dury, employed as chaplain to the Princess Mary in the Hague, fretted that he was unable to act there as a minister 'without giving scandale to these Churches on the one side or offending the King on the other'. But when he departed in May 1644 to take up his new post as minister to the merchant adventurers in Rotterdam, Dury was left with the conundrum of what form of religious service he should follow. He noted that in the company's church their communion table was railed in an altarwise position but (he was told) it could only be taken down by parliamentary authority. While wishing that he could be given direct instructions by parliament or the Westminster Assembly on the right form of worship, he was reduced to begging his friend Samuel Hartlib to tell him how his London parish minister Herbert Palmer conducted services so that Dury could know 'how to settle the public worship here in Conformitie to that which is most approoved now amongst yow'.[54]

Further conflict was prompted by the attempts in 1645 of the Queen of Bohemia's chaplain William Cooper (appointed to the position at Parliament's insistence the previous year) to administer the eucharist according to the newly-introduced Directory. This led the royalist ambassador Boswell to complain to Jacob Cats the Grand Pensionary of Holland (as Strickland reported) 'saying this would make a schism and division in the Church'. Cooper's action either provoked or was a response to the decision by Elizabeth's court to sponsor the publication of a Dutch translation of the Book of Common Prayer in the same year (which, as Helmers notes, can only have had an apologetical rather than a practical purpose).[55] At the same time, the English congregationalist preacher at the Hague Samuel Balmford dropped every element he had retained from the English liturgy in the eucharistic service, leading Boswell to petition the States General and States of Holland against these 'innovations', and allegedly pressing Balmford to revive 'all the English liturgies and ceremonies'. Balmford reportedly secured an order from the classes that nothing should be changed in the English church without their consent, but when he then sought permission to use the Directory the classes refused, directing him instead to use only the Dutch liturgy in English 'for the Classis takes notice that this state is N[e]utrall and the Directory is avowed only by the Parliament'.[56]

V

After the regicide, contests over the reform of the English church took place on European soil among the exiles. We can note here the acrimonious exchanges between Robert

[54]SUL, Hartlib MS 3/2/3A, 13A, 25B, 34B.
[55]BL, Add MS 72435, fol.86r; Helmers, *Royalist republic*, pp.93-4; Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism*, p.353.
[56]BL, Add MS 72435, fols.86r, 88v; Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism*, p.153. Cf. BL, Add MS 6394, fol.369r.

Baillie and Bishop John Bramhall as they vied to influence the new king.[57] But still more striking is the intriguing role played by foreign divines in attempts to create an alternative version of the Church of England that could embody religious concessions to the Scots in order to secure their support for Charles II's attempt to gain the throne. Charles II's ill-fated negotiations with the Scots and the subsequent Treaty of Breda have been discussed by many scholars. But historians' habitual focus on Charles's eventual capitulation over the Covenant means that they have neglected the prior attempts to hammer out a compromise religious deal with the Scots under the mediation of the Dutch, with a particular focus on schemes for reduced episcopacy. The close participation of the Prince of Orange in attempts to draft a settlement led to the involvement of a number of 'Dutch' divines, including Rivet (now conveniently placed at Breda) and Spanheim (Baillie had made sure in advance to contact Spanheim and Rivet himself to gain their support, and although Spanheim died before he could answer his letter, Rivet reportedly 'had his best affections and prayer going along with us in all our desires, as he signified to us in private Letters'). The Scottish ministers also reportedly sought to draw in Voetius.[58]

It was assumed by some commentators that both Rivet and Voetius would 'soften' the Scots' position on church government and 'make them more yeelding according to the Dutch pattern, which is nothing so rigid as the Scottish', but there were certainly later suggestions that Rivet's presence might have actually been intended to fool the King's followers into expecting more moderate conditions. As in 1641, Rivet may not have been merely a moderating presence.[59] But there were other schemes proposed at this time that tried to find a way of reconciling the King's episcopalian chaplains to some form of Presbyterianism, along a 'reduced episcopacy' model. Two figures prominent in presenting models to this effect were Huguenots: Daniel de Mazières (the elector Palatine's physician) and Louis Hérault (minister of the Walloon congregation in London), and De Mazières attempted to bring on board the dean of the chapel royal Richard Steward (of all people). Where Steward and Hérault did agree was in seeing the humour of the English people as being so ungovernable that they needed episcopacy to keep them under control (and Baillie had earlier commented that 'the humour of this people' was so 'inclinable to singularities' that 'no people had so much need of a Presbytrie').[60] The royal chaplain George Morley also tried to promote a strategy that Baillie had attempted earlier – of sending pertinent questions concerning the necessity of Presbyterian government and the lawfulness of episcopacy to the divines of Holland and France. But in this case Morley hoped that the foreign divines would curb the excesses of the Scots.[61]

Another old plan exhumed by these negotiations was that of a national synod to resolve England's religious controversies, to which some foreign divines would be admitted. According to Clarendon this was suggested by the Prince of Orange (Clarendon assumed that this was at the prompting of the Scots, although Rivet

[57] John Bramhall, *A faire warning to take heed of the Scottish discipline* (1649); Robert Baillie, *A review of the seditious pamphlet lately pnblished [sic] in Holland by Dr Bramhell* (Delft, 1649).
[58] *The proceedings of the Commissioners of the Church and kingdome of Scotland, with his Majestie at the Hague* (1649), p.26; S.R. Gardiner (ed.), *Letters and papers illustrating the relations between Charles II and Scotland 1650* (Edinburgh, 1894), p.52.
[59] Gardiner, *Letters*, pp.52, 81, 85, 88.
[60] BL, Add MSS 78265, fols.34r-37v, 78204, fols.151-56; Baillie, *LJ*, II, p.177; Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, pp.324-5. On this point of the distinctive temper of the English see also Raymond Gaches' letter published in White Kennett, *A register and chronicle* (1728), p.465.
[61] *ClarSP*, II, 519-20.

might have been an alternative influence here). But the prospect of admitting foreign divines to a synod literally gave the dean of the chapel royal Richard Steward sleepless nights, and it is telling that in the 1650 Treaty of Breda (when Charles II finally capitulated to the Scottish presbyterians) there is no direct reference to any such plan.[62] It may have appealed to Charles as a way of avoiding a specific commitment to presbyterianism. The abandonment of these proposals for continental involvement in a religious settlement meant the end for the moment of attempts to bring Presbyterianism and episcopalianism together on the international stage, although this forms an intriguing counterpoint to previous and later 'reduced episcopacy' initiatives.

More broadly, it is important to note that some of the most detailed reformulations of the identity of the Church of England in the 1650s were composed, not on English soil, but on the continent, and were often written by exiles who were engaged in debates with foreign divines. This is true of a number of works by John Cosin and John Bramhall. But even those divines such as Henry Hammond who remained in England were involved in key debates with foreign Reformed divines such as David Blondel in his 1651 *Dissertationes quatuor*. [63]

For their part, French Huguenot divines made their own important contribution to the defence of the English church and its martyr king, but also emphasized Charles I's supposed commitment to solidarity with the Reformed churches. Thus, Peter du Moulin's *Défence de la Religion Reformée, et de la Monarchie et Eglise Anglicane* (published in 1650) attacked the English rebels for systematically preventing the king from assembling a national synod to which he had proposed to invite representatives from the other Reformed churches (and also invoked Charles's 1644 *Declaration*).[64] The distinguished French scholar Claudius Salmasius combined his denunciation of the regicide with a defence of episcopacy (here reversing his earlier hostility to this form of church government).[65]

The European dimensions of the contest over the Church of England's identity in the 1650s extend vastly further and longer than there is room to discuss here. The continuing impact of English religious events is indicated by the fact that in his enormous *Summa Controversiarum Religionis* of 1653 the Leiden professor Johannes Hoornbeeck devotes 106 pages to the English 'Brownists' while spending only 36 pages on what we would assume was the more immediate threat to Dutch orthodoxy from Socinians and Remonstrants.[66] But for our present purposes we will move forward to another (perhaps unexpected) flashpoint – the settlement of 1662.

[62]Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W.D. Macray (6 vols., Oxford, 1888), V, pp.40, 42.
[63]John Bramhall, *An answer to Monsieur de la Militiere* (The Hague, 1653); Bramhall, *A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon* (1656); Bramhall, *A just vindication of the Church of England* (1654); *The Works of John Cosin* (5 vols., Oxford, 1843-55), IV, pp.1-369; Isaac Basire, *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Britannicae Libertate* (Bruges, 1656); Henry Hammond, *Dissertationes quatuor* (1651).
[64]Peter du Moulin], *Défence de la Religion Reformée, et de la Monarchie et Eglise Anglicane* (1650), sig.***3r, pp.125, 168. Du Moulin also gave a withering assessment of the Westminster Assembly's 1644 letter, and provided his own belated reply in the name of the French Reformed churches (pp.81-100).
[65]Claudius Salmasius, *Defensio Regia pro Carolo I* (Paris, 1649), praefatio, pp.8-9 (contrast idem, *De episcopis et presbyteris contra D. Petavium Loiolitam* (Leiden, 1641)).
[66]Johannes Hoornbeeck, *Summa Controversiarum religionis* (Utrecht, 1653), pp.619-725.

VI

The eventual so-called 'restoration' of the English Church is quite rightly seen as an important stage in the normalization of episcopalianism in the church and the marginalizing of puritanism. But, as Tony Claydon has aptly observed, the tendency to treat the 1662 settlement as 'a domestic revenge tragedy' has meant that the European dimension to the religious events has often been missed.[67]

Initially, in the months preceding the Restoration, English Presbyterians were suspected of trying to get the Dutch Presbyterians on their side when travelling over to the Hague to meet the king.[68] Evidence for specific contacts is frustratingly scanty, and the problem may have been that there was no longer a Rivet on the Dutch side to act as a courtly contact and facilitator. Nevertheless, the Scottish agent James Sharp reported in April 1660 that there was talk that 'there will be a Synod called from all the reformed Churches' to ensure 'a more reputeable settleing of the Church of England'.[69] Just like Charles I in 1641 and 1644, the Presbyterians were apparently gambling that the foreign churches would provide support and vindication for their preferred form of church government.

As a counter to such plans, a scheme was launched to induce foreign Protestants to write in support of the restoration of bishops, and even of the Book of Common Prayer. George Morley was urging in May that the king should resist proposals to call a synod to include the assistance of foreign divines. Instead, he should engage foreign divines to persuade the English Presbyterians 'to submit to such a government as your Majesty shall settle by bishops'. Morley argued that it was very important 'to draw something from the Dutch and French Presbyterians, though it be an acknowledgement only of Episcopal government, which I think none of them will stick at, and that will be enough to oblige the Presbyterians in point of conscience to submit to it'.[70] Morley's suggestion seems to have been rapidly implemented. The following month Sharp noted that it was reported in Paris that 'some learned men of the Protestants in France and of the professors of Leyden, were wryting for the lawfullness of Episcopacy' and that if the king would write to the Charenton assembly in July they would doubtless approve 'his purpose to settle Episcopacy in England'.[71] The pro-episcopal letters from French divines including Perre Du Bosc, Etienne Le Moyne and Jean Maximilien de l'Angle, were mostly addressed to the Jersey episcopally-ordained divine Daniel Brevint, and were swiftly translated by Lewis's episcopalian brother Peter du Moulin, ready for publication.[72]

This policy presumably reflected the fact that royalists had already successfully called upon French Reformed testimonials in April of the same year. Three defences of the King's 'steadfastness in the Protestant religion' written by the Huguenot divines Jean

[67]Tony Claydon has written impressively nuanced analyses of the invoking of the Reformed churches by all sides in the later Stuart church in his *Europe and the Making of England* (Cambridge, 2007) (p.286 quoted above) and 'The Church of England and the churches of Europe 1660-1714' in G. Tapsell (ed.), *The later Stuart church, 1660-1714* (Manchester, 2012), pp.173-92, although he does not discuss specific Anglo-European interactions.
[68]R.S. Bosher, *The making of the Restoration settlement* (1951), p.128; Bodl., Clarendon MS 72, fol.316r.
[69]Glasgow University Library [GUL], MS Gen 210, p.82.
[70]Bosher, *Making*, p.129; *Clarendon State Papers*, III, 743-4; Bodl., Clarendon MS 72, fol.352.
[71]GUL, MS Gen 210, p.147.
[72]See e.g. Jean Durel, *A view of the government and publick worship of God in the reformed churches beyond the seas wherein is shewed their conformity and agreement with the Church of England, as it is established by the Act of Uniformity* (1662), pp.122, 125, 126, 141.

Daillé, Charles Drelincourt and Raymond Gaches were published with English translations (shades here of Charles I's 1644 declaration of his Protestant orthodoxy).[73] In the event, the French Reformed defences of episcopacy that Sharp reported as being in progress in June of 1660 were not published at that time (perhaps because plans for the king to write to the Charenton assembly were abandoned, or because his address did not meet with the desired response).[74] Instead, these pro-episcopacy letters were published in 1662 by the episcopally-ordained Jersey minister Jean Durel (now serving in London) in what is in a sense the apotheosis of foreign Reformed testimonials for the Church of England. Compiled specifically to convince those not conforming to the new settlement that they were effectively breaking communion with foreign Reformed churches too, Durel's work is entitled *A view of the government and publick worship of God in the reformed churches beyond the seas wherein is shewed their conformity and agreement with the Church of England, as it is established by the Act of Uniformity*. In the meantime, the newly-appointed bishops were receiving the endorsements of celebrated foreign divines, most notably the patron of Durel and Brevint, John Cosin. Cosin received the flattering dedication ('Reverende Praesul') of the distinguished Huguenot theologian Moïse Amyraut's *In orationem dominicam exercitatio* of 1662.

Nevertheless, attempts to depict the 'restored' episcopalian Church of England as one closely aligned with the foreign Reformed churches ran into problems with the countervailing desire to maintain the purity of episcopal discipline. Such tensions are reflected in the fact that foreign testimonials defending the Book of Common Prayer in Durel's 1662 *View of the government and publick worship* derived from Durel's own controversial decision to embrace the king's offer that his French congregation could meet in the chapel of the Savoy Palace on the condition that they use the Book of Common Prayer in French and have their ministers instituted by the bishop of London.[75] In one sense, these events constituted a perfect public demonstration of the foreign Reformed community's recognition of episcopacy and the English liturgy, and Durel did his best to present events in this way by seeking letters of support for his actions from French Reformed divines abroad. Durel prefaced the printed version of a 1661 sermon in which he defended his use of the English Prayer Book with extracts from recent letters by several familiar French divines – including Bochart, Gaches, de l'Angle and Daillé (father and son) – sent in December 1661. In these letters, the French divines thanked Durel for the copy of his sermon which he had sent them, praised his actions and defended the English ceremonies as 'choses indifferentes de leur nature' (while the sermon itself systematically flags parallels of the Prayer Book's ceremonies in the liturgies of other Reformed churches).[76] These and other letters were then reproduced in Durel's *View of the government and publick worship*.

However, this process of acquiring foreign endorsements was not as smooth, or the testimonials as unambiguous, as Durel implied. His actions in 1661 had in fact drawn stinging criticisms, and French divines who supported Durel's schemes themselves came

[73] *Certain Letters evidencing the Kings Stedfastness in the Protestant Religion: Sent from . . . the Ministers of Charenton, to some Persons of Quality in London* (1660) (see also GUL, MS Gen 210, p.81, which shows that by 13 April the letters were already collected and known, but not yet translated). None of the writers could of course claim specific personal knowledge of Charles's religion as he had never attended services in Charenton.
[74] Durel, *A view*, pp.122, 126, 141. On the Charenton assembly plans see Bosher, *Making*, pp.132-3.
[75] TNA, SP 29/32, fol.59.
[76] Jean Durel, *The liturgy of the Church of England asserted in a sermon* (1662), sigs.a1r-a2v.

under attack for doing so.[77] More generally, the foreign Reformed churches and divines could not be relied upon to play the role that was desired. The arguments of Durel, and much of the royalist position on foreign Protestantism, relied on making a stark distinction between presbyterians in England and those on the continent, but foreign Reformed divines and churches were not always willing to distance themselves in this way (albeit Huguenots in the 1650s had been anxious for their own monarch's consumption to distance themselves from English anti-monarchical parliamentarians). The initial foreign letters in April 1660 testifying to the king's steadfastness in the Protestant religion had all expressed satisfaction that the Presbyterians were now in control of the English Church and 'tiennent le timon de l'Etat'.[78] These French correspondents who were so happy to see a presbyterian triumph could not necessarily be taken to be endorsing the episcopacy that was subsequently established in England. In fact, the French letters of support for episcopacy were just as problematic as Baillie had found European letters in the 1640s against Congregationalism (and indeed, one of the French divines- - Charles Drelincourt – had written for both occasions, as he himself noted).[79] The foreign divines were quite emphatic that they were supporting only an episcopacy reduced to 'une juste moderation', and not the lordly *iure divino* episcopate of the pre-war period.[80] In fact, Drelincourt published his critical *Lettres sur l'Episcopat d'Angleterre* in 1661 as a deliberate warning against the restoration of a more tyrannical form of episcopacy. In this publication he supplements his letters to Brevint with other letters to his relatives written later in 1660 that are full of concerns about the revival of more extreme episcopalian ideas. He clearly told Durel in another letter in 1661 that the restored English bishops were doctrinally suspect and guilty of 'trop de pompe & de s'attribuer trop d'autorité'.[81] Similarly, Pierre Du Bosc's 1660 letter to Brevint had not contented itself with simply affirming the lawfulness of episcopacy (as was desired), but also sounded the wrong note in condemning the past behaviour of England's bishops. He also urged (with telling wording) that 'on reduise l'Episcopat' and proposed what is essentially Ussher's model, tying bishops to making all decisions by agreement with their presbytery, 'qu'ils ne prononcent de sentences Ecclesiastiques, que suivant les resolutions de cette sainte & venerable Compagnie; & qu'enfin ils soient responsible de leurs actions à leurs Synodes'.[82] These sections of Du Bosc's letter were (not surprisingly) omitted from Durel's published version.[83]

[77]B. Armstrong, 'Une lettre de Jean Durel à Charles Drelincourt', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 122 (1976), pp.263-279. The *Apologie des Puritains d'Angleterre* (Geneva, 1663) seeks ostensibly to distinguish between those French ministers motivated by a desire to promote the accommodation of presbyterians who were simply poorly informed, and those propelled by less honourable motives (pp.138-40). Those singled out for explicit attack are Goyon, Rondelet, Du Bosc, Le Moyne, De l'Angle and Bochart d'Alençon (pp.142-59). By contrast, Drelincourt's *Lettres sur l'Episcopat* are praised (pp.26, 82-3, 141, 146, 147).

[78]*Certain Letters evidencing the Kings Stedfastness*, p.37.

[79]*Lettres de Monsieur Drelincourt sur l'Episcopat de l'Angleterre* (Paris, 1660), p.6.

[80]E.g. Drelincourt, *Lettres*, pp.5, 6-7, 9-10.

[81]Drelincourt, *Lettres*, pp. 14, 16-31, 38-9; Armstrong, 'Une lettre', pp.268-72.

[82]Philippe Le Gendre, *La Vie de Pierre Du Bosc* (Amsterdam, 1716), p.26.

[83]For other letters of French ministers sent to Durel's colleague Daniel Brevint, see the extracts in Kennett, *A register*, pp.463-7. In his reply, Brevint explains that he will remove certain sections from Du Bosc's letter that would appeal to the wrong people, yet implies his support for the objective of a reduced episcopacy, stressing that 'il n'y a rien de plus aisé que de concilier l'Episcopat avec le Presbitere, après l'excellente lettre que vous nous avez envoyée, & qui peut beaucoup contribuër à cet effet' (*La Vie de Pierre Du Bosc*, p.30). There is no hint of this material in the extract published by Durel.

On liturgical matters, Durel admitted that Drelincourt had opposed a number of features of the Book of Common Prayer as needing reform, but did not quote from these letters and instead claimed that Drelincourt had now been convinced otherwise.[84] Moreover, while another distinguished Huguenot correspondent, Jean Daillé, had affirmed Charles II's Protestant orthodoxy and made guardedly positive remarks about the English liturgy (which Durel enthusiastically published), he was at the same time involved in a controversy with Henry Hammond over the practice of confirmation where Hammond described Daillé's views as an act of war against the Church of England. Daillé would go on to write an enormous treatise against Roman Catholic ceremonies which also by implication condemned those required by the re-established Church of England, including kneeling at communion and the sign of the cross in baptism. Daillé's works would now in turn be seized upon by nonconformists as evidence of Reformed hostility to the ceremonies of the 'Restoration' church, while the same puritan authors singled out for condemnation those French Reformed divines who supported Durel's scheme to embrace the English liturgy.[85]

We have noted above Sharp's report in June 1660 that Leiden professors were writing in defence of episcopacy. This also merits further investigation. The Leiden professor Johannes Hoornbeeck did in fact write and publish in 1660 a lengthy set of annotations on the revived scheme of Archbishop Ussher for a reduced episcopacy. Hoornbeeck's discussion of episcopacy is not mentioned in Durel's collection, but this is unlikely to have been an oversight. In fact, Hoornbeeck's book – published in Utrecht (presumably with the support of his mentor Voetius) – was still more subversive than the (unedited) remarks of the French divines. Hoornbeeck is implacable in his insistence that in the early church presbyters appeared before bishops did (the only distinction then being between presbyters and deacons), that bishops should be elected by presbyters, that no presbyter should ever be barred from the ministry of the word and sacraments, and that presbyters have a key role to play in the ordination of ministers. Hoornbeeck also upholds Beza's three-fold categorization of bishops (condemning the demonic, tyrannical form in which they dominate over other clergy).[86] Despite this, Hoornbeeck claims that the 'reduced episcopacy' model proposed by 'Usserius noster' would have upheld these principles of ministerial parity in achieving an acceptable blending of presbytery and episcopacy (while also reflecting that we cannot always obtain what is best but must accept in its place what is nearest to it).[87] In fact, Hoornbeeck goes on to conduct what is a masterclass in amassing the evidence for past royalist support for reduced episcopacy – noting the 1641 *Directions* attributed to Ussher, Joseph Hall's 1644 *Modest offer*, and pertinent passages in the *Eikon Basilike* concerning church government (which he quotes at length and in English – Hoornbeeck's knowledge of English vernacular writing is on impressive display here). And Hoornbeeck ends his comments on Ussher's scheme with an appeal for the unity of all English Protestants.[88]

[84]Durel, *A view*, pp.190-1 (cf. Drelincourt, *Lettres*, pp.43-56).
[85]J.-L. Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009), pp.276-84; *Apologie des Puritains d'Angleterre*, pp.54-5, 115, 125.
[86]Johannes Hoornbeeck, *De Independentismo Epistola . . . addita est Jacobi Usserii . . . de Reducendo Episcopatu ad formam regiminis Synodici, Dissertatio cum Notis* (Utrecht, 1661), pp.35-6, 43, 48, 52, 55-7, 72, 75.
[87]*Ibid*., pp.20, 71-2, 78, 82-5.
[88]*Ibid*., pp.85-8, 99-107. On these sources for reduced episcopacy see Milton, *England's Second Reformation*, pp.119-20, 192-3, 215-16.

As usual, the foreign Reformed churches and divines would not act as ciphers, at the beck and call of those who sought their backing. They reserved the right to make their own assessment of English events, and to proffer their own solutions. In the end, the foreign Reformed churches and divines could never *quite* be trusted to say what was required.

The input of European divines into English debates over the church's identity thus constitutes a significant and relatively unexplored aspect of the religious divisions of these decades. But there is of course another major dimension to these interactions, and that concerns the traffic in the other direction, namely the impact of these English religious developments and ideas upon European Protestantism. Here the evidence is even more voluminous. Not only is European Protestant interest in English religious developments undeniable, but this was also a period when an unparalleled quantity of materials in the English language were being read by prominent European divines, not only in translation but also in the original language. Voetius was a key figure here. He himself learned to read English and possessed many books written in the language (the auction catalogue of his library includes 270 works by puritans in English). He also integrated detailed analysis of English theological controversies into his published works (as did his disciple Johannes Hoornbeeck): indeed, the 1651 edition of Voetius' *Exercitia et Bibliotheca Studiosi Theologiae* provides extraordinary evidence of how English scholarship published in English was being written into the European Reformed curriculum at this time.[89] Guilelmus Saldenus testified that Voetius' students at Utrecht were strongly encouraged to learn the English language. Puritan practical divinity was an important draw here: Voetius himself commented that Hungarian, Transylvanian, Dutch, German and Swiss students studied the English language and examined English books both at home and in England in order to study practical theology more effectively.[90] But in the process they were exposed to new developments in doctrine and ecclesiology too, while even those unable to read English could study expositions of English congregationalist arguments and refutations of Laudian positions in Voetius' Latin works.[91] And if British divines repeatedly attempted to persuade André Rivet to comment on English events, it should be stressed that pressures were (allegedly) also being applied simultaneously in the opposite direction. At the same time that Rivet was being approached to condemn English congregationalists, there were claims on the continent that Rivet was seeking to persuade the Westminster Assembly to condemn the doctrines of his Huguenot opponent Moïse Amyraut, and the Assembly was forced to issue a formal denial.[92] More generally, reports of English events and ideas were manipulated within internal debates in European countries. English sectarian excesses, the emergence of congregationalism, Erastianism and other tensions in church/state relations, and Laudian 'popish' tendencies all provided invaluable ammunition in European internal religious debates. This is a broader theme that I hope to explore elsewhere.

[89]Gisbertus Voetius, *Exercitia et Bibliotheca Studiosi Theologiae* (2nd edn, Utrecht, 1651). I plan to discuss this work in more detail elsewhere.
[90]Voetius, *Selectarum disputationum*, III, p.11; W.J. op 't Hof, *Engelse pietistische geschriften in het Nederlands, 1598-1622* (Rotterdam, 1987), p.585.
[91]For anti-Laudianism in Voetius's works see e.g. *Selectarum disputationum*, III, pp.79, 1238, 1242-3..
[92]F.P. van Stam, *The controversy over the theology of Saumur, 1635-1650* (Maarsen, 1988), pp.183, 186-9, 194, 226-35; *MPWA*, III, pp.717-18, V, p.262.

The European dimensions of the contest over the Church of England's religious identity thus offer us not only a greatly enhanced perspective on England's religious struggles, but can help us to see the significance of those struggles for other countries and cultures. England's crisis of religious identity had implications and opportunities for all of Protestant Europe.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Bibliography

Primary

Manuscript sources

Geneva, Bibliothèque de Genève, Archives Tronchin 14/22
Glasgow, Glasgow University Library, MS Gen 210
Leiden, Universiteit Bibliotheek, Leiden, MS BPL 285B
London, British Library, Add MSS 6394, 72435, 78265
London, The National Archives, SP 29/32
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Clarendon MS 72
Sheffield, Sheffield University Library, Hartlib MSS 3, 5
Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, MS S.173, items 48–9

Printed sources

Acta der Particuliere Synoden van Zuid-Holland 1621-1700, ed. W.P.C. Knuttel. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1909.
van Aitzema, Lieuwe. *Saken van Staet en Oorlogh*. 6 vols. The Hague: J. Veely, J. Tongerloo & J. Doll, 1669-74.
The Answeres of some Brethren of the Ministerie. Aberdeen: Edward Raban, 1638.
Apologie des Puritains d'Angleterre. Geneva: Jean Colin, 1663.
Baillie, Robert. *A review of the seditious pamphlet lately pnblished [sic] in Holland by Dr Bramhell*. Delft: Mich. Stait, 1649.
Baillie, Robert. *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, ed. D. Laing. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1842.
Basire, Isaac. *Deo et ecclesiae sacrum*. Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1646.
Basire, Isaac. *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Britannicae Libertate*. Bruges: 1656.
Bramhall, John. *A faire warning to take heed of the Scottish discipline*. London: 1649.
Bramhall, John. *An answer to Monsieur de la Militiere*. The Hague: 1653.
Bramhall, John. *A just vindication of the Church of England*. London: John Crook, 1654.
Bramhall, John. *A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*. London: R.H. for John Crook, 1656.
A brief censure upon an appeale to Caesar. Oxford: 1625.
Certain Letters evidencing the Kings Stedfastness in the Protestant Religion: Sent from . . . the Ministers of Charenton, to some Persons of Quality in London. London: Thomas Newcomb for Gabriel Bedell, and Thomas Collins, 1660.
Certain briefe treatises. Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1641.
Charles I, King. *Declaratio Serenissimi Potentissimique Principis Caroli . . . ultramarinis Protestantium Ecclesiis transmissa Verklaringe des doorluchtigen ende seer Machtigen Prince Carel . . . aen de over-Zeesche Protestantsche Kercken over gesonden*. The Hague: 1644.

Charles I, King. *His Majesties declaration, directed to all persons of what degree and qualitie soever, in the Christian world*. London: Jane Coe, 1644.
Charles I, King. *Reliquiae Sacrae Carolinae*. The Hague: Sam: Browne, 1658.
The Works of John Cosin. 5 vols. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843-55.
Deodati, Jean *An answer sent to the ecclesiasticall assembly at London by the reverend, noble and learned man, John Deodate*. 'Geneva' 1646, Newcastle: Stephen Bulkley, 1647.
Drelincourt, Charles. *Lettres de Monsieur Drelincourt sur l'Episcopat de l'Angleterre*. Paris: 1660.
Du Moulin, Lewis. *Declaratio Regnorum Angliae et Scotiae*. London: Edw. Griffin, 1645.
Du Moulin, Lewis. *Proposals and reasons*. London: Iohn Redmayne, 1659.
Du Moulin, Lewis. *Vox populi expressed in XXXV motions*. London: 1641.
Du Moulin, Lewis. *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae ad . . . Johannem Cosinu*. [Leiden]: 1661.
[Du Moulin, Peter]. *Défence de la Religion Reformée, et de la Monarchie et Eglise Anglicane*. The Hague?: Samuel Brown?,1650.
[Du Moulin, Peter]. *The letter of a French Protestant*. London: R. Young, and R. Badger, 1640.
Duplyes of the Ministers & professors of Aberdene. Aberdeen: Edw. Raban, 1638.
Durel, Jean. *The liturgy of the Church of England asserted in a sermon*. London: R. Royston, 1662.
Durel, Jean. *A view of the government and publick worship of God in the reformed churches beyond the seas wherein is shewed their conformity and agreement with the Church of England, as it is established by the Act of Uniformity* (London: J[ohn]. G[rismond]. for R. Royston, 1662.
Dury, John. *An Epistolary Discourse*. London: Charles Greene, 1644.
Generall demands concerning the late covenant. London: Robert Young, 1638.
Groen van Prinsterer, G. *Archives ou correspondence inédite de la maison d'Orange-Nassau*, 2nd series, vol.III. Utrecht: S. and J. Luchtmans, 1859.
Hall, Joseph. *A defence of the humble remonstrance*. London: Nathaniel Butter, 1641.
Hall, Joseph. *An humble remonstrance*. London: [Miles Flesher] for Nathaniel Butter, 1641.
Hall, Joseph. *A short answer to the tedious vindication of Smectymnuus*. London: Nathaniel Butter, 1641.
Hammond, Henry. *Dissertationes quatuor*. London: J. Flesher and R. Royston, 1651.
Hammond, Henry. *A view of the new directorie*. Oxford: Henry Hall, 1646.
Hoornbeeck, Johannes. *De Independentismo Epistola . . . addita est Jacobi Usserii . . . de Reducendo Episcopatu ad formam regiminis Synodici, Dissertatio cum Notis*. Utrecht: J. Versteeg, 1661.
Hoornbeeck, Johannes. *Summa Controversiarum religionis*. Utrecht: 1653.
Huygens, Constantijn. *De Briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens*, ed. J.A. Worp. 6 vols. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1911-17.
Hyde, Edward, earl of Clarendon. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W. D. Macray. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888.
Hyde, Edward, earl of Clarendon. *State papers collected by Edward, earl of Clarendon*, ed. Richard Scrope and Thomas Monkhouse. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Printing-House, 1767-86.
Journals of the House of Commons.
Kennett, White. *A register and chronicle*. London: R. Williamson, 1728.
Le Gendre, Philippe. *La Vie de Pierre Du Bosc*. Amsterdam: R. & G. Wetstein, 1716.
Leslie, Henry. *A full confutation of the covenant*. London: John Raworth, for George Thomason and Octavian Pullen, 1639.
A Letter from the Synod of Zeland to the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland. Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1643.
A letter from the assembly of divines in England. London: Richard Cotes, for Ralph Smith, 1644.
Letters and papers illustrating the relations between Charles II and Scotland 1650, ed. S.R. Gardiner. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1894.
Lightfoot, John. *The Whole Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot*, ed. J.R. Pitman. 13 vols. London: J.F. Dove, 1822-25.
Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, ed. C. van Dixhoorn. 5 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
Montagu, Richard. *Appello Caesarem*. London: H[umphrey]. L[ownes]. for Matthew Lownes. 1625.

Morton, Thomas *Confessions and proofes of Protestant divines of reformed churches*. London: 1662.
Morton, Thomas. *The presentment of a schismaticke*. London: I. Okes, for R. Whitaker, and S. Broun, 1642.
Peirce, Edward *The English Episcopacy and liturgy asserted*. London: Tho. Leach and Henry Seile, 1660.
The petition for the prelates briefly examined. London: 1641.
Prideaux, John. *De Episcopatu*. London: R. Royston, 1660.
The proceedings of the Commissioners of the Church and kingdome of Scotland, with his Majestie at the Hague. London: Robert Bostock, 1649.
Prosphonesis Classium et Ecclesiarum Zelandicarum ad Ecclesias Anglicanas intestine bello perturbates. London: Jo Rothwell, 1643.
Prynne, William. *Canterburies doome*. London: John Macock for Michael Spark, 1646.
Rivet, André. *Apologeticus*. Leiden: Elzevir, 1643.
Salmasius, Claudius. *Defensio Regia pro Carolo I*. Paris: 1649.
Salmasius, Claudius. *De episcopis et presbyteris contra D. Petavium Loiolitam*. Leiden: J. Maire, 1641.
Scultetus, Abraham. *Die Selbstbiographie der Heidelberger theologen und hofspredigers Abraham Scultetus (1566-1624)*, ed. G.A. Benrath. Karlsruhe: Evangelischer Presseverband, 1966.
Seaman, Lazarus. *The diatribe proved to be a paradiatribe*. London: T.R. and E.M. for John Rothwell, 1647.
Smectymnuus, *An answer to a book entituled An humble remonstrance*. London: Tho. Paine for J. R. and M.S., 1641.
Smectymnuus, *A vindication of the answer to the Humble Remonstrance*. Iohn Rothwell, 1641.
Spanheim, Friedrich. *Epistola ad . . . Davidem Buchananum, super controversiis quibusdam quae in ecclesiis Anglicanis agitantur*. Leiden: Danielem à Gaesbeeck, 1645.
A true copy of the whole printed acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland beginning at the assembly holden at Glasgow the 27 day of November 1638. Edinburgh?, 1682.
Voetius, Gisbertus. *Politicae Ecclesiasticae Pars Tertia & Ultima*. 4 vols. Amsterdam: Johannes Janssonius van Waesberghe, 1676.
Voetius, Gisbertus. *Selectarum disputationum theologicarum*. 5 vols. Utrecht: Johannes à Waesberghe, 1648-69.
Voetius, Gisbertus. *Exercitia et Bibliotheca Studiosi Theologiae*. 2nd edn. Utrecht: Johannes à Waesberghe, 1651.
Walker, Henry, *A Reply to a letter printed at Newcastle*. London: J.C., 1646.

Secondary

Armstrong, B. G. 'Une lettre de Jean Durel à Charles Drelincourt', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 122 (1976).
Bosher, R.S. *The making of the Restoration settlement*. London: Dacre Press, 1951.
Bouwman, M. *Voetius over het gezag der synoden*. Amsterdam: Bakker, 1937.
Claydon, T. *Europe and the Making of England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Claydon, T. 'The Church of England and the churches of Europe 1660-1714' in *The later Stuart church, 1660–1714*, ed. G. Tapsell. Manchester: Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2012.
Dibon, P. ed., *Inventaire de la correspondence d'André Rivet*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1971.
Duker, A. C. *Gisbertus Voetius*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1897-1914.
Helmers, H. J. *The Royalist Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
Luiten, L. 'The Dutch Republic and the English Civil War: consensus or conflict?' *Dutch Crossing* 42:2 (2018).
Milton, A. *Catholic and Reformed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
Milton, A. 'The Church of England and the Palatinate 1566-1642' in *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, ed. P. Collinson and P. Ha. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
Milton, A. *England's Second Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Milton, A. 'A Missing Dimension of European Influence on English Protestantism: the Heidelberg Catechism and the Church of England 1563-1663', *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 20:3 (2018).

Milton, A. 'Puritanism and the continental reformed churches' in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. J. Coffey and P.C.H. Lim. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Nijenhuis, W. *Ecclesia Reformata*. E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1994.

Nijenhuis, W. 'A Disputed Letter: Relations between the Church of Scotland and the Reformed Church in the Province of Zealand in the year of the Solemn League and Covenant', *Studies in Church History Subsidia*, *vol.8*: *Humanism and Reform: the Church in Europe, England and Scotland 1400–1643*. 1991.

Op 't Hof, W. J. *Engelse pietistische geschriften in het Nederlands, 1598-1622*. Rotterdam: Lindenberg, 1987.

Peacey, J. *Politicians and Pamphleteers*. Abingdon: Ashgate, 2004.

Pettegree, A. 'The spread of Calvin's thought' in *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin*, ed. D. McKim. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Powell, H. *The crisis of British Protestantism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015.

Quantin, J.-L. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Sprunger, K. L., *Dutch Puritanism*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982.

Van Stam, F.P. *The controversy over the theology of Saumur, 1635-1650*. Maarsen: APA-Holland University, 1988.