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IN MEMORIAM
CARISSIMI PATRIS,
QUI ME HOC OPVS PERFICERE
AVXILLIO, BENIGNITATE, MULTOS PER ANNOS AMORE

COHORTATVS EST:

VIR QVIDEM CLARUS
PIETATE ET BENEVOLENTIA
INSIGNIS,
TALEM HIC NVMVS RVRVS
NVNQVAM VIDERIT.
INTRODUCTION

Upon That Memorable Scene

As old books open on the past, their times rise around them, regaining in varied scenes the pulse of life. A Huguenot congregation listens admiringly as its eloquent minister retells how John Calvin saved True Religion from the night of Babylonian ignorance, or denounced the political doctrines of the Jesuits as homicidal. Kept at a distance by Roundhead soldiers, a tense mob watches as a King of England, with ceremonial dignity, bows his head upon a squat wooden block to pray and await the thud of a gleaming ax. Far from his birthplace in France, an Anglican priest combs his Latin lexicon for words strong enough to convict before the world those fanatic rascals who killed his King. A blind Puritan poet, certain of Divine illumination within, also seeks adequate terms to crush the secret adversary who has besmirched him. Wrongly accused by the poet, a gifted preacher who never quite got along with his colleagues protests vainly, again and again, his innocence of charges of writing an offending book, questioning the mysteries of religion, and robbing the virtue of serving-maids. Or, eagerly searching the horizons of a science which promises unlimited prosperity and dominion of the world, members of the fledgling Royal Society try to silence croaks of "Atheism!" and, to prove the existence of God, solemnly debate the occult powers of old crones and the evil eye. All these are parts of the life of the seventeenth century as it emerges from the book here translated, and from the life of its author.
Written by Dr. Peter Du Moulin, the book is entitled Regii Sanguinis Gloriam ad Coelum Adversus Partidas Anglicarum (The Hague, 1652). Despite its bloodthirsty title, the volume is much more than a literary oddity; it is a lively document expressive of political theory stoutly maintained by French and English Protestantism during much of the seventeenth century. Because it is a conservative statement of the old order based on the Divine Right of Kings, it attacks the Puritans who fought, and the Regicides who tried and executed Charles I in 1649. Of the many Royalist tracts denouncing that judicial murder, it is the most effective. If one wishes delightful recreative reading, polemics will, of course, never do. But, as Citizen Tom Paine bears witness, propaganda can sometimes become art, and Regii Sanguinis Gloriam may at moments aspire to this status. If one can bear an occasional dash of bitterness, its chief qualifications are its clear-cut, coherent organisation, and the whiplash of its invective. These were probably the qualities which made the book dangerous and gave it contemporary fame—or notoriety.

It was addressed to an international audience which the execution of Charles had gravely disturbed. The scene of King Charles upon the black-draped scaffold outside Whitehall—as with courtly bearing he gave his locket to Bishop Juxon, bowed his comely head upon the ugly block, called "Remember! Remember!" to the Bishop, and uttered his final prayers—will always have its own grim fascination. But the thrill of horror which the deed sent through Europe grew from far deeper causes. The Reformation of a century before had cleaved the religious
unity of Europe and then turned upon itself. No real adjustment between Protestant and Catholic nations had been achieved as yet, and so long as religion weighed heavily in the diplomatic balance, no principle of equilibrium was likely to be found. With religious toleration generally unacceptable, the relationship of Church and State was uncertain or uneasy. This situation was worsened by the political intrigue of the Jesuits and the propagation of their teaching that the people had made and could break their Kings, with the Pope holding the power to depose monarchs and free subjects of their allegiance. Particularly in France, where the Huguenots had earlier stressed the right of rebellion, was there uneasiness at the English revolt. Having gained its freedom by rebelling against Philip II (who technically was not its King), the Dutch nation had not yet decided on a monarchy. As a horrifying assertion of a people's right and power to try and execute its sovereign, the execution of Charles seemed to strike at the traditional foundations of government, law, and order. The King's death was no insular affair.

The three nations which principally made up the audience watching the royal tragedy were held together by a cultural bond which we may call Protestant humanism. As understood here, the term may be defined as the veneration and study of ancient authors in philosophy, history, religion, and literature within the elastic boundaries of Protestant doctrine. Because of its reverence for Antiquity, as well as tradition and utility, humanism employed Latin as its medium of communication. It was to such humanism, on account of the foregoing reasons, that influential books about the English revolution were addressed, and it is
the culture reflected in Regii Sanguinis Clamor. Acclaim by this public was a great reward.

If the age venerated Ancient learning, it idolized the mastery of it. Consequently, scholars made up a sort of intellectual aristocracy and because of their prestige were often solicited to write works in major controversies, works heavily freighted with the baggage of ancient authors, their credentials. Later in the century, the intellectual and spiritual revolt, of which the King's execution was a part, would turn against this humanism as it was found in the Aristotelian curriculum of the Universities, and seek to promote a new philosophy of experimental science instead. Because of the materialistic implications of the New Science, as well as of other new philosophies, alarmed men would elevate witches to the zenith of their literary popularity in an attempt to prove the existence of evil spirits, and hence God.

But in the meanwhile, the King's execution was gripping the minds of men. Shortly after his death, a book which he is believed to have written excited a great wave of sympathy for the figure of Charles the Martyr. It was entitled Εἴκον Βασιλικῆς, The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in his Solitude and Sufferings. Written in a limpid prose, it was a prayerful justification of the political and religious policies of Charles which had brought his downfall. It was an almost perfect reflection of the royal personality which Charles had displayed at his trial and on the scaffold. Since the immediate effect of the book was domestic, John Milton, the Latin secretary for Cromwell's
government, was called upon to answer it with his Eikonoklastes. But partly at the instigation of the new refugee King, Charles II, and partly because of his sympathy with the English Royalists, Claude de Sausmaise, a Huguenot then resident in Holland and the most celebrated scholar of his time, wrote a much heralded book, the Defensio Regis Pro Carolo I. Designed for an international audience, the book was quickly read throughout Europe and Scandinavia. Milton also wrote a reply to this, his Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio (1650). Milton's reply also was widely read, and he convinced himself that he had vanquished Sausmaise. Mortified at the things Milton had said of him and his work, Salmassius was working on a reply to Milton when he died at the Spa in 1653; but the reply, his Responsio ad Miltonum, was not published by his son until 1660.

So impressively had Salmassius, "the Prince of Letters," loomed on the horizon that he was invited to Sweden by Queen Christina, also the patron of Grotius and Descartes; but finding the severe climate too much, he returned to Europe. His return Milton eagerly and mistakenly took to be a loss of Swedish royal favor because of the effect of the poet's reply. But while Europe, England, and Scandinavia were awaiting the rebuttal of Milton by Salmassius, Regii Sanguinis Clamor appeared anonymously to give the quarrel a new turn. Though Peter Du Moulin had written the work, Milton had received reports that Alexander More, a Calvinist divine of Genevan origin, had composed the book. Despite disclaimers from More conveyed to Milton by responsible persons, including the Dutch ambassador, the blind poet continued the scathing
Latin reply in which he denounced More as the author of Regii Sanguinis Clemor. Milton's answer, the Defensio Secunda, accused More of debauching a serving-maid named Bontia while a guest in Salmastius' household in Leyden, and worse yet, of unorthodox religious opinions.

Milton had reason to vent his anger on the author of Regii Sanguinis Clemor, if not on the wrong man. For the book dealt him appalling blows on every point about which he was sensitive. His sight having completely gone while he replied to Salmastius, Milton chose to regard his blindness as a sacrifice made on the altar of Liberty. The dedicatory epistle to Regii Sanguinis Clemor called him a monstrous, blinded Cyclops. The Puritan cause, which besides real patriots had its share of rogues, was wastefully portrayed as a conspiracy of sniveling hypocrites with a lust for power and gold. Thus his political idealism, exalted and at moments rather unworldly, was assailed and his whole psychological adjustment built upon it jeopardized. Milton had preached virtue all his life and was, moreover, proud of the recognition shown him on his Continental tour of 1638-39. In Regii Sanguinis Clemor, the trip became an attempt to escape the disgrace of a scandalous expulsion from Cambridge; and his divorce tracts, written out of the unbearable misery of a bad marriage, were mentioned as the work of a chronic trouble-maker bent on splitting matrimony and kingdoms. But most effective of all was a long Latin poem appended to Regii Sanguinis Clemor which completed the demolition of Milton's intellectual ability, learning, and personal character. Bristling with wrath, Milton ignored the evidence presented him and concentrated on annihilating Alexander
More. When the *Defensio Secunda* appeared in 1655, it sought, besides obliterating More, to vindicate Milton's personal character and the cause for which he was the spokesman. It is sublime alike in its political ideals and personal egotism.

Milton's *argumentum ad hominem* was something More could not afford to ignore. As a youthful prodigy of Greek learning and a brilliant preacher, he had made enemies as he gradually moved from Geneva to Holland. The aspersions cast by Milton on his character were bad enough, but the doctrinal deviations of which Milton accused him were more serious. To the Reformed Churches of the seventeenth century, orthodoxy was almost the supreme guarantee; in Geneva, the stake and faggots awaited those who deviated, and elsewhere, exclusion at least. When More produced his self-defense in *Fides Publica*, he made an able answer to Milton, the best he could have done under the circumstances. On a note of injured innocence, he repeatedly deplored Milton's gross language, his willful ignoring of responsible evidence, and especially the egotism running through the *Defensio Secunda*. Much of the *Fides Publica* is made up of letters testimonial from illustrious men which clear his personal character and particularly stress his Calvinistic orthodoxy. More such information is added in a *Supplementum* to the *Fides Publica* which came out in 1655. From the information in these books, Milton by then must have had misgivings about More's authorship of *Regii Sanguinis Flamen*, but too much was involved for him to admit a mistake. Consequently, when his *Pro Se Defensio* was published in 1655, it berated More for defending his innocence. About this time, More
privately informed Milton that Peter Du Moulin was the real author of *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, but Milton could not afford to confess his error. Since he had supplied fresh scandal, passed on by More's enemies, in the *Pro Se Defensio*, it was too late to retreat. Fortunately, however, if Milton's charges did not help More's career, they did not ruin it, for, having attained prominence in Holland as a preacher, he was called to the great Huguenot temple at Charenton, near Paris, where he ended his career and was buried.

Dr. Peter Du Moulin wrote in *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* what is probably the ablest polemic on the Royalist side of the Salmasian Controversy. It does not, be it confessed, blaze into the occasional incandescence of Milton's *Defensio Secunda*. It has, however, qualities which the works of Salmasius do not possess. For all his immense learning, Salmasius in his *Defensio Regia* was a philologist, not a philosopher. He presents a full array of standard evidence for the theory of the Divine Right of Kings and, Milton to the contrary, does a thorough piece of research into English law and precedent concerning royal prerogative. But even though his organisation is clear and consistent, the *Defensio Regia* is quite unoriginal and far too long. Because it was written in Salmasius's declining days and was never finished, one may be unfair in criticising the *Responsio ad Miltonum*. It is, nonetheless, shapeless and repetitive of the arguments in the *Defensio Regia*. Its retorts to Milton are sometimes effective, but often, where the poet's blindness is concerned, in bad taste. The *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, however, has a bite and mobility which Salmasius
never attained. The lines against Milton are a masterpiece of audacious invective.

Du Moulin's mastery of polemics was no accident. He was the eldest son and namesake of Pierre Du Moulin, the celebrated Huguenot preacher and disputant who had engaged a multitude of Catholic adversaries, including Cardinal Bellarmine and the Cardinal Du Perron. The preeminence of Pierre Du Moulin in controversy is due to his unfailing grasp of his arguments, succinctness, and a style of wit, elegance, and point. Walking in his father's footsteps, if never quite under his shadow, Peter Du Moulin manifested some of the same ability in _Regii Sanguinis Clamor_. In a work of the sort, sarcasm and irony naturally replace wit; but if the sarcasm and irony do not attain that peculiar finesse and polish we associate with Voltaire, they are still withering in effect. His use of invective, especially in the lines against Milton, is masterly. In opposing Jesuit doctrines of popular sovereignty, the right to try and depose kings, and tyrannicide, Pierre Du Moulin had upheld the Divine Right of Kings and submission to them. He had been friendly, though a French Calvinist, to an episcopal form of church government. He had lived and been partly educated in Holland and England. These facts explain how Peter Du Moulin, also educated in Holland and England, wrote with such zeal, though of French extraction, for the English Crown and Anglican Church. They also account for the easy familiarity with which he addressed his book to the Protestants of France and Holland. He, like his father, Salmassius, Milton, and More, was a part of the community of Protestant humanism we have described.
It is out of this cosmopolitan background that all of the works considered here really grow.

Of the authorship of *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* there can no longer be any doubt. On four occasions Du Moulin claims it with some pride, and on one of them provides an account of its publication which fits perfectly every known fact. In a volume of his Latin poems published late in life he told the full story and reprinted his lines against Milton along with an Ode to Salmassius also found in *Clamor*. Aside from overseeing publication of the book, Alexander More contributed only the dedicatory epistle appearing over the publisher's name. The style of the epistle is precisely the same puckered Senecon Latin to be observed in the *Fides Publica* and *Supplementum* which he avowed. So marked, in fact, is the difference of Latinity between the dedication and the rest of *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* that one is surprised that even blind Milton did not perceive it when the works were read to him. In any event, Du Moulin, residing in England and Ireland during Puritan rule, was in grave danger if his authorship were immediately known. Rather than risk his head, he allowed the innocent More to suffer the abuse Milton heaped upon him. In this, as in other events of his life, he was a man of singular prudence. Though not an ignoble man, he seldom wasted his time in a fruitless idealism, and if he erred, it was on the side of utility. He occasionally showed bravery and loyalty, but always prudence.

Particularly after the Restoration he became a clergyman of prominence, in favor at Court and resident at Canterbury. He was
active in the religious and scientific controversies which then came
to a head, looking backward in thought at times but also showing a
Calvinistic receptivity to scientific progress. He was an associate
of not only leading officials of the Church, but also of such repre-
sentative figures as Robert Boyle, Marie Cassubon, and Joseph Glanvill.
Aside from his personal prominence, he himself is a representative of
the large group of Anglican clergy for whom Calvin's theology and
Hooker's view of Episcopacy still sufficed.

For a long time there has been a need for a useful translation
of Du Moulin's book to present the Royalist side of the Salmassian Con-
troversy, and for a study of Du Moulin and his family which may cast
some light on the contribution they, and others comparable to them,
made to English life and thought in the crucial period out of which
modern times emerged. It is hoped that the translation and information
offered here will help supply these needs.
CHAPTER I

ERIT MONDO LUPUS

It was no accident that Milton's secret adversary, Dr. Peter Du Moulin, was in Regii Sanguinis Clamor his most powerful opponent. The origins of the book were in France, where, to defend their foothold against the pens of Jesuit priests and the swords of Catholic princes, the Huguenots had exploited the resources of pulpit and written controversy. With the fanatic butchery of the St. Bartholomew's massacre (1572) always reminding what failure could mean, the defeat of Catholic theorists, great or small, was for them urgent, the survival of the fittest. Of the Huguenot controversialists of the seventeenth century, none was more skilled or successful than Pierre Du Moulin. What the great Isaac Casaubon was to Protestant scholarship in France, Pierre Du Moulin was to its pulpit, and when faced with grave political and religious attacks abroad, King James I of England sought the talents of both men. Besides personal ties, there was a community of interests, especially religion and scholarship, between Protestant humanists in England and on the Continent. Therefore it was natural that the Du Moulin family, like their many oppressed compatriots, would seek a home and honor in the Isles under Royal protection, and that when attacking Milton, Cromwell, and the Puritans, Dr. Peter Du Moulin should have mastered his father's weapons. In England the Du Moulin family strikingly shows the different ways French Protestant humanism could go—Dr. Peter, a strong Royalist noted as a neo-Latin poet, Anglican
preacher, and friend of the great; Dr. Lewis Du Moulin, a physician who professed history at Oxford and, after a bizarre showing as a Puritan controversialist, came to a pathetic end; and obscure Cyrus Du Moulin, the temporary pastor of the Walloon Church at Canterbury, whose scapegrace son entangled Anglo-Dutch relations in cloak-and-dagger diplomacy. Following the closest in his great father's footsteps was Dr. Peter Du Moulin, and his life showed the influence of his father's long and colorful career. We shall understand him and his times much better for knowing something of his father.

There was no more strenuous warrior for French Calvinism than Pierre Du Moulin. "Athlète intrépide et infatigable du calvinisme pur," it has been aptly said of him, "il soutint d'ardentes controverses, non seulement contre maints docteurs catholiques ou redevenus tels . . . mais contre plusieurs de ses coreligionnaires . . . . Dans toutes ces disputes, il déploya un grand zèle pour les intérêts de son église et une activité sans égale; mais on doit regretter qu'il se soit souvent laissé emporter par l'impétuosité de son caractère. Son humour impérieux et son talent de spirituel raillieur lui firent beaucoup d'amis, surtout parmi les Jesuites qui avaient ainsi anagrammatisé son nom: Erict mundo lupus. 1 However lordly his nature, this confident master of verbal swordplay was trained in a hard school, the life of danger into which he was born. It is vividly pictured in his autobiography.

His father was the Huguenot minister Joachim Du Moulin (1538-
1615-187),² who on 24 April 1564 married Françoise Gabet, widow of Jacques Du Plessis and daughter of the Royal judge Innocent Gabet, in the Protestant church at Orléans.³ There were four children: Esther, Joachim, Pierre, and Kléasar. Esther was born 10 June 1565, and Joachim on 27 February 1567 while their father was a pastor at Mony.⁴ In 1568, religious wars broke out, and Joachim Du Moulin and his family fled the Château de Mony, which had been taken by the Duc de Foix-sous. Moving from place to place to escape the severe persecution, Du Moulin and his pregnant wife arrived 25 September 1568 at Buhy in Vexin-Français. Pierre de Buhy, elder brother of the "Huguenot pope" Philippe de Monnay, took them in; and there Pierre Du Moulin was born at 3 a.m. October 16, and was presented for baptism by the Seigneur de Buhy.⁵ Increasing persecutions in 1569 saw the temporary breakup of the family, and the death of Pierre's widowed grandmother, a Catholic who by her will disinherited his father. Joachim Du Moulin was then at Sedan, where there was a large Huguenot congregation; but when peace was made in 1570 he was called to the Church of Soissons, which met at Coeuvres at the home of Monsieur d'Estrees, a Protestant. The family once more reunited, Mme. Du Moulin bore her third son, the ill-fated Kléasar, on 3 December 1570.⁶

On 26 August 1572, the horrors of the St. Bartholomew's massacre spread from Paris throughout France. Ill himself and penniless, Joachim Du Moulin and his sick family were chased from Coeuvres by Monsieur d'Estrees, who had conveniently become a Catholic. Desperate, Du Moulin hid his children in the home of a Catholic nurse named
Ruffine, who loved and would protect them, and sought safety with his wife at Muret, which belonged to the Prince de Conde, four leagues from Coeuvres. As the murderers approached, according to the DNB, the valiant nurse rattled her pots and pans, pretending to clean them, while hidden away, Esther stifled the cries of the frightened Pierre. Du Moulin's own recollection, however, omits the nurse's clattering defense:

La maison de cette femme estoit hors du village de Coeuvres, éloignée d'un quart de lieues. Là, vinrent les massacreurs qui avoient charge de nous tuer. Mais cette bonne femme nous jeta sur de la paille et nous couvrit d'un lict et d'un couverture, tellement que nous ne fumes point descouvertes.

The family gradually found its way to Sedan, where Pierre and Esther arrived 3 January 1573 in freezing weather. Having suffered too much, his mother soon died there on February 13—"une femme vertueuse et courageuse, et craignant Dieu, qui a souffert beaucoup de maux pour la Parole de Dieu." Pierre was then four years old.

Burdened with the care of four children, Joachim Du Moulin on June 12 married Guillemette d'Auvigny, the widow of a pastor named Mercatet. One of their children, Pierre's half-sister Marie, later was married first to a Captain Des Guyots, who was killed fighting with his Picardy regiment at the siege of Amiens in the reign of Henry IV; and then to the celebrated André Rivet, professor of theology.
at Leyden who supervised studies of the young Prince Henry of Nassau.\textsuperscript{11}

An uneasy peace between the warring factions was made in 1576, and at the Synod of Mussy Joachim Du Moulin was sent as a pastor to St.-Pierre Aigle,\textsuperscript{12} near Coëuvres and Soissons. Leaving their children behind at Sedan, Du Moulin père and mère went to St.-Pierre Aigle, only to be forced by renewed troubles to return to Sedan (11 January 1577). After going back to St.-Pierre Aigle the following year, Joachim Du Moulin returned and put his three sons to board with Jean de Vesle, fourth regent of the Collège de Sedan. When in 1580 the Prince de Condé took La Fère, fresh hostilities drove Du Moulin back to Sedan; but soon returning to St.-Pierre Aigle, he boarded his sons with M. Le Fort, second regent of the College.\textsuperscript{13} Thus, at ten Pierre entered the Collège de Sedan for a demanding course of study.\textsuperscript{14} The death of the King's brother François de Valois (20 June 1584) at Château-Thierry brought on efforts of the League to exclude Protestant Henry of Navarre from the crown, and in the resulting turmoil Joachim Du Moulin returned with his wife and other children from St.-Pierre Aigle to Sedan. That July young Pierre narrowly escaped death by drowning.\textsuperscript{15}

It was in the year 1588, when the Armada descended on England, that young Du Moulin would first go there to seek his fortune. Recovering from a serious illness, Joachim Du Moulin had called Pierre, now twenty years old, to his bedside and told him that because of their poverty he could support him no longer, and that when he was well, they would go to Paris, where he was owed some money he would use to provide for his family. On his recovery, the two made the perilous journey
from Sedan, then surrounded by troops of the Duke of Guise, to Paris—the father on horseback, and Pierre afoot, wearing bad shoes in the spring thaw. Joachim Du Moulin received 800 crowns, most of which he placed with Monsieur de Cressi-Rémond, whose son and young Pierre were boarding together. But when Paris, controlled by the Duke of Guise, barred Henry of Navarre on the Day of Barricades, Cressi-Rémond was imprisoned in the Tuileries, and returning to Paris, Joachim Du Moulin somehow contrived to set up with Rémond an annuity of a hundred livres. Since the gates of Paris were closely guarded, Du Moulin left in disguise with young Pierre walking well before him, carrying their papers and money in case the father should be searched.\(^6\)

Then came a scene of parting which, though told years later by a mature writer, still pulses with the heartbreak of a boy:

> Je sortis par la porte Saint-Honoré. Mon père vint après et m’atteignit à une demi-lieue de Paris, où je lui rendis ses papiers et son argent. Là, il me dit un dernier adieu. Il me donna douze escus. S’estant séparé d’avec moy, je le suivois de l’œil tant que je pus, et me mis à genoux sur le grand chemin, priant Dieu pour sa conservation parmi les périls, et pour la prospérité de lui et de sa maison, car je faisois estat de ne le voir jamais. Et demanday à Dieu qu’il voulust m’entre mon père et mon conducteur, puisque je n’avois plus de père sur la terre.\(^7\)

Finding upon his return to Paris no means of livelihood there,
Pierre Du Moulin resolved to go to England by way of Rouen and Dieppe. Landing at Rye, he went to London by boat from Graveline, losing his hat in the stormy weather. Life in the British capital was restless for the French youth, for the Spanish Armada was off the coast, and Queen Elizabeth was soon to send 5000 English troops led by Essex to aid Henry IV, surrounded at Dieppe. So poor he could spend only a son a day, and grasping for security in a strange land, Du Moulin's aversion to Catholicism was further sharpened by news of the shocking burial alive of his brother Eléazar. Lured perhaps by adventure, Eléazar Du Moulin had left his studies to enlist in troops commanded by M. De La Noué Bras de fer. While on reconnaissance, a detail of six including Du Moulin were trapped in a house in a village near Senlis, and fought on until all were killed except Eléazar. Catholic peasants were dumping their bodies, stripped nude and despoiled, into a mass grave, when Eléazar, still alive, pleaded for his life and promised ransom. Turning a deaf ear to the wounded youth's pleas, the faithful threw him into the pit with the bodies of his comrades, and buried him alive. He was seventeen.

The natural resort of the Huguenot refugees in England was their French churches there, and Pierre Du Moulin frequented them to hear sermons and make friends. There he met his future brother-in-law René Bochart, Sieur de Ménilet, who was studying for the ministry to serve the church at Rouen and advised Du Moulin to do the same. Perhaps feeling himself still unprepared, he declined an offer to assist at the French church in London, but through Bochart met Henry Constable,
whose father had charge of munitions in the Tower of London. The Englishman liked young Du Moulin, and though declaring himself a Papist upon arriving in France with Essex's army, he promoted Du Moulin's interests with the Countess of Rutland. When her son went to Cambridge, Du Moulin went as his tutor, and there continued his own studies with the learned Dr. William Whitaker and Dr. John Beinolds. 21 This was the first association of the Du Moulin family with Cambridge and the learned men there.

But in 1591 Du Moulin left the service of the Rutlands to go to Leyden, a university with which the Du Moulines were also to have intimate connections. The Dutch city was becoming a haven for the learned, and the scholars and intellectuals who gathered there will figure prominently later on in our study of the Salmassian Controversy. Du Moulin was approached by M. De La Faye, minister of the Huguenot church of Paris, visiting in England, to serve that congregation, which he hoped to re-establish. Upon Du Moulin's acceptance, he promised him fifty crowns a year. Wishing to visit Leyden, where Franciscus Junius had recently become professor of theology, Du Moulin went to London, and through the French ambassador, M. de Beauvais de Nools, obtained passage to Zeeland aboard the ship of the Duke of Wittenberg, leaving early in September. The ship was caught in a tempest at night en route, and after jettisoning its cannon and cargo, became so full of water that the wheel was abandoned. But the storm subsided, and the ship put in at Rammezaen, held by the English. Du Moulin had lost his clothes and books. Upon his arrival at Leyden, he described the adventure in his
In Leyden commenced Du Moulin's career as a figure of controversial brilliance, and the agitation of his youth continued in the world of letters. After two months in the Dutch city, his money began to run out, and he found a position as corrector at a college in Leyden, of which one Stokima was the principal. Du Moulin taught Greek, music, and Horace, and his popularity because of his youth aroused the principal's jealousy. Therefore, according to Du Moulin, Stokima got four students to enter his classes masked, and pelt him with snowballs. Despite orders from the college governors, the students went unpunished, and fresh incidents so upset Du Moulin that he briefly visited his acquaintance the French ambassador, M. De Bœsenval, to recuperate. Upon returning to Leyden, he found that the college governors had ended the impossible situation by discharging him honorably with double a three-months' salary of forty crowns.

This, however, proved fortune in disguise. When two months later the professor of Philosophy at the University of Leyden—a Scotsman named Ramsay—died, Du Moulin sought the post with the recommendations of De Bœsenval and the Princess of Orange. With such illustrious patronage, on 8 October 1592 at the age of twenty-four, Du Moulin became Professor of Philosophy there. He lectured on works of Aristotle—the Organon, the Physics, De Osse, De Generatione et Corruptione, On the Soul, and On Meteors, and among his applauding students was Hugo Grotius. Du Moulin was also a colleague of the great
Joseph Scaliger, whom he repaid forty crowns that Joachim Du Moulin had borrowed. In addition to lecturing and teaching Greek at the college of Theology, he was a reader in Pindar, and gave private lessons. Thus, he was able to write M. De La Faye, who was sending him fifty crowns a year for his commitment to the church at Paris, that he no longer needed the sum. News of such success evidently was too much for his old persecutor Stockis, for, Du Moulin tells us, "il fut saisi d'une telle douleur qu'il mourut subitement d'une soudaine suffocation." After a successful stay of five years and three months at Leyden, he returned to France in 1597 to visit his father, whom he had not seen for nine years. In the brilliant young man before him, Joachim Du Moulin did not recognize the boy who had said farewell on the high road from Paris. Their reunion was at Jargeau, where Joachim Du Moulin had at last found security under a Protestant governor, and remained until his death in 1618. Traveling in France, Pierre Du Moulin had seen many ministers, especially those of the church at Paris. Taken, no doubt, with his accomplishments—and probably remembering the church's contribution to them—they urged him to become one of the clergy. Leave such a windfall as Leyden? Du Moulin refused—until De Busenval persuaded him. The ambassador shrewdly played on the challenge offered by a post at Paris: its poverty, hard work, dangers, and the hostility of the Catholic clergy "surtout à Paris qui est un haut théâtre." Du Moulin had thrived on danger, always known hard work. As for poverty, to judge from the aplomb and even theatricality
of his later career, the "haut théâtre" of Paris was enough to offset that. And so the following year, he left Leyden, and after arriving in France in December, 1598, he was taken by his father to Gien. There, after examinations, Joachim Du Moulin joined four other pastors in ordaining his son to the ministry. In January and February, 1599, Pierre Du Moulin served the congregation at Blois, and in March went to Paris, where fate, if not fortune, awaited him. There he associated intimately with the great Isaac Cassubon, corresponded with Bishop Lancelot Andrews, attacked Catholic controversialists, gained ascendancy in Huguenot affairs, and made a reputation which brought him twice to England with honors by royal invitation.

The church to which Du Moulin came was not the great Huguenot temple at Charenton with which his name is associated. Parisian Protestants so far had been allowed to meet for worship five leagues from Paris at Grigny at the home of the Sieur des Bordes Mercier. After being permitted closer worship—four leagues distant—at Ablon in 1601, the congregation settled at Charenton in 1606 by letters patent issued August 1 by the King. However, the church's inconvenient situation did not retard Du Moulin's rise, for he delivered his first sermon in the home at Soissons of Princess Catherine de Bourbon, sister of Henry IV, and also preached before her at the Louvre. Catherine, wife of the Duke of Bar, immediately named Du Moulin as her chaplain, which required him to conduct her religious services three months a year. Thus he accompanied the duchess on her periodical visits to her husband at his
palace in Lorraine, preaching before her on the journey, ironically enough, in Meaux Cathedral and other Catholic churches.\textsuperscript{122}

It was on his first journey to Lorraine with Catherine de Bourbon that love and marriage came to Du Moulin. The duchess and her suite stopped to rest en route at Vitry-la-Française, and he stayed overnight at the home of a minister's widow, Marie de Colignon, whom he admired at once. Having to leave the next morning, Du Moulin wrote back to her by the next relay from Bar-le-Duc, and his letter was favorably received. They were married at Vitry, near the end of 1599.\textsuperscript{123}

The death of Princess Catherine in 1601 brought Du Moulin into an embarrassing collision with his later political antagonist, the distinguished Cardinal Du Perron. A persuasive expert at converting notables to Catholicism,\textsuperscript{124} the Cardinal had been sent by Henry IV on such a mission to the Princess's deathbed. As a favorite chaplain, Du Moulin was in attendance at her bedside, and Du Perron, with more zeal than tact, tried to thrust him from the room. Tenacious as usual, Du Moulin clung to the bedpost while the dying Princess remained constant to the Protestant faith, and the disgruntled Cardinal retired.\textsuperscript{125}

Loss of his royal patroness, however, did not retard Du Moulin, and by pen and pulpit he rose to celebrity at home and abroad. Though he was at Charenton for twenty-one years until 1620, Du Moulin became very early the masterful figure whose endless list of works had a remarkable vogue. Granting that a minute survey of them is beyond our scope here, yet even in the ones we shall inspect Du Moulin appears primarily as a personage. To understand him as a man, as well as the
direction and limitations of his thought, it is helpful to see him together with his associate at Charenton, the scholar Isaac Casaubon. In fact, the names Du Moulin and Casaubon are inevitably linked for two generations in the seventeenth century, and this tie begins at Charenton.

Casaubon was at Charenton for a decade, 1600 to 1610. During his stay there, Casaubon’s relationship with Du Moulin showed much mutual admiration and yet was not altogether happy. It needs some re-examination; for, led by sympathy for Casaubon, his piquant biographer Mark Pattison has made influential appraisals of Du Moulin that are shrewd but not always fair. Indeed, what had Du Moulin become at this time? While conceding his native ability, his power of intellect and eloquence, Pattison seems to view Du Moulin as a disputant who was vain, dogmatic, half-learned—almost a glib sophister. He repeatedly contrasts this unflattering estimate with the breadth and depth of Casaubon’s phenomenal knowledge and his scholarly diffidence, particularly in the matter of applying the church fathers to formulation of religious beliefs. Pattison’s statements, then, oppose the desirability of an historical scholarship operating with some freedom within and upon the framework of revealed religion, to the practical necessity of defending a fixed system of belief. But the scholar needs his freedom to change conviction, perhaps to suspend it; the apologist or controversialist must have a system as his pointe d’appui et de rallie- ment. Though no Casaubon, Du Moulin seems to have been much more than “half-learned,” and his role as a spokesman for the Huguenots, as well as his earlier life, may help to explain the limitations of his
Calvinistic certitude.

Casaubon's diary reveals that for almost their entire decade together at Charenton, he and Du Moulin were on the friendliest terms. To judge from entries extending from 1602 into 1609, Casaubon found Du Moulin's conversation and sermons—despite Pattison's unfavorable account—delightful. And though most of their talks were of religion, Casaubon usually speaks of Du Moulin superlatively as eruditissimus, desiring that Du Moulin's godly counsels make him a better man.\textsuperscript{18} Pious though he was, the scholarly Casaubon would scarcely have remained enthusiastic about the sound morality of Du Moulin's sermons, if the matter of them had appeared hollow. Of two entries for 1609 pertaining to Du Moulin, the second is an account of a communion sermon delivered April 18:

\begin{quote}
Audivimus Molinææ quæ actiones formæ magna cum voluptate
audivi, nunquam cum tanta; et utinam Deus mihi det pericarum
quad hodie dum illum audirem statui volente Molinae.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

Until well into 1610, Casaubon, still impressed with Du Moulin's learning and eloquence, gave no hint of a disagreement. But on 26 May 1610, Casaubon wrote John Utensogaert of his distress at Du Moulin's teachings about the Holy Communion, wherein Casaubon felt he differed both from Calvin and the Church Fathers; and at Du Moulin's rejection of any ancient writers who disagreed with his views.\textsuperscript{20} Specifically, Casaubon singled out the eucharistic doctrine which had appeared in a book by Du Moulin and was commonly heard in Huguenot churches.\textsuperscript{21} The
book of which Cassubon speaks is almost certainly the 1610 edition of Du Moulin's Apologie Pour la Sainte Cène du Seigneur. Contre La Presence Corporelle, & Transubstantiation, first published in 1607 and now expanded to answer its Catholic attackers. Rejection of antiquity, Cassubon says, will gain credit with the half-learned; Du Moulin is deceived, and the Fathers are quite right about this mystery. About this time, Du Moulin was maintaining in his communion sermons doctrine which Cassubon thought more new than true—namely that Scripture needed no interpreter. This the historically minded Cassubon could never accept, finding it dangerous and especially absurd concerning the nature of Holy Communion, the sign of the invisible Church, and the degeneration of the early Church. Yet he terms Du Moulin "eruditum quidem virum, sed qui videtur in S. Theologia id habere propositum ut nova omnia preferat." Hearing an "eruditum concionem" of Du Moulin, Cassubon thought that, compared to the doctrine and ritual of Holy Communion found at Charenton, one must admit "veteres aliquando alter et sensisse de eo sacro mysterio, et longe aliam illius praexin habuisse." He was nostalgic for the faith and rites of the early Church, but felt that, lacking Biblical prescription for them and being only a layman, he had no just cause to urge a change which might encourage superstition, old or new. What had been a marked difference in views without disrespect of persons sharpened the next month into some personal ill will, especially on the part of Du Moulin. Entering the field of international political controversy, Du Moulin published at Paris in 1610 his Defense de la
Foy Catholique Contenu au livre de . . . Jacques I., Roy de Grand Bretagne . . . contre le Réponse de M. Coéffeteau, a book defending the English King's theological and political writings against the attacks of Cardinal Bellarmine, the Dominican Coéffeteau, and others. Obtaining a copy, Cassaubon marked what seemed to his major errors in it. He may also have criticized the book verbally, for Du Moulin heard of it and came to the scholar on September 30 to complain of reports that Cassaubon had spoken ill of his writings. Cassaubon admitted his displeasure at Du Moulin's repudiating, condemning, and vituperating the Fathers. Thereupon, Du Moulin asked for Cassaubon's marked copy of the Defense, which was given him with the request that Du Moulin take it in good part. Rather naturally, however, Du Moulin did not. What Cassaubon may have said of the work, we can only infer from his own account; he does not appear to have discussed the book with Du Moulin before voicing public criticism of it. This oversight, showing some tactlessness in view of their friendship, clearly hurt and angered Du Moulin, and made him show his worse side.

Shortly after their encounter, Cassaubon left for England upon an official invitation from the Archbishop of Canterbury received some months before, on July 20. He arrived in England the latter part of October, creating a favorable impression upon Archbishop Bancroft, and, following the prelate's death shortly after (on Nov. 12), upon his successor Archbishop Abbott. King James I, who was behind the invitation, sent for Cassaubon on November 8, and thereafter the scholar had a career of royal favor—including a £300-a-year pension—and absorption
into the Anglican communion. For this, he had already been prepared by the patristic studies which had intellectually and spiritually made him an Anglo-Catholic before he ever saw England. With such interests, Casaubon was naturally drawn to the society of Bishop Lancelot Andrews, just translated to the diocese of Ely, and their growing association was a delighted "collision of learning with wit." But Du Moulin also was well known to the Anglican hierarchy, and his distress and anger followed Casaubon across the Channel in a letter written toward the end of 1610 to James Montagu, Bishop of Bath and Wells. Substantially, the letter expressed the hope that the Established Church, by suitable employments, would keep Casaubon in England, where converse with learned men would prevent his slipping into the Roman faith. Thus, he wrote, the Anglican Church would gloriously acquire the "prince of letters," while the French Reformed would avert the scandalous disaster of losing Casaubon to a jubilant Catholicism.

The letter is so important to understanding Du Moulin, and Pattison has made so much of it to his detriment, that it must be examined briefly. Presenting it in an English translation with a key sentence dropped, Pattison uses the letter to paint Du Moulin as a vain, sophistical disputant, and reduces Du Moulin's motive for writing it to the statement that "It was absolutely necessary for Du Moulin's supremacy over his flock, and for his comfort in his pulpit, that Casaubon should be kept away from Paris." Though the secrecy of the letter may have been unworthy, Du Moulin's motives were mixed enough to deserve our sympathy. The missive notes Casaubon's deviations from Genevan
orthodoxy, traces them to an angry feud over financial loss, and describes Casaubon—whose learning is great but character wavering—as ready to fall into Catholicism because of his reading in the Fathers and the clandestine persuasions of the Cardinal Du Perron. Du Moulin has vainly tried to lead him back to the right way of Calvinism; perhaps the Anglican doctors will have greater success. If Casaubon can in no wise be diverted from his opinions, it would be most helpful and safest to busy him writing about church history and the refutation of Baronius. Now if, read impartially, the letter in its Latin form reflected only the patristic issue and pastoral zeal, one might suspect the latter to be specious. But Du Moulin writes, with the greatest emphasis:

*Denique oro, obtestor, facite, ut quocunque modo vester sit; nam si ad nos redierit [Casaubon], certa est defectio.*
*Unde ingenio Ecclesiae scandalus & offensio infirmorum; Vivimus enim inter adversarios, qui nostrorum lapsu incredibiliter triumphant, & ejusmodi Circenses pompas speciose circumducunt.*

By omitting the sentence *Unde ingenio . . . circumducunt,* Pattison has distorted the letter’s perspective. Whether or not it was comfortable for Du Moulin to have Casaubon in England, the endless efforts the convertisseurs had spent on Casaubon, and the blow the Huguenots would have suffered at his loss, give Du Moulin’s statement the sincere urgency of a stout religionist upholding his cause, fearful what damage
an erring member of his flock might do to that cause. It may well be, too, that the usual pastoral seal of Du Moulin’s talks with Cassaubon lingered on, despite their disagreement over the Fathers.

Though his aversion to patristic studies and his severe Calvinism may bar Du Moulin from standing as a profound theologian, yet a reading of his work, as well as Cassaubon’s testimony, surely frees him of the charge of having been “half-learned.” He was a preacher who had to maintain something concrete, and a disputant who had to hold the line against Catholic attack. The rigor of his views gave edge to his writings. As a scholar, Cassaubon would find this not a breastplate of faith, but a straitjacket. If Du Moulin felt animosity toward Cassaubon, he had reason; and his motives for the “delation”70 to Bishop Montagu certainly included his usual zeal for the Huguenot cause. One can scarcely forget that the year 1610 saw Henry IV fall under Ravaillac’s knife.
CHAPTER II

VETERANUM ILLUM CHRISTI MILITEM

FORTENQUE ATHLETAM . . .

Insecure at best, the Huguenots, because of a bond of faith still felt strongly to exist between the Continental Reformed and the Anglican Churches, had an affinity for England. Besides sharing the community of Protestant humanism, they faced common enemies in the Papacy and the Jesuits. Since churches sought political status and political theories religious sanction, this cultural and religious exchange made controversies international. An inkered dual involving basic issues, though emanating from the island kingdom, could become a pitched battle ranging the breadth of Europe. Three times Pierre Du Moulin was a major participant in such struggles. Of his many controversies, we have selected these three, because in them he rose to his zenith as a disputant and made the name Du Moulin influential with the English crown; and during these years his namesake, Dr. Peter Du Moulin, formed as a boy the admiration for his father noticeable in his writings as an Anglican divine. Having enjoyed English hospitality and education in his youth, Pierre Du Moulin as a Huguenot leader was to become famous in England by championing its Church and the Divine Right of Kings. His eldest son later maintained both vigorously against Milton.

The Gunpowder Plot of 1605 and its aftermath touched off a long, confused war of books which lasted through much of the seventeenth
century. But though Papal claims and Jesuit political doctrines probably collided most noticeably with the Divine Right theory of the Stuarts during the reign of James I, the general lines of the conflict had already been drawn in the reign of Elizabeth by the Bull of 1570 "deposing" the Queen, and by the Armada of 1588. Opposition to James's succeeding the aging Queen was voiced in 1594 by the Jesuit Robert Parsons in his Conference About the Next Succession to the Crown of England, a book which dangerously tried to undermine James's favorite doctrines of legitimism and Divine Right by asserting that the Crown was held by popular granting and by attempting to prove that the one rightful claimant to the English throne was the Spanish infanta.\(^1\)

James I at first showed moderation toward English Catholics; but in the general alarm over the Gunpowder Plot (1605), he pressed for the Oath of Allegiance passed by Parliament in 1606. The Oath required English Catholics, in swearing allegiance to the King, to deny as 'impious, heretical, and damnable the doctrine that princes excommunicated by the Pope could be deposed or killed by their subjects.\(^2\) The Oath was shrewdly aimed to drive a wedge between the two factions of English Catholics—the aggressive, led by the Jesuits, who wished speedily to reclaim England for the Faith, and the moderates who yearned for toleration and feared extremists\(^3\)—and it achieved its purpose. The issue was really far broader than insular fears about the Gunpowder Plot, for influential Catholic writers, especially Cardinal Bellarmine, had maintained the Papal right to depose Kings and absolve subjects of their allegiance, and the doctrine of tyramicide had come to be associated
with the Jesuits. This latter teaching, coupled with unfortunate praise by the Jesuit Mariana of Jacques Clement, the assassin of Henry III of France (1589), was converted by both Catholic advocates of Divine Right and Protestants into a loose and alarming doctrine of regicides. Aside from the fear princes might have at such a prospect, the Oath of James had raised another issue basically European. Strengthened by the Counter-Reformation, the Roman Catholic Church was preparing to renew the old struggle between Church and State in a Europe changed by the Reformation into a congeries of national states and state churches, the medieval unity, even supremacy, of the Faith having been fragmented. England seemed the one place where the successful march of Catholicism could be stopped. In France, the Huguenots were forever apprehensive.

For English Catholics, however, the Oath—though nominally an additional burden to the penal laws in force—might mean in practice a lightening in application of the existing recusancy laws. But the Papacy quickly saw how the Oath threatened its powers, for it undercut the Pope's claims to temporal and spiritual authority. In a sense, the Oath of James was an advance over Elizabeth's Act of Supremacy (1559), which had denied all Papal authority in matters ecclesiastical or spiritual within the realm. The Oath of 1606, however, did not touch directly on the Pope's spiritual authority (which Catholics had to recognise), but it required, besides loyalty to James as the rightful King, the rejection of any deposing and absolving power. By not mentioning the Pope's spiritual authority, the Oath apparently recognised
the division between spiritual and secular jurisdiction—the doctrine of the two kingdoms. It also forbade the Pope to cross this boundary by using the secular power of deposition under pretext of a spiritual end. This much the English Catholics might have accepted, as being an oath merely civil; but in requiring the Catholic Englishman, layman as well as priest, to condemn as damnable, impious, and heretical the Holy See's power to depose, the Oath of James was sapping the Pope's spiritual authority as well, and thus inviting attack.

Pope Paul V did not wait, for on 22 September 1606 he issued a Breve flatly forbidding English Catholics to take the Oath, as contrary to their faith. The situation was alarming, for the penalties for refusing the Oath were heavy. English Catholics, however, professed to doubt the genuineness of the Papal Breve, which George Blackwell, the Archpriest, would not publish. Meanwhile, Catholics including Blackwell took the oath. With a Breve dated 23 August 1607, the Pope angrily confirmed his earlier letter and bound Catholics to observe it; this was followed by a letter on 28 September 1607 from Cardinal Bellarmine to Blackwell, reproving the aging Archpriest for swearing to the Oath, and urging martyrdom instead. To this, Blackwell replied on November 13. And now King James I entered the lists against the Pope. To answer the two Breves and Bellarmine's letter to Blackwell, James published in 1607 his *Triplex nodus, triplex sensus or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*; and though it was anonymous, its authorship was obvious, for it was put out by the royal printer, Robert Barker, and bore the royal arms. The book received a royal welcome, for Rome's greatest
controversialist, Cardinal Bellarmine, immediately answered it by a
Responsio ad Librum Inscriptum Tripliici nodo, Triplex Cuneus . . . .
1608. It appeared under the name of Matthaeus Tortus, one of the Card-
inal's almoners, but this book's authorship was an open secret also.
Wide reading of the two books made a royal answer necessary, and so
James I in 1609 published a new edition of Tripliici nodo with his name
on the title page, and important supplementary matter to strengthen
his case. And at this point erupted two controversies in which Du
Moulin played a leading role.

To the new edition of Tripliici nodo, James prefixed "A Premoni-
tion to All Most Mighty Monarches, Kings, Free Princes, and States of
Christendom," and dedicated it to the Holy Roman Emperor Rudolph II.
In thus bidding for European support for a common cause against extreme
Papal claims, James had to define his own position favorably. Since
Cardinal Bellarmine had called him an heretic to whom subjects could
not swear allegiance, James included in his 1609 "Premonition" a per-
sonal confession of faith designed to prove himself Catholic, though
non-Roman, and no apostate. He also added a catalogue of "lies," to be
found in Bellarmine's work, and their confutations, and a list of
novel doctrines imputed to the Roman Church. The new edition of
James's book became an important document in the European paper war
over activities of the French Jesuits, the defense of Gallican liber-
ties, and the quarrels of the Venetians with the Pope, and a flood
of replies came. Of these, a major one was the Response à l'ad-
vertissement addressé par le Sérénissime Roy de la Grande Bretagne,
Jacques Ier, à tous les princes et potentats de chrétienté (Rouen, 1610) by the famous Dominican preacher Nicolas Coeffeteau—a notable help to the Papal cause from a non-Jesuit source. Du Moulin, equally celebrated, 21 pounced upon this with his Défense de la Foy Catholique. The book was later answered by Coeffeteau with an Apologie pour la réponse à l'advertisement du sérénissime roy de la Grande Bretagne, 22 which seems to have been anti-climactic.

Speedily translated into English by order of James, Du Moulin's Défense de la Foy Catholique showed the author's real power as a controversialist. It was divided into two books, the first discussing in eight chapters the relative powers of Kings and Popes, and the second defending in twenty-three articles the doctrines of James's confession of faith. Although Book I touches upon many facets of the quarrel, its two main sections are Chapters V and VII; the line of approach is shown by the title "Of the Vae Rupert of Popes over Kings." Chapter V argues that the Pope has no power over the temporality of Princes, that he cannot take away their crowns or absolve subjects from an oath of fidelity, and that Bellarmine's reasonings are invalid. 23 Having demolished Papal claims, Du Moulin neatly turns the argument in Chapter VII to prove that, on the contrary, emperors and kings have always had authority over the Bishops of Rome—that they have chosen Popes, punished them, degraded them; and that, moreover, princes have always had power over bishops and their temporalities. 24 Here, then, Du Moulin clearly aligns himself with those Huguenots who favored the divine right of Kings. 25 Because it follows point by point the royal confession
of faith, agreeing and justifying as it goes along, Book II is perhaps less interesting for us. It seems logical to believe, however, that Casaubon's distaste for the work may have been aroused most by Articles Two and Three, dealing with the Church Fathers and the authority to be given them; and Articles Nine through Eleven, discussing the Eucharist. 26

Concurrently with his 1609 reissue of Triplici nodo, James I had Bishop Andrewes make a detailed answer to "Tortus" (Bellarmine), which was published the same year with the witty title Tortura Tortissive Ad Matthias Torti Librum Responsio. 27 Cardinal Bellarmine rejoined with his Apologia pro Responsione sua, wherein he acknowledged his own earlier Responsio and answered James's "Proemition." This book included a new edition of the Responsio. 28 But the next year, 1610, Bishop Andrewes replied with his long, elaborate Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini, in which he is thought to have had Casaubon's help. 29 The next four years saw the appearance of a bewildering profusion of books on both sides, with the Catholic publications extending from Germany to Spain. On the Protestant side, the predictable number of Anglican divines rallied to their King, and amongst the Jesuits such illustrious names as Martin Becon, Suares, James Grether, and Leonardus Lessius appeared. 30 Becon was still involved as late as 1619. 31 Du Moulin, however, dipped into the controversy at flood tide in 1614 with his De Monarchia Temporali Pontificis Liber, 32 a work which again commended him to the English crown.

In De Monarchia, Du Moulin expanded the thesis he had developed
in the Defense de la Foy Catholique, that the Papacy had by various ruses usurped, or defrauded princes of, an authority to which the Pope, the bishops, and the clergy had originally been subject. Perhaps as well as any other work of his, De Monarchia shows why Du Moulin was valued or feared in an inkbhorn barrage. It has the French literary virtues of grasp, clarity, brevity, and point. Compared with the shapeless bulk of most such works—even to an extent those of Andrewes—it has a fine structural clearness as well as sharp mobility of reasoning. Aside from its flowery praise of James I, the dedication to him gives some of Du Moulin’s reasons for entering the quarrel again: Catholic accusations that Protestants are inconsistent, especially in the beliefs of Huguenots and Anglicans; attacks made on the Protestant religion in the person of James; and a common cause, in the face of Catholic theories of tyrannicide and deposition of kings, between French Protestants loyal to their King, and James I. After three chapters reviewing the controversy, Du Moulin in Chapter IV attacks the Jesuits by citing fifteen pages of rules and axioms ascribed to them, and purporting to show that their Society was founded for the ruination of Commonwealths. He threshes over the familiar arguments about the Order—the Spanish leadership of the Jesuits, their blind loyalty to superiors, their doctrines of deposition and tyrannicide, their claims of clerical exemption from civil laws, Papal assertion of power to absolve subjects of their loyalty, the divine right and holy secrecy of confession, and so on. Chapter V reviews the general encroachment of the Pope on civil power, and then makes specific application to
England. 35 Then Du Moulin turns to the refutation of Bellarmine's theories. The Cardinal, Du Moulin observes, 36 has tried to cast his odious doctrines with palatable distinctions of terms, mere quibbles which Du Moulin will expose as window dressing which really means nothing. The so-called indirect power of the Pope to depose Kings, he says, has "tantundem virum ad disturbandos reges, & transferenda sceptrum si directa vocaretur." 37 Equally fraudulent, Du Moulin charges, is Bellarmine's claim that the pope has power over worldly things so far as they touch spiritual ones, or are ordered by them. 38 This still leaves everything at the Pope's command, he says, "nihil animum est temporale quod non aliquo modo pertinent ad spiritualia." 39 The idea that the Pope's temporal power is not temporal in origin, but extends to worldly things from his spiritual commission, Du Moulin finds ridiculous. 40 This in fact augments the Pope's power. To Bellarmine's plea that he had not denied the divine law of obedience to kings, but had said that each king came of human law, Du Moulin rejoins that Bellarmine cancels himself by conceding a principle but denying its application. 41 If the Pope claims authority over Kings outside his Church, Du Moulin asks, what about the Turk? 42 Thereafter, in Chapters VII-XIII, Du Moulin seeks to disprove Bellarmine by Scripture, reason, and the Ancient Church. Through Chapters XIV-XVII, Du Moulin contends that the Roman Emperors and Italian Kings had full power over the Pope, that in any nation the clergy was always subject to Kings and Princes, that the Pope had usurped the royal powers of calling Councils and presiding over them, and that later Councils had strayed from earlier form and
doctrines.\textsuperscript{43} Clerical exemptions are attacked through Chapters XVIII-XXXI; and next (Chapters XXXII-XXXIV) the Papacy is portrayed as succeeding and imitating the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{44} Du Moulin's parting shot is a discussion (Chapter XXVI) of what artifices the Papacy has used to twist spiritual power and Christian doctrine to its own worldly advantage.

The warfare over James's Oath, as this influenced French politics, involved Du Moulin in a third controversy on behalf of the English crown, in which he was pitted against his old foe the Cardinal Du Perron. In 1614, the year De Monarchia appeared, the Estates-General of France assembled for their last meeting until 1789, and the Third Estate presented a cahier containing an oath to be sworn by officers, churchmen, and others, which condemned the teachings of deposition, rebellion, and regicide in much the same language as the Oath of James. The French clergy labored for suppression of the cahier, and the Cardinal Du Perron was selected to present their views to the other two Estates. The Cardinal's fiery speech\textsuperscript{45} was masterfully done; he agreed that assassination of kings is not permissible and that in their bare administration of temporal affairs they depend on God; but he objected long and systematically to the doctrine that subjects could never be absolved of their oath of loyalty.\textsuperscript{46} His objections were chiefly based on how the passage of this section might divide the Church and introduce schism by causing laymen to give private judgment on matters of faith which only Authority should determine, and by calling that very authority into question; and on how this might bring back the civil
It would, the Cardinal said, rend the unity of faith on which the Church rests, and under its avowed purpose of protecting the King lurked just such an intent. Compared to this oath, he asserted, the one of James I (whom he flatters) is more sweet and modest. Then, despite a defense of the oath by Miron, president of the Chamber of the Third Estate, the article was left out of the cahier after the Council forbade further discussion and Louis XIII ordered its omission.

Publication of the Cardinal's Harangue in four editions during 1615, and its status as a manifesto of the French clergy, required an answer. The reply came from James I himself, in a Déclaration du sérénissime roi Jacques I, roi de la Grande-Bretagne, France et Irlande, défenseur de la foi pour le droit des rois, et indépendance de leurs couronnes contre la Harangue d'illustrissime Cardinal du Perron, prononcée à la chambre du tiers-état, 1615. The text was followed by an Advertissement by Du Moulin, who may have helped James with the Declaration. Du Perron prepared two replies to James's book, one of which was published in 1620 after the Cardinal's death under the title Réplique à la Réponse du Sérénissime Roy de la Grande-Bretagne par l'illustrissime et reverendissime Cardinal du Perron, archevesque de Sens, Primat des Gaules et de Germanie, et Grand Avocatier de France. The other answer, much longer, was not printed. It was to rebut Du Perron's book that Du Moulin wrote his Nouveauté du Papiisme, Opposée à l'Antiquité du Vray Christianisme. Contre le Livre de Monsieur le Cardinal Du Perron, Intitulé Réplique à la Response du Sérénissime Roy
Jacques I. Roy de la Grande Bretagne (Sedan, 1627).

A large folio of much preliminary matter and more than 1083 pages, Nouveauté du Papiisme was undertaken, Du Moulin tells us, at the command of James I, completed as a point of honor after his death in 1625, and then dedicated to Charles I.\textsuperscript{53} It was written at least in part during a serious illness of nearly two years,\textsuperscript{54} and despite trips and the lack of books. Compared to his treatment of the Cardinal later on, Du Moulin opens with comparative praise for Du Perron's skill as a disputant, noting his command of language and style, his diligent research into antiquity, his inventiveness, his ability to throw up a screen of obscure words and excessive distinctions, and his mastery of evasion.\textsuperscript{55} Du Moulin's line of attack through the seven books of the work partly branches from, partly develops the contention of De Monarchia and the Defense that Papal supremacy was not an inherent principle of the Church, but instead was the result of conniving by bishops who in the Early Church amounted to little. The Cardinal's second preface Du Moulin dismisses as a mere exhortation to submit to the True Church without specifying which it is, or teaching how to recognize it, or giving necessary instruction in the Word of God.\textsuperscript{56} Book I (in 65 chapters) discusses the church of the elect and the visibility of the church, its capacity for error as shown by Rome. It plays off the relative authority of Scripture and Church, attacks the Papal succession, and finds the Roman position on using the Fathers self-contradictory. The truth and purity of Holy Writ is defended against the Cardinal.\textsuperscript{57} In Book II, of nine chapters, Du Moulin
contends that the church visible should not be monarchical, and denies
that Peter had jurisdiction over the other Apostles or was monarch of
the universal church.\textsuperscript{58} Having laid this groundwork, Du Moulin pur-
sues Church history through Books III–VI to show that, whatever efforts
he may have made, the Bishop of Rome was not recognised, even by the
time of the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.), as the head of the Church;
and that Councils were called by the Emperors, not the Pope.\textsuperscript{59} Such
examination of the nature and evolution of the Church and its beliefs
raises other questions: the problem of Scriptural interpretation, and
if interpretation at all, by whom; the weight to be given the Fathers,
and which ones. In refuting Du Perron, Du Moulin clearly expressed
his nature views. Will Rome give people a sure and infallible inter-
pretation of Scriptures? The Cardinal, charges Du Moulin, sends them
to seek the non-existent, since the Church has no one official inter-
pretation of Scripture—rather, many Doctors commenting upon it and
disputing among themselves.\textsuperscript{60} To resolve this difficulty, since all
agree that the Old and New Testaments are the Divine Word, let the
people there find what is necessary to salvation. But Du Moulin’s ad-
versaries will ask, who will interpret Scripture; does each man have the
divine inspiration to penetrate its meaning? It needs no interpreter,
Du Moulin asserts,

\textit{Car les choses nécessaires à salut sont si clairement}
couchees en l’Ecriture qu’il n’est point besoin d’inter-
prète pour les entendre suffisamment à salut. L’Ecriture
nous enseigne que Dieu a créé le monde, que Jesus Christ est mort pour nous, qu'il est ressuscité. Elle commande d'aimer Dieu de tout son coeur, à son prochain comme soi-même. Elle défend de tuer, de paillarder, de désrober, &c. Pour entendre ces choses faudra-il trouver un interprète infaillible? Or le dit qu'en l'Ecriture les choses qui sont ainsi claires suffisent à salut.

This, of course, belongs to moral theology and might suffice, were Scriptural readers not going to inquire about strange or mystical passages. But such a view is open to question for matters more abstruse and requiring exegesis, and it is plainly not enough for those who wish to understand the historical Church and its dogma. Here the patristic issue appears again. Du Moulin charges Du Perron with making conformity with the Fathers, rather than Holy Writ, the mark of the true Church, and with picking out only those Fathers who suit his purpose. And Du Perron, he says, has marvellously twisted their sense to prove his point:

Si jamais homme eust de la dextérété à genahir, & à destourner les passages de leur vray sens, Monsieur du Perron en emporte le prix. Par une soupplesse ingenieuse il prend les paroles de respect & d'honneur dites à l'Enseque de Rome, pour paroles de suijetion. Il baille les conseils que les Pontifes ont donné à leurs amis pour loix & ordonnances; à les recours des personnes oppréeses
pour des appels. Et le secours fraternel que quelque
Enseigne de Rome a donné à un affligé, pour une action
de juges et de souverains.63

The Fathers themselves are an endless labyrinth of confusion, require-
ing, Du Moulin asserts, more interpretation than the Scripture they
are supposed to explain—discordant, ambiguous, erroneous, obscure.64

But there was more. Following his Preface, Du Moulin supplied
a seventeen-page "Eschantillon de Faussetes et Dérautions de Passages
Allégées par M. le Cardinal Du Perron, en son livre contre le Roy de
la Grand' Bretagne. Le lecteur en trouvera plusieurs autres que j'ai
remarquées en l'Indice mis à la fin de ce livre."65 With a dash of
esprit gaulois, Du Moulin spiced the Index to Nouveauté de Papisme with
six lists of ignorances allegedly shown by the Cardinal in his book.
There were ignorances in Scripture (nine headings), Philosophy (thir-
teen headings), Greek language and Latin grammar (three headings),
Geography (one), Hebrew (three), and the Fathers and Ancient History
(twenty).66 Moreover, Du Moulin accused Du Perron of falsifying both
Scripture and the Fathers. There are twenty-two headings of Scriptural
falsification and a hundred for the Fathers, whom Du Perron is charged
with truncating, twisting, falsifying, and deliberately mistranslat-
ing.67 Indeed, it is a kind of poetic irony that such a monument as
this catalogue of "ignorances" was left to the learned prelate who had
by similar tactics shamed De Mornay at the Fontainebleau conference of
1600.68
Du Moulin's connection with England, however, involved more than writing partisan political works, and brought him into intimate contact with the Crown. Motivated, perhaps, by the desire to lessen Catholic threats by Protestant solidarity, and seeing that this must rest on concord of belief rather than on ecclesiastical structure, James I dreamed of Protestant union. Therefore he wrote to the Huguenot National Synod of Tournaine, which began in May, 1611, to plead for peace and union among all who sincerely professed the Christian faith.

The Synod wrote an appreciative letter to James and suggested a plan for reuniting Protestant churches in belief and adjusting differences between them. Barring any distracting quarrels over rival tenets, it would set up a congress of theologians to formulate a joint confession, a symbol which would be a consensus of the beliefs of the reformed churches of England, Scotland, and the Continent. This creed would omit the more arcane points of faith, about which there was difference, and concentrate on matters of salvation. James also wished to draw up a plan of reunion, and invited Du Moulin over in 1615 to help with this and other work. Given a most flattering reception, Du Moulin stayed three months. He attended James at dinner, and the King gave him a prebend in Canterbury Cathedral and a benefice in Wales, each worth £200 a year; while Cambridge, where Du Moulin had studied as a young man, conferred a doctor's degree upon him. The plan for reunion on which James and Du Moulin collaborated was amiable but ineffective. "On y remarque," it has been observed, "une modération fort éloignée du caractère de Du Moulin et dans laquelle on doit reconnaître
l'influence du roi Jacques.” Though the plan spoke hopefully of peace and concord, it failed because nobody really desired a union for which he would have to make concessions.

Through the Synod of Tournai, James I also helped make peace between Du Moulin and Daniel Tilénus, professor of theology at the Académie de Sedan, which was under the protection of the Duke of Bouillon. For some time, the two clergymen had quarreled about how divine and human natures could be united in the person of Christ, and because many churches had become embroiled, the Synod was anxious—even though favorable to Du Moulin—to bury the matter. King James had David Hone, the elderly pastor of Duras, urge Du Moulin to a reconciliation with Tilénus, while the Synod decided on a conference for that purpose at Saumur. There, Du Flessis-Mornay and the professors of the Saumur academy would try to persuade the bickering ministers to end their quarrel in a union of doctrine. In 1613, however, Du Moulin had issued at Paris a Copie de la lettre écrite contre Tilénus aux Ministres de France. But the efforts of James on one side, and Du Flessis-Mornay and seven clergymen on the other, succeeded, and the two ministers each made a grudging admission of the other’s orthodoxy. As a result, Du Moulin gave up the printing of an Examen de la Doctrine de Tilénus, but the Lettre had been republished at Schiedam with the printer suppressing an offensive portion. This part appeared anonymously at the Hague in 1617, but nothing further was heard of the quarrel.

During 1617 and 1618, Du Moulin was busy writing two works whose
purpose was domestic—to refute Catholic attacks on the French Reformed faith—but which nonetheless had their effect in England and on his connection with the Stuarts. These books were the Bouclier de la Foi (Charenton, 1618) and De la Vocation des Pasteurs (Sedan, 1618); their relationship is clarified by his correspondence with Bishop Lancelot Andrews. The central issue is Episcopacy as it affected the ecclesiastical arm of the English government, caught between Catholic and Presbyterian agitation. Du Moulin’s eventual position—close to Hooker’s and conciliatory to the nascent Anglo-Catholicism of Andrews—is quoted and developed by Du Moulin’s eldest son in the anti-prelatical arguments on the eve of the English Civil War, quarrels in which Milton was prominent.

Few of Du Moulin’s controversies failed to include a Jesuit. This one began when Father Jean Arnoux, confessor of Louis XIII, asserted while preaching before the young King that Scriptural passages in the margin of the Reformed Confession of Faith were all falsely adduced. Four clergymen of the Charenton temple undertook the necessary answer, the Défense de la Confession des Églises Réformées de France par les quatre Ministres de Charenton: Montigny, Durand, Du Moulin et Nestresat, contre les Accusations du sieur Arnoux jésuite (Charenton: Nicolas Bourdin, 1617). Evidently Du Moulin composed much of the forceful work, for it had immediate effects. One was a flurry of Catholic pamphlets, some amusing; the other was official action. The dedication of the work, praised as “fort belles et pleines de force,” was addressed to Louis XIII, and sharply reminded the King
that his family owed its throne to Protestant swords. This was too much, and Catholic pressure brought an order in council forbidding any future dedications to the King without his permission. Richelieu, still Bishop of Laon and as yet neither Cardinal nor Prime Minister, also contributed to the pamphlet war. Here the matter halted momentarily, but Roman pressure on the Huguenots did not.

Hardly any aspect of rival faiths was left untouched by partisan thrusts—dogma, sacraments, church polity. From a legal point of view, the valid performance of spiritual functions depended, in general, upon a rightly constituted clergy. To Catholic emphasis upon the Papal succession and validity of Roman orders—supported by evidence from Scripture and the Fathers, Papal and Conciliar decrees, official interpretation, and tradition—was opposed a Protestant stress upon the calling to a ministry set up, so far as possible, in conformity with Scripture only, or at least not contradicting its final authority. On the grounds that the clergy of the French Reformed Churches was being charged with lack of a proper calling, Du Moulin now published a treatise De la Vocation des Pasteurs (Sedan; Jean Jannon, 1618). The charge was made, he wrote, to distract the Reformed faith from its "exposure" of Roman doctrine by the rule of Scripture; but he would defeat the enemy by showing "la validite de nostre vocation, et la nullite & corruption de la leur." Divided into two books, De la Vocation has Du Moulin's usual combination of a clearly unified organisation, and an elegant edge of style. Otherwise, it generally falls in line with Calvinistic argument, seeking to prove the Scriptural purity of the French Reformed
ministry in its structure, vocation, and ordination. While not rejecting Episcopacy per se, it roundly condemns its development in the Roman Catholic Church as a perversion growing from the turning of a spiritual government into a temporal monarchy with worldly gain and power as its objectives. Since the book was designed for the Huguenots, not clergy, Du Moulin felt little need for restraint, and went far indeed in his allegations about the Roman Church—so far that without careful reading the book might seem a blast at Episcopacy per se.

Because of his new prominence in England, and the fact that the Established Church was trying to maintain its validity against both Catholic and Puritan, Du Moulin's book could expect careful reading there. Consequently, his argument is worth noting.

He points out that the words Priest and Bishop were interchangeable in the New Testament, that bishops were instituted for good order, and that sometimes there were more than two in one city. The French Reformed do not use the term, he says, because a bishop now is a prince in the Pope's temporal empire, and a priest is a sacrificer. Though anciently the power of ordination belonged to bishops, this practice was founded in custom and Church policy, not divine right. Churches have liberty in this matter, he continues, and since such polity is not necessary to salvation, it would be quite blameworthy to trouble the peace of the Church about it. Whenever it is expedient to change something, it should be done by common consent, not by tumult or obstinacy about some particular. Because heretics rejected parts of Scripture, Du Moulin asserts, the Fathers could not use the Bible as authority in
suppressing them, but had to employ history and the Succession. This
was possible especially for those Fathers living shortly after the
Apostles, when consecutive bishops were fresh in memory. But 1500 years
later, it is impossible to use these two arguments with certainty.90
By Succession, the Fathers meant continuity of pure doctrine as well
as chairs—not a succession of persons, as today, without succession
or conformity of doctrine.91 Succession is no good proof of the true
religion, for it does not preclude heresy or idolatry.92
The Jacobean Church was just beginning its theological develop­
ment from the Church of Elizabeth, and though Du Moulin's foregoing
observations were not aimed at it, and Bishop Joseph Hall was not yet
championing Episcopy,93 still, the rather negative character of Du
Moulin's remarks, wrapped in his anti-Papal attacks, could not help
the Anglican cause. Indeed, if not prominent in context, three of Du
Moulin's statements brought a frown from James, and an exchange of
letters with Bishop Andrews.94 These were Du Moulin's assertions that
the words Bishop and Priest were equivalent, that there was one and the
same order of Bishop and Priest, and that—here was the gravest matter—
episcopal primacy was by church law, not divine right.95 Since it
comprises six Latin letters extending from September, 1619, well into
1619, the Du Moulin-Andrews correspondence becomes too complicated
for detailed treatment here; but there are important central issues of
theology and biography. In the first letter, Du Moulin wrote Andrews
of the double effect De la Vocation des Pasteurs had produced: King
James was offended because it disparaged the episcopal order, whereas
the Huguenots complained loudly it had promoted episcopacy, and were angered at Du Moulin's admission that episcopacy dated from the earliest times, and that a clergyman prominent in a city was called a bishop. Du Moulin admits all of the offending statements—what else could he do?—but tries to soften their effect. When saying that the names Priest and Bishop were interchangeable, Du Moulin pleads, he was not detracting from the dignity of the episcopal office, for that function could not be interchanged. As to his statement that the order of Priest and Bishop is one and the same, he says the Ancient Church thought so and the Roman Church still does; witness the Roman Pontifical, which treats of the consecration of a bishop, but nowhere of his ordination. Order is one thing, Du Moulin argues, and grade another—as between Bishop and Archbishop. If he did assert that episcopal grade and prerogative was of church and not divine law, it would not be the part of a good and sensible man for a Frenchman living under the polity of the French Reformed Churches to advocate Episcopacy, and thus come under the censure of its synods. To say that it was of divine right would be to brand the Reformed Church as heretical and disturb the conscience of the weak. Moreover, when he had mentioned the Anglican Church, he did so with honor and he asks Andrews to regard him as one with whom Antiquity has great honor.

Andrewes' first reply gives the gist of his position, which like Du Moulin's, does not greatly change throughout the letters. Admitting that James I had noted the three points mentioned, he first concedes that the terms Priest and Bishop once were used indiscriminately.
When Andrews then says that James was more concerned by the intent and motive than by the surface statement of Du Moulin, the Bishop shows how suspicious Puritan din for parity of the clergy had made the "English Solomon." Andrews then steps up Du Moulin's schappatoire for the second argument, namely his distinction between order and grade, ordination and consecration. The use of consecration in the Roman Pontifical, he observes, does not mean that a bishop is the same thing as a priest, though of a higher grade; for there is a fresh imposition of hands, signifying a new order. Of the question of Episcopacy by divine right or church law, Andrews maintains that whatever was done by the Apostles was done by Apostolic right; the Holy Spirit guided them in what they did. The Bishop then adds some objections from his own offended sense of history; the words vocation and pastor used by the Reformed Churches—and Du Moulin's book—are novelties; ancient Church writings use other terms for the ordination of clergymen. Having asked Andrews' opinion, Du Moulin is subsequently buried under an avalanche of Scriptural and patristic information. In his last letter, Du Moulin rather unsuccessfully defends his tenets and use of the words vocation and pastor, but the result is not entirely convincing compared to Andrews' exhaustive reply, which after reiterating James's three objections, takes over Scripture and the Fathers to elaborate the Bishop's views. It is steeped in Andrews' veneration for the magic word Antiquity.

The exchange of letters may safely be said to reinforce one's impression of Du Moulin as more of a wily disputant than a theologian;
and if there is a faintly patronising air about Andrews' letters to Du Moulin, the Bishop still shows considerable appreciation of the Frenchman's equivocal position in the Reformed Church.

But however understanding Andrews may have been, James's displeasure with Du Moulin's views of Episcopacy brings us again to the Defense of the Reformed Confession which he and the Charenton ministers had written against Father Arnoux. During the latter part of 1617 and early 1618, Du Moulin reworked the defense into a book of his own entitled Boulier de la Foi, a work of considerable popularity. The method of the book was to take one or more articles of the Reformed Confession at a time, annex a comment of Father Arnoux, and then to refute the Jesuit and to interpret the article. Because of the range of topics covered by the Reformed confession, the book is a compendium, uttered in his prime, of Du Moulin's opinions on many things. Not only was it being composed at nearly the same time as De la Vocation des Pasteurs, but on Articles XXX and XXXI of the Confession the Boulier de la Foi dealt with the same topics—the prelatical rule of the Roman Church and the calling of pastors. As expected, the book was soon translated into English, first in 1626. It was dedicated to the Prince of Wales, later Charles I. In "An Advertisement to the Reader," the printer of the translation, Richard Field, shows the reception Du Moulin's views on Episcopacy had in England. "Christian Reader," writes Field,

may it please thee to understand, that when two sundry
Editions of this works had speedily been set forth in French, the Author was advertised that some in the Church of England disliked somewhat in it; whereupon he reviewed it all againe, purposing to explain himselfe in that manner in the next Edition, as should give full satisfaction. But before that could conveniently be set forth, having notice of my intention to publish his works in English, he sent me the copie, wherein some things he omitted, a few passages he somewhat altered with his owne pen. In one place he inserted two whole leaves, viz. in the 12th Section, wherein at large he seteth downe his judgement touching Episcopall authoritie, and the discipline of the Church of England. Thus much I thought to acquaint thee withall beforehand, that thou mightest not give lesse credit to this English copie, though it somewhat vary from the French alreadie published; for nothing is herein added, omitted, or altered, but by direction from the Author himselfe, who hath promised that the next French edition shall be set forth with the like corrections and additions. 108

Du Moulin's explanation of Article XXXI on the calling of pastors is practically an epitome of De la Vocation des Pasteurs (to which a marginal note on p. 355 refers), condensing the same arguments, making the same charges against Rome. The English commentary on Article XXX
shows unmistakably the influence of the correspondence with Andrewes, in just the place to thrust it into prominence—the declaration that "We believe, that all true Pastors, in what place soever they be, have the same authority and equal power, under one and the same head Jesus Christ ... ."\textsuperscript{109} Not only does Du Moulin repeat the arguments that run through his letters to Andrewes, but he also affords a clear example of the bond felt between Reformed churches of different polity in the days before Laud.

The repeated statements of Du Moulin to Andrewes implying that he favored episcopacy but dared not propagate it among the French Reformed may easily sound like mere expediency, and thus they raise the unpleasant question of whether Du Moulin tailored convictions to patronage. His motives, however, seem to have been understandably mixed. It is evident that he personally wished to keep James's favor, but it is also apparent that he wanted to preserve the bond between English and French Protestants. Arnoux had objected to Article XXX that it "introduceth anarchie, division, disobedience, and disorder into the house of God, and overthroweth the manner to governe established by divine Law ... ."\textsuperscript{110} Du Moulin supports the equality of pastoral functions, and adds:

\begin{quote}
... But as touching Ecclesiasticall policie, we do not refuse to acknowledge those for pure and true Churches, where this equalitie is not observed; because we esteeme not this order to be a point of faith, nor a doctrine
\end{quote}
tending to salvation. We live (God be thanked) in brotherly concord with the neighbour Churches which observe another form, and where Bishops have some superiorities. 111

The obvious Catholic strategy was to split Protestant unity by emphasizing differences in polity. How could Du Moulin avert this? First—as above—by maintaining that polity is really an abhorrer, secondary to the doctrine and faith about which the English and French churches agree. Secondly, by demonstrating that different polities do not practically affect the community of the two churches. 112 Thirdly, by asserting that "if sometimes we speak against the authority of Bishops, we condemn not Episcopall order in itself, but speak onely of the corruption which the Church of Rome hath induced into the Bishoprick, making it a temporall principalitie, depending upon the Papall Throne." 113 And lastly, to justify the different Protestant church governments by necessity and national exigencies. 114

Du Moulin's statements are, of course, clearly intended to dispel misunderstanding, and to placate James and Andrewes, and to keep the royal favor. His success is clear from his later commission to write the Nouveauté du Papisme. But a further and sincere purpose was preservation of the vital unity between the two Protestant bodies under Catholic fire, and permanently to identify the interests and unanimity of the Anglican and French churches. That he achieved some success here is evident from the use made of his comments nearly twenty years later by his son Dr. Peter Du Moulin against another attempt, this time
Presbyterian, to break the tie between Anglicans and Huguenots, and instead to equate the Huguenots with the Covenanters. Already an Anglican divine but still much aware of his French origin, young Da Moulin wrote a book to destroy this equation, a work in which he quoted the very passages we have discussed.\textsuperscript{115} He makes his father appear almost a strenuous champion of Episcopacy in the Buckler:

There also hee complaineth, as farre as hee may, of the disorders that follow equalitie, relating and allowing the just objections of the English Clergie in these words: they say, AND THAT WITH GOOD REASON [Capitals Da Moulin's], that no societie . . . .\textsuperscript{116}

How can one say more, living under a different Discipline? Any man may perceive, that hee speaketh feelingly, as one that had an especiall knowledge and experience of the inconveniences of his Discipline: And that hee thinkes more yet then he saith.\textsuperscript{117}

Because we are examining that part of Da Moulin's career related to England, which helps to explain the writings of his eldest son, a lengthy review of his activities in the French Reformed Church is not à propos. His connections with the Synod of Alais and the National Assembly of La Rochelle in 1620 are significant. Under his presidency, the Synod of Alais condemned the teachings of Arminius, and the Synod's relationship to the Assembly raised the question of the obedience to kings which had become a crux of religious controversy.
It was indeed a critical moment for the Huguenots when the Synod of Alais met from October to December, 1620, in the Cevennes mountains. For years, the Catholic hierarchy had pressed for the official restoration of the Faith in strongly Protestant Béarn. Even after turning Catholic, Henry IV had rebuffed the bishops' importunities, but Louis XIII took an opposite view. Much more than Roman Catholic worship was involved, for the hierarchy demanded that church revenues now Protestants be restored to the Catholic Church. On 25 June 1617, Louis XIII by an order in council granted both demands, autocratically violating the constitutional rights of Béarn. Though the King assured the Protestants of freedom to worship and promised financial support for Huguenot establishments to replace the seized revenues, Louis' record of bad faith inspired little confidence. Therefore, the Béarnese considered resistance, and Louis invaded the principality and entered Pau as if he were a victorious enemy. Eventually, the results were disastrous to the Huguenots. Under this ominous cloud, the Huguenots assembled in the mountain town under the leadership of Du Moulin. Of the acts by the Synod of Alais, three are of especial concern here. One was an oath expressing the inseparable unity of the Reformed Churches and their complete loyalty to their confession of faith and their discipline. Led by a cautious group of ministers, among whom Du Moulin probably figured, the Synod refrained from issuing a forceful statement to back the Assembly of La Rochelle, then considering a defensive war against Louis XIII. This conservative view brought accusations that royal gold had bought some members, and the Béarnese deputies
cried they were betrayed. And finally, the Synod read and approved the canons of the Synod of Dort, condemning the teachings of Jacob Arminius (1560-1609), who had opposed the doctrine of unconditional predestination of Calvin by stressing free will as an element in salvation.

Du Moulin had a strong personal interest in this action. Commissioned earlier by the Synod of Vitré to attend the Synod of Dort, Du Moulin and the other deputies were overtaken at Geneva, en route to Holland, by an order from Louis XIII forbidding them to proceed. The Synod of Dort met in late 1618 to early 1619, but at the beginning of 1618 Du Moulin had impatiently sent to press his attack on the teachings of Arminius, the *Anatome Arminianismi*. Judging this premature, Du Moulin's colleagues vainly tried to persuade him to delay the printing; and when they failed here, they obtained from the provincial synod on 14 May 1618 a decree holding up publication until after the Synod of Dort had closed. Consequently, Du Moulin presided over the Synod of Alais with such gusto that he was accused of usurping a papal authority. However Du Moulin may have viewed Episcopacy, he was fiercely against the Arminian tendencies which were beginning to color Anglican theology.

Dedicating his *Anatome of Arminianism* to the States-General of the United Provinces, Du Moulin sulphurously attributed the rise of Arminianism to the Author of Evil himself:

Sathan, that hee might hinder the course of these prosperous affaires, hath for many yeaers tried outward forces:
From which enterprise being driven, he hath betook himself to crafty subtleties, and to intestine dissentions: having gotten men, who affecting novelty, under the pretence of Pietie, have torn the bowels of their own Country and Church. Pittifull was the sight of your Provinces: The enemy of salvation did brandish amongst you the fire-brand of deadly dissention: A tumultuous tragedy was acted on the Theatre of Belgia, your adversaries beholding it with much pleasure: Finally, wee saw your Common-wealth shaking, and your estate almost desperate, had not God appearing, beyond all expectation, turned away this imminent destruction by timely and seasonable remedies . . . .

The remedies were, of course, the Canons of the Synod of Dort, than "which Synode for many ages past there hath beenes none more famous, more holy, nor more profitable to the Church." Du Moulin portrays school debates over Arminian tenets becoming a tumult which passed from pulpit to barbershop, "Whence hatred hath been bred into the people, and pietie is turned into contention, and obedience towards Magistrates is more slack"; but, thanks to the States-General, "the flame of so great a fire is abated, liberty is recovered, the Common-wealth is settled, the universitie purged, and truth, which in many places durst scarce open the mouth, or else was disturbed by contrary clamours, broke through the obstacles, and . . . shone more clear by the very conflict . . . ." But what are the "unavoidable evils" whereby the Arminians "enwrap mens consciences" and abet Satan?
... For hereby is man puffed up with pride, teaching, that man can separate himself; that he can convert himself; that he can convert himself before he be converted in act by God; that man hath whereof he may boast; that God is bound to give him sufficient grace; that God doth give to man, what he is indebted to him; that the grace of God is not the total cause of faith; that the grace of God is subjected to man's free-will. And on the other side Arminianism doth vex men's consciences with a careful doubting. For who can be certain of his salvation, if our salvation is not certain by the Election and decree of God? And if the number of the elect be not certain by the will of God?

The rigidity and Calvinistic certitude which this shows may really preclude Du Moulin from being in the best sense a theologian; and the fact that he approved of the intellectual straitjacket made in Dort, and of the sorry events following the Synod, is not pleasant. His background, however, accounts for much; and it was his power as a disputant which put him on familiar terms with the Anglicans to whose doctrinal leanings he was unsympathetic.

Returning from the Synod of Alais, Du Moulin was forced to quit Paris for Sedan, where he became alarmed at the Assembly of La Rochelle's drift to war, and wrote to it on 12 February 1621, urging a moderate course. Admitting the justice of Huguenot grievances, he
said nothing of submission because of the Divine Right of Kings, but
gave instead a shrewd appraisal of the Protestant internal weaknesses
which resulted in eventual failure:

Pardon me, Gentlemen, if I tell you that you shall not
find all our Protestants inclined to obey your resolutions;
and that the fire being kindled, all about you shall remain
helpless beholders of the ruins which you have drawn on our
heads. Neither can it be unknown to you, that many of the
best quality among us, and best able to defend us, openly
blame our actions holding and professing, that suffering
for this cause, is not suffering for the cause of God.
These making no resistance, and opening the gates of their
places, or joyning their Arms with the Kings, you may
easily judge what loss and what weakening of the party that
will be. How many of our Nobility will forsake you, some
out of Treachery, some out of weakness? Even they who in
an Assembly are most vehement in their Votes, and to shew
themselves Zealous, are altogether for violent ways, are
very often they that will Revolt and Betray their Brethren.
They bring our distressed Churches to the hottest danger,
and there leave them, going away after they have set the
house on fire.131

As Du Moulin warned, so it happened. The Assembly of La
Rochelle plunged on its ruinous path, drawing up on 10 May 1621 a plan
for carrying on defensive war against the King. It was cumbersome, and the entire proposal ignored the unpleasant realities which Du Moulin had pointed out. Of the eight generals drawn from the high Protestant nobility and assigned districts, only two—Soubise and Rohan—served with the necessary zeal. Conduct of the First Huguenot War was further hampered by selfish fears of the nobles, and dissensions in the Assembly itself had alienated popular support. Moreover, the people could hardly be aroused to fight in such a war, when for years the Huguenot clergy had extravagantly taught the theory of the Divine Right of Kings and had dimmed into their congregations the doctrine of non-resistance to higher powers. Among the other tragic results of the war was the burning of the beautiful Huguenot temple at Charenton by a Paris mob angered by the death of the Duc de Mayenne at the siege of Montauban. Thus disappeared the great edifice in which Du Moulin had preached and Isaac Casaubon worshipped.

Du Moulin's prophetic letter was written from Sedan, with which his name was associated for the rest of his life. To this city he was compelled to flee because of the aftermath of a letter he had written to James I. In 1620 Edward Herbert, first Lord Herbert of Cherbury and then the British ambassador at Paris, persuaded Du Moulin to write King James on behalf of the Elector Palatine in connection with current affairs in Bohemia. In his letter, Du Moulin stated that the eyes of European Protestants were turned, in their misery, to the English King. Upon returning to Paris from the Synod of Alais, Du Moulin was informed that the highly secret communication had been divulged, perhaps through...
the treacherous agency of the Duke of Buckingham, and that he was in trouble; the letter had been taken as a plea for James to interfere in European religious conflicts. 136 Fearing arrest, Du Moulin took the advice of Lord Herbert and fled Paris for Sedan, where the Duc de Bouillon appointed his tutor to his son and pastor of the Huguenot church there. In October, 1621, the Académie de Sedan named him professor of theology. 137 It was at this time that the Cardinal Du Perron’s Reply to King James’s Declaration was causing a stir.

Seeking Du Moulin’s talents to answer the Cardinal, James brought him to England to compose the work eventually called Nouveauté du Papisme, which we have already considered. Du Moulin made the trip either at the end of 1623 or early 1624, and remained in England until the death of James in 1625. Official machinery turned late in 1623 to facilitate the visit, for on October 13 Secretary Conway wrote to Secretary Calvert that “Leave is to be obtained from the French King for M. du Moulin, now at Sedan, to come to England, to settle the deaneries bestowed on him by the King, and to remain or not, as he pleases. The former directions thereon [for the Duke of Bouillon] were by mistake.” 138 There are few records for the early part of 1624, but a letter to Du Moulin by Secretary Conway on September 2 from London reveals that several benefices had been conferred upon him, and that he was seriously ill. Through the Secretary, James expressed his grief, and assured Du Moulin that his two sons should have the benefices after his decease. 139 On September 9 a warrant was issued for payment to Du Moulin of £100 of the King’s free gift, which must have eased Du Moulin’s mind. Some
weeks later, a living worth £200 had been conferred upon Du Moulin, but name of the living, the diocese, and the person to whom he must apply for the funds had been overlooked, necessitating a letter of November 8 from Du Moulin to Secretary Conway in London. In any event, money came, for on November 20 Richard Oliver, servant to the Duke of Buckingham, had obtained a receipt from Du Moulin for £200 made as a free gift from the King. 114 A letter from John Packer to Conway dated November 27 at Westminster reveals that Du Moulin had been recommended for the Deanship of Ripon, if it could be held without residence. 115

However, on 11 January 1625 Du Moulin was presented to the rectory of Llanarmon in the diocese of St. Asaph, voided by the promotion of its rector, the famous Dr. Godfrey Goodman (1583-1656), to the bishopric of Gloucester. 116 Meanwhile, Du Moulin was also serving as pastor of the French church in London. At some time after James's death on 27 March 1625, Du Moulin left England and returned to Sedan. 117

There Du Moulin stayed until 1628 when, after petitioning Louis XIII with support of the Synod of Castras, he was allowed to return to Charenton. 118 When war broke out again in France that year, he left Charenton, and by November was at the Hague. 119 Thence he returned to Sedan, where he was undisturbed the rest of his life, even when that principality was annexed to France in 1642. 120 As the time passed, his career of teaching, preaching, and writing almost innumerable controversial works continued. 121 There are several interesting glimpses of his later years.

One of them is a sequel to the writing of the Nouveauté du
Papisme. Writing on July 20/30, 1630 from Sedan to the Dowager Duchess de la Tremouille, Du Moulin recalled his composition of the book and its dedication to Charles I. By Secretary Dorchester, Charles I thanked Du Moulin and promised to gratify him on any occasion which might arise. Being old and with ten children, Du Moulin wished to secure from Charles the survivorship for his son Cyrus Du Moulin of his prebend at Canterbury, which was bringing in 1000 francs a year.\textsuperscript{167} On July 28/August 7, Du Moulin wrote further to Secretary Dorchester that he was not worthy that a person of Dorchester’s quality should convey the royal approbation.\textsuperscript{168} The Paris lawyer Claude Sarrau, however, has two rather diverse entries in his letters, which contrast sharply with this touching picture of an old man concerned about his survivors. When writing to Vincentius Fabricius in March, 1640, Sarrau had painted Du Moulin as “veterum illum Christi militem fortissimque athletam”;\textsuperscript{169} but to Salmassius, on 11 June 1649 from Paris to Leyden, he gives a picture of Du Moulin in his shaky old age as a man who has deserved well but outlived his usefulness, and whose vanity has a more pungent fragrance than his piety. Compared to the startling language which Sarrau uses, not even the Jesuits had said such things of Du Moulin.\textsuperscript{150}

One could wish, however, a happier close to a long career than Sarrau’s tart account. And perhaps, with its emphasis on making a godly end to things, the seventeenth century pays the best farewell one could to a man whom contemporaries regarded as a Gospel athlete. William Bates’s Latin biography records that on 20 February 1653 Du Moulin gave his last sermon, choosing as his text Psalm 16:7—“I will
bless the Lord, who hath given me counsel; my reins also instruct me in
the night seasons." Speaking with deep feeling, Du Moulin was inadvert-
ently delivering his own funeral oration. 151 Upon his return home,
the old man took to the sick bed from which he would not rise, and
there taught and consoled himself and bystanders. "Scripturam in ore
perpetuo habens, & preces ardentissimas fundens . . . ." 152

As eighteen days wore on, Du Moulin continually uttered pious
remarks to strengthen the attendants' faith. His last hours came on
10 March 1658, when he was heard saying, "I hasten to my God and
Father—I see my God—O how beautiful is His nature." 153 And he died,
extending his arms as if to greet the Divine beauty he seemed to behold.
CHAPTER III

MILTON'S SECRET ADVERSARY

Dr. Peter Du Moulin in Dangerous Times

(1601-1659)

If Pierre Du Moulin on his deathbed glanced back over his ninety years of strenuous activity, he may well have felt justly pleased at the illustrious personages whom he had known and the great issues in which he had engaged. His devotion to the Huguenot cause and the Reformed Faith had never swerved. A man of action rather than a scholar, and perhaps, as a strong Calvinist, essentially lacking in a balanced historical perspective, he maintained much and did so effectively. He was a master of dispute and far more than a mere rhetorician. For England, he had considerable affection; it had been the haven of his poverty-stricken youth; and the works he wrote supporting the Crown and the Anglican Church, though they brought him rewards, are not the performances of a hireling. To his eldest son, during these years an impressionable boy, the future was clearly to be found across the Channel.

Within the complex of his father's life we shall find the influences which made Peter Du Moulin probably the most able Royalist opponent of John Milton. And though these influences are clear, Peter Du Moulin is much more than a pale imitation of his father, or than a mere Philistine who jeered at the English Samson grinding in Gaza. Because of his close ties with the great of his time, Peter Du Moulin figured prominently in activities ranging from politics through witchcraft
to the New Science. In an age of bickering, he appears pleasantly as a Calvinist who really welcomed science and did not therefore fear atheism. As a neo-Latin poet, he had considerable ability, and even his "practical" works often have creative touches which are refreshing. His personality is sometimes winsome. And if a saving grace were needed, he possesses it—amongst grimly posturing spiritual gladiators, he had a sense of humor.

Since there are few records and hardly any personal utterances concerning his early years, we are perforce left with the picture of a boy who admired his celebrated father and moved where need or danger required. Peter Du Moulin was born at Paris on 24 April 1601, during his father's years of prominence at the great Huguenot temple at Charenton and association with Isaac Casaubon.¹ The growing Du Moulin family was made up of a sister and four brothers of Peter—Joachim (b. 1602), Esther (b. 21 September 1604), Lewis (b. 25 October 1605), Cyrus (b. 2 September 1606), and Samuel Du Moulin (n.d.).² It was during this period at Charenton that Peter Du Moulin formed his life-long friendship with Meric Casaubon, which was a notable feature of their later years together on the staff of Canterbury Cathedral. As to Peter Du Moulin's early education, we can only conjecture; but, to judge from his later works, it included intensive grounding in Latin and a fair amount of Greek. During these years, too, his interest in England was aroused, for he must have wondered at his father's memories of his youth adrift in Elizabthan London, and of student days at Cambridge. An even deeper impression must have been left on the
fourteen-year-old boy when the elder Du Moulin returned to his admiring family and friends in 1615, with familiar accounts of collaboration and dinners with the English King.

When Du Moulin fled Paris for Sedan in 1620, the family evidently joined him there. In 1623, young Peter Du Moulin upheld three theses at the Académie de Sedan, where his father was professor of theology. They were De Vetig, maintained with his father presiding at the function, and De Angelis and De Veris Peccati Poenit, both defended with Rambour in the chair. The following year, Pierre Du Moulin was in England at the behest of James I to compose the Nouvauté du Papisme, remaining there into 1625. At some time during this period, Peter Du Moulin also went to England to make acquaintances and to study under "des professeurs les plus renommés," probably at Cambridge.

His attention turned toward the ministry, and in 1625—rather surprisingly, after imprisonment at Dunkirk—he was appointed to the living of St. John's Church, Chester, a post which his father had refused. There is, however, no trace in the church books that he resided there. His movements for the next few months are obscure, but it may have been in March, 1625, that he was named sinecure rector of Llanarmon in Yale, County Denbigh. Young Du Moulin had decided to remain in England, for on 31 March 1626 a preparatory signet letter of denisation was issued for him—a grant which, however, was unexplainably not completed until 23 May 1633.

About 1628 Du Moulin began serving as chaplain to Lord Strange, continued his studies, and had became known to the Bishop of Exeter.
These facts emerge from a letter, dated 3 February 1631 at London, which Du Moulin wrote to his father's correspondent, Secretary Dorchester, to free himself from accusations of being a lazy pastor.

Still worse, Du Moulin wrote, King Charles was "leaning unto a bad opinion of the writer, some one having represented him to be a lewd and debauched fellow." His enemies, according to Du Moulin, had represented him "as consuming an ecclesiastical benefice in idleness." The benefice—not St. John's or that at Llanarmon is not clear—brought in £80 a year. Vindicating himself, Du Moulin gives Lord Strange and the Bishop as character references, and mentions the disfavor "of his father in France for his devotion to the service of King James, which is known to Lord Carlisle." If thought worthy of his Majesty's good opinion, Du Moulin pleads, he "would be more earnest for employment than recompense."

Evidently he cleared his name of the charges of sloth and debauchery, for in 1633 Peter Du Moulin obtained a new rectory and a wife. The new position was at Witherley in Leicestershire, as yet, no record has appeared of the romance and courtship which led to his marriage. The official entry is dryly succinct:

Moulin, Peter du, clerk, of St. Martin-in-the Fields, bachelor, 33, and Anne Claver, of Fosscott, Bucks, spinster, 27, daughter of Matthew Claver, deceased, consent of her mother, Jane Claver—at St. Martin-in-the Fields, 7 May, 1633. B.
The hopes, joys, and fears of the newlyweds can only be conjectured; but as yet, there was little reason to feel insecure about the future. The elevation of William Laud that year to the archbishopric of Canterbury was ominous to the Puritan intellectuals who urged, with more or less learning, a more thorough, godly reformation of the Established Church; and to the "affectionate" preachers who, with histrionic abandon, were attracting crowds to the drama of man's struggle for salvation—that warfare of the spirit which was soon to spill blood on the fair fields of England. Apparently the only blemish on Du Moulin's happiness at Witherly in the mid-thirties was an obscure litigation extending from April into October, 1635. Neither the cause of the suit nor its outcome are as yet clear, but "Peter du Moulin, clerk, pretended rector of Witherly," appeared before the Court of High Commission, along with Thomas Claver, Edward Claver, Ralph Hunt, Christopher Leister, Henry Dunisthorpe, and Richard Nocke. The suit was initiated on April 30, and the last entry for it is the issuance of a commission to examine witnesses, dated October 15. After this glimpse, we lose sight of Du Moulin and his wife in the groundswell of events leading to the outbreak of the Civil War. The previous year had seen the performance of young Milton's Comus at Ludlow Castle, and two years afterward (1637), Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton lost their ears and were fined £5000 for writing and publishing scandalous and libelous books against the state. John Lilburne was whipped in London, and riots broke out in Edinburgh when Archbishop Laud tried to replace Knox's Book of Common Order with his new prayer book. Milton
published *Lycidas* (November), his first great attack on prelacy,\(^{15}\) and
Hampden's Ship Money Case went to trial, dragging on into the next
year. Amidst such events, the life of a country parson easily became
obscure.

During 1639, the policies of King Charles I toward his Scottish
subjects and their Presbyterian faith resulted in strife which produced
Du Moulin's first publication of any importance. Determined to pre-
serve their national religious identity, the Scots in the winter of
1637-38 entered into a Covenant to defend their religion and resist
Laud's prayerbook, which "had received the finishing touches at Lambeth
and had been sent down ready-made for use, like a sack of English
goods."\(^{16}\) Consequently, the First Bishops' War broke out, ending with
the Treaty of Berwick on June 16. The following year, the Short Par-
liament (April 13-May 5) insisted on debating royal prerogative instead
of voting funds for a campaign against Scotland, and Charles I dissolved
it. By the time the rag-tag English army moved mutinously north in the
Second Bishops' War, the Scots had realised that English public opinion
was on their side and sent an army across the Border into England,
seized Newcastle, and threatened London. This war ended with the
Treaty of Ripon, confirming Presbyterianism in Scotland. Moreover,
Charles, with an indemnity and a daily allowance for their soldiers, had
to pay the Scots to leave England. To stave off bankruptcy and inva-
sion, he summoned the fateful Long Parliament.\(^{17}\) The Treaty of Ripon
was signed October 21, and the Parliament met on November 3.

It was a militantly Puritan Parliament which met, and it quickly
settled down to business. The Earl of Strafford, fresh from his despotic rule of Ireland, was arrested November 11, and old Archbishop Laud was thrown into the Tower. On December 11, the lengthy Root and Branch Petition for ending episcopacy was received by Parliament for debate. As the year 1640 ended, the Presbyterians of England were on the offensive. Naturally, they sought the endorsement of those foreign Reformed Churches on whose Calvinistic model they wished to refashion the Church of England.

Meanwhile, Du Moulin, who was evidently still holding his living of St. John's, Chester, had taken a D.D. degree at Leyden,\(^16\) and was turning his attention to winning foreign support for the Anglican faction. We have seen that his father had been anxious, some years before, to propitiate the English King and hierarchy when they frowned upon some of his statements about Episcopacy; and that in mollifying them, he did so because of a real desire to preserve the community of doctrine and interchange between the French Reformed and English Churches. His son Dr. Peter Du Moulin, now a loyal clergyman of the Established Church, had the same view. The political wisdom of such a Protestant bond was quite evident to King James and to Bishop Andrews, but not to Charles I and Archbishop Laud. And so the King and his pontifex maximus followed a course of action which impaired the strong Royalist sympathies of the Huguenots and, to some degree, of the Dutch Reformed.

This was done, where foreign Reformed Churches were concerned, by hardening the Jacobean theory that Episcopacy was the preferable,
if not essential form of church polity, into a doctrine of its necessity. Growing gradually from this was the requirement that Reformed ministers entering the Anglican Church receive episcopal ordination.¹⁹ Nor was this all. Because of the persecutions in France, many Huguenots had fled to England. Despite their hard lot, they had been loyal to the French King, and now as English residents they were predisposed to the Royalist side in the oncoming conflict.²⁰ But unable to bridle his episcopal enthusiasm, Laud curtailed the liberties of the churches the refugees had set up in their new homeland, and sought to herd them into the fold of the Established Church.²¹ This, too, had its effect upon the Continental churches. For though the English quarrels were not yet drawing the acute interest which their sensational developments provoked later, French and Dutch Protestants were responsive to these events, and there was some division of opinion about them abroad.²²

To such cross-currents of international opinion, Peter Du Moulin was highly sensitive. We would expect this from his father’s Anglo-French background; and even as an Englishman, the son for many years would be aware of his Gallic antecedents and Dutch education. He was therefore especially qualified to justify the Royalist position abroad, and such was the purpose of his three earliest works of any importance.

In the latter part of the sixteenth century, France and Scotland had been intimately connected. Mary Queen of Scots had been closely tied to the House of Guise, the French crown, and the interests of Catholicism. And Reformed Scotland, where Mary’s son was continually
reproved by the Kirk’s bony finger, kept up its contacts with French Protestantism. When the Bishops’ Wars of 1639 and 1640 began to make French Protestants wonder about possibly sinister intentions of the English crown, Peter Du Moulin tried to undercut the Scottish Covenanters’ propaganda in France with his first book. It was entitled A Letter of a French Protestant to a Scottishman of the Covenant. Wherein one of their chiefest pretences is removed, which is their conformity with the French Churches in points of Discipline and Obedience. London, Printed by R. Young, and R. Badger. 1640. 23

Dated “Chester. March 1, 1639./11. 1640,” the Letter of a French Protestant is signed “Your friend and servant in Christ, Peter Du-Moulin the sonne.” 24 After pointing to the long connection between France and Scotland in matters of state and the Protestant churches of both kingdoms, Du Moulin nonetheless wishes “that our example be not mistaken, and abused to our disparagement, and your ruines, and the perpetuall disgrace of Christian Religion.” 25 Rather naturally, Du Moulin wishes to strengthen his case by personal experience. Of his own credentials, he asserts that “although I am happily engrafted into the body of the Church of England, I may be admitted in this case to speak as a Frenchman borne, that knoweth the tenets of that Church better than strangers, that would abuse the example of the French to their owne ends; And I am assured in my conscience, that when I was adopted by the Church of England, I was not removed into another Gospel.” 26 He then adds, with a bit of unconscious irony:
This also I may affirm of mine own knowledge, that the French Divines and other godly men that travel into England, return home with great satisfaction, seeing the soundness of doctrine and decence of order so well matched together; and joyn their hearty praises with the Te Deum and Magnificat of our Quires; praising God chiefly, because they see the purity of the Gospel, and the Royall Authority linked together with a most neere interest in their mutuall conservation.27

Du Moulin then reduces the Scottish claims of conformity to three headings—doctrine, discipline, and actions. The French, he stipulates, "will heartily embrace a Christian conformity with you, so farre as you shall not draw their necessitie into counsell, nor their faults into example."28 Blessing God for the Reformed Churches' unity of doctrine, wherein "there is neither deformity nor differency," Du Moulin avers that "of that faith the Kings Majestie is Defender, of which he hath lately published many solemn protestations, to the great satisfaction of all good Christians, both within and without the Kingdom."29 Since the Bishops' Wars occasioned the debate, Du Moulin concentrates on the issue of Episcopacy, about which his father had written so much:

For whereas in one of your Petitions to his Majestie you are confident, that your neighbour-Churches will approve all your proceedings; your neighbour-Churches of
France have solemnly disapproved all your proceedings, and herein given good satisfaction to his Majesty: For it was farre from our wishes, that your conformity with the reformed Churches of France should be mis-applied as a pretence of your expulsing of your Bishops, much lesse a president for you to take arms against your gracious Soveraigne. 30

"A main point of difference pretended by the Covenanters," Du Moulin continues, "is the superioritie of Bishops (for I will not search into your other anes) which you affirms to be Antichristian, and contraries to the Word of God; wherein I see not how you can claims conformity with the French Churches. The French indeed have no Bishops, but they never put downe Bishops, nor induced others to put downe Bishops . . . ." 31 Moreover, adds Du Moulin, "it was necessity, not any Theologicall decision, that made them frame a Church without Bishops." 32 It is therefore not the use, but the abuse, of Bishops to which the French Reformed object; and, he claims hopefully, "They onely crave the reformation of Religion, and are ready to submit themselves to Episcopall power." 33

But what about those other persistent cavils of the Puritans, the sign of the Cross in Holy Baptism and the wearing of the surplice? "The French Protestants," Du Moulin smugly notes, "keeps their scale of religion for higher matters, than a Surplice or a Cross in Baptizmes; and wonder much, that for such small things, you would parallell them [the Anglicans] with Antichrist, that maintains the same holy Faith with
No need to quibble about such trifles, he adds, for the benevolence of King Charles has removed the thorn. In thus obviating the Scots, Du Moulin outlines his concept of Christian liberty:

But if those ceremonies be a yoke upon your consciences, the yoke is removed; and his Majesty is graciously pleased not to urge them upon you; which would never have been granted, if the King and his Counsell had thought them to be in their nature necessary, and binding the conscience. And though the Episcopal order (which the King will have you to receive) were a yoke upon your consciences; thinke on the other side, that rebelling against your Sovereign, is a staine upon your consciences; And you are no good Divines, if you choose rather a foule staine than a light yoke. Neither doe you consider, that you may suffer a wrong in your Christian liberty, without wronging your conscience. . . . For spirituall liberty lieth not in the outward act, but in the intention and believe . . . . But if the thing be indifferent in it selfe, and yet seeme in the judgement inconvenient, we may and must do it, and neither wrong our libertie, nor our conscience; for in such cases our actions are limited, though our consciences be free, and the superior power may bind us in foro exteriori, and leave us free in foro interiori, wherein Christian libertie lieth. 

Although the Letter of a French Protestant shows little novelty.
of ideas, it does have several points of interest. It shows a fairly complete assimilation of Du Moulin into English life and Anglican thought, as well as the staunch Royalism which runs through his later work. And if French Protestants were less hungry for Episcopacy than Du Moulin implied, we find him here first assuming the part of an interpreter between England and the Continent. He shows already the same aplomb in the role that marks his attack on Milton and the Puritans in 1652 with the publication of _Clamor ad Coelum_ to assist Salmasius. Furthermore, his style already shows the qualities which, more fully developed, elevate his later English prose to the level of artistry—clarity, brevity, graciousness, and a sense of just proportion.

After the publication of the _Letter of a French Protestant_, Du Moulin led a life as a private citizen during the hectic decade of 1640-1650, that often included wandering and danger. As the Puritans, by attacking Episcopacy, struck at the political authority of the Crown and buttressed that of Parliament, and broke away the prelatical control which had confined their fervent energies, other figures moved more prominently than he through the successive acts of the national drama which climaxcd in that memorable scene of the Martyr King on the scaffold. Among these were John Milton and Lewis Du Moulin, Non-conformist younger brother of Dr. Peter Du Moulin.

While we are not attempting to retell the tragedy and romance of the English Civil War, or advances or retreats of gallant Cavaliers and sternly disciplined Roundheads, or to hear the Puritan saints heralding the New Jerusalem, we should consider some of the issues which
agitated England and the events they produced. One such issue was the quarrel over prelacy. In an age when for Protestants the Church had to re-orient its form and beliefs, and to re-define, as it was related to the state, the form it should take, the question of church structure was fundamental. Certainly the issue was both complicated and intensified by the great problem of Authority, Reason, and Scriptural interpretation—which we still have with us. Tiresome are the long tracts of theologians who solemnly club quotations to prove or disprove that the Holy Spirit inspired Episcopacy; and the protests by stump preachers that Popery and Antichrist were being smuggled into the Established Church are unpleasantly fanatical. Whereas at the start of the century Episcopacy had been a matter of leisurely correspondence between Bishop Andrews and the elder Du Moulin, it now concerned all strata of English society and was a matter no longer academic.

The Bishops' Wars released the pent-up resentment and energies of the Puritans which, through the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission, had been checked by the ecclesiastical arm of the government. Drained of funds, King Charles had to summon the Long Parliament of 1640, and the military backing which the Scottish army could supply English Presbyterians further enabled them to effect what they had only wished before. Against the background of what the militantly Puritan Long Parliament might do, the quarrel over Episcopacy erupted in an angry cross-fire of books and pamphlets. The Bishops' Wars started after the defiant General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, meeting at Glasgow from November 1 to December 20, 1638, eradicated remnants of
episcopacy from the Kirk, tightened up its presbyterian organisation, and condemned the service book. Compelled to try chastisement, Charles I mustered his sorry forces and sent them toward the Border, and also sought to justify his action against the Scots by issuing in 1639 A

Large Declaration Concerning the Late Troubles in Scotland. Quite as if sweet reason could prevail, when the Scots had been aroused in an Assembly led by such a man as Alexander Henderson, Bishop Joseph Hall of Norwich wrote Episcopacie by Divine Right (1640). Developing the theory of Apostolical institution outlined earlier by Bishop Andrewes, Hall apparently thought it irrefutable and therefore final. He seemed hardly aware of the growth of Puritan economic power as a challenge to the old order, and did not understand how dangerously far private judgment had become a popular habit, especially in Scriptural interpretation, which undermined the foundation of hierarchy in Church and State.36 While Hall's treatise, with the encouragement of Laud, was being advanced to uphold tradition in Scotland, the Scotch leader Robert Baillie, with the approval of the General Assembly, tried to step up the godly work of further Reformation in England. This was the Presbyterian intention of his Leisenium ... the Canterburians Self-Convocation (April, 1640).37

The Long Parliament soon made it clear how effective Presbyterian propaganda emanating from Scotland had been in England. As the demands of pulpit and pamphlet for a Presbyterian reformation of the English Church were echoed alarmingly in Parliament, Bishop Hall published his Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament (January, 1641),

which briefly repeated the arguments from *Episcopacie by Divine Right*.

This brought Puritan replies, among which was a long pamphlet *An Answer to a Booke Entituled, An Humble Remonstrance* (ca. 20 March 1641), the work of five Presbyterian ministers including Thomas Young, John Milton’s old tutor. To this, Bishop Hall replied with *A Defense of the Humble Remonstrance, against the Frivolous ... Exceptions of Sceptysamus*, his “most compelling synthesis of Episcopal dogma.” The Sceptysamans replied, and by late May or early June, John Milton had entered the paper war with *Of Reformation in England, and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it*. With this work, the promising young poet threw himself into the surge of public events, and began the long sequence of controversial works which ended nineteen years later with *A Ready and Easy Way to establish a Free Commonwealth* (1660). This series, the three *Defenses* and associated works will be considered later; and having been extensively treated by scholars, the other works do not call for discussion here.

Standing beside Milton in the firing line of Puritans against the Crown and Established Church is Lewis Du Moulin, Doctor of Physick. Already a religious enthusiast in 1641, he had not as yet passed through the embittering experiences which later made him a bizarre figure, and, at the last, pathetic. While his Anglican brother Dr. Peter Du Moulin was moving to Yorkshire to take over the parish at Whaldrake, Lewis Du Moulin was absorbed by the excitement sweeping England, and particularly the capital, over the prospect of a Presbyterian reform of the Established Church. For some, Presbyterianism may have been welcome
because it seemed what the Bible required; but for most Puritans, it
probably stood for successful resistance against tyranny. That the
people had created the magistrates and therefore could rebel against
oppressive rulers was comfortable doctrine to a group smarting under
absolute government. This theory Presbyterianism had made fact in
Scotland, and in so doing had become a cohesive national force. The
fact that, because of differing situations, it could only have strangled
the exfoliating genius of English Puritanism under the direction of
parish popes was not clearly seen. Du Moulin's orientation in the
struggle appears to have been primarily religious, with political con-
siderations second.

During the crowded year 1641, Lewis Du Moulin took time away
from his profession of curing bodies to seek a cure for the nation's
spiritual ailments. To spread Puritan truth abroad, he wrote a Latin
account of the Bishops' Wars. He also joined his conferee John Milton
in refuting Bishop Hall's claims of divine right for Episcopacy—again
in Latin works designed for consumption abroad. And he drafted a peti-
tion to Parliament, which is probably the most interesting of the
documents.

The account of the Bishops' Wars—Rerum Nuper in Regno Scotiae
Gestarum Historia—was written under the pseudonym of Irenaeus
Philalethes, and was designed to make a Puritan version of the wars
available to an international audience. Without chapter headings, the
text of the book runs 576 pages, and is supplemented by a six-page
letter from the Scotch to the Swiss Churches tracing the struggles up
to April, 1640. The copious detail of the book is illustrated with
supporting documents.\textsuperscript{45} And though there appears no distinct personal
animus, Lewis Du Moulin went on countermixing Royalist propaganda such
as his brother's Letter of a French Protestant with his own Irenaei
Philadelphi Epistola, ad Renatum Veridaeum. In qua Aperitur Mystrium
Iniquitatis novissimae in Anglia redivivum, & exoutitur liber Iosephi
Halli, quo assiritur Episcopatum esse juris divini ... (Basle,
1641).\textsuperscript{46}

This refutation of Bishop Hall's theory was addressed to Lewis
Du Moulin's uncle by marriage, the celebrated Andreas Rivetus; and yet
Du Moulin partly robbed the book of effect by using an anagram of
Rivetus' name on the title page. Rivetus (1573-1651) was a man whose
support was worth something. In 1621 he had gone to England to wed
Marie Du Moulin, sister of Pierre Du Moulin, and had been honored by
Oxford. Later taking up residence in Holland, he had been made governor
of Prince William by the Stadtholder Frederick Henry. It was Rivetus
who negotiated Prince William's marriage to the Princess Henrietta
Mary, daughter of King Charles I.\textsuperscript{47} Therefore, in urging the Puritan
view of Episcopacy and the disturbances in England, Du Moulin shows some
moderation. He is not necessarily opposed to bishops when they are
created for utility and good order, and suggests a compromise between
Presbyterianism and Episcopacy by favoring a bishop as a spokesman
and permanent presiding officer whose power is limited by an assembly
which confers it. He disagrees with Andrews that there cannot be a
ture church without bishops,\textsuperscript{48} and observes that if Bishop Hall's
divine right theory is correct, salvation is doubtful under the polity of the Reformed churches.19

That Lewis Du Moulin's orientation was sincerely religious can be seen when he approaches the relationship of Crown and Church, by now so much identified that an attack on one involved the other. Although Du Moulin denies that Kings by divine right are the only legitimate administration for a commonwealth, he wishes to detract nothing from their sacred person and majesty. He would, however, unmask the ruse of the Bishops, who protect their own interests by paralleling monarchical and church government, and have so confounded church and state that when the Hierarchy is attacked the crown is also.50 He denounces Archbishop Laud, and speaks respectfully of Bishop Hall.51 If Peter Du Moulin in his Letter of a French Protestant had considered rites and rubrics too trifling for the Scots to rebel at, Lewis Du Moulin found them too frivolous for the Bishops to insist upon.52 And, of course, he includes the usual charge that the bishops abuse their office because of avarice, ambition, and luxury, and that the lesser clergy follow their example.53

Some of Lewis Du Moulin's characteristic thought in this decade is contained in a pamphlet he drafted in 1641 under his pseudonym Irenaeus Philadelphus. The eleven-page work is entitled Vox Populi, Expressed in XXXIV. Motions to This Present Parliament. Being the generall voyce and the humble and earnest request of the people of God in England to that Most Honorable and Religious Assembly. For reforming the present corrupt State of the Church . . . Printed in the yeare,
16th. At a popular level, the work sets out, in Du Moulin’s occasionally confused prose, how he would merge Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, reform the Episcopate, set up a kind of thought control, and bring the English Church into the strongest possible union with foreign Reformed Churches. Since the pamphlet, especially on this last point, must have represented the view of many, it is worth examining. To work out a revised form of church government, Lewis Du Moulin proposed an assembly of forty or fifty English divines who would not favor the High Church party, ten Scots divines, and eight “Foreign Divines of the most learned and famous; such as Rivetus, Primrose, Diedati, Moulin, and the like . . . .” The form of polity they might devise would come up for Parliamentary approval. Because the Reformed Churches had no quarrels over rituals, the new church discipline should “be approaching unto theirs, yet a sensible difference kept betwixt their and ours.” As the next step, Du Moulin argued, a national synod should be called to frame a confession of faith, “to which may be called a competent number of Foreign Divines.” The Laudian divines who had rent the garment of faith should be chastised, Du Moulin acidly remarked:

However, since so many have been so earnest of late, to be in charity with the Roman Church, that they have been uncharitable to the Reformed Churches; Let Canons be made in the Synode, and an Act of Parliament for union with other Protestant Churches in matter of Doctrine; and all the fire-brands of these late innovations in the Church, that have
made us a laughing stocke to the neighbour Churches, be
sharply censured, if not cut off as banes of the
Church . . . .

To remedy "the principall deject of our Discipline, and the spring of
all erreours in Doctrine and Practice, which is the want of Synods,"
Du Moulin would have imported the system of the French Reformed
Church. He urged a "Nationall or Metropolitall Synod, which for the
publike Union, is to be kept once every two years," and to implement
this demanded that "there be provinciall Synods convocated in each
Diocesse once a yeares; and that every moneth there bee a meeting of
ministers within the Precinct of sixe or seven neighbour parishes
through the whole Diocesse . . . ." While thus merging synodical
government and the English diocesan arrangement, Lewis Du Moulin sug-
gested a reformed episcopate. If retained, bishops would become ordi-
nary ministers serving as permanent diocesan administrators. Moreover,
they would "be enjoyed to preach diligently, as is the duty of their
place and office." The bishops' visitations would be synods, and
the bishops would be censurable by either provincial or national synods,
losing their episcopal power to impose, by canon law, rigorous penal-
ties upon the clergy. Only spiritual censures ought to be passed on
the clergy by the church; fining and imprisonment should be returned to
the civil magistrate. The clergy of a diocese should choose its own
bishop or present two candidates to the King, and each parish, in its
turn, may "have the presentation of as many Ministers, as the flocks
requireth to the synod or bishop. Lastly, all intermediate grades of the clergy—ranging from Dean and Archdeacon to the humble reader—should be swept away.

To avert the unholy lure of Babylon, the possibility of dangerous thought should be controlled at the source—specifically, as Lewis Du Moulin urged, "That the Fountains of Learning, Cambridge and Oxford, be purged from superstitious Rites and Popish doctrines, and Orthodox Readers be provided." Furthermore, public University readers should be squarely under control of the proposed national Synod.

Hardly imposing in size, Vox Populi still expressed many of the principal ideas which appear in Lewis Du Moulin's works for the next several years. The book was produced by a Nonconformist who sincerely wished, by compromise and eclecticism, to avoid civil disturbance and needless bloodshed.

But while Dr. Du Moulin was thus devising salve for the nation's sores, great events were agitating the country. The year saw debate over the "Root and Branch" Petition; the beginning of Strafford's trial on March 23, and the great Earl's execution on May 12, as buds came out on the trees. Following the Irish Rebellion (October 23), the Grand Remonstrance was presented on November 23, demanding that Charles I reform the Church and protect civil rights. The new year 1642 brought still worse news. After the attempted impeachment of the Five Members (January 3), King Charles illegally invaded the House of Commons (January 4), and in the hubbub that followed, fled London on January 10. When armed conflict could no longer be avoided, the King
raised the royal standard at Nottingham on August 22, and the Battle of Edgehill was fought on October 23, with indecisive results and the Puritan Earl of Essex's retreat toward London afterwards. During the year 1643, futile negotiations were conducted by King Charles and commissioners from Parliament from February to April at Oxford. Milton's *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* appeared in August, and on September 25 Parliament entered into an alliance with Scotland by means of the Solemn League and Covenant.

There is little record of Dr. Peter Du Moulin's movements during this period of feverish activity, but his Puritan brother was busy bringing out two more works. Lewis Du Moulin, now writing under the pseudonym of Christianus Alethocritus, renewed the plea made in *Vox Populi* for a compromise solution to the problem of reforming the church, even at this late hour. This appeared first in his Latin tract *Consilium de Reformanda Ecclesia Anglicana a Christiano Alethocrito Suggestum Amplissimo Coetui, authoritate augustissimi Consessus Regis & Regni Ordinis, indiceto, ad consultandum de rebus gravissimis in Religione . . . .* (London, 1643). As had *Vox Populi*, this book urged a large assembly to settle problems of church and state, and practically repeated the earlier work. Du Moulin hoped that the proposed assembly would not abrogate but amend the Episcopate; that Bishops would be colleagues, not masters of Presbyters; that they would do more preaching, and act primarily as spokesmen for their own "synedrions."69 Frequent synods and a national synod every third year were urged.70 While seeking essential parity of the clergy, Du Moulin would have
 Indeed, **ATTOMAXIA** is a curious work. It is nominally a conversation between four abstractions—Reason, Religion, Prejudice, and Partiality. Strolling along, Reason and Religion spy those trouble-makers Prejudice and Partiality walking ahead of them, and overtake them to start up conversation. The latest news is that "the London Petition, and the Ministers general Petition, and their Remonstrance are Committed, and that only the point of Episcopacy is reserved to the Houses." And from here the book hobbles along. Du Moulin's explanation for the troubles of the time is that some persons "to maintain their own interests, give entertainment unto two dangerous Dames, whose perpetuall practice is to screw themselves into acquaintance with those whom they find most fordo in troublesome times, to take a side and make a partie . . . ." The "dangerous Dames" are, of course, Prejudice and Partiality. But Reason and Religion soon find they are really at one in belief, though apparently separated by "divers counter-feit wanderers abroad . . . bold to assume our names unto themselves . . . ." At first clear-cut if wooden, the prose of **ATTOMAXIA** soon breaks down into an exchange of sermons written in a sometimes incoherent prose which may have baffled even the godly seeking edification. Reason makes twelve criticisms of financial inequalities of the
clergy, abuses of church revenues, and excessive arbitrary power of Church officers. As for the great problem of settling a church government, the book suggests that a form drawn out of both episcopal and presbyterian government, with the virtues of both, might do.

And so, as Lewis Du Moulin repeated his proposals in the hope they might help end the strife, 1643 ended, with Pym dying in December. The year 1644, destined to importance in English civil and literary history, opened with the invasion by the Scots to assist their Puritan brethren. It was the year of Milton's treatise Of Education (June 5), his tract The Judgment of Martin Bucer concerning Divorce (July 15), and finally the classic plea for freedom of the press, Areopagitica (November 24). As spring moved into summer, the Siege of York (May-June) was followed by the disastrous Battle of Marston Moor, where Fairfax, Cromwell, and Scotch forces under Leslie crushed the Royalists. The year ended with Cromwell's personal attack upon Manchester in Parliament, the Self-Denying Ordinance, and progress toward the strong New Model army.

As the tide of battle flowed into Yorkshire, Dr. Peter Du Moulin left his rectory at Wheldrake for the cathedral city of York. Though a man of peace, he had become an English patriot, and even while the Puritan cannon thundered around the ancient city, he was risking his life under fire to write another book which he hoped would help discredit the Rebel cause and serve his King. The intent of the book was the same as that of the Letter of a French Protestant, though done on a broader scale for a Continental audience—to undermine Puritan
propaganda abroad. Quite apart from the danger in which it was written, the book itself has an interesting history of publication. Better than any paraphrase, Du Moulin's own account captures the excitement of the times in which it was written:

Our gracious king and now glorious martyr Charles the First, finding that his rebellious subjects, not content to make warre against him in his kingdom, assaulted him with another warre out of his kingdom with their tongues and pens; he set out a declaration to invite all his loving subjects and friends that could use the tongues of the neighboring states, to represent with their pens the justice of his cause, especially to Protestant churches abroad. That declaration smote my heart, as particularly address unto me; and I took it as a command laid upon me by God himself. Whereupon I made a solemn vow to God, that as farre as Latin and French could goe in the world, I would make the justice of the king's and the church's cause to be known, especially to the Protestants of France and the Low Countries, whose the king's enemies did chiefly labour to seduce and misinforme.

To pay my vow, I first made this booke, which was begun at York during the siege, in a room whose chimney was beaten down by the canon while I was at my work; and after the siege, and my expulsion from my rectory at Wheldrake,
it was finisht in an underground cellar, where I lay hid to 
avoid warrants that were out against me from committees to 
apprehend me and carry me prisoner to Hull.

Having finisht the book, I sent it to be printed in Hol-
land, by the means of an officer of the master of the postes 
at London, Mr. Pompeo Calandrini, who was doing great and 
good services to the King in that place. But the king being 
dead, and the face of publique businesses altered, I sent 
for my manuscript out of Holland, and reformed it for the 
new king's service. And it was printed, but very negli-
gently, by Samuel Browne, at the Hague.

The title of the book was then as I have set it downe in 
a page by itself. Much about the same time I set out my 
Latin poeme Ecclesiae Gemitus, with a long epistle to all 
Christians, in the defense of the king and the church of 
England; and two years after, Clamor Regii sanguinis ad 
coelum.77

Dr. Peter Du Moulin's French book was originally entitled Apologie de 
la Religion Reformée, et de la Monarchie et de l'Eglise d'Angleterre, 
contre les Calomnies de la Ligue rebelle de quelques Anglois et 
Escossois (The Hague: Samuel Browne, 1650). The book was later re-
titled Histoire des Nouveaux Presbyteriens Anglois et Escossois, reach-
ing a second French edition in 1660 after its English translation in 
1659 by Matthew Playford.78 Coming as it did after the horrifying
execution of Charles I, the History of the English and Scotch Pres- 
byterian was capable of far greater effect than in its first form.

Du Moulin managed to escape from the siege of York unharmed, 
perhaps returning for a time to Wheldrake to work on his book and to 
minister to his parishioners as best he could. The next year, 1645, 
was a disastrous year for the Royalists, opening on January 10 with the 
execution of old Archbishop Laud. On June 14, the King's military 
power disappeared when Fairfax and Cromwell won the field at Naseby. 
The plight of Charles became hopeless when attempts by Montrose to 
bring Scotland around to the King, and by Glamorgan to obtain Irish 
support, both failed. Milton (March 4) published two more divorce 
tracts, Tetrachordon and Colaterion, and Lewis Du Moulin published a 
piece of hack-work Latin translation, the Declaratig Regnorum Angliae 
et Scotiae Foedere & Arnie junctorum pro vindicanda communi causa . . . 
adversus acquirerem factionem Episco-papistam. During 1646 the 
King's plight grew worse. On May 5 he became the voluntary prisoner of 
the Scots, and Oxford fell on June 20. Furthermore, the King lost the 
respect of both the Scots and English by his slippery tactics in nego-
tiating the propositions of Newcastle. Full of godly zeal, the Pres-
byterian leadership of Parliament moved on with the work of reformation. 
The Prayerbook was proscribed, and more than 2000 Anglican clergymen 
were expelled from their livings. Among them was Peter Du Moulin, 
sequestered by the Westminster Assembly. And having suppressed the 
Prayerbook, the Puritans further enlarged the wound by penalizing the 
Cavaliers, for helping the King, with huge fines levied on their
estates. But the Presbyterians then foolishly undermined themselves by turning on the Independents, who were the backbone of the Puritan army. Jealous of the New Model soldiers, and bitter because the Self-Denying Ordinance had cut short their own military careers, the Presbyterian leaders assumed the role of the friends of order. They tried to win the King, Cavaliers, and most conservative citizens by persecuting the sects. The Scots, to whom Charles had fled, had sold their King back to the English for the money due them, and the royal prisoner was now being held by Parliament at Holmby in Northamptonshire. The Parliament leaders now plotted an alliance with the King against the Independent chiefs in the New Model Army. The Houses of Parliament first ordered (27 May 1647) the New Model to disband without its arrears of pay. Then, having drawn up a Presbyterian government for a national church, they decided on a system of thought control comparable to the rigor of Geneva or the Synod of Dort. In September, 1646, a bill had been read in Commons by which Unitarians and freethinking heretics could be put to death, and Baptists and other sectaries imprisoned for life because of their religious opinions; now persecution of the sects was to begin. In the familiar pattern of the Reformed churches abroad, as exemplified in the Dort canons and the French version of them adopted at the Synod of Alais, any creative thought was to be eliminated. As Trevalyan remarks, "A prospect of intolerable dreariness was opening for the speculative and religious life of England." Milton, who had so warmly urged the Presbyterian system, angrily declared in his sonnet "On the new forces of Conscience" that
"New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ Large."

The New Model, however, did not disband, but gradually approached and finally occupied London (6 August 1647). After eleven Parliament leaders were expelled, the Presbyterian majority was permitted—on sufferance—to return to power, and the Army retired. But the split was complete. The Independents had converted the Army, and it was now the seedbed of democratic opinions. Opinion in the ranks was dominated from 1647 to 1649 by Lilburne and the Political Levellers, who stood for republicanism, universal suffrage, and religious toleration. Afraid of the possibly anarchistic results of these ideas in a society not yet ready for them, Cromwell and Ireton withstood a proposed democratic constitution, embodying these principles, put forward by the elected Agents of the Army in debates at Putney (October–November, 1647). Making a last desperate try at preserving the traditional power of the Crown under the new conditions, Cromwell and Ireton negotiated with Charles from July into September. The treaty offered Charles, called the Heads of the Proposals, was almost the settlement of 1639, and embodied more than the King could have hoped for. But the King had only toyed with the stern Puritan generals, and on November 15 fled from Hampton Court to Carisbrooke Castle on the Isle of Wight. There, he spent the winter and spring in summoning Scots, Presbyterians, and Royalists to rise and destroy the sects.

The King's call was answered, and the Second Civil War went on from May into August, 1648. Permitting only the rallying cry "God Save the King," it fused the permanent Royalist alignment of Presbyterians
with the Anglican and Catholic aristocracy. But Royalist hopes came to an end at the terrible battle of Preston fought August 27-29. Parliamentary leaders again negotiated with the King at Carisbrooke (September, 1648); but returning Army men would have no treaty, and Colonial Pride purged Parliament (December 6) of Presbyterians favorable to the King. All that was left, the Rump Parliament of less than one hundred men, declared Parliament the supreme power in the nation (1 January 1649) and erected a "High Court of Justice" to try the King for treason (January 6). Begun on January 20, the King's trial ended with his sentencing to death on January 27. It was, historians agree, nothing more than a judicial murder and political folly. By the exclusion of any who might favor the King and thus give him a fair hearing, the results were predetermined. The brutality shown the King during his last imprisonment, even while at his prayers, made his execution a martyrdom in fact, and not a pose. With his handsome dignity and courtly mien, he became the very symbol of the Monarchy which during centuries had become part of the English soul. For it to be so rudely plucked away was more than the popular mind could bear; and the loud groan which the crowd around the scaffold uttered when the King's bleeding head was held up for inspection was also the prophetic death cry of Puritan attempts at government.

If it seems extravagant to call the King's execution political folly, subsequent events proved it had been so. We must recapture soon the surcharged political atmosphere which the deed created, but now it
is necessary more briefly to see the framework within which Peter Du Moulin lived and wrote until the Restoration of 1660. The execution had effect at home and abroad. Domestically, the popular sympathy for the slain King was greatly enhanced by an appealing book which he was long believed to have written during his imprisonment. This was the Eikon Basiliké, a pious and prayerful apologetic for his record of behavior with Parliament; it virtually completed the canonizing of Charles the Martyr. Milton answered it with his Eikonoklastes. But the foreign impact of the King's death was also great, and it meant serious problems for whatever new government might rule England. There were the foreign marriage ties of the Stuarts. The English Queen, Henriette Marie, was the aunt of the French King, Louis XIV; the daughter of Charles I was married to the future Dutch stadtholder, William II. Even allowing for some division of opinion in both France and Holland about the rights and wrongs of the English revolt, the diplomatic situation was precarious. But still worse, the execution of Charles I wrote a bloody exclamation-mark after the long continental debate over popular sovereignty and the right to try kings. As Jesuit theory was doming Puritan home spun, the most learned man of the times, Claude de Saumaise, restated the principal counter-theory, the Divine Right of Kings. This appeared, we will recall, in his Defensio Regis for Charles I, a work which received a sensational welcome from Europe and Scandinavia. Like the Eikon Basiliké, it appeared in 1649, while excitement over the King's death was feverish. Nor did interest subside much, for the issues were continental as well as insular; and the angry debate which
followed, in which Milton and Du Moulin appeared, kept it current. Therefore, now if ever, works were timely which would win support for either side.

During 1650, Peter Du Moulin was writing and projecting several works intended to demonstrate to Europe, and especially the French Reformed, that the Puritan Revolt and the execution were a conspiracy of sniveling hypocrites or rogues crazed by fanaticism. The violence with which he writes is to be expected of the seventeenth century, and the mounting turbulence of affairs in England, with the personal suffering involved, exacerbated what he had to say. The first of the works was the *Apologie de la Religion Reformée, et de la Monarchie et de l'Eglise d'Angleterre* which, as we have seen, was begun at the siege of York, completed while Du Moulin hid in an underground cellar, and was returned from Holland for necessary manuscript revisions before its first printing at The Hague in 1650. The second was his fulminatory Latin poem *Eclesiae Gemitus*, which bitterly depicted the plight of the Anglican Church under the Puritan regime. This, according to Du Moulin, was first published at London the month after the King's execution. The third book was his scorching attack on Milton, Cromwell, and the Excidiums, the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor ad Coelum adversus Parricideas Anglicanos* (The Hague, 1652). The three works were anonymous; and prudently, for on 8 June 1659 the Council of State had considered an act "for settling £100 a year a-piece upon Peter du Moulin, Mr. Hartlipp [Samuel Hartlib], Peter Sterry, Thomas Fexley, and Jno. Owen, read the first and second time, and committed to the members of the House that
are of the Committee of Goldsmiths' Hall. Since *Ecclesiæ Canitius* and *Clamor ad Coelum* will be treated later, we will here consider the *Apologie*, or, as it was later retitled, *The History of the English and Scotch Presbytery*.

The book attempted to nullify efforts by the Covenanters to persuade the French Reformed that their natural affinity and interests were with the Puritans. Taking a position of moderate episcopacy and the Divine Right of Kings, it recalled the view of Hooker and the elder Du Moulin that episcopacy, though desirable, is not essential to a valid church. It pleads that a liturgy, since it can vary and does not necessarily exclude free prayer by gifted clergymen, is desirable for solemnity and form. With particular emphasis, the *History* stresses that the Reformed Churches and the Establishment hold a common faith despite differences of forms and polity. These are the general contentions of the book. It also included a preface "to the Ministers of the Reformed Church at Paris"; and its supporting documentation comprised a manifesto by Charles I (in Latin, English, and French) that he did not intend to introduce Romish religion, and the Articles of Religion of the Church of England.

Because of the baleful attitude of the French Crown toward the Huguenots, it would have been unpatriotic for them to sympathise with the English rebels who had just killed their King. Astutely making still more of this point in his later *Clamor ad Coelum*, Du Moulin here first bluntly presents it for their consideration.
Know then, Gentlemen, that your most holy Religion is much defamed by the Actions of these paraside Zealots, who have particularly courted and invited you to Covenant with them, and that your Churches are blemished in reputation, only because these men have dared to address their infamous compliments to you, a thing nevertheless which ye could not prevent how great soever your aversion were from their wicked actions; wherefore we beseech you, as you love your subsistance and the honour of the Gospel, which ought to be the dearer to you than your lives, that you exhort the general of your Churches to declare readily and vigorously by a publick Act against these false brethren and their pandacious Maximes, for fear least the crime of men, be imputed to Religion, and that the innocent suffer not for the guilty. Let it appear to the State under which ye live, that the Reformed Religion for conscience sake upheld Kingly Authority, and that it is the true Doctrine that maintains subjects in their duty and a Kingdom in peace.93

The matter of Episcopacy offered some difficulty. The subject was no longer one for pleasant speculation by corresponding divines; and Peter Du Moulin was in fact asking the French Protestants to stand by a church government which no longer legally existed in England, a church polity whose own leaders had done much to alienate the Huguenots. But was any such alienation really the work of Laud and his followers, or
merely a misunderstanding created by conniving Puritans? Some misguided Anglicans may have contributed, De Moulin admits:

In these great tryalls of our faith and patience, whilst we seek ease in pouring forth our griefs into the bosoms of our brethren, behold yet another encrease of affliction; for we find to our great regret, that the subtily of our enemies have begotten an evil understanding between you and some of ours, to which some have much contributed, if the complaints we hear be true, that they have manifested and declared themselves contrary to the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, and that they have despised your assemblies, as not being Churches, and maintained that there could be no Church where there was no Bishop.96

In fairness, Du Moulin had to concede such a position to be "full of rashnesse and void of Charity ... indeed a cruel sentence to deprive of the benefit of the Gospel, and of their union with Christ, all those Churches which live under the cross, and cannot enjoy the Episcopal Order." To show that this was not representative of the Anglican teachings, he turned back to the revered Lancelot Andrews and his correspondence with Pierre Du Moulin. "That Famous Df Andrews Bishop of Winchester," he recalled, "was not of this opinion, for in one of his Epistles touching Episcopacy, He (saith he) should be harder then Iron, who would not acknowledge that there are holy Churches that subsist and flourish without Bishops; and with what respect our Bishops
speak of your Church, you shall read in this ensuing Treatise. Scripture enjoins good order, he points out, but "there is no entire Rule of Discipline laid down," and to seek it is "to search that in the Word of God, which is not there to be found." Provided that the Bible is not contravened, it is left to ministers of the Word to fashion what church polity circumstances dictate. "It's easy to see that the Episcopall Order is wholly incompatible with the present condition of the Reformed Churches of France," Du Moulin grants, "for if there were twenty or thirty Bishops amongst you, that should Govern all the other Churches, it would be easy for those of the contrary Religion under whom you live, to fill up those places with some persons who should be at their devotion; whence would follow, either a seduction, or an oppression of the other Pastors ...."

Du Moulin then advances the theory that church polity must be shaped according to the nature of the civil power, and angrily rejects the theocratic state as universally necessary. To parallel the Presbyterian equality of the clergy in the civil state will obviously subvert monarchical government:

Whosoever shall consider the Kingdoms and Commonwealths of Christendome, shall find that every where the Religion of the State hath a Discipline suitable to the Civil Government, the Church taking hold of the State, as the Ivie that growth about a Tree: But the Covenanters pretend the quite contrary, labouring to Form the State to their new pattern
of Ecclesiastical Discipline. Hither tended the Petition of the Rabble of London, to the House of Commons; which was after by the same House in a Body, presented to the House of Lords; Wherein they required an equality in the State, that thereby there might be one in the Church. An action which will leave for ever to Posterity, an infamous and true Character of the Intentions of the Covenanters; But in this they have but followed the Doctrine of their Sect. . . . Thir designe is wholly void of all Prudence and possibility, and being ruinous to the State, must of necessitie be the ruine of it self. 100

Du Moulin's three books undoubtedly had some effect, which he felt was the result of Divine intention. "God blessed these books, and gave them the intended effect," he wrote some years later, "the disabusing of many misinformed persons. And it was so well resented by his majesty, that at Breda, that, being showed my sister Mary among a great company of ladies, he brake the crowd to salute her, and tell her that he was very sensible of his obligations to her brother, and that if ever God settled him in his kingdom, he would make him know that he was a grateful Prince." 101 And so it happened.

But the good fortune and recognition which awaited Du Moulin at the Restoration were still well in the future. During the Interregnum, he continued to move about and to write, safe so long as the anonymity of his three books, especially Glorior ad Coelum, was preserved. The
year 1649 had seen publication of Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, upholding popular sovereignty and justifying the doctrine of tyrannicide as it might apply to the late Charles I. With the appearance of Milton's reply to Salmasnus, the *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*, in 1650 and then Du Moulin's *Clamor ad Coelum* in 1652, there opened up the literary cannonade which we shall treat separately. It is much easier to share the brilliant and cynical atmosphere of the Restoration with Du Moulin than it is to keep pace with him in the Fifties; but we can still follow his activities during the Interregnum with some certainty.

As a man of learning and an illustrious name, he attracted the patronage of Richard Boyle, the Earl of Cork. After the rebellious Irish had been reduced by the Parliament forces in 1650–52, Du Moulin lived there, sometimes at the Boyle family seat of Lismore, sometimes at Youghal where there was a Boyle residence, and at other times at Dublin. During this time he was evidently serving as a tutor in the family; and after the incorporation of his D.D. degree at Oxford on 10 October 1656, he continued to serve there as tutor to Richard Boyle and to Charles Boyle, the Viscount Dungarvan. It was through this connection that he formed the association with Robert Boyle, the "father of modern chemistry," which is a prominent feature of his life during the Restoration. Known as "an honest and zealous Calvinist," Du Moulin preached frequently at the church of St. Peter-in-the-East at Oxford, and served as vicar of Bradwell, Buckinghamshire, for a few days in October or November, 1657. Also in 1657 he published the
first edition of *A Treatise of Peace and Contentment of Mind* (London, 1657), an unusually pleasant contemplative work which was to have a great vogue.  

In contrast to this work of spiritual repose, Peter Du Moulin brought out the next year the first edition of another book, one which reflected both human credulity in the mid-seventeenth century and belonged to a curious literature of the Restoration. Du Moulin translated a gossipy account by a French Reformed pastor, François Perreaud, of a visit made by a spirit to his house. The translation was made, as we shall see, at the request of Robert Boyle. After the highly successful crusade of 1645-47, in which the witchfinder Matthew Hopkins and his assistant John Stearne had sent several hundred victims to the gallows in a nation convulsed by war, both interest and prosecutions for alleged witchcraft dropped off in the more stable civil and judicial conditions of the 1650's. Consequently, Du Moulin's book, entitled *The Devil of Mason*, did not reflect the Puritan bigotry which helped the Hopkins campaign along, but rather looked forward to the philosophical witchcraft literature of the Restoration.

While Dr. Peter Du Moulin was thus passing his time quietly until the Restoration should raise him to prominence, his brother Dr. Lewis Du Moulin was enjoying a time of prosperity before the King's return plunged him into the sad notoriety of his latter years and a pitiful death. He had become a licentiate of the London College of Physicians in 1640, and in 1648 was appointed Camden professor of ancient history at Oxford, succeeding the ejected Royalist Robert
Waring. The medical degree he had taken at Leyden (8 July 1627) was incorporated at Cambridge on 10 October 1634, and at Oxford on 14 July 1649. His letter of denization was recorded 28 June 1655, and a naturalization bill was introduced 9 October 1656, finally passing Commons on 8 June 1657 and receiving Cromwell's assent the following day. Dr. Lewis Du Moulin was now a man of solid position and passible financial circumstances, whose assured place in the world it would take some change to overthrow.

But England was ready for such a change. The political forces of Puritanism, divisive as they were, had required a strong man to bind and direct them. Death had taken Cromwell on 3 September 1658; and unable to govern, his inept son Richard had abdicated. On 8 May 1660, the Convention Parliament voted for the restoration of Charles II, then at Breda in Holland. After long years of grim Puritan virtue, England wanted to be merry again—or at least amused. For this pastime, it had chosen the best man it could have found.
CHAPTER IV

OLD WITCHES AND NEW SCIENCE:
Du Moulin in the Restoration Milieu

Upon retiring on the eve of the Restoration, an optimistic Englishman might have felt that, like the swain of Milton's Lycidas, he would "Tomorrow to fresh Woods, and Pastures new." Certainly, when King Charles II landed, a new breeze blew in which swept away many old opinions. And while the history of the Restoration need not be re-written here, one does need to catch afresh the atmosphere in which Peter Du Moulin moved. It is the age of such diverse figures as John Milton, John Dryden, Marc Casaubon, Sir Thomas Browne, Joseph Glanvill, Descartes, Thomas Hobbes, Sir Isaac Newton, and Robert Boyle. It is also the age of the Cambridge Platonists and one in which old witches are the subject of serious philosophical writings. Of absorbing ideas and personalities, it offers God's plenty. At once a Calvinist, a Royalist, and an Anglican priest, Du Moulin is often a prominent figure in this mixed political, intellectual, and religious milieu.

Even though reform in speech to match new ideas was soon to be demanded, older ideas and modes of utterance persisted, however traditional diction might be given new applications. Scriptural allegory which the Puritan would have used for the progress of the wayfaring, warfaring Christian, John Dryden turned to brilliant political satire in Absalom and Achitophel (1681). When lampooning Slingby Bethel, a sheriff of London, as Shimei, Dryden expressed the political corruption
of the age (11. 597-598):

During his office, treason was no crime;
The sons of Belial had a glorious time.

And yet one senses it is with this dubious moral climate that Dryden really sympathised. Darkly aloof said the blazing noon of royal prosperity, Milton spoke of the courtly sons of Dagon and their glorious time with the iron bell-tone of the Puritan conscience in Samson Agonistes, his final summing-up. Indeed, Samson could not have been "doctrinal and exemplary" to the English nation, without the need for, and richness of, a really moral criticism of the time; its standard is that of intelligent Protestant humanism. Trying to buy his son's freedom from the (Philistine) lords (11. 1457 ff.), Manoah, the father of Samson, finds some

Contemptuous, proud, set on revenge and spite;
That part most reverent Dagon and his Priests,
Others more moderate seeming, but thir aim
Private reward, for which both God and State
They easily would set to sale . . .

The wittiest document of this "Idolatrous rout amidst thir wine" is, of course, the sprightly comedy of the Restoration; but this properly belongs to dramatic history. And so, though Puritanism remained as part of the national morals, worldly advancement now awaited men who could perform a volte-face adroitly. Andrew Marvell, who had succeeded
Milton as Latin Secretary in the Protectorate, was dexterous enough in An Horatian Ode to praise both Cromwell and Charles I. In his Heroic Stanzas first published in 1659, Dryden could conclude that Cromwell's "name a great example stands, to show/ How strangely high endeavors may be blast'd/ Where piety and valor jointly go."\(^1\) The next year (1660), he could extol in Astræa Redux the returned Charles II in these terms:

\[
\begin{align*}
0 \text{ happy age! } 0 \text{ times like those alone} \\
\text{By fate reserv'd for great Augustus' throne!} \\
\text{When the joint growth of arms and arts foreshow} \\
\text{The world a monarch, and that monarch you.}^2
\end{align*}
\]

If one surveys the intellectual achievements of the Restoration, Dryden was to a degree prophetic. He was also testifying that, in this milieu of new clarity and old grotesqueries, of political equivocation and cerebral juggling, every alert man must be his own Janus.

This dualism touched the deepest things, such as the delicate relationship of faith and reason, science and knowledge, body and soul, rationalism and experimentation, determinism and free will. Cartesian dualism aside, the whole period seems almost to have been foreshadowed by the dichotomy imbedded in the logic of Peter Ramus—even to man and the cosmos. It was an age of flux and dissociation.

Sir Thomas Browne wrote in Part II of Religio Medici (1643) that

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I cannot think that Homer pin'd away upon the riddle of the fisherman; or that Aristotle, who understood the uncertainty of knowledge, and confessed so often the reason}
\end{align*}
\]
of man too weak for the works of nature, did ever drown himself upon the flux and reflux of Euripus. We do but learn to-day, what our better advanced judgements will unteach tomorrow; and Aristotle doth but instruct us, as Plato did him; that is, to confute himself. I have run through all sorts, yet find no rest in any: though our first studies and junior endeavours may style us Peripateticks, Stoicks, or Academicks, yet I perceive the wisest heads prove, at last, almost all Soupicks, and stand like Janus in the field of knowledge.3

The problem of man’s knowledge and God’s ways was painfully crystallised by the Restoration, and bequeathed to posterity without an answer. By traditional theology, Milton twice sought to dramatise the justice of God’s ways to man, with the gorgeous canvas and homocentric cosmos of Paradise Lost, and with the austere concentration of Paradise Regained (1671); and he reaffirmed the providential order in the somber, muted magnificence of Samson Agonistes (1671). Here, even as the deterministic philosophy of Hobbes, the dualistic rationalism of Descartes, and the propaganda of the New Science were undermining the traditional foundations of faith, he stubbornly insisted that

Just are the ways of God,
And justifiable to Man;
Unless there be who think not God at all,
If any be, they walk obscure . . . .
Yet more there be who doubt his ways not just,
As to his own edicts, found contradicting,
Then give the rains to wandering thought,
Regardless of his glories diminution;
Till by thir own perplexities involv'd
They ravel more, still less involv'd,
But never find self-satisfying solution.\(^2\)

Here, then, were stated the spiritual and intellectual cruxes of this Restoration which was external only. Exhausted by its civil convulsions, England could somewhat restore the old political order; to regain the old, easy confidence in the meaning of things was beyond its power. This is signalised by the irony that the year 1667 produced Bishop Sprat's glowing apology for the New Order, the *History of the Royal Society*, and Milton's last-stand defense of the Old, *Paradise Lost*. If spiritual comfort had ever been a paradise, it was indeed lost, for in 1668 appeared Joseph Glanvill's *Plus Ultra*, to advance the forces of the New Science and the problems that followed their camp. Now elevated to prominence, Peter Du Moulin, molded by the old if ever man was, had to find his bearings in the new order, among the great men who shaped it.

Though largely formed on the angular pattern of Calvinism, Du Moulin adjusted comfortably to the Restoration. The satisfaction with which he viewed the New Science and the Royal Society seems due partly to Calvinistic inclinations to natural research, and partly to a
personal quality of Du Moulin—namely a Gallic prudence which made one's duties to God, to King, and to self coincide remarkably with good fortune. If, in general, there were two Restorations—the first, political and social in 1660, the second, religious in 1661—church rewards still came early to those who had served well. Undoubtedly zealous, Du Moulin had not long to wait. Because of his effective works for the Royalist cause, he was made a prebendary of Canterbury Cathedral and a chaplain of Charles II. Whereas his connections with the Boyle family during the Interregnum were now to bring him into contact with the New Science, his appointment as a canon of Christ Church, Canterbury, put him on terms of familiarity with the leading dignitaries of the Church. The works which caused his promotion were, we will recall, the Apologie de la Religion Reformée, et de la Monarchie et de l'Église d'Angleterre, started during the bombardment of York and finished in hiding in a cellar; and the Regii Sanguinis Clamor ad Coelum, which had flayed Milton and the Puritan government of Cromwell. These books had come to the attention of Charles II, who made it a point, while still at Breda, to express his gratitude for them to Du Moulin's sister Mary.

The new King landed amid wild applause, at Dover on 25 May 1660. He was soon beset with requests for preferment, and among the deserving was Du Moulin. Probably in May, 1660, Du Moulin asked for "the same spiritual estate which was bestowed on his father by King James, viz., a prebend in Canterbury, with the rectory of Llanrhiaedar, diocese Bangor." The petition was quickly acted upon, for on 29 June 1660
Du Moulin was presented as a canon in the fourth prebend, succeeding his father. As the Church slowly began to function, key appointments were made. Among these were several notable figures with whom Du Moulin had varying degrees of intimacy.

The inevitable choice as the new Archbishop of Canterbury was the aged William Juxon, who as Bishop of London had attended Charles I in his last hours on the scaffold, and to whom the dying King had entrusted his famous last command—"Remember! Remember!" Juxon was elevated to the archbishopric on 20 September 1660, and was consecrated in King Henry VII Chapel at Westminster. Restored as Dean of Canterbury was Thomas Turner, who had been appointed by Charles I in 1643, and was belatedly installed on 10 August 1660. Du Moulin was later to deliver the funeral sermon upon Dr. Turner's death in 1672. But his closest associate among the incoming or returning clergy was Marc Casaubon, who had been presented as a canon in the ninth prebend on 19 June 1626, and was now sixty-one years old. Even if differences about Scriptural interpretation and the mysteries of religion had caused a rift between their fathers Isaac Casaubon and Pierre Du Moulin a half-century before, the sons now were staunch friends despite opposed views about the New Science.

At the very center of English religious activity and conservatism at Canterbury, both Peter Du Moulin and Marc Casaubon were necessarily involved in the spiritual and intellectual conflicts following the Civil Wars. In the earlier quarrel of Isaac Casaubon and Pierre Du Moulin there is, for all their heavily orthodox piety, a foretaste
of the broader and more enlivening struggle for men's minds which swirled around the New Science. However admirable from a standpoint of historicity, the great Casaubon's worship of Christian Antiquity—the Fathers—still faced backward. Antiquity was the touchstone for all. And if the severely Calvinistic Du Moulin gazed back wistfully to the vision of a pristine Church, yet his belief that Scripture alone provides formulae which unaided human reason can decipher was part of the rebellion against Antiquity and Authority which marked the Reformation and subsequent secular thought. The disagreement of Casaubon and Du Moulin thus looks forward to the greater quarrel of Ancients vs Moderns, which, when full-blown, informs the controversies about the New Science. The attitudes of the elder Du Moulin and Casaubon in a quarrel over a religious view hinted at the positions their sons would take concerning the broader question on a quasi-secular plane. In the field of philosophy, Marie Casaubon stood firmly by Aristotle and Antiquity. With Peter Du Moulin, however, Antiquity was not a great consideration. His thinking showed, very often in an attractive way, Calvinism's receptivity to natural knowledge, if taken as an additional testimony to God's glory. All considered, his view is pragmatic, religious, and progressive.

The many studies, still being augmented, of the evolution of modern thought in the seventeenth century make such a task unnecessary here. To review the intellectual trends of the Restoration, however, helps us to define Peter Du Moulin's place in this milieu. Some attitudes, religious and secular, are overtly a rebellion against the
authority of Antiquity, particularly the philosophy of the purpose, method, and confines of scientific reasoning as found in the doctrine of the medieval Schoolmen. Here we may place Calvinism, the experimental science proclaimed by Sir Francis Bacon, and the mechanistic philosophy of Descartes. On the other hand, still other reactions against scholasticism dethroned Aristotle and Aquinas only to borrow other authorities from antiquity for a fruitful modern development. Of such, we may name the philosophical skepticism stemming from Pyrrho of Elis and Sextus Empiricus to Sir Thomas Browne, and the atomistic, materialistic determinism coming from Epicurus to the terrible Thomas Hobbes. When these forces, Calvinism excepted, converged upon the Aristotelian logic and philosophy still intrenched in the Universities, the defenders of tradition shouted "Atheism!" in alarm. What they meant was that these bogeymen would not only dismantle the old order, but also would leave along with the wreckage a world, a universe, void of imaginative richness, warmth, or meaning. On the other side, the champions of the New Science, as their ideas blended or coalesced, enthusiastically promised unheard-of material progress through the mastery of nature to the glory of God. To hold things together, the peacemakers in distress tried to soften the war cries by professing a nominal respect for antique philosophy, and the argument that the awful inscrutability of God's ways was a good reason for searching the Book of Nature instead.

Calvin himself had blessed the investigation of Nature's operations, provided that it redounded to God's glory and that the scientist
did not ungratefully substitute Nature for God as the architect of the universe. With an eye upon the danger of forbidden knowledge, he observed that it is better "not to attempt with presumptuous curiosity to pry into his essence, which is rather to be adored than minutely discussed, but to contemplate him in his works, by which he draws near, becomes familiar, and in a manner communicates himself to us . . . ." Rightly used, more knowledge brings "deeper insight into the workings of divine wisdom," he held, and from the very incompleteness of the evidence yielded, one may infer a fuller manifestation in another life. The dominant view of Elizabethan England was that natural science came from, and must return to, God; and that science must not be divorced from its religious frame of reference. If it were, neglect of the spiritual realm under God would lead through materialism to atheism, "the final horror." But there was a basic opposition between the Providential yearnings of religion and the cold requirements of natural science, which pointed an ominous finger toward the seventeenth century:

As against science's optimum demand for an exact natural order, religion wanted a completely providential order, one which was directed by the Almighty to man's moral schooling, and ultimate salvation . . . . On the other hand, the idea of a divine plan was in no way useful or necessary to science. And of course the fewer miracles the better.

Sir Francis Bacon revealed to men a tantalizing vision of future
progress possible through a new gospel of method, and held out as goals
the advancement of learning and piety. This was to be achieved by
sweeping away the finely spun cobwebs of scholastic reasoning, a method
which, applied to the material universe, was barren of works. The
ancient authors, whose scientific theories, based on abstract reason-
ing only, were demonstrably wrong, also must go. He urged instead the
direct observation of Nature and the experimental method, with produc-
tivity for human good as the criterion of value. On suspended judgment
and the avoidance of overhasty generalization hung the Law and the
Prophets. Calling upon men to work slowly upward from a sensuous
knowledge of Nature to abstract general truths, the learned Verulam
held out constantly the incentive of greater material prosperity. Partly sanctified by Calvin, then, the doctrines of the learned Lord
Chancellor had a twofold appeal for the Puritan—the rejection of the
scholastic logic and ancient authority in which the theology of both
Roman and Anglican churches was grounded, and a utilitarian purpose
which beckoned enticingly to the practical turn of Puritan minds. As a
result, Baconian science began to flourish during the Interregnum,
while Du Moulin was acting as a tutor in the Boyle family and trans-
lating The Divell of Mascon (1658). So noticeable was Puritan enthusi-
asm for practical science that it proved a measurable handicap in the
Restoration. Other forces also were at work during the Interregnum
which complicated later attempts to promote the New Science. After
outcries of "Atheist," and "Epicure," had already been heard against
him, Thomas Hobbes in 1651 published his Leviathan, or the Matter,

When these opposing forces collided over the founding and growth of the Royal Society in the sixties, Peter Du Moulin was caught in the middle. His friend Dr. Meric Casaubon became the ablest spokesman for conservatism, while Joseph Glanvill—whose ideas Du Moulin approved and pugnacity he deplored—was the champion of progressive ideas. Because of his sympathy for the New Science, Du Moulin even found publication of his own works held up.

Casaubon's antipathy to the New Science appears to have stemmed both from his political and his humanistic points of view. Before the Civil Wars, he had enjoyed the favor of Archbishop Laud and the personal interest of Charles I. The Puritan usurpation of power hurt him deeply, for not only were his patrons executed, but he lost his church preferments and had to live in retirement. Worst of all, his poverty forced him to sell most of his books.20 Because of Casaubon's eminence as a scholar, however, Cromwell tried several times to persuade him to write a history of the Civil Wars, offering Casaubon the library of his father Isaac Casaubon as a partial reward.21 Despite Meric Casaubon's adamant refusal on grounds that the results would not please Cromwell, the Protector as a gracious gesture ordered that between £300 and £400 be placed in a bookseller's hands for him. This, too, Casaubon
declined.22 Deciding to end his days in England, Cassaubon refused an offer of Queen Christina to head a Swedish university.23 A man whose temper was hardly irresolute, Cassaubon took the field early against Puritanism. His attack was leveled against the evil angel of the Puritan soul, Enthusiasm. Depending on the point of view, those who wondered at these fits of ranting attributed them either to divine inspiration or diabolical possession. Even if his medical learning was Galenic, Cassaubon took a shrewd approach: in A Treatise Concerning Enthusiasme, As It Is an Effect of Nature; but is mistaken by many for either Divine Inspiration, or Diabolical Possession (London, 1655), he showed that the prophets of the stump were only mental cases.24 This shrewdness is worth noting, for if one is misled by Cassaubon’s antiquarian bias or strong language against materialistic philosophies, the value of his really penetrating critique of the New Science may suffer.

As a Royalist and humanist, Cassaubon must have been further sourcd on Puritanism and experimental science by a work published the year before his Treatise Concerning Enthusiasme appeared. John Webster, a country doctor who was both a Puritan and a Baconian and later criticized Cassaubon and Du Moulin in the witchcraft war, published a volume generously entitled Academiarum Examen, Or the Examination of Academies. Wherein is discussed and examined the Matter, Method and Customs of Academick and Scholastick Learning, and the insufficiency thereof discovered and laid open; As also some Expedients proposed for the Reforming of Schools, and the perfecting and promoting of all kind
of Science. Offered to the judgements of all those that love the
proficiences of Arts and Sciences, and the advancement of Learning
(London, 1654). After Webster had brandished his verbal club, little
was left to be said about the Aristotelian university curriculum
fostered by the Established Church:

This Philosophy is merely verbal, speculative, abstrac-
tive, formal and notional, fit to fill the brains with mon-
strous and airy Chimaeras, speculative, and fruitless con-
ceits, but not to replenish the intellect with sound
knowledge, and demonstrative verity, not to lead men prac-
tically to dive into the internal center of natures ab-
struse, and occult operations: But is only conversant about
the shell, and husk, handling the accidental, external and
recollassious qualities of things, confusedly, and continually
tumbling over obscure, ambiguous, general and equivocal
terms . . . 25

Webster's utilitarian motive is clear. Moreover, his approval of the
Cartesian philosophy and the neo-Epicureanism of Cassendi is unquali-
fied. 26 As a mid-century scientific propaganda tract of recognised
importance, 27 the Academiae Examen will enable us to sort out the
differing views of the New Science held by Glanvill, Casaubon, and Du
Moulin. Hostility to the New Science was especially strong in the
Universities, a fact which is explained partly by the baleful attacks
on them, and partly by the natural conservatism of old institutions.
The situation was aggravated by the Church's unhappy policy of opposing scientific discoveries and new ideas,\(^28\) which was really a collision between dogmatic and revisionist points of view. The Puritan origin, hearty invective, and democratic practicality of Webster's book necessarily ruffled University clergymen who had been nurtured on St. Thomas and Aristotle and who made up a self-conscious aristocracy of humanism.\(^29\)

But if Bacon, Webster's spiritual godfather, had directed the attack on disputatious scholasticism and stressed practicality,\(^30\) he had also conjured up a dazzling prospect. As he denounced investigative systems based on authorities and ancient books, he also evoked, with Solomon's House in the *New Atlantis* (1627), the limitless horizons of collective research. Thus early, he caught the century's trend to such scientific organisations as the Accademia del Cimento of Florence (1657-1667), the Académie des Sciences (1666), the Royal Society (1667), and the Berlin Academy (1700).\(^31\) Despite the patronage of Charles II, the Puritan forerunners of the Royal Society during the Interregnum helped bring the Society and its *virtuosi* under attack during the Restoration. The Society therefore came to need both an historian and an apologist, and it found them in Thomas Sprat and Joseph Glanvill. Since Puritans and Episcopalians had been able to bury their differences in those scientific meetings during the Interregnum, it is not surprising that both Sprat and Glanvill chose to defend the Society as Anglicana.\(^32\) Glanvill helped touch off the drum-fire of propaganda in the Restoration with *The Vanity of Dogmatizing*
(1661). Flashily presenting Bacon's arguments in Browne's prose, Glanvill "play'd with the Dogmatist in a personated Scepticism" and would not have the design of the whole discourse measur'd by the seeming tendency of this part ont. But the indulgence he craved was not forthcoming, for he infuriated his solemn enemies by irreverent sarcasm. "That the Aristotelian Philosophy is an huddle of words and terms insignificant," he offered, "hath been the censure of the wisest: And that both its Basis and Superstructure are Chimaerical; cannot be unobserv'd by them, that know it, and are free to judge it." However imposing, the scholastic philosophy and divinity were but a windy dist:

The Intellect, that can feed on this air, is a Chamaelion; and a mere inflated skin. From this stock grew School-
divinity, which is but Peripateticism in a Theological
Livery. A Schoolman is the Ghost of the Stagirite, in a
body of condensed Air; and Thomas but Aristotle sainte.

Republished in 1661 as Scepsis Scientifica, the work acquired a dedication to the Royal Society which probably brought Glanvill's admission to the group. Though Glanvill echoed the revered Bacon by conceiving scientific skepticism as a temporary suspension of judgment until evidence justified asserting general principles, because of his barbs the harm was done. It was easy to blur the difference between Glanvill's viewpoint, wherein a limited degree of skepticism was a preparative for knowledge of material things, and philosophical skepticism. Based as it was upon the non-experimental methodology of the
Greeks, and usually confined to metaphysical subjects, philosophical skepticism taught the impossibility of attaining certain knowledge. It was the antithesis of the rational theology taught by both Anglican and Roman churches, and almost certainly led to the atheism and fideism which those churches denounced. The Society was easy to attack on ground of skepticism. But there was other danger also, for the scientists in the group had made the idea of atoms in motion an integral part of their thinking, and thus their foes could connect them with Hobbes. Consequently, the Society had to disclaim both skepticism and the Malmesbury dogmatist. It also had to counter the raillery of Court wits, who were asking what the amateurs of the Society had accomplished. It is against this background that the controversy involving Glanvill, Casaubon, and Du Moulin was fought.

Writing in prose that was lucid, flexible, and exact, Sprat skillfully parried the thrusts of the peripatetics. His task was one of conciliation, justification, and definition. Whereas Glanvill angered conservatives with sarcasm, Sprat soothed them insofar as he could. Paying tribute to the "Criticks, and Philologists" who had scrubbed up the learning of Antiquity, he thought that "the Monuments of the Antients, will be wonderfully advantageous to us"—provided that mastering them were not made a lifelong task—"if they be employ'd, to direct us in the ways, that we ought to proceed, in knowledge for the future; if by shewing us what has been already finish'd, they point out to us, the most probable means, to accomplish what is behind." Beginning his greater work of proving that science and religion are not
inimical, Sprat admits, as others have done since, that "I am not ignorant, in what a slippery place I now stand, and what a tender matter I am enter'd upon." He rightly anticipates the vilification sure to come, ostensibly from a seal for the Lord, from nettled conservatives—"a fault which is very incident to men of devotion." He strikes a note of modernity in remarking that, for those who think independently, the disgruntled "have strait the reproachful Term of Atheist to cast upon them; which though it be a Title that ought only to be employ'd against the bold and insolent defiers of Heaven in their words and actions, yet it is too frequently us'd to express the malice of any eager and censorious spirit, that has the confidence to object it." Such a caution was well taken because of the tendency to link the Society and Hobbes; atheist was a term which frequently adorned Casaubon's later treatises. Then, too, the Society had banished theology from its discussions. As Sprat presents it, this approach would strengthen natural religion by scientific experiment, and avoid forbidden knowledge. As for God, Sprat writes, "they meddle no otherwise with Divine things, than only as the Power, and Wisdom, and Goodness of the Creator, is display'd in the admirable order, and workmanship of the Creatures." Sprat walks on somewhat shakier ground, though he hedges a bit, when he declares that as a result of physiological studies, "there, without question, be very near guesses made, even at the more exalted, and immediate actions of the Soul; and that too, without destroying its Spiritual and Immortal Being."

Two other tasks confronted Sprat, which both involved reconciling
the New Science with that Anglican emphasis upon law and reason which had been Hooker's legacy. First, if Sprat could then scarcely fuse empirical science and Thomism, he could at least try to find their intentions compatible, and in accomplishing this dissociate the New Science from Puritanism as well as explain away any religious indifference within the Society. For assistance, he called on the bugbear of Enthusiasm, which Casaubon himself had already denounced. Recalling the violent eruptions of Puritan religious fervor, Sprat observed that "It is now impossible to spread the same clouds over the World again; The universal Disposition of this Age is bent upon a rational Religion . . . . By refusing to seek (as the Puritans usually did) "in every Turn of human Actions many supernatural Providences, and miraculous Events," Sprat pointed out, the Society was not diminishing God's majesty. As Sprat said, "... it is enough for the honour of his Government, that he guides the whole Creation in its wonted course of Causes and, Effects; as it makes as much for the reputation of a Prince's wisdom, that he can rule his subjects peaceably, by his known, and standing Laws, as that he is often forc'd to make use of extraordinary justice to punish, or reward." After charging some scientists' lukewarm religion to a disgust over Enthusiasm, Sprat finds the Church of England especially fitted to advance the New Science. "If we compare the changes to which Religion has bin always subject," he says, "with the present face of things, we may safely conclude, that whatever vicissitude shall happen about it in our time, it will probably neither be to the advantage of implicit Faith [Rome], nor of Enthusiasm."
Sprat's second task was attractively to define the Society's intellectual position—a difficult task because the pool of philosophy could be (and was) easily muddied. As he had done when discussing religion, Sprat again took a sensible middle way, this time between philosophical skepticism on one hand, and dogmatism ancient and modern (this meant Hobbes) on the other. He had already put the Stagirite and the Sage of Malmsbury, and others like him, cheek by jowl in the same compartment when he classified as "Modern Dogmatists" those who, having deposed the tyranny of the Ancients (especially Aristotle), erect in their place modern systems of speculation whose principles are asserted too quickly and therefore also end in a fruitless effort.

He also included those who renounced Aristotelianism only to restore some other ancient philosophy (probably atomistic or Pyrrhenistic) instead. As for classical skepticism, he explains, the Society is "as far from being Sceptics, as the greatest Dogmatists themselves. The Scepticks deny all, both Doctrines, and Works. The Dogmatists determine on Doctrines, without a sufficient respect to Works; and this Assembly ... have been very positive and affirmative in their Works."

The Society concentrates upon the particulars, from which general principles can in time be deduced. Much more than any one philosopher, the Society's collective effort can attain such "wariness and coldness of thinking, and vigorous examination; as is needful, to a solid assent, and to a lasting conclusion, on the whole frame of Nature." The Society's position of scientific skepticism we shall meet
again in connection with witchcraft. As evidence of the Society's work, Sprat's History also included papers by such Society stalwarts as Lord Bruncker, Sir William Petty, and Hooke, which show that the group's accomplishments were rather slender to date.

But meanwhile, Glanvill also had been working on a book intended to vindicate the new experimental science by its intellectual and practical accomplishments. He awaited the appearance of Sprat's book—presented to the Society on 10 October 1667—to see what revision should then be made in his own work. Aside from wishing to help the Society of which he was a member, Glanvill had a personal motive for publishing his book. He had been attacked as an atheist by a choleric Puritan minister, Robert Crosse, who was a staunch Aristotelian in philosophy and a Puritan in theology—a "Man of Gath." The quarrel arose when some sprightly local students brought Glanvill into Crosse's presence as the crotchety minister was dealing justice to the Royal Society as a Jesuitical conspiracy, and extolling Aristotle. When Glanvill defended the Society, Crosse made this a personal matter, and allegedly wrote a book against Glanvill, which the licensers at the university presses refused. The squabble then became the sport of wags in the local coffee-houses. When Glanvill's book appeared, it remedied the shortcomings of Sprat's History with a fuller account of achievements by the experimental method. Probably because of Glanvill's experience with Crosse, his polemics against scholasticism had been sharpened to a razor edge. Its title was *Plus Ultra: Or, the Progress and Advancement of Knowledge Since the Days of Aristotle.* In
an Account of some of the most Remarkable Late Improvements of Practical, Useful Learning; To Encourage Philosophical Endeavours. Occasioned By a Conference with one of the Notional Way (London, 1668). In itself the clearest statement for the New Science, Plus Ultra drew from Meric Casaubon the most acute criticism uttered by the conservative, humanistic camp. It was through Peter Du Moulin that the issues of the New Science were brought into their sharpest focus.

The problem was far more than a blind fondness for old, settled ways, or an equally blind enthusiasm for the gospel of progress offered by new ones. As was clearly seen at the time, it was a philosophical crisis which eventually would have far-reaching effects upon society as a whole, and especially upon an England which had already seen enough intellectual dislocation for some time to come. About all that could be said against scholasticism had already been voiced by Bacon, Webster, and others; no need to repeat it. Olavvill gathers it all up in stating the purpose of Plus Ultra:

... to encourage the freer and better disposed Spirits, to vigour and endeavour in the pursuits of Knowledge; and to raise the capable and ingenious, from a dull and drowsie acquiescence in the Discoveries of former Times; by representing the great Encouragements we have to proceed, from modern Helps and Advancements ... . In which, I confess, I had a principal eye upon the ROYAL SOCIETY, and the Noble Purposes of that Illustrious Assembly, which I look upon as the great ferment of useful and generous Knowledge ... .
However much Glanvill might have wished to abolish scholasticism, he
prudently championed in *Plus Ultra* a balanced synthesis of old and new.
His attitude is perhaps not that of a philosopher, but of an apologist
for practicality who can see how the old may contribute to the new.
He suggests a nominal compromise. The customary "First Studies," he
thinks, should be retained to fulfill statutory requirements. "Nor do
I deny," he adds, "but that those Speculations raise, quicken, and
what the Understanding, and on that account may not be altogether un-
profitable, with respect to the more useful Inquisitions; Provided It
keep it self from being nice, nicy, and addicted too much to general
Notions. But this is the danger, and the greatest part run upon the
Rock."58 This might be avoided in two ways. One would be "if the
Mathematicks and Natural History were mingled with these other Studies,
which would indeed be excellent Preparatives and Dispositions to future
Improvements." Secondly, the "young Philosophers" should not consider
"their Systematrick notions as the bounds and perfections of Knowledge," and ought not take these theories "as establish'd and infallible cer-
tainties," but "consider them in the modest sense of Hypotheses" help-
ing to better knowledge.59 Glanvill manipulates two symbols—Aristotle
and Robert Boyle—to develop his arguments. He never quite approves of
Aristotle, but will "give cheerfull Acknowledgements to his Rhetorick,
History of Animals, and Mechanicks, and could wish that these were more
studied by his devoted Admirers . . . ."60 Because Glanvill's study
of the "notional and disputing" parts of Aristotle had allegedly delayed
his survey of God's works in Nature, Glanvill professed that his seal
for God's manifest glory hath inspired me with some smartness and severity against those Heathen Notions which have so unhappily diverted Learned men from the study of God's GREAT BOOK, UNIVERSEAL NATURE, and thus robbed the Almighty. Moreover, Aristotle did not personally cover the range of knowledge, but used unreliable hearsay, and even then twisted evidence to fit preconceived theories. As a contrast to Aristotle, Glanvill offers Robert Boyle—a wise choice, because Boyle's pious, stainless character, and scientific achievements demonstrated the utility of the New Science and its harmony with religion. Two sections of Plus Ultra—Chapters XIII and XIV—are taken up with Glanvill's description of Boyle's scientific accomplishments, personal character, and published and unpublished writings for mankind's material welfare and betterment. To forestall attacks on the Royal Society on grounds of being dangerous to the Church and Universities, Glanvill had already furnished a long list—starting with the two Archbishops—of the distinguished clergymen of the Establishment and Universities who were members of the Society. "For whoever phancloth or suggests," he declares, that the Universities are undermined by the Society "casts a black Character upon the sagacity and faithfulness of those Reverend Men, who all have been Eminent Members of one or other of those Schools of Learning; and most of them do still retain a Relation to those ancient and venerable Bodies." This, in part, is the case which Glanvill made, and for which he supplied formidable buttresses.

As we have seen from Glanvill's altercation with Crosse,
arguments about the New Science had filtered out to the provinces, and naturally to ecclesiastical centers. Because Du Moulin brought the matter to his attention, Casaubon entitled his reply to Glanvill A Letter of Marie Casaubon D.D. Ac. to Peter Du Moulin D.D. and Prebendarie of the same Church: Concerning Natural experimental Philo-

sophie, and some books lately set out about it (Cambridge, 1669). In view of the well-known infirmities of Casaubon, it would be easy to consider his reply as the view of a crabbed, hopeless conservative. If this criticism is sometimes true of his later writings, in his Letter to Peter Du Moulin Casaubon put his finger unerringly not on the danger of the New Science, but on the empty and chaotic moral order into which enthusiasm for a blindly materialistic education would lead. Truth, whatever it is, looks to the future; and like Janus, it looks also to the past. Intelligent conservatism may clearly show the dangerous extremes of a trend, but it may be unable to offer a satisfactory alternative. This was the intellectual tragedy of Casaubon. Du Moulin appears in a less philosophical but more pleasant light. He had often discussed the issue with Casaubon, taking the part of the New Science. Their long discussions did not ruffle the conversations of the two old friends; Du Moulin humorously appreciated Casaubon’s foibles, while the aging scholar allowed for a difference in views. Du Moulin ob-
tained Glanvill’s new book, which seemed to provide more ammunition for his friendly arguments with Casaubon. One day when Casaubon was con-
ferring with two young University men, he recalled to Du Moulin, “you came with a book in your hand, and delivered it to me with a smiling
countenance, which, as soon as I had opened the book [and seen Glanvill's title], I did interpret, having already contested with you more than once about the matter, as though by it you hoped to stop my mouth forever. I cannot say you did intend it so really; but so I did interpret it then; but it did fall out much otherwise. After viewing the title page alone, Casaubon admitted, "I was much confirmed in my former opinion, and professed it so to you, which occasioned much discourse between us until I was weary, and (as my condition is now) somewhat spent." The question had been

... whether this way of Philosophy, of late years much cried up in London and elsewhere; was, as set out by some, more likely to prove advantageous, or prejudicial, if not destructive, to good learning: by which I mean (not excluding natural Philosophy) what in former ages of the world, and by many to this day (by you also, I make no question) hath been and is accounted true, solid, and useful learning: which hath been cherished and countenanced by Kings and Princes in Publick States, in their generations, in all places of Europe hitherto; and hath gotten credit and admiration to the Owners and Professors of it during their lives, and after their death, immortal fame.

Here is the case ipse facto for the body of humanist learning, a legacy from Antiquity which "Owners and Professors of it"—such as Casaubon—had made available, to their "immortal fame." But this
learning was not valuable for its bulk, or because of the vanity of
its professors. It provided a rational and meaningful frame of refer-
ence for the human being. What if it were removed? Casaubon states
the humanists' case as no paraphrase could:

For if nothing must be accounted useful, (as some seem to de-
termine) but what doth afford some use for the necessities,
or conveniences of this present life; I do not know but that
a Brewer, or a Baker, a skilful Horse-leech, or a Smith, or
the like, may contest in point of true worth or desert with
many, who for their learning, as then thought, have been
reputed generally, the great Lights and Ornaments of their
age; though such, as never medled in their writings with
experimental philosophy. They that believe that man doth
consist of two chief parts, the body and a soul, whereof
the soul the more noble and more considerable part, as even
Heathens most of them have determined it: natural reason
will oblige them to believe, that a greater share of care
and provision doth belong to that which is immortal, from
the right ordering of which all true happiness, present or
future, doth depend; then to that which is mortal, and
naturally brutish, and of little continuance.\footnote{71}

As shown by Epictetus and his commentators, it is a rhetorical question

Whether those men who make it their work to reclaim men
from that ἀποκατάστασις, or close adherence of the mind to the
body and senses (which most men are naturally prone to) to
the care and culture of their souls, ought in reason to be
accounted unprofitable to the Common-wealth; or rather, of
all Professions, the most useful and necessary.\textsuperscript{72}

Thus, if he could not envision a substitute for the old humanistic
learning, or even see how it could be sifted and revised to fit changing
times,\textsuperscript{73} Casaubon "drew into the future" further than the eye of ma-
terialism could see.

How did he come to grips with Glanvill, and were there any
points of agreement between them? Certain embarrassments, public and
private, required a wary approach. "But before I enter upon the busi-
ness," Casaubon admitted, "I must make my way by removing of a block,
which I meet with artificially laid by some, to fright us in our
progress, and hinder the freedom of our enquiry."\textsuperscript{74} As a recipient of
royal bounty, and with his church superiors active in the Royal Society,
Casaubon could not be rash. He had to disengage Glanvill from the
shield of Royal prestige—*that Sacred name* Charles II; to do so, he
pointed out that because of the differing judgments of its members, the
Royal Society did not necessarily sanction their private utterances.
Consequently, "a man may write against the opinions of some of the
Royal Society; yea and censure them as they may deserve, without any
reflection at all upon the Royal Founder, or Royal Society in gen-
eral.\textsuperscript{75} Boyle was another problem, because of the nearly universal
respect for him and because of his friendship with Du Moulin. "I know your relations," Casaubon addressed Du Moulin, "to some of eminent worth and piety in that Honourable Society, whom though we have not the happiness to know otherwise, then by the fame of their writings; yet we honour their worth as much as you do. I hope you do not think any thing I have written can reflect upon any such." Coming to the matter of natural investigation per se, Casaubon sought a hearing in the enemy camp by professing himself "studious" of natural science from his youth and "still a great lover and honouner of it." Reflecting Calvin, he conceded that for the man of grace and secure faith, a deeper knowledge of Nature than illiterate admiration "may afford somewhat . . . to the glory of God, and acknowledgement of his Power and Wisdom . . . ." The issue, then, was the emphasis misplaced by those "who do so magnifie this study, as though there were no other wisdom in the world to be thought of, or pursued after; that make it the only useful, true, solid learning, to which they would have all Schools and Universities fitted . . . ." Against the New Science's advertising slogan of usefulness—for which the Creator's manifested glory, power, and wisdom often appears to be mere window dressing—Casaubon raised the sobering question: What really is the most useful? This he flanked with two cogent arguments—the danger of forbidden knowledge, and the horror of atheism. It is doubtful, he warned, "that God will give a blessing to such a violent pursuit, that will not keep within its bounds, but . . . doth aspire to an absolute Sovereignty over all, that in so
many ages of the world hath been accounted useful learning and knowledge,61 Because of its emphasis on matter and second causes, moreover, the New Science is "very apt to be abused and degenerate into Atheism."62 On this point, Casaubon reveals the same basic fear which lies behind the witchcraft literature and demonology to which he, Glanvill, and Du Moulin severally contributed.63 As to the existence of spirits and therefore the soul, why, he asks, should the Aristotelian (or Platonic?) metaphysics be abolished as merely notional and abstract, when the much-praised system of Descartes is abstract too? Casaubon then shrewdly makes the point that to some extent either system rests upon what the thinker feels to be a clear and distinct notion of truth.64 "To me truly," he concludes,

it is no good sign that this secondary kind of Theology, or Divinity . . . is so out of request. But Natural Philosophy I grant is more taking and bewitching generally; there is a plain reason for it; and though cried up for the only useful knowledge, yet if well considered, it may be found sometimes, to have more of pleasure and curiosity in it than use and profit; even in that sense (for what is truly useful and profitable, or most useful and profitable, is another question) which they intend.65

The point on which Glanvill and Casaubon most nearly approach agreement—the retention, to some extent, of scholastic discipline—is also a major point of difference. Glanvill had favored using earlier
portions of the curriculum (with caution) to what students' wits. He had also liked Aristotle's "Rhetoric, History of Animals, and Mechanicks," though he obviously preferred "the more useful Inquisitions" (the New Science). But there was no mention of ethical or metaphysical works, an omission perhaps reflecting the amoral character of the new philosophy of method. Casaubon, on the other hand, dealt lovingly upon the Ethics, "that incomparable piece" of which "in all ages, even since Christianity, many thousands have reaped the fruit . . . ." 86 Casaubon next considers the professional standing of Aristotle the naturalist, which raises the touchy question of experience, method, abstract system, and preconception. In the Ethics and Metaphysics, he points out, Aristotle prefers experience without art (or method) to art without experience. It is true, of course, that the Stagirite considers systematic speculation "which doth look into the causes, and can give satisfactory reasons of events, more commendable, than illiterate or irrational, though successful experience." 87 This insistence upon rational understanding, Casaubon feels, makes it unlikely that Aristotle would have framed theories "not grounded at all, upon particular observation." It is "very possible" for Aristotle to be mistaken or defective in particular observations, but these may be rectified "and thereupon his Theories, by men of judgement and ingenuity, amended or perfected." With an ear to the New Science's watchword Utility and an eye to its still haphazard experiments, Casaubon points out that "particular observations until they be reduced to art or theories, that is, to general rules or maxims (which is the highest operation of the
rational faculty) are not much useful . . . ."88 The point on which Glanvill and Casaubon most nearly agree, then, is that there must be some admixture of old and new in university curricula, with Glanvill accepting the traditional rudiments as a whetstone and Casaubon urging the discipline's continuation, subject to revision.

If Glanvill's seal for the Lord had inspired him "with some smartness and severity against . . . Heathen Notions," Casaubon put him in far worse than heathen company. Conceding that Glanvill "can express himself smartly upon very light occasions," Casaubon dryly remarks that, but for this busy seal, "I should have been very suspicious, if not confident, he had borrowed all this godly language from some profane Chymist, such as our Robert Fludd was, with whom such professions of seal for the glory of God are very frequent and ordinary . . . . But it is indeed the common language of all extravagant Chymists; they all . . . insist upon the same thing."89

Since apologists for the New Science so frequently attacked the scholasticism taught in the Universities, Casaubon's views on the subject need clarification. The Deism found in Lord Herbert of Cherbury's treatise De Veritate, Casaubon distrusted as "a new Religion."90 On the other hand, far too many persons "taught by Epicurus and his mates [including Hobbes], are apt to despise and vilifie the "admirable Works of the Creation" as being the works not of a wise God, but blinde atoms . . . ."91 Rejecting both Deism and the philosophy of Hobbes, Casaubon believed reasoning and dispute to be inevitable concomitants of the Christian faith—"who can expect, or imagine, that any other
course can be available to the maintenance of true Christianity? In view of the irascibility found in his other writings, does this statement show a relish for controversy only? Because Meric Casaubon was a child of his age, it is easy to be unkind to him. Several considerations, however, help us to a clearer understanding of his real position. Like his father, he was committed to the Anglican tradition of historical Christianity, including the mysteries of the faith. Holding thus, he had to reject Herbert’s design “out of the Religions of mankind to extract a Religion that should need no Christ.” Because he therefore believed in a faintly anthropomorphic spiritual realm, as his witchcraft writings show, he rejected the materialistic determinism of Hobbes, with its atheistic emptiness. The frenetic enthusiasm of the Puritans he considered a mental aberration. As a savant, he realized that the thorny points of Christian dogma would perhaps always require defense and explanation. As a Christian humanist, Casaubon felt that faith and reason must be reconciled, and therefore he clung, as a man of intelligence, to a viewpoint which in his experience accomplished this. He therefore belongs in the Anglican tradition of rational theology steming from Hooker. However accurately he projected the line of the new scientific thought to its direst point, he did not suggest—who could have?—a really adequate bridge over the new chasm between faith and reason, science and theology. Because of the magnitude of such a task in a world of growing materialism, the literature of the last century swells with a desperation, of which Casaubon’s words seem prophetic:
And certainly, when and where men (whether through force, or want of good learning) shall be made incapable to uphold their faith with sound reasoning and disputing (which they call wrangling) what will be the issue, or who will get by it, any man may guess.95

But as men became understandably tired of heated dispute and sought cool refuge in science and mathematics, Casaubon's words went unheard.96

In the light of the New Science's reception, we best find Peter Du Moulin's intellectual temper, which is not entirely clear in his political writings or sermons. Judging from his extensive polemics, one would have to conclude that he was only an opportunist who could whip up a synthetic wrath, or else that he was a singularly angry man of God. The bitter virility of his prose and verse denunciations of the Puritans and Milton seems to confirm this. His connection with the controversies over science and witchcraft, however, helps to correct this impression, and reveals a personality which has the attractiveness of good sense. The sources for such information are three: his correspondence with Robert Boyle about the New Science; his masterpiece, A Treatise of Peace and Contentment of Mind; and a number of incidental Latin Poems which show his characteristic ideas, attitudes, and friendships, particularly with Marie Casaubon and the Boyle family. His personality is further revealed by verse to his associates at Canterbury. While John Webster fulminated against university discipline in the Academiarum Examen (1654) and John Milton, in shadow-
boxing with an unknown assailant, wrongly hit Alexander More in the Defensio Secunda (1654) and the Pro Se Defensio (1655), that secret adversary—Du Moulin—was improving his fortune with the high nobility. He had been retained by Richard ("the Rich") Boyle, later Earl of Burlington and Cork and Lord High Treasurer of Ireland, to act as tutor to his sons Richard and Charles Boyle, later Viscount Dungarvan. Thus introduced to perhaps the wealthiest family in England and Ireland, Du Moulin was brought into a pleasant contact with the uncle of his young charges, Robert Boyle; and with their aunt, Lady Ranalagh.97 Du Moulin's correspondence with Robert Boyle shows a mutually cordial relationship, and further develops his interest in the New Science shown during the argument between Glanvill and Cassubon. Though his activities reviewed so far have obscured the fact, Du Moulin was a neo-Latin poet of distinction,98 and had composed a considerable amount of verse, collected in Petri Molinasi P.F. [APE]P A Postatum Libelli Tres... (Cambridge, 1670).99 Du Moulin dedicated the book to Robert Boyle,100 and wrote him from Canterbury on 28 December 1669 begging him to accept the dedication.101 Attracted to the New Science, partly at least, by his friendship with Boyle, Du Moulin had wanted to include a poem praising the Royal Society. But the years 1668-1669 had seen the scientific controversy develop with the books of Glanvill and Cassubon, and Du Moulin's role in it brought difficulties. Du Moulin hoped that Boyle, through the apparent harmony of his religious and scientific interests, could ease the situation, and wrote him in some distress:
One of the prime licensers of the book, Dr. Gunning, would not suffer the heroes in commendation of the Royal Society to be printed with their fellows. It grieves me to see a feud between that noble Society and the Universities, to which Mr. Glanvill's books have much contributed. Your great credit, prudence, and moderation, may stop that growing evil, if any thing in the world can. 102

Since the volume included a poem to Gunning written in the friendliest terms, 103 the licensor's behavior was personally ungracious. It also showed the extent of the real bitterness created by the book war, and when the first edition of \([A\)PEP']A appeared, the poem in question was omitted. But when the second edition appeared in 1671, a new title page had been supplied, as well as an *Incrementum* containing more poems, including the one to the Royal Society. As a later note (Canterbury, 3 July 1671) to Boyle shows, Du Moulin had outwitted the licensor:

The first time that I asked a license to print my \([A\)PEP']A at Cambridge, Dr. Gunning got it upon condition, that the verses to the Royal Society were put out of the manuscript.

But the license for the *Incrementum*, where the verses are, was got in his absence. 104

Appearing as the final selection in \([A\)PEP']A, the poem, entitled
Pro Regia Societate Londinensi 1E7711MIA, is pleasant to read. But unfortunately, in praising the Society the poem dwelt on several ideas which had become anathema to such critics as Casaubon. The tired old world was virtually to be renewed by those divinely sent allies of the Almighty, who, with clear vision unimpeded by Aristotelian logic or systems which distorted reality, would compel Nature—including the universe—to give up her secrets; allies who would bring through knowledge and utility a never-ending progress to the world, who would cause agriculture to flourish, who would spread wisdom—and trade—to the ends of the earth.105 The poem is much better than the verdict of R. F. Jones would suggest—a mediocre performance of two or three pages106—and is comparable to the praise of the Society by Cowley and Dryden.107 While it is fervent in its praise of the Society and what it may do, and is, as one would expect from a staunch Calvinist, not warm to the scholastic discipline, the poem is scarcely belligerent in tone. It therefore emphasizes through the prelusive behavior of Gunning how far the anger and alarm over the Society's activities had gone. It also displays Du Moulin's receptivity to new ideas.

A more complete grasp of his views, however, involves a survey of other works. If favorable to the New Science, how, for example, did he react to the varieties of skepticism which give a tone of modernity to the Restoration? One could welcome a more explicit statement of this, as also of his theory of the nature and purpose of education, for he was caught in the quarrel about this crucial issue. There is also the tantalizing question of how he—to say nothing of such cool
intellects as Boyle and Glanvill—could simultaneously have faith in science and in witches without being aware of some inconsistency. And finally, since Du Moulin was a poet and creative writer, some estimate of his stature and limitations as an author is needed. These questions are most easily approached through his Treatise of Peace and Contentment of Mind, which, besides his poems, is his most revelatory work. The Treatise was in part a reaction against the Pyrrhonism infused into English thought by Montaigne and his disciple Charron. It was their classical skepticism from which the New Science had to separate itself; and their teaching of man's innascience, through influential Roman Catholic apologists, sometimes became a prelude to the acceptance of religious faith on the authority claimed by Rome. The French skeptical writers, Bredvold has observed, contributed in England to the pagan culture, the cynicism, and naturalistic ethics which gradually were diffused throughout English society, at least in the upper strata, before 1660. This is, of course, to say nothing of the England of Charles II. In his Petit traité de la sagesse (1606), Charron, though a priest, had appeared a man of the world and considered wisdom both Stoic and Pyrrhonistic in a secular way. With Charron's cardinal definition—"Wisdom is a sweet and regular managing of the soul"—Du Moulin had no quarrel; peace and contentment of mind was the aim of both authors. Their approach, however, differed widely. As Du Moulin interpreted him, Charron dangerously gave to human wisdom what belonged to divine, and depicted theological wisdom as such a slattern that "One would say, that he is drawing the picture of some..."
old bare-footed Capucine Sister. Against "the stream of a great
torrent, so I call the numerous abettors of Charron," Du Moulin
tried to show that the wisdom which must work in us that excellent
effect [peace of mind], is Divine Wisdom. While praising the "mas-
culine and lofty spirit" of Charron, Du Moulin hoped that "we may
restore to Religion that which Charron takes from it," and return
Theological Wisdom to her primacy. Human wisdom, however, is not
to be despised; she is "not only the servant, but the daughter of
Divine Wisdom, from which all true moral wisdom is descended. And when
that daughter goeth astray from her Mother, she must be brought to her
again, and put in mind of her duty." Although Du Moulin, when we
consider his works broadly, is a writer of ability, he made no pretense
of being a systematic philosopher. Therefore, his attitude toward
skepticism and Cartesianism—he refers to "That prime Philosopher of
our Age Monsieur des Cartes"—must to an extent be conjectured.
When he awarded the palm to theological wisdom, he clearly objected to
grounding morality in the relativity of secular philosophy. And while
he was, as we shall see, a Calvinist at heart, one gets the impression,
because of his status as an Anglican divine and his friendliness to
the New Science, that he would have objected to fideism and supported
rational theology as found in Hooker. His admiration for Descartes may
have been superficial, for the phrase quoted occurs as Du Moulin
quibbles with the Frenchman about definitions of the passions of gen-
erosity and pride. His attitude toward philosophy is then, on the
whole, utilitarian.
The superiority he gives theological to human wisdom is summarized when he declares that "all the Learning that we lay up must end in Prudence." 121 Perhaps the closest he comes to a definition of Prudence is "To judge wisely of the businesses of the world"; 122 and Prudence both scholarship and practical experience must develop. 123 "Prudence is above Science in dignity, but Science precedeth Prudence in order, as the means go before the end," he explains. "This position that prudence is the end, and sciences are the means, gives the true light to choose those sciences that deserve a serious study," Du Moulin asserts. "Sciences are multiplied to a great number, and grown to a godly perfection in this Western world. They have their several uses and beauties," 124 Utility it is which determines the individual's emphasis in learning, and God's intentions for man are perfectly clear:

For there are some sciences, which, though especially profest by some, belong alike to all, and regard the profession of man as he is man. For God hath created and placed us in the world to learn three things; How the world is made, What the world doth, And what we must do in the world. How the world is made, we learn by natural Philosophy, the Sphere and Cosmography. What the world doth, we learn by Histories. What must be done in the world we learn out of Ethicks and Politicks, and especially out of Divinity. These Sciences are beneficial and delightful; and to be altogether ignorant of these, is to live in the world, not knowing for what.
A prudent man will pick out of these what is most fit for
his principal end, which is to glorify God, inform his
judgment, order his life, and content himself.\textsuperscript{125}

Even if Du Moulin is practical rather than philosophical about educational discipline, and if his assumption of divine intent might be questioned, yet his viewpoint is not without merit. At the least, it is a pleasant respite from the parakeet-pulling of Glenvill and Casaubon. His Calvinism, as adapted to the Anglican Church, was not committed to the peripatetic system, and because of his emphasis on utility, Du Moulin was able to fit experimental science into an educational framework that was on the whole balanced and harmonious. In his aversion to the scholastic discipline, Du Moulin seems to echo both his father and Sir Francis Bacon:

There are studies that have little lustre and less price,
and yet by their severe garb go for wise and serious. Such is School-philosophy, which for three or four hundred years hath reigned in our Universities, and rough-casted Divinity with barbarous terms and crabbed distinctions. For as if School-men would outdo Pilate's soldiers that crowned the head of our Saviour with thorns, they have habited his doctrine with thorns all about from top to toe, so thick that themselves can hardly see the day through. The writings of School-men are like Labyrinths, which in a little piece of ground have a very long and intricate way. For
the learning of those Ages being confined within a short compass, those resolute and irrefragable Doctors (for so they stilke one another) not being able to travel far, and yet eager of going, did but turn and wind within their narrow limits, and cross a thousand times the same way. It is scarce credible how little there is to learn in all that huge mass of harsh subtily. It is true indeed that in all studies of men there is vanity, and the learning that succeded that rusty learning hath a merrier vanity. But since it is so, that there is vanity in both, give me rather a fair and smooth vanity than a grim and haggard. Si mugas, saltam sint canores. Serious fools are the most troublesome. 126

It is, then, from the viewpoint of Calvin's theology, as domesticated in the Established Church, that Du Moulin welcomed the New Science despite its taint of the Puritanism which he loathed. Because of his pragmatic nature, he apparently found the element of scientific skepticism acceptable. As a Calvinist and a man of prudence, he may possibly have thought that the dire future which his friend Casaubon predicted was somewhat exaggerated.

Seldom is the Janus visage of the Restoration more striking than in the peculiar relationship between religion, scientific skepticism as found in the New Science, and the outburst of serious literature
about witchcraft and demonology. The principal contributors to such writings are figures we already know well—Du Moulin, Casaubon, Glanvill, Hobbes, Browne, Boyle, and the redoubtable John Webster. Whatever their positions might have been in the controversy between the New Science and the Universities, these warriors easily switched sides in the broomstick war. The losing camp—for witches—includes the greater catalogue of worthies: Du Moulin, Boyle, and Browne, with Glanvill serving as generalissimo and Casaubon, rather surprisingly, as his aide-de-camp. Attacking with a blunt vigor of thought and style, the slender winning forces—against witches—counted Hobbes and Webster. Though the argument about witchcraft was fairly old, it acquired new prestige when James VI of Scotland (later, as James I of England, the patron of the elder Du Moulin) published his Daemonologie in 1587. The quarrel flickered on during the Interregnum with the publication of Hobbes’s Leviathan (1651), which the Cambridge Platonist Dr. Henry More answered with his Antidote Against Atheism (1652). Continuing sporadically through the rest of this period, the debate flared up after the founding of the Royal Society and was climaxed in 1681, three years before the death of Du Moulin, with the posthumous publication by Henry More of Glanvill’s Sadducismus Triumphatus. It is hardly necessary to rewrite Nostier’s classic study of English witchcraft and its literature, but a clearer picture is needed of Du Moulin’s place in the argument.

Hobbes had grounded Religion in man’s anxiety about the future and his wish to know, to be free from fear. While thus reducing
Religion to a perennial form of wish projection, he made witchcraft a form of religious manifestation, especially of a belief that supernatural causes of the future can be known. 129 Hobbes' equation of religion with wishful thinking, of course, reduced to nothing the providential theory which conservatives were desperately fighting to save. Du Moulin and Casaubon were on the ground early to keep God in the universe by means of familiar spirits. At the request of Robert Boyle, Du Moulin had translated and published The Divell of Mascon (1658), reporting the jaunt in 1612 of a sportive spirit to the home of François Perreaud, a Huguenot minister in Burgundy. Marie Casaubon followed this in 1659 by editing a bizarre account of traffic with spirits by Dr. John Dee, the antediluvian chemist, mathematician, and judicial astrologer of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Its title was portentous—A True & Faithful Relation of What passed for many Years Between Dr. John Dee (A Mathematician of Great Fame in Q. Eliz. and King James their Reignes) and Some Spirits: Tending (had it succeeded) to a General Alteration of most States and Kingdomes in the World . . . (London, 1659). The book was strange, both in its own history and in its account of séances by Dee and his assistant Edward Kelley with such rulers as the Emperor Rudolph of Germany and King Stephen of Poland. 130 In his preface to the book, Casaubon stated the arguments which thereafter would be followed in writings to prove witchcraft:

The first [use] is against Atheists, and such as do not
believe that there be any Devils or Spirits . . . . I do not know what can be more convincing than this sad story, so exactly, so particularly, so faithfully delivered.

Truly, they must see further than I do, that can finds what to answer (rationally) and to oppose: This is a great point, and a great ground of Religion; but this is not all: For if there be Spirits indeed, so wicked and malicious, so studious and so industrious, to delude men, and to do mischief, which is their end, all which is so fully represented in this Relation; then certainly it must follow, that there is a great over-ruling Power, that takes care of the Earth, and of the Inhabitants of it; of them especially that adore that Power, and worship it with true affection and sincerity: For without this over ruling Power, what a miserable World should we have?131

With the reprinting of Reginald Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft* in 1665, the controversy gathered momentum, and reached its climax almost concurrently with the quarrel about the New Science. Glanvill answered Scot's old book (originally published in 1584) with *A Philosophical Endeavour towards the Defense of the Being of Witches and Apparitions* (London, 1666). Most of the first impression was destroyed in the Great Fire of London that autumn, and in 1667, as Sprat's *History of the Royal Society* and Milton's *Paradise Lost* were coming out, the book went into its second edition. The year 1668, with the
publication of Plutus Ultra, began the quarrel between Glanvill and Casaubon, but it also saw both divines contributing to the literature for witchcraft. Having acquired a new title page and some additional matter, Glanvill's Philosophical Endeavour appeared in a third edition entitled A Flow at Modern Sadducism In some Philosophical Considerations About Witchcraft. To which is added, The relation of the Fam'd Disturbance by the Drummer, In the House of Mr. John Mompesson; With some Reflections on Drollery and Atheism. By a Member of the Royal Society. Except for a condensed version in Glanvill's Essays (1676), the work was eventually to reach its fullest form in the great witchcraft classic, Sadducismus Triumphus (1681). Casaubon fired a broadside at Hobbes and the disparagement of witchcraft and the Ancients with Of Credulity and Incredulity, In things Natural, Civil, and Divine. Wherein, Among other things, the Sadducism of these times, in denying Spirits, Witches, and Supernatural Operations, by pregnant instances and evidences, is fully confuted; Epicurus his cause, discussed, and the jugling and false dealing, lately used to bring him, and Atheism, into credit, clearly discovered: the use and necessity of Ancient Learning, against the Innovating humour, all along proved and asserted... (London, 1668). Although Casaubon objected to credulity, he made his book primarily a corrective to incredulity, which he considered the danger of the age; and therefore directed his fire against skepticism, the Royal Society, Descartes, and atomistic philosophy, all of which he thought promoted disbelief. It is by Glanvill's A Flow at Modern Sadducism that serious
Witchcraft literature is thrust into its closest conjunction with the New Science. Not only did Glanvill link the book with the Royal Society on its title page, but the volume tries to adopt the method of the dawning science and to approach its philosophy. It is here that the apparently hopeless confusion in the thinking of Glanvill and Boyle, and perhaps Du Moulin, is cleared up. So contradictory has seemed his faith in science and in night-riding hags, that Glanvill (and others like him) has been taxed, even by a sympathetic biographer, with credulity and muddled thinking for justifying witchcraft.\(^{134}\) Granted that it was an age of intellectual flux and that the New Science, despite its self-confidence, was embryonic, Glanvill manages a fair consistency in his thinking. How, after all, was one to vanquish an atheist? Airy philosophical speculation would not do, and the Witch of Endor could not really be resurrected if Scripture were no mutually acceptable authority. Taking his cue from Henry More,\(^{135}\) Glanvill tried to meet the scoffer on his own ground by providing authenticated instances of spiritual intervention and witchcraft as tangible, material evidence. Therefore, following a separate title page promising "palpable Evidence of Spirits and Witchcraft,"\(^ {136}\) Glanvill produced in A Blow at Modern Sadducism, two letters to supply it. Addressed to William, Lord Brereton, one contained the now-familiar story of the Drummer of Tedworth,\(^ {137}\) and an account of the bewitching of a twelve-year-old boy, Richard Jones of Shepton Mallet in Somersetshire.\(^ {138}\) This case started Sunday, 15 November 1657, and ended with the condemnation of Jane Brooks, the alleged witch, at Chard Assemblies on
26 March 1658. The second letter added by Glanvill was written to Dr. Henry More and discussed the Drummer of Tedworth. Because his opposition sneered at witchcraft as fantastic, Glanvill sought a reasonable approach to explain the operation of witches and spirits. His own view was one of scientific skepticism, specifically that if some features of witchcraft seemed improbable, one should still beware of the vanity of dogmatising that witches did not exist. He advanced—like a scientist, he hoped—cautious hypotheses which would explain, according to factual evidence of witchcraft trials, how witches and spirits might function; hypotheses which consequently could maintain at least the possibility of witches' existence. Paradox though it be, it was such an attitude of scientific skepticism which, within the Janus mind of the seventeenth century, reconciled old witches and new science.

From just this viewpoint, Robert Boyle prevailed upon Peter Du Moulin to translate a Huguenot pastor's account of a diabolical visitation. First published in 1650, the book had reached a fourth edition by 1669. Its reappearance was timely, for in that year two fresh attacks were launched against witchcraft—The Question of Witchcraft Debated by John Wagstaffe, and the True Interpretation of the Witch of Endor by Lodowick Mugleston. Du Moulin's book was entitled The Deuell of Mascon. Or, A true Relation of the chief things which an Unleas Spirit did and said at Mascon in Burgundy, in the House of one Mr. Francis Paresoud, Minister of the Reformed Church in the same Town. Published in French lately by himselfe; and now made English by
one that hath a particular knowledge of the truth of this Story

(Oxford, 1669). In a commendatory letter first prefixed to this edition, Robert Boyle placed the account under the patronage of his name and that of the elder Du Moulin:

But the conversation I had with that pious Author during my stay at Geneva, and the present he was pleased to make me of this Treatise before it was Printed, in a place where I had opportunities to enquire both after the writer, and some passages of the Booke, did at length overcome me (as to this narrative) all my settled indisposednesse to believe strange things. And since I find that you have received an account both of Monsieur Perreaud himself, and several things relating to his booke from that great scholar and excellent person your Father: I have no reason to doubt, but that as your skill in the tongues, out of which and into which this treatise is to be translated, will bring it the greatest advantages that it can receive from a translators pen; So the reputation which your and your learned Fathers name will give it, will prove as effectuall as any thing of that nature can be, to make wary readers . . . believe even the amazing passages of it . . .

In his dedicatory epistle to Robert Boyle, Du Moulin thought "this admirable story" was "worthy to be known of all men, and of singular use to convince the Atheists and half believers of these times:
Most of which will persuade themselves that there is no such thing in the world as any spiritual, immaterial, intelligent substance. If they could only believe in devils, he continues, they would also believe in God. But in order "to confirm these pretenders to the title of strong wits in their pernicious unbelief"—and thus spread atheism—Satan was lying low, revealing himself only "to the rudest poor people, and the most beastial natures in some remote barren heath" or to magicians of ill repute. There were, of course, the Scriptural accounts of devils, all quite unacceptable to atheists. "But no history," Du Moulin professes, "either sacred or profane, ancient or modern related such a voluntary, publique, continued, and undeniable manifestation of the wicked Spirit, as this doth." It is valuable evidence, he points out, because the visitation occurred "not in a corner, but in the midst of a great City" before both Catholic and Protestant witnesses when the sprite equally taunted. This brought the examination and confirmation of the incident by the local magistrate and diocesan bishop. Moreover, Ferreaud himself, "a Religious well poised and venerable Divine, who (if he be alive still) is above 60 years of age," related the particulars to the elder Du Moulin "when he was President of a National Synod in these parts..." Thus cloaked with weighty prestige, the spirit, "a witty Devil," whiffled at his listeners despite the frequent godly reproves of Pastor Ferreaud. Once he vented his diablerie upon a stubborn Catholic jurist who, in spite of Ferreaud's objections, insisted on cross-examining him. When the tiresome questioning was done, the spirit took his turn, informing the crestfallen
lawyer that "at this very time" a local citizen "is doing your busi-
ness with your wife, and then revealed many secret foul dealings of
the Lawyer, which made him appear a dishonest man." The spirit
then cut a merry caper with the confounded lawyer:

Then upon a sudden the whole company could see the man
drawn by the arms into the midst of the room where the
Devil whirled him about and gave him many turns with
great swiftness, and the man touching the ground with his
toe [.] and then threw him down upon the floore with great
violence. His friends took him up and carried him to his
house where he lay sick, and distracted many dayes, giving
by his example a lesson to all; that the Devil may be for
a while a fair companion to them that will keep company
with him, but will pay them in the end with torment and
despair."

After the deaths of Cassubon (1671) and Glanvill (1680), the witchcraft
war moved on to the posthumous edition of Glanvill's How at Modern
Sadducism in its fullest form, Sadducismus Triumphantus. Meanwhile, in
1670 the third part of Cassubon's Of Credulity and Incredulity was
finally published, and in 1672 the first two parts were reissued
posthumously with a sensationalised title page which perverted the
work's philosophical intent—A Treatise Proving Spirits, Witches, and
Supernatural Operations, by Pregnant Instances and Evidences: Together
with other Things worthy of Note . . . (London, 1672). In 1676
Glanvill put out a shortened form of his Philosophical Endeavour, and the following year John Webster issued The Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft, which criticised Glanvill, Casaubon, and The Devil of Nascent. Glancing back to Casaubon’s preface to Dee’s book, Glanvill flatly stated the central proposition: “those that dare not bluntly say, There is no God, content themselves, (for a fair step, and Introduction) to deny there are Spirits, or Witches.” This Webster flatly denied, maintaining that “the denying the existence of Angels or Spirits; or the Resurrection, doth not infer the denying of the Being of God; nor the denying of the existence of Witches . . . infer the denying of Angels or Spirits; and that they do unjustly charge the Authors of this opinion with Sadducism, we shall prove . . . .” Rolling up his sleeves, Webster then belabored Casaubon and Glanvill and their books.

Though by writers against witchcraft and “the grave proceedings of many learned judges” these beliefs “were pretty well quashed,” Webster finds that “two persons of great learning and note, . . . Dr. Casaubon and Mr. Glanvill, have afresh espoused so bad a cause, and taken the quarrel upon them; And to that purpose have newly furbished up the old weapons, and raked up the old arguments, forth of the Popish Sink and Dunghills, and put them into a new dress, that they might appear with the greater luster, and so do with Tooth and Nail labour to maintain the old rotten assertions . . . .” Webster then exposed the illogic of reasoning from witch to spirit to God. Because God existed before spirits, who “are not immortal à parte anté,” and
because spirits existed before witches, the denial of witches is not a
denial of spirits, nor to deny spirits to deny God. They are all
separate. Therefore, even the denial of angels and spirits or witches,
is not the denial of God, though denying the Creator would of course
negate the creatures.\textsuperscript{155} The assertion of Glanvill, Casaubon (and Du
Moulin) is "but a poor fallacia consequentiae."\textsuperscript{156} It is the Scrip-
tures—here speaks Webster the Puritan—which "do with infallible certi-
tude teach us, that both good and bad Spirits have most certainly an
Existence." Therefore, "believe not them that say, If you would know
the power of Devils and Witches, go to the writings of Dr. Casaubon,
Mr. Glanvill, and to the rest of the Demonographers and Witchmongers,
that mass and heap together all the lying, vain, improbable, and im-
possible stories that can be scraped forth of any Author . . . . .\textsuperscript{157}
Webster dismisses as "foolish" the usual features of witch lore—
diabolical contract, carnal copulation with the Devil, "that he sucks
upon their bodies, that they are transubstantiated into Cats, Dogs,
Squirrels . . . or that they raise tempests, and fly in the air."\textsuperscript{158}
Working entirely through natural means, they may do harm by the imagina-
tion, poison, and so on.\textsuperscript{159} He defines two classes of witches: "active
deceivers,"\textsuperscript{160} and those "under a passive delusion" as to their supposed
powers and activities.\textsuperscript{161} Such witches have always existed. But how
can sane persons believe in witchcraft? Ignorance and superstition,
says Webster: "The ignorance or mistaking of these things, joined with
the notions Men have imbibed from their infancy, together with irre-
ligious education, are the true and proper causes . . . . .\textsuperscript{162} It is
the Book of Nature—here speaks Webster the Baconian—which will show men the true causes of many strange things which seem supernatural. With so much to learn of Nature's boundaries, "no Man can rationally assign a beginning for supernatural agents and actions, that does not certainly know when the power and operation of nature ends." Man's marvelous ignorance of Nature "is most evident in those many elucubra-
tions, and continued discoveries of those learned and indefatigable persons that are of the Royal Society, which do plainly evince that hitherto we have been ignorant of almost all the true causes of things, and therefore through blindness have usually attributed those things to the operation of Cacodemons that were truly wrougt by nature, and thereby not small augmented this gross and absurd opinion of the power of Witches." 

Du Moulin's translation of The Devil of Mascon had achieved some celebrity, to judge from Webster (the translation reached its fifth edition two years later, in 1679). It is twice given a fairly extended mention in the Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft. Webster does not classify it as witchcraft literature—which indeed it is not, though it has the same purpose. The puckish, sometimes wistful be-

And whosoever shall seriously read and consider that little Piece that was printed some few years since, though written long ago, and by some (that pretend to no small
share of Learning) cried up exceedingly for a most convincing Relation, to prove the Existence of Spirits, called, The Devil of Mascon, may easily gather, that if the thing were truly related, as to the matter of fact, that it must needs be some Creature of a middle Nature, and no evil Spirit, both because it was such a sportful and mannerly Creature, that it would leave them, and not disturb them at their devotions; as also (as far as I remember, for I have not the Book by me) because it denied that it was a Devil, and professed that it hoped to be saved by Christ. 165

And again, after reviewing the book's auspices—translated by Dr Peter Du Moulin, at the request of the honourable and learned person Mr Boyle—Webster remarks that

The Character given of this Author, and the assent of such learned persons to the things related, have gained an ample suffrage to give them credit also. But notwithstanding all this, there are many passages in the relation that a quick-sighted Critick would find to be either contradictory or inconsistent, and it cannot rationally be thought that he was a Casodemon, his actions were so harmless, civil, and ludicrous; and if he were to be believed . . . he was no Devil, but hoped to be saved by Jesus Christ. But whether a Devil or not, yet the story for substance doth sufficiently
prove the existence of such kind of Demons, that can work strange and odd feats.\textsuperscript{166}

Despite his often modern turn of thought, Webster obviously looked to the past also. It was largely in reply to Webster's \textit{Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft} that Dr. Henry More published the posthumous edition of Glanvill's \textit{magnus opus} on witchcraft, \textit{Sadducismus Triumphatus} (1681). But even as the book appeared, the more rational followers of witchcraft were disbanding, and the malevolent hags Glanvill defended had most of them flown over the horizon, henceforth to persist only as folk feeling or a shadowy element in the works of Hawthorne.\textsuperscript{167}
CHAPTER V

POLYRHYTHMIA AND PRACTICALITY

As with the Restoration it moved through the Janus gate to the future, England often felt alarm as the old issues of religion and politics showed a semblance of life. But since Enthusiasm had gasped its last with the Stuarts' return, only the Catholic threat remained. If the Papacy no longer hoped to extirpate established Protestantism, the zeal of the Jesuits even after the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) kept Europe in a turmoil by furthering the ambition of Louis XIV. Though most English Catholics merely wanted to be let alone, the Stuart intrigues to restore the Roman faith, often sensed uneasily by the people rather than clearly perceived, indirectly promoted hysteria over the Popish Threat. While Atheism stalked the darkling plain as witch bands obscured the stars, the Babylonian woe still sent men to the shambles of Tyburn. The similar political theories of the left-wing Puritans and of Bellarmine and Mariana had long since created suspicions that the Jesuits had helped to martyr Charles I. Flirtatious in religion as in other things, his son Charles II first importuned Rome in 1662-1663; and by secret treaties, open diplomacy, and advancement of Catholics to key positions, he created an atmosphere wanting only a spark for an explosion. The spark came in the testimony of the habitual liar Titus Oates, and the madness called the Popish Plot kept the scaffold drenched with the blood of innocent men, Jesuits and others, from November, 1678, to the middle of 1679. Like his father, Peter Du Moulin
was a controversialist, and as he busied one hand with the quarrels over science and witchcraft, he dipped the other into the holy war of books concerning Catholic political activities.

His entry into this dispute began with his reply to a tract entitled *Philanex Anglicus; or, A Christian caveat for all kings, princes, and prelates*, published anonymously in London in 1663 by Sir Henry Janson. Du Moulin's reply was *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion in the Point of Obedience to Sovereigns. Opposed to the Doctrine of Rebellion, authorised and practised by the Pope and the Jesuites. In Answer to a Jesuitical Libel, Entitled *Philanex Anglicus*...* (London, 1664).* Following second and third editions in 1667 and 1668, Du Moulin published a fourth edition in 1679 in which, according to the title page, "more light is given about the horrible POPISH PLOT, whereby our late Sacred Sovereign Charles the I. was Murdered." Professing horror at the Puritan rebellion and the late King's execution, *Philanex Anglicus* had sought to discredit Protestantism by attributing revolutionary doctrines to it, and by denouncing the Independents who had brought the King to trial.² Such a denunciation was maladroit, for Du Moulin pointed out, as others have done since, that the political theories by which the Independents justified their deed had been taken from such Jesuits as Bellarmine and Mariana.³ Reading his book, one is returned to the days when the elder Du Moulin had striven mightily against Cardinal Bellarmine and the Cardinal Du Perron. "With what face or conscience can the Jesuites pass a hard Sentence upon the late Rebels and King-killers," Du Moulin asks,
"seeing that these furious Zealots have neither taught nor done any thing in that horrible defection, but what they had learned of the Jesuits?" The Puritans got from Bellarmine, according to Du Moulin, the teaching that political power originates with the people, who therefore may alter the government. What of the "High Court of Justice" which Parliament erected to try Charles I? The Independents borrowed this from Mariana's De Regis et Regis Institutione, he points out. The doctrine of the people's right to depose a king as a tyrant and kill him, Du Moulin continues, the Puritans found in Lessius and Suarez. But even if the Puritans had learned this much from the Jesuits, Du Moulin promised his Catholic foes, "now far you are yet before them, I will shew before I have done with you." Du Moulin kept his promise. He charged that, with the express approval of the Sorbonne and the Holy See, Jesuits had infiltrated Cromwell's army, disguised as Independents, and had actively conspired for the execution of King Charles. Sent by their party in England, he asserted, a group of Jesuits had put in writing first to the faculty of the Sorbonne and then to the Pope and his council the question "that seeing the State of England was in a likely posture to change Government, whether it was lawful for the Catholics to work that change, for the advancing and securing of the Catholic Cause in England, by making away the King, when there was no hope to turn from his Heresie?" Gaining approval, according to Du Moulin, a great party of Jesuits came to England to work for the King's downfall, principally in the Army. When the execution of Charles was subsequently assailed as
an heinous crime, Du Moulin wrote, "the Pope commanded all the papers
about that question to be gathered and burnt"; but "a Roman Catholic
in Paris" refused to give up his copy and divulged the contents to a
Protestant friend.11

When Du Moulin published the charge in the first edition of his
Vindication, "it struck such a terror among the Gentlemen of Sommerset-
House (where a man of great note was much concerned in it) that they
cast themselves at the King's feet to crave Justice against me" on the
pretense of an incident related by Du Moulin in which a priest rejoiced
in the late King's execution.12 The clamor was soon hushed, he con-
tinued, but the group got the Queen Mother to persuade the King that
Du Moulin should write no more books of such nature. Owning a debt of
gratitude to Du Moulin's writings, Charles II was in an awkward posi-
tion, and resolved the problem by asking Du Moulin, through the Secre-
tary of State Sir William Morrice, to abstain from writing books in
English "because it was not my Natural Language."13 The prohibition
was removed, a marginal note in the 1679 edition points out, when the
1668 edition appeared.14 There were several replies to the Vindica-
tion, principally one by the young Earl of Castlemaine entitled The
Catholique Apology . . . together with a clear refutation of . . . Dr.
Du Moulin's Answer to Philanex . . . (London, 1674). In its third
edition (also 1674), Castlemaine's book challenged Du Moulin to prove
his charges, since he had "been defied by Papists, & solicited by
Protestants" to do so.15 Jearing at his opponent as "the Sieur du
Moulin," Castlemaine scored a hit in observing that when Du Moulin
should be called on for proofs, "you'll be still as tenacious as an usurer, & part with none of them, unless the summons issues from Authority, though, you know, we come not at all to Court."

Du Moulin answered Castlemaine in the fourth edition of his Vindication. "As for my being defied by the Papists," he snapped, "I have defied them now seventeen years to call me in question before our Judges, and so I do still." Protestants, too, "some of them of great Place, have express to me a great desire that I should discover the whole Plot." Du Moulin had "set down the whole matter as far as I know, nothing wanting to it but the witnesses," and emphatically stated (in italics) that "This certain intelligence shall be justified whenever Authority shall require it." Since a "matter of that high nature must not be squabbled out between private interested persons, but pondered by those grave men in Power that have the decisive voice," Du Moulin stood by his resolution to give evidence only to authority.

But some corroboration was now badly needed; it would not do merely to repeat his charges. To prop his case, Du Moulin printed a letter from Secretary of State Morrice, "that Eminent Gentleman in Piety, Learning, and Wisdom . . . now with God." Morrice had relayed the King's command by letter to Du Moulin, but the letter had been mislaid. Du Moulin wrote him on 17 February 1673, and asked the retired official "to send me a confirmation of that passage, and withal some Idea of the behaviour of those Papists at that time." Replying in the friendliest terms from Wherington on 9 August 1673, Sir William applauded "Your pious Zeal, and good designs . . ." and wished "happy success to Your
undertakings with reward proportionable . . . ."22 He verified Du Moulin's account of the King's command, pointedly avoided any reflection on the Queen Mother, and, if he could not speak of the alleged conspiracy as a proven fact, Morrice admitted that all appearances favored Du Moulin's assertion of papist guilt in the King's murder.23

Du Moulin had to maintain his position by bold assertion, but what supporting evidence he could have produced is unclear. The seriousness of his charges, especially since the Queen Mother was involved by name, had brought them to the attention of Parliament in 1673, and there was talk of summoning Du Moulin to present his evidence. Apart from the Queen Mother, the redoubtable Sir Kenelm Digby, whom (p. 60) Du Moulin had identified as "a man of great note," was considered the active head of the alleged conspiracy. Because one of the principal witnesses had died, Du Moulin was in a quandary and might be hoist by his own petard. In anxiety, he wrote to Robert Boyle for advice from Canterbury on 1 October 1673:

Mr. Peregrine Bertie, who is a member of the House of Commons, told me, that at their last session a motion was made by Sir Thomas Clarges, that I should be sent for, to justify that, which I have undertaken in my book against Philanex, to make good before authority about a deputation of some Jesuits from their brethren in England to the Sorbonne, and so to Rome, about their design of promoting the late king's death. But that some wise man of the House would not have me sent for,
till it was known first what I could say. This put me to a necessity to prepare myself, that I might not be sent for being unready; and I have set down in the paper, that I sent to you, all that I can say. The like I have given to Sir Edward Deering, and may give the like to some other parliament-men, hoping, that seeing all I can say, they will not send for me. You may soon see, that if I had been sent for, when I made this offer, I had convincing proofs. But the main witness being dead since, I cannot convince an adversary, but persuade all equitable judges with the clearness of my evidences. My business is now, and with me of all wise and pious protestants, to look out more intelligences of the papists, in two conjunctures; the one about the time of the king's death, the other in 1663, when my book appeared first; and the mention of that deputation struck an extreme terror into those malcontents, of whom Sir Kenelm Digby was the head. In this important occurrence I do in all humility consult the oracle of your wisdom, and crave the assistance of your love.24

Boyle's counsel remains unknown. So far as we know, however, Du Moulin was not called before Parliament; evidently the information he had given Sir Edward Deering, even if it tended to show Catholic guilt, was not strong enough to merit a summons. And it apparently was not enough to bring sub rosa action to suppress the book, for the Vindication reached its fourth edition six years later.
As for the accusation of Philanex Anglicus that the doctrine and practice of the Reformed religion was rebellion, Du Moulin took a line of reply which, if not profoundly original, was effective. As he put it,

The Adversary to disgrace our Doctrine, hath objected to us some passages of our Authors, most of them false or wrested, and some actions of persons of the Protestant party. But though he had proved all these to be true, he had done no harm to our Doctrine, which is not built upon private opinions, or upon private or publick actions. He should have taken our Confessions in hand, and Indicted them of rebellious Tenets, if he could have found any; or finding none, he should have given glory to God, and confessed the Truth of God with us.25

Du Moulin then presents from eight Reformed confessions of faith, including that of the English Church, articles enjoining the faithful to obey their magistrates.26 Against this, he quotes a long list of papal bulls and decrees27—the citations extend from Gregory I (A.D. 611) to the fiery Paul V, in whose pontificate King James's Oath of Allegiance was debated by Bellarmine and the elder Du Moulin—to show that "the Doctrine of the Roman Court in the point of Obedience to Sovereigns, is a Doctrine of Rebellion."28 Du Moulin backs up this accusation with a lengthy review of Jesuit teachings—by Suarez, Mariana, Bellarmine, and others—and activities, all seeking to show how the Jesuit doctrines of
deposition and tyrannicides fomented and furthered rebellion. A bit
smugly, he points out that what individual Protestants have said or
done toward rebellion, orthodox Protestants may condemn but the Papist
is "sworn to approve all that the Pope saith or doth." The truth, as
Du Moulin sees it, becomes simple:

The difference between the faults of the Pope and those of
Protestants about the point of obedience, is this; That
disobedience with us is a crime, but with him it is a Law.
We punish rebels, but the Pope rewards them.

English Catholic attempts to make Protestantism and rebellion
synonymous were paralleled by similar propaganda in France; and though
Du Moulin had for years thought of himself as an Englishman, he still
felt strongly the old religious bond between the English Church and the
French Reformed, however this might cross High-Church pretensions within
the Establishment. The campaign by the French Crown, the Jesuits, and
the Catholic Church to whittle away the dwindling rights of the Hugue-
notes was accompanied by systematic written attacks, such as that by
Paul Hay, the Marquis de Chastelet, entitled Traité de la Politique
de France, par Monsieur P.H. Marquis de C, Avec quelques reflexions sur
de traité par le Sr. L'Qrmegny (1669). Depicting the Huguenots as
dangerous internal enemies to the French Crown, the book called for
their complete suppression. Either because he had betrayed designs of
the French ministry or had meddled in high matters of state, the Marquis
was thrown into prison. Du Moulin had written adverse comments upon
the book's fourth and fifth chapters under the name of the Sieur
L'OrmeGregory, and the entire work was translated into English in 1680.32
The "Reflections upon the Fifth Chapter of the Politicks of France,
Which Treats of the Huguenots," is especially similar to the arguments
of the Vindication. In this section, Du Moulin depicts the Huguenots
as the real friends of the French crown because of their official
doctrines of obedience and Divine Right, as opposed to Jesuit claims
of the Pope's temporal jurisdiction.33 The attitudes of the Jesuits
and the French Reformed are sharply contrasted.34 In the section en-
titled "Reflections upon the Roman Clergy," Du Moulin challenges papal
claim of temporal jurisdiction, attacks the Jesuits as fomenters of
regicides, opposes the channeling of French revenues into Italy, and
tries to persuade Louis XIV to limit the powers of the Catholic Church.35
In order to show the loyalist sentiment of the Huguenots, Du Moulin
quotes (in the English translation) the letter written by his father in
1621 enjoining obedience upon the mutinous Assembly of La Rochelle;36
the text is identical with that quoted in various editions of the Vindi-
cation.37

His years in England and his loyalty to the Anglican Church had
not weakened Du Moulin's awareness of the community of Protestant re-
ligious interests. He was deeply distressed at the plight of the
Huguenots, and as "a moderate episcopal man" he wrote to Boyle from
Canterbury on 3 July 1672 that

The truth is, Sir, I am stung with a jealousy of God, at
the pride, insolence, and uncharitableness of our men of
preference, that unchurch our churches [the Continental
Reformed]; and I intend (God assisting me with his grace)
to take occasion of these miseries of our brethren, to
make them (for others, that are better Christians than
they) sensible how criminal before God and man is their
insultation. 38

Though Du Moulin was a man of practicality, his sincerity in
these bitter debates seems unquestionable, and is consistent with his
other writings and activities for Crown and Church. Broadly speaking,
he transplanted the ideas of his father, with all their strength and
limitations and pragmatism, to English soil. As he came to think and
feel as an Englishman within the comprehensive Establishment, his ideas
completely lost their alien tinge. This process demonstrated one of
the great strengths of the communal bond of Protestant humanism, of
which he and his great opponent John Milton were equally parts.

Seen in the context of his times, Du Moulin is primarily a
practical divine who engages in polemics as circumstances arise; but
there are other parts of his work which deserve mention. One of these
is his neo-Latin poetry. Much of this verse is good enough, or bio-
graphically important enough to deserve some inspection. Any critical
estimate of poetry or verse is, of course, ultimately perhaps a matter
of taste, and doubtless a poet is entitled to choose his subject matter.
But he also incurs its consequences. Because of the often heavy religiosity and acrimonious tone with which Du Moulin writes, the corpus of his Latin poetry is not likely to be revived because of its literary interest. His undeniable talent, to be straightforward about it, was blighted by Calvinism and preaching. The limitations of his viewpoint we can gather from his statements about Charron quoted earlier, where all philosophy and learning were made subservient to theology, particularly moral theology. Where Du Moulin’s creative talent was concerned, this was (to echo a contemporary) to hang weights on the wings of the wind, and it often made his Pegasus merely a hobby-horse.

Du Moulin’s verse was collected in *APEPTA*, which we have mentioned already. In its final edition (1671), the volume was made up of four sections, and fitted with a general dedication to Robert Boyle. Book One was a series of hymns on the Apostles’ Creed; Book Two (*Ecclesiæ Gemitus*, or “The Groans of the Church”) a tearfully angry picture of the Church under Puritan oppression; Book Three a miscellany (*Sylva Variorum*); and the last section the *Incrementum* which Du Moulin slipped past the Cambridge licensers. The first book is dedicated to his distinguished relative, Samuel Bochart; the second to his close friend Marie Cassaubon; the third one to Thomas Fotherby, an associate at Canterbury; and *Incrementum* is without dedication. Only the most devout could relish the piety of the *Hymn XIII in Symbolum Apostolorum*, whereas the angry lamentations of *Ecclesiæ Gemitus* have long since died away. His other verse, however, has considerable interest and, aside from some of a varied description, may be considered as
There are three poems of obvious biographical interest. One, Deo Liberatori Sacrum (III, 52 ff.), gives a dramatic account of Du Moulin’s escape on 22 December 1624 from prison in Dunkirk, then in Spanish hands, and his flight on horseback to France. In another poem (III, 56 ff.) Quid retribuam Domino?, the incident is recalled as Du Moulin thankfully views his deliverance from danger in the period of Puritan domination. Dated 1665, the poem Senectuti gratulatur (III, 84-85) reveals what must have been Du Moulin’s prevailingly cheerful disposition, as at sixty-four he happily contemplates the joys which mature years can bring. It also treats a favorite theme of his, peace and contentment of mind.

Passing by the turgid, bloodthirsty invective of the four poems making up Eclesiae Semitum—for which Du Moulin apologises in his preface—one comes to a group of political poems. If not delectable for matter and style, they have an historical interest as they compare with Du Moulin’s book against Milton and the Nascendae, Regii Sanguinis Clamor. They were in fact arranged in HAEFPA according to common subject matter: the execution of Charles I, the literary war over the murder, the plight of England under the Puritans, and her deliverance at the Restoration. An undated poem, Magni Hanes Caroli Primi Regis & Martyris (II, 30 ff.) fetches up the slain King’s ghost, who awakens Du Moulin from slumber and, by turns indignant and compassionate, mourns England’s sad condition under the Puritan tyranny. As Du Moulin seeks to awaken sympathy for the Royal Martyr, the poem becomes somewhat
grisly in describing how the decapitated Royal head wobbles because poorly fastened:

Pallor in ore sacro, macies, cava lumina, torvus
Aspectus, cervis caesa & malè sarta, vacillis
Vix caput attollens, delabentâaque coronam,
Jusserat impexos sanies concrescere crines
Et crudo horrendus stillabat sanguine barba.

Even Lucan would have had difficulty in surpassing this. Linked with it are two other poems. One, In Zelotes rebellæ (II, b3-4h3), is dated 1643, and inveighs against the fiery zeal of the Puritans lately sent forth from Hell to defile the Church, fill the Universities with insane rant, and, with hypocritical promises of liberty, to incite the fickle mob to criminal rebellion against the King. Because of a comparison of Charles I to Christ, the poem was apparently touched up after 1643 to suit the Royal martyrdom. In lines to Nobilissimo Pádre (II, b8), dated 1649, Du Moulin urges a youth of the highest birth—perhaps the Prince of Wales—to flee to the French court and a sure welcome by Louis XIV in view of the disasters raining down on England. Both imaginative and bitterly clever is the monologue Terrae Semitus (II, 73), in which Mother Earth objects in agony to the incredible monsters she has just had to spawn—the King-killing Puritans. Perhaps its equal is the dramatic monologue Tyrannus (the speaker is Cromwell) in Anglies Servitus Rege Eemante (Incrementus, 31). Here the Lord
Protector is shrewdly portrayed as a psychological cross between Machiavelli and a debauched Roman emperor, a magnificently unprincipled villain who has subdued land and sea, become the Patron of the fervently hypocritical Puritan saints, corrupted Royalist supporters with gold, and now wishes to numb his conscience with wine, women, and song. He is followed by the object Populus (Inar., 34-35), which rather pathetically prays for deliverance from the miseries of Puritan rule. As a foil to "England's Slavery during the King's Exile," in Angliae Libertas Regae Redeunte (Inar., 36-39), Psalms 124 and 126 are turned to account to show the blessings conferred upon England by the return of Charles II.

The acrid verse which comprises so much of Du Moulin's output is offset by a cluster of poems having, in comparison to his polemics, a charm which is surprising. Limited in range by Du Moulin's religious orientation, the poems are at their best when he has a chance for natural description. His usual theme is Calvinistic, the discovery of God in the beauty and wonder of his creation. And yet, from the spontaneity and freshness of his writing, it is clear that Du Moulin had an almost Romantic feeling for nature, which, if his talent had not been almost stifled by an imposed religious system, might have produced really significant poetry showing a kinship with such Picturesque writers as Gilpin and the English pre-Romantics. Perhaps a good compendium of the subjects found in this descriptive poetry is found in Naturae Vanae (III, 7)—cool shades from the hot sun, dewy grass, the starry heavens, and (ll. 9-10)
In Coelumque minantium
Scabrorum scopulorum horror amabilis . . .

To obtain a fair view of Du Moulin's talent and feeling for nature poetry, we must consider, besides the short *Naturae Famae*, the longer poems *Spectacula Coeli* (III, 92-93), *Quantum est quod nescimus* (III, 90 ff.), as well as two descriptive sketches he wrote as a young man in a conscious prose-poetry—*Schola Naturae* (III, 143-146) and *Villa Cambria* (III, 147-149). The concept of Nature as the Temple of God—in the beauties of which the spectator beholds the power, wisdom, and majesty of the Creator and perceives how he is a link in the golden chain joining Heaven to Earth—is given its fullest statement in *Schola Naturae*. Du Moulin put his best youthful eloquence into this rhapsody on Nature as a teacher. It is, however, in his realistic and sympathetic description of rugged Welsh mountain country in *Villa Cambria* that Du Moulin finds one of his most congenial subjects. His picture of the jagged peaks, or animals' difficulty in feeding there, or a mountain torrent pelting through its carved rock bed, or a large, sinister cave—these, a topographical poet could scarcely have bettered. The fine effect of the sketch is paralleled by a similar description in a *Treatise of Peace and Contentment of Mind*. Celestial phenomena also fascinated Du Moulin, and he was able to transmute certain passages from Calvin's *Institutes* into poems which convey a genuine wonder at the beauty and order of the Heavens. *Spectacula Coeli* is a picture of night descending on a sunset sky brilliant with colors; and if, from
one standpoint, the final religious reflection could well have been omitted, at least it brings the poem to a quiet close appropriate to the settling twilight. The title of *Quantum est quod nascimus* is sufficient clue to its moral, didactic character, but the treatment is, on the whole, successful. As ignorant man considers the colorful brilliancy of the stars moving on their courses, the ruddy tails of plunging comets, and the natural law which governs other worlds, he falls prostrate before the Great Architect. Because the point of the work is implicit throughout, *Quantum est* achieves unity. Some imaginative power is also shown in *Aula Scandia*, where Du Moulin dreams that he is offered a kingship and out of courtesy accepts it, making his own abdication—in the interests of virtue, of course—his first and last official act. Humor and geniality mark his brief poem *De Tabaco* (III, 134-135), wherein his moral is wryly turned:

*Memento Dei speculum mentae purgare laborans,*

*Sic studium cerebrum scopis everrare pasti,*

*Quid nisi facess novâ destergere tentem?*

There is considerably less general interest in the two other groups of poems by Du Moulin, those addressed to members of the Boyle family, and those to his friends and associates at Canterbury. Of the five pieces comprising the Boyle group, two are exceptions to the eulogistic tone of the rest. They are an extensive epitaph (III, 121) for his former student Richard Boyle, killed on 3 June 1665 by a cannon ball while shielding the Duke of York during a naval battle in the Second Dutch
War, and a following epigram (III, 122) also to Richard Boyle. They are dignified by a sincere and restrained grief. Du Moulin's "Canterbury" poems, on the other hand, are valuable chiefly as they show the extent and cordial relationship he had at Christ Church with such ecclesiastics as Archbishop Juxon, Meric Casaubon, Thomas Fotherby, William Barker, John Castillon, and Peter Gunning. Perhaps the most unsuccessful poem in the group is the Epicodium to Archbishop Juxon (III, 128-130), which connects with Du Moulin's account of the prelate in Clamor ad Coelum. Though it touchingly recalls the good old man's sufferings under the Puritan regime, the Epicodium as poetry is weakened by a comparison of the doddering Archbishop to Atlas. There is, however, a feeling of deep personal concern in Du Moulin's consolatory poem to Meric Casaubon, Schola Morbi (III, 11-13). It was evidently written when long illness had plainly shown that death was nearing for the aging scholar. The poem's close is marked by a stoic fortitude:

Vir Magna, cujus plurimis exercitā
Morbi & laborum fortitudine praebiis,
Suum approbavit Imperatori fidem;
O perge quidquid est super certaminēs
Certāre, perfer hoc tibi incumbens onus;
Precāre, opera, fide, sanēe persistās,
Perennitāte praevidis laetissimās
Acerbitātis ome tempus est breve.

Of Du Moulin's Latin verse, it may be said that often his
fresher poems were designed as *exempla* to point a moral. Despite his great competence at writing in a difficult medium, he formulated no critical statement and had no real aesthetic theory. He had, nonetheless, clear-cut ideas about the scope and amount of poetry one should write: not too much in quantity, and edifying in character. He was distrustful of more warly passionate, more delightful poetry, for it might weaken the moral fiber. And yet he enjoyed poetry. As a Calvinistic divine, he could not escape the constrictions of godliness and utility. But in these moments when Du Moulin's imagination is kindled by the starry sky, or he feels a thrill of romantic pleasure at a wild mountain prospect, we wish that his very real poetic talent had not been so nearly smothered by a surplice made in Geneva.

If the range and artistry of Du Moulin's creative work are unfortunately curtailed by such purposes as edification or propaganda, the practical aspect of his life as a clergyman illuminates facets of life in the Restoration which are easily overlooked among the Popish alarms, slippery diplomacy, or intellectual swordplay of the period. The anger at property damage which so prominently marks, or mars, the verse of *Ecclesiæ Genitus* and page after page of *Clamor ad Coelum* draws little or no sympathy from the modern reader. And yet the wreckage and disfigurement of church buildings during the Wars, the mistreatment of the Anglican clergy, the siphoning of Church revenues and spoliation of its libraries and treasure were left to the English people at the Restoration.
as scarred monuments to the subversive fanaticism of the Puritans. The
digotry and destructive emotionalism of the Puritans at their worst
were nowhere better seen. Hardened by what it had suffered during the
Wars, the restored Anglican Church made iron-clad conformity the rule,
with unhappy effects upon the Church's relations with European Protes-
tantism. Aside from such domestic legislation as the Clarendon Code,
this attitude resulted in a stress upon Anglican reordination of foreign
clergyman seeking either incorporation into the Church or use of its
facilities, and in a demand that foreign congregations in England con-
form to the liturgy of the Established Church. This struck at the
community feeling between the Anglican and Reformed Churches which
Peter Du Moulin had repeatedly emphasized, and it grew from elements
perceptible in his father's correspondence with Bishop Andrews fifty
years before. Beside his duties of preaching, Peter Du Moulin in his
Canterbury years was concerned with the problems of the Cathedral's
restoration and of the foreign congregation worshipping there.

As canons of Christ Church, both Du Moulin and Marie Casaubon
figured in a quarrel in 1661 between factions of the Walloon Church, a
Huguenot refugee congregation which met in the crypt of Canterbury
Cathedral. The disagreement had begun in 1657 under the Protectorate
when one group tried, in opposition to the consistory, to force the
election of Paul Jannon as their minister. The group's failure and
withdrawal were temporarily healed by a reconciliation in 1661, urged
by the Mayor and Aldermen at the King's orders, and the congregation
united with Jannon as one of its ministers. But several months later,
there was a fresh breach when Jannon tried to bring in John Stocker, a Swiss (and later rector of St. Alphage, 1663-1709), to be one of the pastors. Jannon and his party, in order to have their way, offered to conform to the Anglican liturgy, and accordingly the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral procured a Royal order for the faction to be put in possession of the crypt. Among the signers of the notice (13 July 1661) to the King from the Dean and Chapter were Cassaubon and Du Moulin, including the greater number of substantial citizens headed by the Rev. Philippe le Keux, the remaining group of the Walloon Church could not promise to conform. Because of their exclusion, they were forced in October, 1661, to find another place to hold their services. But after the French Church of London interceded with Du Moulin and Cassaubon to use their influence as canons of Christ Church, the group's position was improved, for Le Keux was permitted to preach in the crypt on Sunday afternoons. On a fresh appeal of Jannon to the King, however, the Chapter now received the Royal command to exclude the non-conforming Huguenots. Still further maneuvering saw the reinstatement of the original congregation (that headed by Le Keux) and the confirmation of their privileges by an order of the King in Council dated 14 November 1662—which has been, in effect, the charter of this church ever since.

The Anglican Church had indeed been sadly abused by the Puritans. If Du Moulin's long, bitter denunciations of this in *Eclesiae Gemitus* and *Regii Sanguinis Gloriar* seem exaggerated, the facts are almost as grim. When the Anglican clergy returned to their great churches at the
Restoration, they found them—particularly Canterbury and Rochester Cathedrals—almost in ruins. Having little veneration for the beauty of holiness, the Puritan saints had used their opportunities. Especially at Canterbury, costly stained-glass windows had been broken, roofs impaired, priceless ornaments stripped of their precious metals, tombs of the dead abused and defaced, and the libraries of deans and chapters sold. Through lack of repairs, the houses of the clergy had become dilapidated, and seals and records were lost and hopelessly dispersed. One document drawn up by the Canterbury staff in 1662 says that the Cathedral looked "more like a ruined Monastery than a Church; so little had the fury of the late Reformers left remaining of it beside the bare walls and roofs..." After listing the appalling details of Puritan vandalism, it continues:

"generally, whatever was money-worth made prise of and imbesilled; and in fine, a goodly brave Cathedral became no better (in respect of those who gott and kept possession of it) than a Den of thieves and plunderers; and to make the better way for such invaders to abuse it, the Churches guardians, her faire and strong Gates, betimes turned off the hooks and burned."

The repairs, together with "other public and pious uses, since our restoration" necessitated the spending of upwards of £10,000 by Dean and Chapter by 1662. As the text of the document makes clear, the returned Anglican clergy were being severely criticised by disgruntled
Puritans, "the black and slanderous mouths of the professed enemies of us and that prosperity which, after many years of adversity and suffering, we now enjoy . . ." It was necessary to refute this "false as foule aspersion and calumny" that Church revenues were going "into our own private barnes and bagges, without due regard either of our Church, the Poore, the Publick, or Posterity . . ." As the Puritan criticism grew, Du Moulin defended in print one source of revenue the use of which the Puritans had denounced—church fines. His answer was *A Letter to a Person of Quality Concerning the Fines Received by the Church at Its Restoration. Wherein, By the Instance of One of the Richest Cathedrals a very fair guess may be made at the Receipts and Disbursements of All the Rest . . .* (London, 1668). He had to show that the capitation clergy deserved what they got, that individual receipts were not excessive, and that money had been spent on the Cathedral itself in the proper spirit. The clergy he praised as persons that had lost their Estates for his [Charles II's] glorious Father's service: Courageous Holy men, who by their unwearyed labours and the authority of their Piety, had kept the most part of the English subjects in their duty to God and the King, against the prevalency of the reigning Rebel-lion. Many of them [—like Du Moulin—] had fought with their Foes against the usurping Powers, to the great danger of their lives; which to save, they lived either in exile abroad, or shifting from place to place in the three Kingdoms.
If after their long tugging against the Tyranny, they were rewarded by their long desired Sovereign with some of the Churches goods, those goods were set in their proper place, and cannot but injuriously be said to be thrown upon such men undeservingly. 57

How much did the clergy receive? The church fines collected covered nearly twenty years of Puritan domination, and, Du Moulin stated, after deducting for reparation of the Cathedral and a present to the King, the sum came to about £1100 for each of the canons. 58 But as he pointed out, “this Proportion did hardly amount to the third part of my losse, by Sequestration and other violences of the War . . . . The condition of my Bretheren cannot be much different from mine.” 59 As a preacher of recognised ability, Du Moulin was chosen to deliver the funeral sermon for Dr. Thomas Turner, Dean of the Cathedral, on 17 October 1672. 60 Dr. Turner had taken an active part in restoring the battered Cathedral to its ancient grandeur, and in praising him Du Moulin recalled that

He was most zealously promoting and upholding the publick worship of God in the beauty of holiness, and decent splendor in the house of God, advancing the good of the place wheresoever he presided, what ever toil or censure or money it cost him. Of which he hath given magnificent memorials to our Church and Library. 61
At last, with the strife of the Civil Wars ended, Peter Du Moulin was finding a peace and contentment of mind not merely philosophical or religious, but one that included the good things of life also. He was well known in the intellectual milieu of the Restoration, intimately connected with the great or near-great, a poet, a preacher, and a disputant of recognised importance. As a chaplain-in-ordinary to the King and a canon of England's chief metropolitical church, he had become a man of note in ecclesiastical affairs. And as the work of restoring the great Cathedral advanced, he found himself in a personally congenial circle of prominent churchmen. Enjoying an income from Christ Church and revenues from Llanarmon and Adisham, he was well off.

Because of his prosperity, he was able financially to help his brother Dr. Lewis Du Moulin, who had fallen upon evil times since the Restoration. Ejected from the Camden professorship of history at Oxford, Lewis Du Moulin was leading the melancholy life of a threadbare Nonconformist pamphleteer, turning out works against divines of the Established Church, the Puritan rationalist Richard Baxter, and the Papacy. As he lost his sense of proportion, he became a pathetic, naive mystagogue whose occasionally bizarre works delved into eschatology or aired Family Linen in public. As Peter Du Moulin vindicated the Anglican Church of Puritan charges of luxury and repelled the Popish Threat, his brother Lewis accused the Establishment of fond glances toward Rome. His charges were contained in A Short and True Account of the Several Advances the Church of England Hath made towards
Rome: Or, a Model of the Grounds upon which the Papists . . . have
built their Hopes and Expectations that England would ere long return
to Popery . . . (London, 1680). In large part, the book was based upon
the Puritan mythos and merely reiterated stock attacks upon ritualism
and the suppression of Nonconformists; but it has more interest as it
outlines, in pamphlets bound up with it, the personalities and rela-
tionship between the Du Moulin brothers. Lewis Du Moulin left little
doubt where he stood as to religious beliefs:

As I believe that the Religion of Rome is a pure blindness,
and ignorance of understanding, and that of the Church of
England an one-eyed Reformation; but the Religion of the
Puritans, that of the clear-sighted, which neither wants
eyes, nor illumination; I had rather be one eyed in the
Communion of the Church of England, than be blind in that
of Rome; but otherwise I had rather have two good eyes in
the Communion either of the Puritans, or that of our Churches
in France, than have but one Eye in that of the Church of
England. Yet I believe, that the spirit of Persecution,
which stirs up the Bishops of England against those who are
Protestants with themselves, makes them incomparably more
criminal than it does the Papists against the Reformed,
whom they look upon as Hereticks and Apostates, and there-
fore upon that consideration to treat them as they do.63

Though Lewis Du Moulin angered his elder brother with such inflammatory
statements, they agreed upon one point: they objected strenuously to breaking semi-organic ties with foreign Reformed Churches, a point on which Peter Du Moulin had corresponded with Boyle. Lewis Du Moulin criticised assistance by High-Churchmen to Rome

... in not acknowledging any other Protestants in the world besides themselves; in discarding all the Reformed Churches beyond Sea, out of the Catalogue of the true Churches of Jesus Christ: in making void all manner of Ordination, but that which is Episcopal, and consequently that of Papists, and their adherents; in putting Calvin the first Author of their Reformation in England, Scotland, and Ireland among the chief of Rebels and Fanatics... 6th

But however firmly both might subscribe to this criticism, Peter Du Moulin had become almost estranged from Lewis Du Moulin because of the nonconformist's repeated attacks on the Establishment. The awkward situation is revealed in a pamphlet bound with A Short and True Account, entitled A True Report of a Discourse between Monsieur De L'Angle, Canon of Canterbury, and Minister of the French Church in the Savoy, and Lewis Du Moulin; The 10th of February, 1679/8 (London, 1679). A near kinsman of the Du Moulins, 65 Canon Samuel De L'Angle had visited Lewis Du Moulin to protest his attacks upon the Church and to urge his repentance. 66 Vexed by Lewis Du Moulin's charges, Dr. Peter Du Moulin had written to De L'Angle "I consider my poor Brother as a man raised by the evil Spirit, for the destruction of the Church; It would be a
double fault in me to assist him to do evil.\textsuperscript{67} Lewis Du Moulin was now partly dependent upon his brother for subsistence, but in his anger Peter Du Moulin may have reduced the financial aid. Through Canon De L'Angle, Lewis Du Moulin was informed of "the good intentions that my Elder Brother had to bestow upon me his liberalities," but that "the diminution of my Brother's bounty to me, proceeded from that Emity which I testified with so much heat and bitterness against the Church of England . . . ."\textsuperscript{68} Peter Du Moulin, Dr. Lewis Du Moulin felt, had acquired "violent prejudices . . . against me,"\textsuperscript{69} and was ashamed at the revelation that he had urged his brother to repent.\textsuperscript{70} But, adds Lewis Du Moulin, "that which grates upon him, and touches him to the quick, is not the sense that he has done ill in exhorting a person to repent of those crimes, but in not being able to verify them."\textsuperscript{71} Uncomplaining of his own lowly state, Lewis Du Moulin attributed "that bitterness of his toward me, not to his natural temper, which is meek and humble, and full of benignity, but to the great distance which he imagines to be between his Fortune and mine, and to that high place of preeminence where he now is."\textsuperscript{72} Paying a compliment to Peter Du Moulin's \textit{Treatise of Peace and Contentment of Mind}, Dr. Lewis Du Moulin hoped for a reconciliation and that his brother would see the "good Spirit" which really animated him, and therefore perhaps even join the Puritans by publishing "his meditations against his false Bretheren" the High-Church divines.\textsuperscript{73} Peter Du Moulin, it will be recalled, had written as "a moderate episcopal man" to Boyle of his intent to counter those who would unchurch Reformed Churches. With a pitiful hopefulness, Lewis
Du Moulin describes his Canterbury brother as one

who so happily treads in the steps of his Father, as to
what respects the purity of his Doctrine, the exactness of
his life, and who possesses, like him, a peace and tran-
quillity of soul so great, that he is the only person capa-
bile to write such a thing from his own experience . . . . 74

It is provocative to speculate whether, for so slight a cause,
Peter Du Moulin withdrew financial aid from his unfortunate brother.
In Lewis Du Moulin's attitude of brotherly love there is a note of
piercing anguish which makes one prefer to believe, whatever De L'Angle
said, that Peter Du Moulin did not act so coldly, and that he merely
threatened such action to bring around his Nonconforming brother. For
Lewis Du Moulin repeats his brother's remark to De L'Angle about evil
inspiration "not out of any ill will, to complain of my Brother, but
to advance and extol his kindnesses to me, which are so much the
greater, and more obliging, in that he Acts quite contrary to what he
threatens me with." 75 Whether the quarrel was patched up is uncertain,
but Lewis Du Moulin was on his way to the grave. Even the unhappy
man's death was made notorious, for a piece of repentance literature 76
tells how his last illness began toward the end of September, 1680,
and with relentless satisfaction gives full details of his recanta-
tion. 77 Wishing to die in charity with all men, Lewis Du Moulin re-
quested a visit by Dr. Gilbert Burnet, 78 and thereafter his sick-
chamber was a resort for Anglican divines who alternated prayers for
Du Moulin with pressure for him to "do something for the repairing the injuries he had done, in as publick a manner as they were committed." Upon the urging of the clergymen, the dying man with a good will signed a retraction, dated October 15 and October 17, of whatever personal reflections he had made in his polemics. Lewis Du Moulin knew humility and, entreating their kindness, endured the clergymen who hovered around his death-bed awaiting the retraction. When the pitiful document was made and copies signed, the clergy still were not content. After his death on October 20 at Westminster, the funeral was held at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, with the Dean of Peterborough, Dr. Patrick, officiating. Perhaps the best description of Lewis Du Moulin is the gracious one of his veteran opponent Richard Baxter: "a sincere honest-hearted man ... apt to take verbal controversies for real." There was not a great deal left for Dr. Peter Du Moulin to do. His brothers Lewis and Cyrus were dead, and a nephew also named Peter Du Moulin had, after a strange career which involved him in secret Anglo-Dutch diplomacy, died in 1676. His close friend Marie Casaubon was thirteen years in his grave. Du Moulin published several more works and despite his age continued his duties at Canterbury. In the course of a long life he had, like his father, known danger and enjoyed renown. Though he had not engaged in high international controversy with such celebrated names as those of Cardinal Bellarmino and the Cardinal Du Perron, he had seen a greater creative writer, John Milton, goaded to fury by his attack in *Regii Sanguinis Clemor*. If
willing to incur danger, by writing a book to aid his King while the Puritan cannon-balls pelted York, he could still stand by and see innocent Alexander More suffer revilement in his stead. He had mingled on friendly terms with the high nobility and intellectual leaders of the time, and was in favor at Court. While ably championing his church, he had rebuffed the advances of the Triple Tyrant and spoken the last word on the dark genius of Puritan enthusiasm. Esteemed as a preacher, he had also achieved distinction as a neo-Latin poet; and in his Treatise of Peace and Contentment of Mind, he wrote a work enjoyed long after his death and still pleasant to read. Like his father, he believed in Calvinistic theology and Protestant unity. While accepting old beliefs in witchcraft, he welcomed the utilitarian possibilities of the New Science. Without being at all a systematic philosopher or theologian, he was always spoken of by gifted men with respect. After his death on 10 October 1681, they could have carved upon his burial place in Canterbury Cathedral—echoing the virtue he prised most—"Here lies a Man of Prudence."
CHAPTER VI

HUMANISM AND THE DIPLOMATIC BALANCE

... considente quasi tota Europa, & judicium
ferante . . . .

When Milton, as if he were an enthusiastic preacher in a toga, addressed in the Defensio Secunda an audience extending from Sweden to Italy, he was aware, in its widest scope, of the humanistic culture with which we have been concerned in Holland, France, and England. Although the English revolution and the execution of Charles were of international interest, it was in France and Holland, where the intellectual picture was colored by migratory scholars and divines, that these events would have their most immediate impact. Holland was evolving uneasily from a republic into a monarchy, and in France there was a perpetual tension between the Huguenots and their Catholic rulers.

For years, Protestants and Catholics had debated the rights of subjects to resist their kings. After practising a Calvinistic theory of resistance in the interests of True Religion, the Huguenots turned officially to a doctrine of obedience in order to preserve their dwindling rights. To maintain and extend the Pope's suzerainty, the Jesuits had taught popular sovereignty and the people's right to try, even kill, heretical kings and tyrants. Such Huguenot spokesmen as Pierre Du Moulin had preached the Divine Right of Kings and urged obedience, to demonstrate the loyalty of Protestant subjects. While such Royalists
as Dr. Peter Du Moulin fought at every turn to keep intact the bond between the Anglican and Reformed Churches, the seditious Puritans courted the Calvinists of both France and Holland. Among the Dutch, sympathies about the English revolt were divided, but to the Catholic kings of France, the rebellion could only prove the essential treason of Protestantism. What would be its effect upon internal and foreign policy?

Now, if ever, the theory of Divine Right required buttressing. Condemned as a traitor and murderer by Parliament, the late King of England needed exoneration. Called upon for the task was Claude de Saligne, "the Prince of the Republic of Letters," a Huguenot by origin and resident in Leyden because of his freedom to publish there without Jesuit interference. It was upon Saligne and his book, and especially upon his friend and associate Alexander More, that Milton trained his heaviest artillery of argument and insult. As worship of Milton has passed into a riper criticism, posterity has given a fairer appraisal to Saligne, but has not yet made full restitution to More for the opprobrium he suffered from Milton or flippancies from the poet's followers. As we have seen, the seventeenth century was marked by the bitter taste of controversy, especially of irresponsible name-calling by clergymen. Sufficient allowance for this needs to be made in dealing with the Salignian Controversy. Indeed, sensationalism marked the quarrel from its beginning, because of the dramatic interest of the King's death and the immense reputation of Saligne. When the book of Saligne, Defensio Regis Pro Carolo I, appeared in 1649, purchases
of it resulted in many editions. As Cromwell's Latin Secretary, Milton was called upon to answer it with *Joannis Miltoni Angli Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio Contra Claudii Anonymi, alias Salmasii, Defensionem Regiam* (London, 1651). The vogue these books enjoyed was all the greater because of collateral works which, by enhancing sentimental excitement over Charles's murder, whetted the public appetite for learned debate about the issues involved. Bullied at a one-sided trial which set off favorably his regal disdain, and hectored even at his prayers, King Charles by his piously gallant composure on the scaffold completed the requirements for martyrdom. Reportedly slipped out of prison for quick publication, the *Nikon Basiliké* ascribed to his cast over his personality, in the book's many translations, an eternal spell of tragic glamour. There hovered over the whole proceeding the strange sense of a ceremony in which each acted his part to a tragic end; there was a sense of destiny; there was even tragic irony—Charles's immolation was his triumph. The formally dramatic quality of the event was commonly perceived. Though Marvell's *An Horatian Ode* is our best-known example of this in English, that tragic quality was underscored for its international audience by the Latin Tragicum Theatrum Actorum, *& Casum Tragicorum Londini Publice celebratorum, Quibus Hiberniae Proregi, Episcopo Cantuarensi, ac tandem Regi ipsi, Aliisque vite aedemptis, & ad Anglicam Metamorphosin via est aperta* (Amsterdam, 1649). Wrongly attributed to Dr. Peter Du Moulin, the Tragicum Theatrum was illustrated with fine engravings, and it gave a full account of the accusations or trials, farewell speeches, and
executions of Strafford, Laud, Charles I, the Duke of Hamilton, the Count of Holland, and others, as well as various documents pertaining to those events.\(^1\) Tersely depicting the events which swept on to a bloody climax upon the scaffold, the Mancins Motuum nuperorum in Anglia; Simul ac Juris Regii et Parlamentarii Brevis Enarratio (Lyons, 1649) went through many editions.\(^5\) George Hare, M.D., had written it in an abrupt Latin style which caught the agitation of the Civil Wars, gave a succinct account of negotiations, and thus built the reader's interest up to the King's death. Such books as this made the event familiar and vivid to the Continental public and, with the added luster of Salmassius's name, assured a wide public for the Defensio Regia.

Quite apart from what Salmassius's professional enemies might have said, the Defensio Regia did not fail the expectations of a philosophical age. Since the arguments over Divine Right had gone on for some years, there was not much left to say on this score. Salmassius did, however, present a wealth of evidence to support the theory, connected the English rebellion with the great European debates over Jesuit doctrines of deposition and tyrmicide, and drove home the danger of the English precedent for Continental monarchs. He wrote fluently in a Latin which, if it did not attain the fiery ardor of Milton, did reach a level of indignant protest and made an effective case for the Royalistes. What the work seems to lack is a philosophic tone, and its length is not offset by an equal energy of pace. It is, nonetheless, a competent discussion of the theory of Divine Right, theory, and justly criticizes Charles's trial. Salmassius was not obtuse. He had vast
learning and a keen mind, and detected an adversary's weak spots; but
he could not focus his argument quite sharply enough for a classic
statement of his viewpoint.

The unique criminality of the King's execution and resulting
public horror, its perversion of all law, custom, and justice are set
out at length in Chapter I. As Salmasius remarks, the "Præcipuum
hujus operis & defensionis Regiae caput ac fundamentum est, rege
judicari non posse. In hoc etiam veluti cardine tota quaestio vertitur,
ut liquidat jure an injuria Rex Magnae Britanniae a populi sui parte
seditiosa & rebelli capitis damnatus sit." Using the customary argu-
ments for the theory of Divine Right, and the usual medley of support-
ing texts from Scripture, Antiquity, and national law, Salmasius de-
velops the doctrines of popular obedience and royal accountability to
God alone. What is more relevant to the book's contemporary vitality,
however, is the way it related the King's trial to current political
fears, and the picture it gave Europe of the execution's dreadful
possibilities. This could affect foreign diplomacy toward the fledg-
ing revolutionary government. Concerning the Puritans, Salmasius de-
clared that

Cum tales sint isti Fanatici nebulones in religione, in
conversatio, in administratione republicae, quis non eos
patris publicos hostes dixerit? Hoc parum est, communes
generis humani hostes judicandi sunt. Putes eos tantum
regibus infestos esse quos per summum nefas necare ludum
habent? Nullus est in orbe Christiano magistratus, nulla in terris potestas, quantulumlibet ordinaria, quantulumlibet a Deo ordinata, ut omnes quae sunt, inde esse constat, quam non pari odio prosequantur & persequi parati sint, quam non aeque exterminares omni ope cupidant, quia ubique apud eos eadem imperandi effrenata libido, eadem parenti imperita contumacia.9

There was also a call to the kings of Europe, in their own self-interest, to restore Charles II to his ancestral throne and to punish the Regicides who had killed his father. The language of this passage, together with a similar one from theikon Basiliké of Charles, foreshadows Du Moulin's Regii Sanguinis Giamor ad Coelum and almost certainly provides one of his main themes:

Ad haec, magni Magnae Britanniae Regis sanguis immani socleare parcellum effusus ad ulationem sui vocat omnes Christiani orbis Monarchas ac Principes. Natus Manibus dignius illi parentare non poterunt, quam si in integrum restituunt legitimum besti ac gloriosi martyris haeremet & successores, solioque paterno sua reddant, inferriis datis, ac mactatis pro victimis ad sepulcrum defuncti sanctissimi regis belluis illis afferatissimis, quae in tanti regis necem conjurarent, tam crudale ausae nefas, ausque potitae.10

Like Du Moulin and other English writers, Salmarius, though French,
pointedly linked the Jesuits to left-wing Independents because of similar political doctrines of deposition and tyrannicide, and thought the Catholics preferable. "Hic regum sanctitati duee hodie sanctitates in orbe Christiano infestae maximeque infensae reparantur," he gibed:

"Papalis & Independentalis. Papalis hoc saltem malior quod eos retinet & observat quos sibi addictos esse cognoverit. Independentalis sine discrimine omnes bonos malosque tollit, & mullos suos esse vult."\textsuperscript{11}

As Du Moulin does later, Salmasius rather grudgingly exonerates the English Presbyterians of direct blame for Charles's death, though he sardonically remarks, "In qua malorum serie indissolubili nova in illum facies exorta est, à Presbyterianis ad Independentes, ut à Pilato ad Caipham traducta ejus captivitate."\textsuperscript{12}

In his attempt to discredit the Puritan government, Salmasius developed two points which are especially germane to Du Moulin's later treatment of the subject. These were the military state, backed by brute force, which the Puritans imposed on England, and the questionable nature of the King's trial as reflected in the court's dubious personnel, procedure, and subservience to military power. It is not to our purpose to review or assess Puritan attempts to legitimise their government by stating it in long-recognised political forms.\textsuperscript{13} To Puritan claims of restoring liberty and realising popular government, Salmasius had some caustic answers. Again and again he drove home the fact of their military tyranny. It was a new monster, a "stratocracy," he charged:
Popularis vero status genus penitus abolverunt quadraginta tyrannorum Consilium eligendo cum summa potestate ad respublicam administrandas, novus autem & inauditus saeculis prioribus status instituendo qui Militarii debet appellari. Hanc enim 

It was in fact, he asserted, a military commonwealth "in qua ne in specie quidem imaginaria potestas populo reliquitur, sed tota ducibus exercitus asservitur, qui & judices sunt & reges & quicquid est in regnando summus, vel usque ad tyrannidis specimen & effectum." When attacking the King's trial, Salmassius is concerned with defining political form and with the influence of military power upon the trial's outcome, which first "assur'd the forced Pow'r." Can Charles be defended, he asks, by the law common to Kings, or is there some special law by which he is set apart, having only a name in common with other Kings? The parricides, Salmassius points out, maintain that in form England is a mixed state and that power belongs to Parliament, not to the King. He concedes that the name of King has been given to those not really Kings, and that, on the other hand, many modern rulers have a kingly power but a different name. But what has been the power of the English King, he asks, as it fits historical evidence of a power
so defined? The King's majesty is indivisible and he is above Parliament, having the power to summon it whereas it has no such power over him.  

England is an unmixed monarchy, he continues, since the King has a free hand in religious and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the administration of civil justice, and the management of war and peace.

The Kings of England are kings—contrary to the Puritan contentions in Charles's trial—by inheritance, by nature, by the law of God, and the law of the land. The King's conviction is even more a crime in Salmasius's eyes because of those who did it; a miserable, mutilated Parliament which was only the tool of the Army compelling it by force, an Army "Qui Senatus quasi captivo imperat, & cum tyrannias dominationem in Anglia exercet, popule tamen persuadere onatur libertatem se illi multo sanguine suo comparasse."  

From another standpoint, Salmasius challenges the trial as a murderous force; the court was illegal and its personnel was incompetent. A court without authority was headed by ignorant judges.

Upon Charles's demand, they could show no real authority, and the King was denied the usual right in trials for high treason to exclude judges prejudiced against him. The court, moreover, was not representative of the people (despite the judges' claim), for though it asserted it had received jurisdiction from the people, they had passed no law empowering it. Indeed, the King was not judged by his peers, Salmasius remarked, but by his feudal vassals. Although Charles was denounced as a "tyrant," he points out, the court did not know the meaning of the term. As the embodied principle of Majesty, the King
cannot be tried for treason; and regardless of its ridiculous claims
of an elective kingship, the Parliament in this trial did not repre-
sent the people—only the Army, a very small fraction of the people. The principle that "The King can do no wrong" shows he is absolute,
just like other monarchs. Comparison of the Puritan rebellion to
the valiant Dutch rising against the Spaniard is mistaken and unjust.
The Dutch, in fact, have no King, but a Count.

Lastly, Salmasius explains why he has undertaken the defense:
not because asked, but because of the merit of the case, for the King
of England has a common cause with all other Kings. The reader must
not suppose, Salmasius emphasizes, that he would have tyrants—say
God's justice catch up with the parricides.

The Defensio Regia was widely read in France and Holland, but
the precise nature of the public response to it is difficult to deter-
mine from correspondence of the period, because of the extent to which
professional animosities or political views colored statements of the
writers. If, because of a community of religion and trade, the Dutch
were at first somewhat indifferent to the rivalry of English religions,
the execution of Charles I changed the situation. At the request of
the Prince of Wales, the States General vainly sent an embassy to fore-
stall the King's execution: the Princess Mary Stuart had been married
to the Stadtholder, William II, with Dr. Peter Du Moulin's uncle by
marriage, André Rivet, negotiating the match. In the wave of Royalist
sympathy which followed the execution, the Parliamentary ambassador,
Strickland, was afraid to appear in public at The Hague. Was war
indicated? The stadtholder headed a war party and the States General refused to receive Strickland, but the ambassador was received by the province of Holland, which opposed a war with England. Moreover, Holland sent its own ambassador to England. The sudden death on 6 November 1650 of William II ended the internal crisis by removing the head of the Orange party. But there was a growing monarchical feeling among the Dutch, and from about 1641 onwards there had been literary attacks upon the English Puritans, especially those by the Dutch poet and Catholic convert Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679). The Latinist and poet Nicholas Heinsius strongly sympathised with the English Royalists. Not only did he write a twenty-line poem in Latin elegiacs entitled Carolus Prinus Britanniarum Rex Neferi à suis trucidatus, but, in view of the strained diplomatic relations with England, his printer dropped from Christina Augusta, a long panegyric on the Queen of Sweden, thirteen lines appearing in an earlier edition of his Latin poems in attack upon the royal execution. Many Dutch scholars reacted to Salmassius’s Defensio Regia largely according to their personal feelings toward the author.

In France, however, the correspondence of Salmassius’s friends reveals something of the reaction among the learned. With his usual enthusiasm for Salmassius, the physician Gui Patin reports from Paris on 28 May 1659 that Salmassius, upon the request of the Prince of Orange, has undertaken the Defensio Regia, wishes him success, and hopes the hated English have "autant de mal qu’ils en ont fait à leur roi." If such uncritical admiration as that of Patin blinded some to defects
in Salmassius's book, the level-headed Paris lawyer Claude Sarrau offered some valid criticisms of the Defensio Regis. 39 A mine of information about publication and editions of the Defensio, 40 the letters from Sarrau to Salmassius touch upon some of the points we have already singled out for comment. On 16 April 1649, Sarrau warns Salmassius not to extol Royal Majesty so that kings seem to freely give their love toward their subjects for nothing; for they ought to profit the people for whose sake they were created. 41 Because of the flattery of courtiers, Sarrau points out, Kings know quite well enough the theoretical extent of their power, that they are absolute and unaccountable to any: "Sed istius potestatibus, verum, legitimam, & moderatam usum pauci eos docent..." 42 To Salmassius's assertion that Kings are liable to God alone, Sarrau rejoins that the English maintain otherwise:

... quin imo populos Regibus antiquiores eos constituisse ad se tutandos juxta latriam Legum & consuetudinum prescriptas formulas affirmant. Non autem ut ad libidinem clima aut super ex communi Regni consilio stabilita vel refixant. Praeterea teneri Reges Sacramenti suas inaugurationis religionis, quod si violaverint, se quoque posse illos contemnere & privatam loco. Nec Anglicum facinus quanquam horrendum, ita est novum, ut exemplo careat. 43

Salmassius' statement in the Defensio Regis that he thought bishops were necessary in the discipline of the Anglican Church, 44 Sarrau remarks, surprised him and many others, in view of an attack Salmassius made on
bishops in his De Episcopis & Presbyteris (1641), urging that they be done away with at the first opportunity. 45 Although Sarau thinks Episcopacy might fit better than Presbyterianism in a monarchy, he writes on 11 April 1650 that Salmassius must be branded inconsistent in first calling for the deposing of bishops and then condemning those who—the Puritans—removed them. 46 Salmassius has also been rather hard on the English Presbyterians. 47 All in all, he reports, the Defensio Regis is getting a mixed reception, and praise for it is sometimes based on self-interest at Court. The obsequious approve its extreme statement of Divine Right, evidently, but "alii vero libertatem magis amant; quam existimant se in moderate regio imperio facilius posse tueri." 48

It was against this background of mixed reactions to the Defensio Regis and tense Anglo-Dutch relations that Milton's reply appeared. The moment was dramatic. John Milton undertook—"considere quasi tota Europa, & judicium ferente," to silence the great Salmassius. 49 He wrote as an official spokesman, an Englishman, and a member of the community of Protestant humanism. Finishing the bulky Defensio Regis, Salmassius must, with Horace, have said to himself,

Exagi monumentum aere perennis
Regalique situ pyramidum altius,
Quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens
Possit diruere aut innumeralis
Amorum series et fuga tempora . . . .
And Milton undoubtedly consol'd himself with the same thought when he laid aside the *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* (1651) to face the world "Content though blind" from his "noble task, Of which all Europe talks from side to side." But if posterity has given a victory to Milton in this great humanistic contest, it is, when looked at fairly, a qualified victory. For despite his contemporary acclain, Salmasius wrote under circumstances which hastened the erosion of time. He was defending a theory which was in fact artificial and repressive, holding no seed of future growth in itself and tending to stifle any literature which was not synoophantic. In defending King Charles, he was, because of the essential artificiality of the theory of Divine Right, often forced to argue from antique or Biblical evidence which had little to do with the pulse of contemporary life. Divine Right ignored the vitality, force, and generative power of the thought and emotions of the common man, sure to explode if bottled up too tightly. As a repressive theory, it contained no seed of growth. Salmasius was indeed treating an issue whose breadth, except for a more galvanic nature than his, meant diffusion and vulnerability. His mind was clear, capacious, and well stocked, but his talent was investigative and not one of creative analysis. He had no deeply personal interest, no great religious and political enthusiasm to set him ablaze. Milton, however, possessed incidental advantages which limit his victory in such a contest. He was on the attack, and both Salmasius and his book presented relatively narrow targets for a greater concentration of his fire. As a creative genius, he had an urge, an intensity, a driving imaginative power—
restless qualities, all of them, which would perhaps have disturbed Salmassius's work as a great philologist and textual editor. Directed by his imperious spirit, these qualities gave Milton's utterances a memorable, oracular tone. He was maintaining a theory which pointed to the future, and he was destined for a poetic supremacy which would shed luster on his works about transitory historical events. Posterity, patriotism, sometimes chauvinism aided him. Salmassius made an adequate and complete, perhaps even an excellent case, but time and tide were with Milton. 1

In preference to following his intricate evidence and arguments for Divine Right, we have examined the broad outlines of the theory, but more especially the approach by which Salmassius related the King's trial and execution to old political quarrels of the Continent. We have also viewed the picture of godly rascality and ruthless force he drew of the Puritans for those European nations, France and Holland, most likely to be cultivated by the rebel government. Peter Du Moulin resumes this aspect of the Salmassian Controversy and develops it further in Regii Sanguinis Clamor (1652) which, intended as a stopgap until Salmassius should reply to Milton, ironically proved a more bitingly effective work than the Defensor Regia itself. Since Du Moulin, in borrowing liberally from Salmassius, follows the same line in his own polemics, it is helpful to see how Milton treats these questions. Some of Salmassius's arguments would seem difficult, perhaps impossible, to refute. Milton therefore sets his rebuttal of theory in a framework of rhetoric intended to ridicule Salmassius and his book, darken the
character of King Charles, eulogize Parliament as the spokesman of the English people, and impart a glowing idealism to the Puritan doctrine of popular sovereignty. Milton turns the production of the _Defensio Regis_ into a beggar's opera, with Salmassius, the "Prince of Letters," cast as an added, fumbling gramarian, the hireling of a threadbare King.\(^{52}\) A foreigner, meddling in English affairs,\(^ {53}\) he has produced a shapeless, disordered book which, through its sheer boredom, will discourage refutation.\(^ {54}\) Madame Sauaise, who had gained international fame as a shrew, also appears: if her Gallic husband would be the cock (Lat. Gallus) of the barnyard, he only succeeds in being hempeaked.\(^ {55}\) For writing this drivel, Milton crows, the miserable turncoat thankfully accepted a hundred Jacobuses scraped together by starving King Charles II, and sent by a royal chaplain.\(^ {56}\)

Having provided this cast of characters, Milton turns to the theory of Divine Right which Salmassius champions. To this, he flatly opposes his counter-theory of popular sovereignty and delegated authority:

To sum up the whole truth, Parliament is the supreme council of the nation, constituted and appointed by an absolutely free people, and armed with ample power and authority, for this end and purpose: vis., to consult together upon the most weighty affairs; the king was created to take care there should be executed, obedient to their vote and resolution, all the acts and decrees of those Orders, Estates, or Houses.\(^ {57}\)
The people were anterior to the King (here he recalls Sarrau); in delegating power to the King for public safety and liberty, the people have made no absolute or unconditional grant of power. If the King fails his duty, he voids the grant. Kings do not inherit their people like brute animals, goods, or chattels, and since the safety of the people, not of a tyrant, is the supreme law, the people may get rid of a bad King and resume their original power. The contention that the King cannot commit treason against his vassals and subjects is ridiculous—feudal law itself arms the vassal against a bad lord, even to death. A whole nation has the same right against a tyrant.

One of Salmassius's most telling charges was that the High Court of Parliament had been a tool of the Army in the King's trial, and a mutilated Parliament at that. There was not much Milton could say to this; the facts were painfully true. The absence of the temporal and spiritual lords he tries to cover by contending that the essence of Parliament was in the House of Commons; and that Commons was therefore able to abolish the upper house. Denying that it failed to represent the people, he excuses its imperfect character by the desertion of Royalist sympathizers to the King's forces. Moreover, Parliament has the right to delegate its power to the trial court. As for the military domination of the court, the King was an enemy and this was in effect a court-martial. Thus, so far as he can, Milton whitewashes the Regicides. For effective contrast, he uses a tar-brush on the defendant, Charles I. If some Englishmen are comparing Charles to Christ, Milton likens him to the parricide Nero and accuses Charles of
poisoning his father James I, in complicity with the Duke of Buckingham. But what about the metaphor of the King as father of his country? In reply, Milton draws a careful distinction between paternal and regal power, especially in that the King did not create the people, but the people the King.

Another familiar issue appeared in the Pro Populo Anglicano, the debate about Episcopacy extending back to Pierre Du Moulin and Bishop Andrews. Salmasius, we will remember, had earlier written against Episcopacy, but had modified his views in the Defensio Regia. To further his portrayal of Salmasius as a turncoat, Milton denounced him as a toady who had exchanged the Geneva gown for the bishop's rochet.

But what of the broad diplomatic issues affecting war or peace? Salmasius had dwelt repeatedly on the sinister threat posed for all thrones by the revolutionary government. He had linked the Puritan political doctrines unmistakably to those of the Jesuits and the Papacy, and their dangerous potential for secular governments. Salmasius was right, and there was not much Milton could say. He indeed acknowledges the charges, but never confronts them squarely, particularly the link to the Jesuits. Milton could hardly afford to say much of this. As for the accusations of Puritan danger, Milton evades them, and indirectly seeks to minimize their effect by portraying Salmasius, their source, as a squeaking kindergarten rhetorician sounding a call to war.

What to do with Salmasius's treatment of the two wings of
Puritanism, the Presbyterians and the Independents, was a problem with which Milton did not successfully cope. Each presented its own difficulty. Compared to the Kirk of Scotland, the English Presbyterians had only a "theoretical and nebulous" understanding of a Presbyterian structure and its feasibility in England. If not by actual polity, at least by aspirations and general beliefs they should have belonged to the community of Reformed Churches in France and Holland, whose gospel splendor they so admired, and endorsement they sought. The English Presbyterians were besmirched by their lack of official status and their activities in the Civil Wars. They had at first moved rebellion against their King, and then, out of a greed for power and lust to persecute, joined him to oppose the Independents, too late. But the French Reformed, for self-preservation in Catholic France, had veered to a theory of obedience and Divine Right, while the Dutch Reformed had an appreciable sentiment, by political faction, for monarchy. From the Reformed standpoint, Salmassius treated the English Presbyterians correctly, condemning their earlier leadership in the revolt but exculpating them of Charles's death. Their record, however, was anomalous, and Milton's treatment of it equivocal. He merely repeats the spanking given them in the Defensio Regis, in an attempt to drive them back, through fear of vengeance in case the Stuarts returned, to a common cause with the Independents. But when Salmassius had linked the political doctrines of the Independents to the Jesuits, he had forged a chain which Milton could not break. If two fanatics, reportedly inspired by Jesuit theories, had assassinated two French kings, the
English Independents had officially capp'd a civil war by asserting popular sovereignty with a public sacrifice to prove the point. Where Salmasius, almost anticipating Du Moulin, clearly spelled out the Independent threat to Kings, Milton hopefully skipped over the embarrassing fact:

Why should I not pass by the telltale rascalities upon which you spend a great part of the rest of your chapter, and those prodigious tenets that you ascribe to the Independents, to render them odious? For they concern not at all this disputed question about kings, and are for the most part such as deserve anybody's laughter or contempt rather than refutation. 72

Because the controversy soon turned in another direction and Salmasius's reply to Milton was not published until seven years after his death in 1653, it may be impossible to judge, by the impact of the documents themselves, who really won. National pride in Milton's poetic genius and in later constitutional evolution color critical opinion in England and, to some extent, in America. In France, the government of Cardinal Mazarin, largely because of Cromwell's military power, reached a sort of accommodation with the Puritan governments, and the Huguenots could scarcely call their loyalty into question as Louis XIV gradually whittled away Protestant liberties. On this score, Salmasius was on the winning side, for the royal prerogative would soon find a consummate spokesman in Bossuet. But if in Holland the evidence is not final
about Salmasius, it seems clearer as to Milton. His book must have
caused some stir, if only because of the anticipation of a reply to
Salmasius. Indeed, Scherphier has found that "The Dutch public appears
to have relished the scandal in the book, but not the principles . . . .
by the book Milton had become notorious, not famous. The **Defensio**
was an impediment rather than a help for Milton's reputation in the Re-
public of the United Provinces." After reviewing the factors which
made **Pro Populo Anglicano** unacceptable to either the republican or the
Orange party, he concludes that

. . . however much similarity there might be between the
original principles of the Dutch Republic and those of the
English Commonwealth, the later history of the Republic was
such that no sympathetic response could be wakened there to
the defense of the proceedings against a king. The publica-
tion of the **Defensio** caused some consternation in Holland, but
it was only of a sensational nature. No lasting interest
was roused. On the contrary, the difference between the two
republics, the one democratic and, later on, dictatorial,
the other in germ monarchical, was emphasised by it.73

Milton's **Pro Populo Anglicano** appeared while Salmasius was in Sweden.
The scholar had been invited by the impetuous Swedish Amazon, Queen
Christina, and in July, 1650, he obtained a leave of absence from the
curators of the University of Leyden to go to Stockholm.73 His tri-
umphal reception there is an oft-repeated legend.74 Milton chose to
believe that the impact of Pro Populo at the Swedish court was so great that Salmatius fell out of favor, and had to retire, crestfallen, to France in the latter part of 1651. \(^75\) Christina lived a life of sensation, but if she was delighted with Milton's lampoon enough to grow cool toward the scholar, the lapse of Salmatius from royal favor was temporary. \(^76\) There were reports that he was at work on an answer to Milton, and when he left Stockholm, despite Christina's pleas to stay, he may have carried the book's beginning with him back to Holland. \(^77\) Depending on contemporary political views, Milton's fame, or notoriety, continued to grow. Wilhelms Worsius, son of the celebrated Olaus Worsius and "a strong anti-Miltonian," visited England in 1652; and when he was shown at the Exchange an inscription, allegedly by Milton, over the empty site of a statue of Charles I, the young Swede penned the following epigram:

Monstrum insanum ingens Milton cui lumen adsimptus
Post haec non Regi eummatl pluram dabit. \(^78\)

Milton was indeed gaining a kind of reputation. The year 1651 saw two violent literary onslaughts on the blind poet, one an answer on behalf of Salmatius to the Pro Populo Anglicano, and the other a rejoinder to Eikonoklastes, which later had an interesting connection with Salmatius's posthumous reply. Upholding Salmatius against Milton was the anonymous Pro Regis et Populi Anglicani Apologia, contra Johannes Polypragmatici (alias Milton Angli) Defensionem Destructivam Regis et Populi Anglicani (Antwerp, 1651). Written by Joseph Jane.
the reply to Eikonoklastes was entitled Eikon Aklastos The Image
Unbroken. A Perspective of the Impudence, Falseness, Vanity, and
Prophanes. Published in a Dblentitled Eikonoklastes against Eikon
Basilike Or the Fourtraiture of his Sacred Majestie in his solitudes
and Sufferings (n.p., 1651). A point-by-point refutation of Eikon-
oklastes, the Eikon Aklastos says of Milton that if "he had written his
booke in a Ferreigne, or learned language, his unfaithfulness, and
impudence would be as open, and odious as his vanity is ridiculous."80
To the Apologia for Salmasius against Milton, John Philips, the poet's
nephew, replied the following year with Joannis Philippi Angli Responsio
Ad Apologiam Anonymi cujusdam tenebrionis pro Rege & Populo Anglicano
infantissimam (London, 1652). 81

These works, viewed as polemics, were mediocre compared to
another book 1652 brought. With the appearance of Peter Du Moulin's
Regii Sanguinis Osamor ad Coelum adversus Paricideas Anglicanos (The
Hague, 1652), the Salmasian Controversy took a different turn. A new
approach to the quarrel was needed, particularly in the Royalist camp,
for Salmasius and Milton had exhausted the usual technique of clubbing
quotations in their duel of political quarterstaff. Du Moulin there-
fore avoided a tedious wrestling with political abstractions and textual
medleys in order to concentrate directly upon influencing the currents
of international issues and treating the personalities involved in them.
He did so with a sustained forward thrust of organisation and biting
invective which neither Salmasius, nor even Milton as yet, had con-
sistently shown. Though in works other than the Defensio Regia
Salmassius had been noted for a certain vehemence, the net effect of his invective in that book, because of his clutter of authorities, had been rather occasional. While Milton in Pro Populo Anglicano tracked Salmassius through the mine of quotations, he could not concentrate his fire as in the Defensio Secunda. Du Moulin was the first to aim for direct impact. If his work lacks the sublime, prophetic egotism of the Defensio Secunda, on its own merits the Regii Sanguinis clamor is worthy to stand by Milton's answer. With an unerring grasp reminiscent of his father, he seizes upon the diplomatic cruxes of the controversy, and develops them with point and clarity. It is a dangerous book.

Making the most of the international shock felt at Charles's trial and execution, Regii Sanguinis clamor sharply focuses its political implications for European kings, and, in the light of the Counter-Reformation, the jeopardy in which the event could place the Reformed Churches. In terms of the King's odorous trial and of Puritan greed and vandalism, it tore away the veil of winsome ideals which Milton had draped over the unlovely military rule of the Independents. On the accepted principle of destroying opposition by ruining the character of its spokesman, Milton had been the first to deal in personalities. By his tasteless ridicule and defamation of Salmassius, he had invited repayment in kind. When, however, the retort came in Regii Sanguinis clamor, he was totally unprepared for the electric energy of the attack, and was long affected by its shock.

Since one of our purposes has been to provide a usable translation of Du Moulin's book for further study, we may allow it to speak
for itself in specific passages. Because, however, we have tried to
develop the extensive background which makes it a significant part of
its times, some insight into its direction and method of organization
may be welcome. The preliminary matter—a dedication to Charles II
and an epistle to the Christian Reader—is interesting chiefly as it
plays off Salmasius against Milton and bears on the problem of the
book's authorship. The dedication extols Salmasius, anticipates his
reply to Milton, and likens the blind poet to a monstrous Cyclops.
The Christian Reader is informed that the anonymous author is person-
ally familiar with the rebellion, execution, and their significance,
and is told one source of the book. Chapters One and Two begin the
exploration of a line of attack opened up by Salmasius. The magnitude
of the crime and its impact abroad are constantly dwelt on, and the
major personalities contrasted. Salmasius and King Charles are favor-
ably placed in the spotlight, while Milton and Cromwell move in sinister
shadows. In Chapter One, the learning, eloquence, and reasoning of the
"Prince of Letters," Salmasius, are given unstinted praise, especially
as shown in the Defensio Regis. Against such magnitude is contrasted
the indescribable audacity of that sniveling rogue, John Milton. This re-
verses the picture which emerges from Pro Populo Anglicano. Du Moulin
justifies the angry invective of Salmasius as falling short of the
crime's enormity, and gives examples of Puritan cruelty after the
Battles of Naseby, Preston, and Dunbar. The principle of dramatic con-
trast is intensified in Chapter Two. An account of the negotiations
between the King and the Puritans, during which Parliament debates
mainly as Cromwell and the Army apply force ever more ruthlessly, builds to a climax in the King's trial and execution. Milton's charge that the King was a parricide is modest compared to Du Moulin's treatment of the Regicide court. At his hands, the Royal Martyr—always equally intent on preserving law, liberty, and religion—moves with stately dignity through his successive misfortunes, and fearlessly acts out his part before a malignant and malodorous tribunal. Fanatic whoremasters, bankrupts, and brewers judge the Lord's anointed. Making a comparison of Charles to Christ, Du Moulin movingly portrays the King’s last hours and death, and Bishop Juxon's mistreatment after the execution. The *Basiliké* is copiously praised. Though not accorded a direct portrait, Cromwell moves steadily in the background as an hypocritical contriver who plots the King’s doom.83

Chapter Three, "The Parricides' Crimes against the People," is an attack on the doctrine of popular sovereignty put forward to justify the rebellion, trial, and execution of the King, and treatment of the Church by the Puritans. Did the people, Du Moulin asks, have any authority against the King? Great Salmacius has proved they did not. But was the King punished and the Kingship abolished by the people’s authority and will? The people were not authors of the Puritans' deeds, since they were done against popular will. Much of the chapter is cast as an extended denunciation by the "People" of their "delegates," who had assumed a power the people never arrogated to themselves, and, with no commission from the people, had deprived Religion and killed the King, thus removing the foundation whereon the laws stood. As the
"People" express it, England had been happy in the old way, a nice balance of liberty and obedience. But government by law has now been replaced with government by plunder, and the "guardians of Liberty" have put England in chains. A grim picture is given of a tyranny of military rule supported by hired spies. 84

Chapters Four and Five are a blistering indictment of religious hypocrisy demonstrated by the Puritans in their treatment of the Church and in attributing their deeds of blood to the Lord. The Puritans and especially the Independents, Du Moulin states in Chapter Four, have always pleaded religious motives and inspiration for their actions. How then did they treat the Church? The Church, he contends, had been wrecked by greed, fanatic enthusiasm, and abysmal ignorance. Reflecting Hooker's concept of a Church coextensive with the nation, Du Moulin holds that in mistreating the people, the Puritans were mangleing the Church. Suffering alike have been "the King of Israel" and "the People of God." The Puritans have destroyed the ministry by replacing learned, pious men with ignorant, destructive fanatics. This has been worsened by Puritan avarice and greed in looting the Church lands and revenues. 85 Moreover, he asserts in Chapter Five, the hypocritical Puritans have injured the Lord by allegedly pursuing their campaign of wanton mutilation to the glory of God. By no means should the military success of the Puritan government be taken as an argument of God's blessing upon their evil deeds.

We have seen already how Du Moulin resumes and develops such themes from Salmasius as the international effect of the heinous
execution of Charles, the ruthless military tyranny—a "stratocracy"—imposed on England, the murderous illegality of the King's trial, and the dangerous fanaticism of the Independents. Linking the Independents to Jesuit theories of popular sovereignty and tyrannicide, he describes them as the public enemies of mankind. This last point Du Moulin uses as the common topic of Chapters Six and Seven of Regii Sanguinis Clamor, chapters in which he pleads for European action against the Puritan government, even to the extent of armed intervention. The appeal is addressed particularly to the French and Dutch, with whom the Commonwealth badly needed good diplomatic relations. Reviewing the dangerous precedent for all Kings set by the English affair, Du Moulin in Chapter Six urges French military action and, perfectly aware of the political divisions in the Netherlands, tries to neutralize any mistaken sympathy shown the Puritans because of a false equation of the Dutch struggle for freedom with the English rebellion. His appeal to the French, Du Moulin grounds on a skillful combination of sentiment and fear. To appreciate its adroitness, we must remember that France had been kept in turmoil for years both by the occasions when the restive Huguenots had been forced to resort to arms to keep their dwindling liberties, and by the protracted debates between Huguenot champions of passive obedience and Divine Right (such as Pierre Du Moulin) and advocates of Jesuit doctrines of deposition and tyrannicide (such as Bellarmine and Du Perron). Salmasius rightly linked Independent and Papal theories; but in seeking French interference Du Moulin had to be more careful, for the Jesuits had the ear of the French King. Therefore, when he
addresses Louis XIV and the French nobility, Du Moulin appeals to family sympathy and pride wounded by the shabby Puritan treatment of the English Queen, Henriette Marie, the aunt of King Louis. As Louis XIV was centralizing arts, letters, etiquette, and absolute political power in the classical elegance of Versailles, Du Moulin held up the ranting bogeyman of the popular state arising across the Channel. An attack is timely, he urges, while the revolutionary government is still unsettled.

The Dutch presented a problem requiring a different approach. With their political life strongly divided between republican and Orange factions, it might have been too much to hope for armed intervention to avenge the Stadholder's father-in-law. Danger could easily lie the other way. For years, the Puritans had sought whatever aid they could get from the Dutch Calvinists. Politically, the natural line for them to take was to attempt a parallel between Dutch resistance to the Spaniard and Puritan struggles against the English Crown. Du Moulin represents this as an insulting comparison between English madness and Dutch valor. Besides affronting the Dutch, he points out (as Salmasius had done before him), 86 that such a resemblance ignored the political fact that the Hapsburgs had not been Kings of Holland, but Counts merely, and hence not absolute rulers above sharing their power. Du Moulin cautions that the Estates' reception of Parliamentary ambassadors, necessitated by commerce, should not be strained into an interpretation of any Dutch approval of the English rebellion. On the contrary, the real Dutch sentiment is shown in the hostile reception
A subject on which Du Moulin wrote several times is discussed in Chapter Seven, "The Parricides' Injury to the Reformed Churches." To gain credit, moral support, and possibly political help, the English Puritans had tried to form bonds between themselves and the Reformed Churches of Europe at the expense of the Establishment. Du Moulin had already attacked this attempt in his Letter of a French Protestant and his Apologie de la Religion Reformée, et de la Monarchie de l'Eglise d'Angleterre. . . . In Regii Sanguinis Clamor, he warned the Reformed bodies away from the English rebels by pointing out the opportunity they give for Catholic propaganda that Protestantism is essentially revolutionary and subversive. This was also the theme of his later Vindication. Such a conviction, he asserted, might cause Princes to take measures against the Protestant churches under them.

The remaining prose in Regii Sanguinis Clamor need not concern us long. Chapter Eight is a summary of the reasons why everybody should turn upon the English parricides and their crime, and the Royal Blood—as theikon Basilike and Salmasius said it would—is heard at some length calling down vengeance from Heaven in ringing Latin. There is also an epistle from Samuel Bochart to Dr. Norley showing the indignant reaction in France, along with an account of several other prominent Huguenot protests.

It is the remaining verse which is most interesting. Here, Du Moulin again pairs off the great antagonists Salmasius and Milton. Salmasius is celebrated with a Thanksgiving Ode for the Defensio Regia.
while in Latin iambics is written the most devastating onslaught ever made upon John Milton before the world. Controversy has taken on better manners since then, and it is doubtless a cheap and cruel satisfaction to enjoy the wrecking of another's good name. As perhaps the best poem about the drama of the King's execution, Marvell's An Horatian Ode rises, in its treatment of Charles and Cromwell, to a poised urbanity which escapes the inroads of time. Furthermore, without becoming flat, the Ode avoids needless exaggeration, and thus the reproach of strained, manufactured emotion. It shows a fine literary taste. Not so with most such verse of the period. In this light, Du Moulin's Alcaic strophes on Salmazius have suffered badly. His command of rhetoric and Latin prosody is enough to give the verse a kind of animation, and in some places his effects may be called neat. But its underlying conceit—that of a gouty philologist triumphantly brandishing a goose-quill—could escape the smiles of only the most narrowly devoted cliques. Salmazius becomes a Don Quixote with Du Moulin cast as Sancho Panza. But if we may briefly concede the century its vein of uncurbed invective, the lines against Milton are another story. Here is drawn a different Milton from the blind seer of the Paradise poems or the dark glory of Samson Agonistes. Here, from the palpable obscurity of Scribbler's Alley, comes a starved hireling of base origin to employ his venal pen for the defense of pickpockets and footpads who have murdered their King, and are revelling in the loot from the crime. Using a rich vocabulary of abuse, the iambics sustain this picture with a bristling vitality to the end of the poem. It is written with a lofty
disdain which, of all attitudes, must have infuriated Milton the most. If the Dedication's comparison of him to a blind Cyclops, or the scandal raked up later in the book affected Milton, the attack in verse must have completed the crushing of his ego. The stercoraceous Muse Cloacina had drowned out his praise of virtue, and it would take a prodigious effort to redeem himself. Vae homini qui talis scripserat!

Whoever might be identified as the author of Regii Sanguinis Clamor, when Milton had gathered his forces, was sure to face the strongest attack the poet could make, and, if an Englishman, great danger to his life. Prudent as always, Du Moulin had evidently foreseen this, and had published the book anonymously. And though the majority of scholars touching on the Salmassian Controversy have considered the work to be his, the fact of Du Moulin's authorship has not until now been conclusively stated. Since his own account, however, agrees with all available data, it may be accepted as final, and his authorship as unquestioned. The principal sources for Regii Sanguinis Clamor also can be ascertained.

The history of the book's publication grows out of the very atmosphere of Protestant humanism. Like any man of education, Du Moulin tried his hand at Latin verse, and at some time in the early 1640's, before the Civil Wars had seriously rent the nation, had begun thirteen Latin hymns on the Apostles' Creed. He had begun a correspondence with Salmassius—when or how cannot be ascertained—and obtained the great scholar's criticisms of the first five poems as well as his encouragement to continue writing. In response to a public
plea of Charles I, Du Moulin resolved (as we have seen) that "as farre as Latin and French could goe in the world, I would make the justice of the king's and the church's cause to be known, especially to the Protestants of France and the Low Countries, whom the king's enemies did chiefly labour to seduce and misinforme." As a result, Du Moulin had begun his Apologie de la Religion Reformée during the siege of York in 1644, sent it to Holland for publication through Fosseco Calandrini, but recalled the manuscript for alterations after the King's execution. In the revised version, he inserted an encomium on Salmastius's Defensio Regis before the volume was printed "very negligently" by Samuel Browne at The Hague. At about the same time, Du Moulin was publishing his poem Ecclesiae Genitus, which strongly foreshadowed his account in Regii Sanguinis Clamor of the Church's ruination by the Puritans. Thus, he was already engaged on works whose viewpoint and theme coincided perfectly with the Defensio Regis, which he, like all other fluent Latinists of the Royalist persuasion, was busily absorbing. His literary consciousness of the Royal tragedy was further sharpened by the Royalist history of the Civil War, the Emanthus Motus superorum in Anglia of George Bate, M.D. Thus, when Milton's Pro Populo Anglicano appeared in 1651 and Du Moulin decided to write again for the King's cause and uphold Salmastius, he was already in the vein and had material from which to work. Apart from the ease with which he wrote Latin, Du Moulin probably composed the Regii Sanguinis Clamor with some speed, for nearly seventy pages demonstrably rely on Bate's Emanthus while the rest, particularly in declamatory
parts, recalls Salmasius at nearly every turn. 95

Perhaps the most obvious use of Bate by Du Moulin is his treatment of the King's final speech on the scaffold and the events following. With two notable exceptions, Du Moulin quotes substantially the Latin text given by Bate, substituting synonyms or altering grammatical constructions somewhat to preserve his own Latin style. 96 His two chief additions to Bate are a moralizing digression on the King's penitent reference to the fate of Strafford, 97 intended to show the pious conscience of Charles to advantage; and a portrait of Bishop Juxon comforting the King there, and of the Bishop's later imprisonment and questioning by the Regicides as to what the King had meant by his farewell injunction "Remember! Remember! Remember!" 98 Indeed, Du Moulin made a little homiletic drama of Juxon's questioning by the parricides. When pressed as to what the late King had ordered him to "Remember! Remember!" Juxon said he had been ordered to give Charles II his father's dying command to forgive his killers. As Du Moulin paints the scene, this shocked the parricides and left them prey to remorse and ripe for a tardy repentance. If the scene appears to us, as it did to Milton, not quite spontaneous, that it was effective is clear from the pains Milton took to discredit it. 99 In other portions of Regii Sanguinis Clamor, it seems thankless at moments to try to determine whether Bate or Salmasius influenced a given passage, for a number of places in the Defensio Regis strongly recall the Misanthus. 100 It is a kind of tribute to Du Moulin's ability that he could synthesize this varied material into so well-knit a book as Regii Sanguinis Clamor.
As Du Moulin finished the book, he recalls, he sent the sheets to Salmasius, who entrusted them to his associate Alexander More for printing. A brilliant Greek scholar and preacher of Franco-Scottish blood, More had a faculty for making enemies, and during his stormy career had come from the oppressive confines of Geneva by way of Middelburg to Amsterdam, where he was professor of history. In an age of iron-clad orthodoxy, he ventured somewhat to think for himself, and his tactlessness made bitter enemies who tried unsuccessfully to convict him of heresy, and later, when this failed, relished whatever scandal of immorality could be used to discredit him. More took the manuscript of Du Moulin's book to the vagabond printer Adrian Vlaeq at The Hague, and supervised printing of the book so busily that he drew attention to himself. First appearing in quarto, Regii Sanguinis Glamor went into new editions the same year (1652), and Milton soon began attempts to find the author of the offending book. Hearing that More had helped with publication of the book, he concluded that he had written the work also, and began writing his attack upon Regii Sanguinis Glamor and More as the author.

There were, however, such strong indications of More's innocence that Milton, if he had not been obsessed with pain and vengeance, should have listened to them as carefully as he did the tittle-tattle which More's enemies gleefully provided. Learning that Milton was planning to assail him, he sent a disclaimer to Milton by such a responsible figure as the Dutch Ambassador to England, Mispur, who forwarded it by Secretary of State Thurloe. Very fairly, More asked that
Milton either suppress his answer, or else avoid defaming him wrongly as the author. Milton, however, insisted that More was the author and ironically promised that nothing "unbecoming" would come from his pen.

Another warning which Milton might well have heeded was the glaring discrepancy in style between the Dedication to Charles II and the rest of the book. In point of Latinity, to which Milton if anyone was highly sensitised, the Dedication's thorny Senecan style differed markedly from the easier flow of the Epistle to the Reader and eight chapters of prose, as well as the bitter verse appendices. As it addressed Charles II, the Dedication showed a familiarity with courtly address and rhetorical skill which a printer might well not show, even Vlaq, who put out the Dedication under his name and wrote a competent Latin in an entirely different style. Even later in the controversy, when these facts must have been apparent to Milton, he still charged More with full responsibility for the book. It was in the Dedication that he had been termed a Cyclops.

When Milton's Defensio Secunda appeared in 1651—more Joannis Miltoni Angli than Pro Populo Anglicano—More was so blackened by Milton's tar brush that the solvent of research is only now uncovering his original complexion. Already the object of much study, the Defensio Secunda need not be reviewed lengthily here. Aside from the old ridicule of Salmasius, the Defensio Secunda shows Milton sitting on a bad eminence of impassioned rhetoric to crush More, extol Cromwell and other revolutionary leaders, and hymn the Queen of Sweden for
discourtesy to Salmastus. Biographically, it shows the deep scars left by Du Moulin’s bolts of invective. The line from the Aeneid describing the Cyclops, which More had applied to Milton——“Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum”——occasions the poet’s famous rationale of his blindness related to passages in Paradise Lost and Samson. The evil character of Milton given in Du Moulin’s iambics, and the “Thanksgiving” Ode are treated scornfully, but aside from Milton’s justly laconic remarks on the Ode, one may easily sense how deeply Du Moulin’s barbs had sunk into Milton:

Indeed, as I have no private malice or enmity against any man, nor, as far as I know, has any man against me, I am the less concerned at the torrent of abuse which is cast upon me, at the numberless reproaches which are hurled against me, as I bear all this not for myself, but for the sake of the commonwealth.

In general, the Defensio Secunda is both sermon and epideictic oratory to celebrate the leaders and spokesman of the Puritan cause, to discredit its enemies, and to persuade the English people to virtue. Its defense of the people is indirect only. Compared to the clear and logical development of Regii Sanguinis Clemor, its form is rhapsodic. And yet it creates a unified, powerful impact. As it rises inexorably to the peroration, there is little or no feeling of rambling or superficiality. Rather, one’s admiration is claimed by the deepest voice of Protestant humanism—at once that of oracle and sage. In the sight of
the nations, a prophet of Israel has mounted the Roman Rostrum to cry out the English Law, and is heard. The Defensio Secunda has indeed the self-conscious command of a classical orator, but, except for its enemies, the Defensio is relieved of an unworthy egotism by its burning ethical conviction. It is by the speaker’s fiery personality and the surging cadences of his Latin—by turns sardonic or fervent—that the Defensio is fused into a masterpiece. Even beside it, however, Regili Sanguinis Cramer still remains a virile and effective work.

Convinced that his sayings of the wise accorded with Divine will, Milton paraded a rogues’ gallery in review—Salmasius, King Charles, Vlaeq, and More. A prodigy in Greek and a brilliant preacher, More is depicted as a spiritual vagrant whose theology and eye for women both go astray. After daring to wander from the sacrosanct truth of Genevan orthodoxy, Milton declares, Alexander More

... by chance conceived a passion for a certain maid of his host, and continued to pursue her even though she was soon afterward wed to another; the neighbors oft would see them together by themselves enter a certain little garden cottage ... now he could praise the garden beds, or desire nothing but the shade, or might merely be allowed to insert a more into a fig, and from thence with the utmost speed to begat many, many figumores—a most delightfull stroll: he could have shown the maiden the method of engrafting: that he could have done these and many others, who denies? ...
Censured by the ministers of Geneva as an adulterer, Milton charges, More was invited to Holland by the French Church at Middleburg through the influence of Salmassius; and obtained cold letters testimonial from Geneva on condition that he leave the city. While paying his respects to Salmassius, More was taken with a serving-maid in the household, and as he and Salmassius (allegedly) began to plan composition of Regii Sanguinis Clemor, he found the conversations a good pretext to visit the house and seduce the maid, Bontia (or Pontia). As Bontia, spurned, complained to the synod and magistrates, Milton says, a literary miracle occurred:

From this union there at length befell a certain thing marvelous, and prodigious beyond the wont of nature, that both woman and man brought forth—Pontia, forsooth, a Morelet . . . More this addled and windy egg, from which burst forth that dropscial drum, the Royal Blood's Overture. This indeed was at first a most gratefully pleasing sop for our Royaliste starving in Belgium; now that the shell is cracked open, they turn away from the discovery's corruption and stench . . . . Whence someone—of a droll wit, too, whoever he was—wrote this couplet:

That nisely moored on Gallic More's sweet couch, Emasored Pontia swelled, who'll not avouch?

Delighted with the book's praise of him, Salmassius took it to Vlaqc for publication. Vlaqc is shown—with some truth—as another vagabond, a dishonest and debt-ridden printer who migrated from London to
Paris and turned up at The Hague. After having sought business mainly from Milton, he now permitted his name to be affixed to the Dedication abusing the poet. Well aware of the powerful appeal of Du Moulin's picture of the late King on the scaffold, Milton turns Charles the Martyr into Charles the hypocrite. He denounces the comparison of Charles to Christ, and accuses the King of contriving the incident arising from the command "Remember! Remember! Remember!"

Balancing these characters is a group of panegyrics. Cromwell is given unstinted praise; Christina of Sweden, who had reportedly snubbed Salmassius, is paid fulsome adulation. After deeming the slain King, Milton did what he could to exculpate the trial by an extended tribute to John Bradshaw, the president of the court. In view of the trial records, as well as Du Moulin's account, his material may have been intractable. There is, of course, Milton's self-justification, particularly the autobiographical account covering his youth, his days at Cambridge, the Continental tour, his divorce tracts, his earlier political writings, and his entrance into the Salmassian Controversy. All of these had figured in Du Moulin's vilification of Milton. Possibly to help vindicate his own character further as well as to offset his abuse of Salmassius and More, Milton also provided Cromwell and the English people with a guide to a life of virtue.

The appeal of Regii Sanguinis Clamor to European nations and the Reformed Churches also had to be considered. By now, the Puritan government was more secure, a fact reflected in Milton's treatment of the question. As for the Dutch treatment of the English embassy, Milton
points to the mutual renewal of perpetual peace. So far as the example of the Dutch rebellion is concerned, he asserts, England does not follow others but leads the way to liberty. There are several slighting references to the Orange party, namely, that through its help Salmiasi got a professorship for More in Holland, and that the Prince of Orange had rewarded Salmiasi for the Defensio Regia, in addition to the famed hundred Jacobuses from Charles II.

In view of Du Moulin's attempts to distinguish the English Puritans from the Huguenots, the attitude of Milton toward the Reformed has particular interest. He tends almost to divorce religion from politics. He points out that the French government has sought the goodwill of England three times. As for the French Protestants, they had already taken up arms against their kings, and their divines—as other Calvinists, witness the Vindiciae contra Tyrannos—had preached resistance to tyrants, even if the English were the first to execute one. Indeed, if the Huguenots had been able, they would have done the same thing. With its lack of appreciation of the uncomfortable status of the French Reformed, Milton's curious statement suggests that, because of promising diplomatic relations, he was not at the moment greatly concerned for Huguenot support of the Puritan government. If some coolness had grown between Huguenots and Puritans, Du Moulin's books apparently helped bring it about.

Milton evidently made no extended examination of Du Moulin's sources. Du Moulin's epistle to the Christian Reader had mentioned the Elachus Notus muperorum as a source, and Milton dismissed this book
as suspect because of its Royalist bias. His narratives, Milton noted, Du Moulin had taken partly from the _Elenchus_ and partly from the _Defensio Regia_. Though both books were clearly familiar to him, he was too absorbed with personalities and panegyrics to spend much time on plagiarism.

Du Moulin, meanwhile, watched with smug amusement the defamation Milton was heaping on Alexander More. As he put it, he watched with a quick smile his baby left at another's doorstep, and the blind and furious Milton flailing the air at a secret adversary he could not see. Unequal to such hate, More grew cold in the Royal cause and revealed the real author's name to Milton. When the revelation was made, we may never know; but Du Moulin, who was in England and Ireland tutoring in the Boyle family, was in serious danger. Thanks to God, he exults, Milton's pride became Du Moulin's protection: for having made his attack on More's life and reputation such an important part of the _Defensio Secunda_, Milton could not bring himself to admit he had been grossly deceived. Finding a kind of adjustment by thinking of himself as a blind prophet illumined within, he would have found it dreadful to risk a psychological collapse from the ridicule sure to come if he admitted his error about More. Nor could the Regicide government afford to have its very articulate champion discredited—his eloquence made into apotheoses of hypocrites and hangmen, his noble preachments into a frenzy of megalomania, the Cause itself a bloody extravaganza defended by a madman. Milton, if no more than
subconsciously, preferred the safety of Du Moulin to the ridicule of himself, and thus ironically became Du Moulin's protector. 140

In its sequel, the Salmasian Controversy turns to a progressively worse abuse of personalities. Never again would the really central issues be treated with the clear focus and spirited invective of Du Moulin, or the lofty ethical vision and magniloquence of the Defensio Secunda. But even as he labored under severe handicaps, Alexander More defended himself ably. Bound by his honor, for a while at least, to protect Du Moulin,\(^1\) and surrounded by a professional jealousy eager to smear his character, More could not clear himself at a stroke by naming the real author. If he had, the charges against him of personal immorality would have appeared in their irrelevance to the real issues. He took the principal way left to him. He denied the authorship and produced evidence to help show that Milton deliberately lied on that score, and supplied responsible testimonies clearing him of theological and moral aberrations. He further argued the improbability of his having written the Regii Sanguinis Classor. And he exposed the vulnerable spots of Milton revealed in the Defensio Secunda. Composed partly during 1653, his reply was entitled Alexandri Mori Ecclesiastae & Sacrarum Litterarum Professoris Fides Publica, contra Calumniae Ioannis Miltoni (The Hague, 1654). The printer was Adrian Vlaq.

More frankly admits that his friends had warned him against entering a contest with Milton whom, he says, they considered a master of mudslinging and falsehood, an artist of slander who would never
quique.112 Because, perhaps, of those clergymen who had vouched for him in his turbulent career, More feels that through him the ministry and the Church are being attacked and brought into disrepute.113 Milton is, moreover, disgracing the Reformed Churches, weakening the faithful, and furnishing the Papists with welcome ammunition.114 Consequently, in making his reply, More will temper his style so as not to descend to the filth of Milton's attack.115 Flatly denying the authorship of Regii Sanguinis clamor, More repeatedly accuses Milton not only of lying but also, in the face of strong evidence to the contrary, persisting in his falsehood.116 What if the real author, he asks, were unknown or dead? The greatest injury has nonetheless been done to him. "At vivit autore, & valer, ignotus mihi de facie, omnibus autem bonis notissimus, quorum ego frater conscientia publicum istud mandacium tota passim libello tuo serpen justissima detestationes prosequer,"

More reveals.117 Furthermore, Milton well knew, says More, that another had written Regii Sanguinis clamor; he had been warned.118 There had been the responsible letter of the ambassador Mespert, and a protest by Durar.119 Furthermore, Milton could easily have learned that the Latin style of Regii Sanguinis clamor differed very strongly from that of More's works, he avers; and it did not agree with his known way of life to meddle in another's quarrel, or to attack someone without provocation. Indeed, "adeo neum ab hoc dicendi gener, ita ut dicam, gladiatorio abhorruisse semper ingenium, ut ne Regium quidem defensorum [Salmasius] in eo probaveris unquam, quod tam illustrem causam agerat convitiando,"120
What of the Dedication, with its tasteless reference to Milton’s blindness? We know that Du Moulin had not approved of this epistle. More declares that he had not known of Milton’s blindness until he read of it in the Defensio Secunda, and had intended the comparison to a blinded Cyclops only “ad animam.” As to Milton’s abuse of him as an adulterer, More points out how shrivelled the Defensio would be with these charges removed, “Quam bella perissent, quam florida & fere dixi Floralia dicta?”

For the unsympathetic reader, Milton had, in the Defensio Secunda, exposed himself to charges of monstrous egotism. With some justice, More took full advantage of this. In the book, More told Milton “tu tibi ostendendas eras, ne superbius insolentiis, & importune cristas erigeres, tibi plaudens, te ipse amans sine rivali.” Milton only bothered to answer Regii Sanguinis Clemor, More asserts, because of attacks on him. The results? In the Defensio, the English people are merely an appendage of Milton:

\[
\text{Clemor etiam credo pepercisses, nisi tuae propriæ noxen}
\]
\[
\text{insectoratur. Nam privatæ quidem injurias, ut Christianus}
\]
\[
\text{es, scriber & implacabili animo persequeris; hoc rei caput est; populus accessio. In hæc ipsæ Defensione secundâ tui an}
\]
\[
\text{populi, quoties pro populo dixis, tua languest, debilitatur,}
\]
\[
\text{jacet oratio Gallica nive frigidior; quoties pro te val de}
\]
\[
\text{te, quod facis haud paulò seepius, tota tumet, ignescit,}
\]
\[
\text{assustat. Nec immoritâ Defensio pro populo secunda dicitur,}
\]
Milton had deceived the public also, for "honesto defensionis nomine, praeceps, quae duo utramque propemodum in opusculo tuo pagina faciunt, sculsum in se tuis, & scriptas à te propries laudes tuas." \textsuperscript{156} Milton's lofty digressions also draw some acid--and well-aimed--comments from More. Sporting with the panegyric to the Swedish Queen, he remarks that "nesciebat Christina te sibi esse tam familiarem." \textsuperscript{157} Milton's sermon to Cromwell draws the withering comment:

\begin{quote}
Quae quidem semia spiritus tibi tatem altos induerunt, ut proximus à primo censeri concupiveris, adeque calissimo Cromvello celsior appareas interdum; quae sine ulla honoris praefatione familiariter appellas, quae specie laudantis doceas, cui leges dictas, titulos circumscribis, munia prae scribis, consilia suggestis, & si secus fecerit minas etiam ingeris. Illi arma & imperium concedis, ingenium tibi togaque vendicas. In colus magnus est, appallandus, inquis, qui res magnas aut gerit, ut ille, aut docet, ut Miltonus de divortiis, aut dignè scribit, ut Miltonus idem pro populo, bis magnus. \textsuperscript{158}
\end{quote}

More had been attacked for both his personal character and theological views. He seeks to clear both by a series of official testimonials, and their confirmations, by the Church and Senate of Geneva. \textsuperscript{159} Given
in both French and Latin versions, and dated 1648, the documents leave a convincing impression. Since they dwell more on the regularity of More's theology than on his character, one might be prone, if his view is colored by Milton, to consider this suspicious. But this emphasis gains its proper perspective, and is favorable to More, when one recalls that during these years the mania for orthodoxy was at its height at Geneva. 160 Running ceaselessly through Reformed documents, from the cruel ardor of the Genevans to the plaintive nonconformity of Lewis Du Moulin, the word orthodoxy becomes almost a magic guarantee. As Geneva amply shows, to deviate could be to die. 161

Confronted with More's wholesale denial of the authorship of 
Regim Sanguinis Clemor, Milton caused further inquiries to be made in the hopes of strengthening the evidence for his accusations. Vlaq, the publisher of Clemor, had been roundly attacked by Milton in the Defensio Secunda; and with an eye to both his own defense and profit, had published at The Hague in 1654 a reprint of Milton's Defensio bound up with the first edition of the Fides Publica of More. The volume was entitled Joannis Miltoni Defensio Secunda Pro Populo Anglicano . . . Accessit Alexandri Mori Ecclesiastae . . . Fides Publica, Contro calumnias Ioannis Miltoni Saurae . . . 162 Vlaq supplied preliminary matter which backed up More's denial of authorship. In his "Typographus Pro Se-Ipse," he reveals that

Autor istius Tractatus [Clemor] mihi adhuc incognitus est,
utpote qui nomen suum supprimere voluit, sicuti ipse in
praefationes sum ibi testatur. Miserat autem Exemplar
manuscriptum D. Claudio Salmasio, eique ejus editionem
commendaverat, cum quo procul dubio, antea amicita ipsi
quadam intercesserat, cui comoda occasione, juxta ac
Regias causas, gratificari voluit. 163

Vlaaq also recounted how he had informed Samuel Hartlib two years before
that More was not the author, and quoted in Latin translation a reply
from Hartlib, dated 29 October 1652, accepting the statement by
Vlaaq. 164 There were, on the other hand, commonly accepted reports in
Holland attributing the book to More. 165 But such well-informed men
as Nicholas Heinsius and Isaac Voss understood that Regii Sanguinis
Clamor had been written by an Englishman, transmitted through Salmasius,
and put out by More. 166 The information which Milton eventually ac-
cepted agreed with this to the extent that More had been the editor of
Clamor, signed the Dedication, and, partly at least, overseen the publi-
cation. Did Milton yet know that Du Moulin was the real author? Since
there is no reason to believe that either man lied, it would seem that
More's reported delation to Milton came at a later time.

As it was, Milton sought finally to crush More with Joannis
Miltoni Angli Pro Se Defensio Contra Alexandrum Morum Ecclesiasten,
Libelli famosi, cui titulus Regii sanguinis clamor ... authores recte
dictum (London, 1655). The once-exalted defense of a whole nation has
now shrunk to a duel of personal abuse, and in the Pro Se Defensio
Milton takes nearly the only course left to him. He accepts the fact
that More put out the book and signed the offending Dedication, and
seeks to twist this into responsibility for everything said in the
rest of the book, including the most pungent sections. The Dedica-
tion's reference to the Cyclops is insignificant compared to the attack
made on Milton in Chapter One and the verses appended to
Mamor.
Whether Milton made an attempt to find who wrote the rest of the book,
we do not know; but it seems unlikely, for, after having gone so far
in the Defensio Secunda, Milton labored to save his own credit by
fastening full guilt on Alexander More. His legalistic interpretation
is forced, and throws the entire matter out of perspective.

To support his portrait of More as a scoundrel, Milton attacks
the testimonial letters from Geneva, including one by the aged Biodati,
as being outdated and obtained on condition that More leave the city.
Milton seeks to strengthen his case further by extracts from two let-
ters, one anonymous and the other from Duraer, dated 1654 and giving
More an odorous character. Milton's grim refusal to give More a
fair chance may be seen in the fact that he preferred his private in-
fations to any reconsideration of the matter even when the Dutch
ambassador intervened.

In reply to the Pro Se Defensio, More published a Supplementum
Fidel Publicae (The Hague, 1655), which contained seventeen testimonial
letters and documents ranging from 1616 to 1654. The net impression
one gets from them is the almost complete vindication of More from the
aspersions of Milton. Perhaps the most striking declaration is that
of the magistracy of Amsterdam ("Consules & Rectores") flatly denying
Milton's charge that More had been reduced to a professorship of Greek, which would soon be taken from him. The testimonial speaks in the highest terms of More's learning, professional zeal, and personal life. As to Milton's charges that he had been barred from the pulpit at Amsterdam, More produces a letter from the Church there showing quite otherwise.

Shortly after the Supplementum, Milton published a Respnsio which adds little but sarcasm and more abuse. Thereafter, the controversy lapsed until the Restoration saw publication of Salmassius's reply to Milton, and permitted Du Moulin openly to acknowledge his authorship of Regii Sanguinis Clamor.

With the Restoration, the principals in the Salmassian Controversy had gone their several ways, and the occasional appearance of their partisan works seemed a curiosity in a new age interested in Popish Plots, New Science, old witches, and royal mistresses. Salmassius had been in his grave nearly seven years. Still accompanied by pride and controversy, Alexander More had been called in 1659 to the great temple at Charenton, where Pierre Du Moulin once preached as Casaubon disapproved; and died there in 1670. Meanwhile, now a canon of Canterbury and a Royal chaplain, Dr. Peter Du Moulin republished in his volume of Latin poems his Ode to Salmassius and lines on Milton, and had the last laugh on both Milton and More. With the clamorous voice of controversy stilled, and all passion spent, Milton had learned wisdom, and sought through his greatest poetry to possess a paradise within him, happier far than when he had demeaned his supreme genius
to hiss an itinerant clergymen, or by an a wandering Queen.

Not only did Du Moulin have the last laugh, but he was also one of the few who profited directly from the publication of *Regii Sanguinis Clemor*. As a preacher of recognised ability, he was chosen to deliver the funeral sermon on 17 October 1672 for Dr. Turner, the Dean of Canterbury, his friend and superior. Du Moulin then illustrated the Dean's kindness to the clergy by a personal anecdote, telling how, when "the most Reverend Archbishop Juxon made some doubt whether he should confirm me in the possession of Adaham by a new Collation, this peerless friend of mine [Turner], shewed him that he could not in honour do otherwise; putting in his hands the true and honourable account which I had given to the world of his rarey virtuous behaviour in assisting our late holy King in his martyrdom, and in his trials for his sake after his death." 175 A printed marginal note specifies *Regii Sanguinis Clemor* as the work wherein Juxon was so portrayed. 176

An echo from the past, however, might occasionally be heard, to remind men of the controversy which in some ways tolled the bell for Protestant humanism. The Restoration itself witnessed publication of Salmasius's almost forgotten reply, *Claudii Salmastii ad Johannem Miltomum Responsio, Opus Posthumum* (London, 1660). 177 The work could scarcely add anything to the late scholar's reputation. Whereas the *Defensio Regia* in proving the King's execution a crime and discrediting the Puritan cause had occasionally risen to some breadth of view, the *Responsio* merely repeats the earlier arguments about Divine Right. In a sustained tone of dreary petulance, it adds a vituperation of Milton
too tasteless to be amusing, and too heavy to carry a point. By in-
cessantly referring to himself in the third person, Salmassius produces
an effect of dampened vanity which weakens his authorities' prestige.
If the Defensio Regia is long, the Responsio ad Miltonum is formless,
collapsing after 304 pages in the middle of his third chapter of abuse
for Milton and the Puritans. Occasionally, however, there are some
points which Tories might use against Whig theories of popular sover-
eignty. 178

This literary cadaver drew at least one further attempt at lurid
public exhibition. Joseph Jans, who in 1651 had published his nearly
incoherent answer to Nikomklastes—the Nikon Aklastos The Image
Unbroken—reissued it in 1660 as a purported translation of Salmassius's
reply. It added an engraved portrait of Charles I, a new title page,
and a dedication to Charles II. The title page gave an idea of how
Milton looked to fervid Royalists in the year 1660—Salmassius His
Dissection and Confutation of the Diabolical Rebel Milton, in His
Impious Doctrines of Falsehood, Maxims of Policies, and destructive
Principles of Hypocrisy, Insolences, Invectives, Injustice, Cruelties,
and Calumnies against his Gracious Sovereign King Charles I. Made
legible for the satisfaction of all Loyal and Obedient Subjects... 179

On such a raucous note died the Salmassian Controversy. With it
had passed away much of Protestant humanism, as the learned eloquence
of past generations coarsened into the jargon of this literary huck-
ster. The great issues of politics and religion which had agitated
the Channel nations, and which had been the subject of lordly debate by Pierre Du Moulin and Cardinal Bellarmine, were to be shaped still further by three revolutions into modern theories of representative government. But the Protestant community which had expressed these issues through its synthesis of Christian and classical learning, held together by the Reformed Religion, was disintegrating. The new era drew away from that common intellectual and spiritual discipline shared by Salmassius and Milton, by the Cassubons and the Du Moulins. Scholasticism and Divine Right would soon be replaced by New Science and popular government. It is an irony of fate that the future should have been welcomed, in their different ways, by John Milton and his secret adversary, Peter Du Moulin.
REGII SANGVINIS CLAMOR AD COELVM
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PARRICIDAS ANULICANOS

By

Dr. Peter Du Moulin
THE TRANSLATION

As the basis for the translation of Regii Sanguinis Clamor ad Coelum offered here, I have used my own duodecimo copy of the book, checking the Latin text against two other editions to correct typographical errors. Aside from printer's mistakes, there is no difference in the matter of the book in these editions.

Regii Sanguinis Clamor appeared in at least three editions in 1652, all printed by Adrian Vlaaq at The Hague. A so-called "Editio secunda" was brought out at The Hague in 1661, reflecting a temporary revival of interest in the Salmasian controversy following the Restoration. I have not had access to this copy, which is in the British Museum. Whatever changes it might make in contents of the book, however, would not materially affect any statements made in the monograph accompanying this translation, for Milton used one of the 1652 editions as the basis for his reply in the Defensio Secunda.

It seems likely that Milton may have employed what was apparently the first of the 1652 editions—a quarto printed with some care by Vlaaq. It is a volume comprising preliminary matter and 172 pages of text. For collation, I have used the copy in the University of Illinois Library. As the book attracted notice, it was printed in duodecimo size at least twice. I have collated two such editions: my own, which is the same as the one in the University of Illinois Library. Aside from the title page and preliminary matter (the Dedication to Charles II and the epistle Lectori Christiano™), it is 189 pages in
length. This volume is easily identified by the misspelling Paricidas on the title-page and a badly scrambled Latin sentence on pp. 122-123. Evidently printed after this volume was the second duodecimo mentioned, which I used in the Newberry Library, Chicago. Though it corrects numerous mistakes and the muddled sentence of the foregoing volume, it introduces a mistake of its own on the title-page: the place of publication is misspelled Nages-Comitw. This edition reduces the book's length to a more economical 148 pages (excluding preliminary matter).

To judge from the glaring errors of the first duodecimo, the misprint on the title-page of the second, and the extreme competence of Alexander More as a Latinist, More's editorship of Regii Sanguinis Glæmor must have ended with production of the initial quarto.

In any event, the mutual corrections provided by the three editions used here, I believe, provided an accurate Latin text on which to base this translation.
The Royal Blood's

OUTCRY

TO

HEAVEN

Against the English

PARRICIDES.

*********

*********

*********

*********

*********

THE HAGUE:

From the Press of ADRIAN

VLAC. M. DC. LII.
To Charles II,
By Grace of God
of Great Britain,
France and Ireland
King,
Defender of the Faith, &c.

A spectacle to be seen by men and angels, my Lord, is shown
by the grievous calamity of your Kingdoms, which, bereft of legitimate
rulers, have come into the sacrilege of Parricides and (lacking fit
terms, we use Tertullian's word) into the power of "Diicides." I say
"the calamity of your Kingdoms," not yours personally—except as you
account all your peoples' sufferings nothing impersonal. Indeed, when
we examine this universal Stage, men's judgments are still as remark-
ably varied as their faces, nor do all value the same thing. Some
complain of the Fates' envy, "call Gods and Stars cruel," bawl of their
empty hopes, and behave poorly when ejected from fortunes, driven into
exile, and forced to seek different lands. Others herein better ob-
serve some hidden force that whimsically crushes men's affairs, or
rather the rod of Divine will by whose disposal all estates are gov-
erned. But meanwhile they never gaze without tears on friends, kins-
men, wife, or offspring. Others, after considering personal gains be-
side, in the death of your Parent of blessed and immortal memory curse
only the crime accomplished, unpardonable, and unheard-of since man's
creation. And some are deeply moved by your misfortunes. But when I view this Drama more closely, though no man lives more eager for your happiness, I confess that your peoples, bound with horrid tyranny's iron yoke, are well mourned indeed, and think one ought not grieve immoderately at your misshaps. They, they ought to grieve, who dulously looked on at law silent among arms, rabble-rousing Furies girt with the sword, God's worship ruined, rascality the law, right perverted to wrong, and nameless dolts, frauds, and peasants bestriding them instead of finest Princes; and their "faces pallor white does mark, and shattered minds are dazed." At their mischances, my Lord, you also grieve with us assuredly more than at your own. For why did your ill Fortune pluck away anything, except that if she had not, you would not trample on her, that is, triumph so magnificently? Gold, gems, crown, scepter—all are tinsel; kingly badges, not Royalty. But she took not away the sacred Unction, the Divine character, the imprinted image of the Most High, or your heavenly nature at which we marvel. She took not away your peoples' hearts, wherein you reign more truly than if otherwise you ruled a hundred Britains; nor that mind, King of itself under God, which thus reigns more widely than if governing many worlds. Your misfortunes have taken nothing from you so far that they indicate little else to be hoped. You have a courage already well versed in danger; a virtue not put on in boasts or made of compliments, but attested by realities; and a judgment not artificially polished up in retirement, but trained out of doors under God's own discipline. And at least you gain from your traitorous enemies this valuable fruit,
that you are wrestling in that arena where formerly David and recently Henry the Great your Grandfather long struggled hard, and finally brought to managing their Kingdoms (which they regained from thieves) a mind adequate to its destiny. Anxiously watching at the prison doors, 0 King, while you revolve so many misfortunes and undertake so many labors like theirs, we long (as is our zeal for you and yours) and expect (as is our confidence in God) that you will obtain from God the same result as they. I say no more—all men more knowing of human affairs and not ignorant of the slipperiness of a resplendent Court or flattering Fortune's baits will avow this with me. God set you apart from the Princely mob (for even the loftiest estate has its mob) lest any Siren bewitch you. And though your happy Genius had avoided every rock, when, pray, would you have touched this port whither the storm brought you? You probably would never have attained it, and to your sufferings you owe it that you seriously learned Philosophising. Marvel not, my Lord; for by "Philosophising" and reposing as in a quiet harbor I mean this: not to indulge in sad labor of foolishness, or with sluggish effort to emit tuneful trifles of vain burblings; but to ascertain by real experiments the plan of the changing world, the condition of mortals, the changes of Kings and politics, the utter vanity of all man's things, hanging by how thin a thread. All these you certainly must have learned; and were that outstanding ability not in you, yet you could not ignore such oft-repeated lessons impinging on every sense. You have not greeted but embraced this wisdom; you have not touched it to your lips, but quaffed it, and drink on—you are going to be no less
learned than your other, very learned Royal Grandfather, who tried and tested everything he securely beheld in peaceful tranquility from his mental eminence; and "through varied trials and dangers manifold," perceived by a kind of searching. Personally, I judge that he who said Kings would at last be happy when Kings philosophised should only be understood thus concerning doctrine not obscurely loquacious but effectually penetrating the heart (which the guilty teach and Kings hardly learn save by mistress Experience), that by the example of the King and Lord of Kings (who "learned through what he suffered") we may acquire that holy joy of the Author to the Hebrews. Immortal God! How many books, sleepless nights, tutors, and years you would need to learn what, drained for more speedily certain result, you have from one volume of your Kingdoms. But now let us suppose none of your actual sufferings befell you, that happily flourishing you sat on your ancestral throne. Who knows whether you would then be such as you now appear, or ever such as you someday promise to be? Were I minded to indict war as a sin and discuss virtue, there would not be leisure. Though you were the bravest, there would have been no occasion to explain fortitude. Nor would we now have your memorable example which blazed forth in that battle God allowed to be unfavorable lest with your hand you press forward too much when, with the enemy forces intact but yours shattered (this we have from eyewitnesses), you dashed, amidst a band of a few followers, like a thunderbolt through the enemy troops, your sword driving all back; when you cast your men into great anxiety for your life, and transfixed the amazed army with admiration of such great, youthful
valor. Nor would we have that sign or miracle of Divine Providence (certainly marking paternal rather than personal care), that God's own hand delivered you from the Lions' mouth—or rather, the Wolves'; and from entangling snares, the selfsame God freed you, as if descended from a machine and not by human aid or artful guidance, a "woman Leader of the deed." It was almost worth losing the victory for you to obtain this proof of divine love. I am prompted to hope it may be that this God will preserve you—so wonderfully saved from the Hell-hounds' very jaws—for great things, you whom even as he has cast down for this, he shall exalt. Meanwhile, O King, waste not these evils. Think how you stand with Him who wishes you to owe all to Him, not to fortune of birth or ancestors or your nobility; that you might be rightly what you are called, "King by Grace of God," he denied you victory but not life, that you should reign someday, not by your own struggles, but through Him. Therefore use hateful fortune by bearing well her excesses, despising her mad fits, as you are beloved of God, guarded by Angels, by all men (I exclude those butchers—they are Demons, not men) acknowledged and hailed as King, and thus seen also wiser and consecrated by your very woes. This way have gone the Princes of Christian name; this is the way prepared to Eternal life. This field your dervés Parent trod; had all flowed according to his considered wish, had he lived peacefully, had he gone to his fate like a lively boon-companion as you closed your eyes, he would not live today in all good men's mouth and heart throughout the world; nor would he have left both by deeds and deathless writings so many clear-cut signs
of patience, perseverance, and pious to go down in History. Let the
generations not only wonder at, but praise him; let us account his
memory of real value, not just honor it (as we do) with the greatest
veneration. Of this veneration this book is witness as long as it
avenges the Royal blood with vigorous, spirited eloquence; this book,
O King, we are going to dedicate to you if you will permit. And the
Author, a notable Man of uncommon ability who suppresses a name quite
well-known and long assiduous for your Royal house, will readily approve
this. After these preludes, and elegant ones too, a terrifying trumpet
he will blow, that Βουμαρίος Σαλμασίνος, who has no peer or second in
the whole world of sciences and letters, who brought to your Majesty's
cause stupendously infinite learning joined to heavenly genius. It is
a work eternal and loftier than the royal site of the Pyramids, though
some scoff and carp at what they hardly understand. But how much more
wisely and favorably do the greatest Lawyers of your Britain react, who
cannot marvel enough that a Frenchman who had never foreseen that such
would become his province thus surprisingly clarified English affairs
and their deepest recesses: laws, decrees, treaties, documents, and
acts many centuries old; and whatever in them is hardest to unfold, he
grasps and explains so intelligently that he seems never to have done
anything else. But soon he personally both will curb the Thoems' mouth
with another attack he is composing against the Rebels, and will hand
us Milton for chastisement as he deserves,

A Monster horrid, shapeless, huge, and blind
--- although not huge, really; for than him there is none thinner, more bloodless, or more shrivelled of the gnats that injure less the more they bite. You will be delighted to see your Hero rending that disgrace to human kind, and "hoisting Antaeus afar from the earth." And now is the opportune time for this, when our hearts and speech are likewise free, and in our Belgium there are both presses and powers against those cancers on the world, those monsters, which prey on our ships regardless of Religion and international law, fatten on widows' and orphans' blood, and as they are soothed with funerals, bare their teeth, growl, and prophesy all the more madly:

nor any fouler Pest
And wrath of Gods arose from Stygian waves.

What like this was ever against us, what indeed! Rather, what did your best, most wise ancestors fail to name harshly and unkindly? They dealt as peacefully, liberally, and humanely with the Federated Provinces, as these do in the manner of fierce, barbarous, rabid Tigers. For these Provinces I might desire nothing more freely than for them to complete this war as easily and happily as Salmassius will overcome Milton. This, just as παροιμίας Ἡμῖν, I believe, posterity will enjoy. But this Epistle must be finished and signed, against my wish, at some place or other, certainly not too far from what I have just written.

May Christ the Most High restore, not the throne to you, but you to the Ancestral throne, O pitied of Your peoples and the Belgians; and may he cause you to realize more and more that you are God's care. Farewell,
and live in your faith, O King unconquered by evils and thus also
dearest to God—unless, like the trees for the forest, you take the
Gospel for words and terms.

Your Majesty's
Most Devoted
A. Vlac.
To the Christian Reader

Because of the most Wise and Pious King's murder, the most heinous of all crimes since Creation,

So great a fear of sudden ruin quite

Confounds mankind, the world's in utter fright.

The minds of European Nations are aroused for thoroughly investigating the whole affair. Especially have our French professing the Reformed Religion, not only dismayed by the horrible deed but burdened with unfair reproach for it, labored mightily to understand the Parricide, the Parricides, and the entire matter from the beginning. By this inquiry they will clearly find from the conspiracy's start many things otherwise constituted than they had believed from, indeed, the conspirators' own word.

Now I have enjoyed such familiarity with Englishmen of better note that I might dare say I know these monstrous men spawned by Hell for this hideous crime inside and out; and that I clearly perceive England's present condition more comprehensively than one unskilled in English and strange to British shores could expect to do. My English friends easily persuaded me to suppress my name, for I, unworthy of glory, desire no recognition from this trifle; but I only seek to protect God's glory, which the English Parricides supremely wrong by
covering their crimes with God's word and (as the World notes with re-
vulsion) masking absolutely loathsome crimes with a most foul, hateful
mask of piety.

For historical chronology, I have been greatly indebted both to
other Writers and especially to the View of Recent Commotions in Eng-
land, compiled by an obviously judicious Man, whoever he is. For
though I am not writing History, yet insofar as I raise The Royal
Hood's Outcry to Heaven, the weight of the crime could not be urged
before God and men without some account of the evil committed.

I thought this outcry indeed should be renewed after great Men
and raised again now almost three years after the crime's commission,
est the assassin's affairs, going (alas!) too well, and delayed divine
justice somewhat habituate weak thinkers to the crime. Here is the
patient trust of the Saints. Let all pious men drink in that lesson of
profound wisdom, Eccl. 5, 8: "If you see oppression of the poor and
perversion of law and justice in a province, marvel not at the will of
God; for the Highest, supreme above even these, stands guard; yes, the
Highest is far above these." For things unjustly done by second causes
are justly done by the first cause, whose secret judgments and marvel-
ous ways shine forth, a light from darkness and glory from men's
wickedness.

And this saying, indeed divinely given, enjoins silence on
reason objecting to the good fortune of bad tyranny, but not on prayers.
May, God's love rejoices us as we mourn under this reproach to the Gos-
pel and Church; and a most bitter sense of the injury done to his holy
name compels jointly to raise prayerful hands and burning groans to
God and with the Royal Blood to cry out to heaven. Were there indeed
no men for this duty, yet the hallowed gore will cry from the earth;
and until it shall have drawn just vengeance from heaven, night and
day it will continually cry, "Arise, God of vengeance, O mighty God
of vengeance, arise."
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CHAPTER I
Occasion of this Writing and Summary

Although the Majesty of Kings has been sacred to all ages, as
being the image of Divinity, the people's safety, and the life of laws;
and their very injuries in silence and patience venerated as heavenly
wraths, as all rights of Majesty or citizens' duties have taught;
yet always there have been subjects' arms hostile to Lords, and treach­
ery, poisonings, parricides. Consequently, few in the series of Em­
perors and Kings have passed away their last day by a bloodless death,
and he rightly showed the rulers' lot who, over the head of Democles
banqueting among golden vessels, harmonies, and flaming courtiers, from
a thin hair suspended a drawn sword.

These trials of Kings are trite, common, and from the middle of
fortune's heap. Nor will Kings' estate be safer so long as men become
pervasive from hate, wrath, greed, lust for power, and a pretence of
liberty, forever fatal to peoples, destined to end in the tyranny of
the few and slavery of all.
This age suffers other Punishments, other Furies also. Our world gases on dismayed, and our generation groans that to it are reserved evil prodigies never known before. After so many Kings, God's Vicar-gents, had been killed in battle, poisoned, or purposely assassinated, it only remained for the Most Venerable King to be dragged before a false show of public judgment. A King, I say, possessing (if anyone ever did) full rights of Majesty and tracing his line of legitimate succession back ten centuries and more, was arraigned for treason and tried as a defendant before his people's very drags, who had usurped the Judgeship; was condemned, and at last (Woe, faith of God and men!) publicly executed, as the whole realm watched and almost cried blood with tears and expired in sobs at its King's severed head.

This monstrous crime utterly confounded us of other lands, and at its rumor we were completely horrified—not by the horror merely that, catching the unprepared at sudden events, soon relaxes with deeper knowledge; nor the grief that, bitter at first (as in the death of dearest parents or children), lessens with time and sound advice. For indeed as we see deeper into the affair, as we more thoughtfully weigh all the horrible crime's circumstances, the more forcibly horror seizes us, the sharper grief burns—not piercing as at the start, but torturing. For our disposition to evil follows nature in that it strengthens by continuance as the crime of parricide progresses into custom, doctrine, and finally an external likeness of the choicest piety.

For this huge evil men's tongues have no name, because it is a
"monster not of our race or blood," and ought to derive its name from its parents, who besetting one man in troops would say, "Our name is Legion because we are many," such a varied, manifold, and almost infinite Hydra of prodigious ills is seen in one crime. Yet, since the crimes are so implicated they hide each other, one would hardly be \( \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau \lambda \gamma \varsigma \) enough in calling this a "Crime of Majesty." To the most immense of all Parricides are added horrible Sacrilege, perversion of all laws, violation of divine and human laws, extinction of nature, the disgrace of Justice, the murder of three Kingdoms at a stroke, destruction of the Church, trampling of Religion, world-wide reproach to the Gospel, and the universal subjection of all Reformed believers to the hostile axes of their lords. And, to cap it all, a horrible injury is offered to the Most High, to whose glorious name this whole play of foulest crimes is acted out amidst prayer and fasting with a pretense of Divine inspiration and splendid show of piety. Finally, all the crimes Hell ever produced joined together to effect this crime.

To it, the crime of the Jews crucifying Christ was nothing, whether you compare their intention or the crime's effect: for the Apostle himself testifies for the Jews that they would never have crucified the King of glory had they known him. Yet by portents these men knew, more than enough for their condemnation, what man they violated—their own legitimate King. Then, from Christ's death came much prosperity for the Church, great glory arose to God. But with its finest King, the Church of England has been finished with the same ax and neighbors brought into extreme disgrace and danger, while all
Reformed believers are charged with the same fatal madness that seized a few falsely assuming the name "Reformed."

Yet I doubt not that glory will rise hence to the Most High. For God, with His marvelous ways, usually gains this from its contraries. But I might dare assert that nothing more against God's glory has arisen since creation, nothing that has cast a fouler stain on holy Truth. For since by their flawed intellect men's sins are usually blamed on doctrine, it also happens that this huge "δρός (I shudder to mention) is protected by Gospel doctrine, and perpetrated to the "defense" of the Reformed Religion.

This enormous injury stabs to their very vitals all those Reformed to the truth, especially the French and Dutch. Everywhere there are tears, wails, assemblies, and the freest indignation against the evil Parricides, plainly as if not a foreign King but fortune, fame, and safety had been lost. Hence come so many justly enraged books by learned men who have only Religion in common with English affairs; so much could Zeal for God's house and love of Religion do. And more would have appeared if all had pressed handy, and good men everywhere enjoyed like freedom of thought and speech. Never did Poetic fire blase with livelier flames or thunder with harsher curses! But an unrestrained, ample discourse, a robust, learned defense, are needed by wounded Religion, the Church arraigned for a strange crime, and the sacred Majesty of Kings placed, by impious new example, under subjects' judgment and hangman's ax.

And so the Prince of letters, Claudius Salmasius, stepped forth
and undertook this defense, a Champion worthy of such clients. To
him, Kings will owe, while the world stands, their claims to dignity
and safety, as will the Church and Religion; every age will praise such
merit of this remarkable man. Samuel Bochart, that other great glory
of our time, trod the same way with a book brief indeed, but good God,
how learned and miney with reasoning! Why should I recall Vincent,
Harald, Forée, and other judicious men who fortunately descended into
this arena? But Great Salmasius quite rewove the design of the English
crime and dragged those HELL-hounds into hated daylight. He is as much
esteemed for intellect, learning, and nearly infinite experience as he
prevails in fame and public admiration. Utterly applying himself to
the Royal Defense, he drew forth the inmost store of sacred and secular
Law for this golden work.

At these things all will marvel, even those peering dully at
such sublime brilliance of erudition. Most outstanding for me is that
frank vigor of aroused speech, whereby he crushes the evil Parricides
as with a thunderbolt. Offended Pity gave eloquence sinews, and in-
spired indignation freely elevated lofty discourse still further.
Never did the Great Man rise higher, never more Salmasius. But I spare
praises, for that Man, even more devout than learned, sought not his
but God’s glory.

The Parricides rage at rumor of such a work—not upon reading
it; for how many of those wretches understand Latin? They kept hearing
this truly Royal Defense praised by all reports, Salmasius himself to
be in high favor, the Princes’ Patron to be the Princes’ pet and asked
over by Sweden's Most August Queen with lavish rewards; and their own
Tyranny, built on parricide; to be universally denounced with curses.
Therefore these beasts, who propitiated ignorance, sought some hungry
Grammataster who would hire out his pen to the parricide's defense.
And one was found, who would dare write Latin after a repudiated
learning, a truly great hero to oppose Salmassius—John Milton. What
doubt is there if this be man, or worm lately come from a dunghill?
What to do? Selden was shrugging off the hateful task; the Universi-
ties were sterile, zealously purged of learning by them; and any
learned men dragging along under their Tyranny drained good sense out
of their very learning. So as the unarmed in pressing need of defense
even fling mud and dung, these men to whom "madness ministers arms" in
their utter want of learned men had seized on Milton and threw that
unworthy clod at Salmassius.

Expelled from Cambridge University for his vices, this man is
said to have fled disgrace at home and wandered into Italy. Thence,
as this rebellion grew, he was recalled by revolutionary hopes to
England and lovingly received by the impious faction, for men infamous
at home are always most welcome to traitors. Indeed, those despairing
of fame and fortune among the honest are hopeful of good credit with
the wicked. Now returned, he wrote a Book of Divorce wherein he main-
tained that any rightly contracted marriage could be dissolved at
either partner's decision. Nor was this punished—in a Republic, of
course, wherein by criminal wrong they claimed for themselves the ab-
solute liberty of God—unless they attributed this, too, to their own
Nor did this man make for violation of all laws stop here, for soon he went from dissolution of Marriages to divorce of Kingdoms. When, therefore, the conspirators deliberated about the King's head and many greatly feared such a huge crime, the Hellish gallows-bird wrote them and drove the hesitant to the evil side, especially urging it be done for their own heads, for they or the King must die. Therefore the conference ended, which severed the sacred King's neck with vile ax; we account him the killer who persuaded the crime, who did it. "I have done it indeed," says he, admitting the crime, embracing, protecting, and praising it. This he does in a depraved book called Ikonoklastes, where that foulest murderer insults the holy Spirit of King Charles; this he does in his notorious pages against Great Salassius, where he paints the most inhumanly wicked parricide the world ever saw with the colors of pious and justice. That such a monster of a man and those parricides like him live—may, rule—is the greatest argument for God's patience, and exercise for our own. While we await Him who is to crush that old serpent beneath our feet, may He bruise the evil heads of these dragons and someday free his truth and justice from the wrong of irreligious assassins.

What? Are we bound by the duty of Christian patience to bear these wrongs silently, especially we against whom these Tyrants are powerless? This, Milton the Parricides' Champion wishes, who, upon the English daring to mutter under Tyranny, enjoins the laws he violates, that—of course—"they be subject to higher powers" as Paul
commands. To Salmassius weighing this most shameful crime by Pity and Justice, he cries out, "What bad interest have you in what the English do among themselves?" He will be remarkably successful, by Jove, if he makes himself and his Masters safe from foreign and domestic enemies both. And of their domestic, we avow that they should not only submit to tyranny but acknowledge its dominion; when there is absolute despair of a legitimate Lord and repeated efforts to bring the Tyrants to Justice have failed. Yes, but the English despair of neither. Milton, however, barely checks foreign protests and pens—perhaps even swords—before Cromwell shall have affected that vow, which he often declared before many witnesses, "that he intended, if God prolonged his life, to overturn all Monarchies and ruin all Kings." He will guard against failing in this protracted effort; let Kings look to their own safety.

Obviously, we are waging war in this cause not with the bare points of swords, but of pens which, perchance, may yet sharpen the swords. And we are contending that this defense does concern those with no English concerns, and that Salmassius has the justest motive for attacking the Parricides with the exerted shafts and sinews of his learned genius. For Englishmen might be thought in this defense to act too bitterly from partisan zeal, and to champion not the cause of justice but their own. But, having no personal motive to pry in a foreign Republic, if the French should freely denounce the veil of pietry hiding bloody tyranny and with sharpest rebuke assail the Tyrants, it is fitting for them, when aroused by the injury to dishonored Religion and the Church jeopardized and disgraced, to have taken no account of
men but overflowed in this wrath.

Great Salmasius so excelled this task that he alone equals all, leaving no further need for descent into this controversy. For who would wield a paintbrush after Apelles? Certainly I am not so empty-headed as to volunteer help for Salmasius or infringe on a Province undertaken by him. Nor have I taken on the job of asserting the Rights of Kings or defending the August Martyr against parricides; for the Royalist Champion quite completed this task and to such a great work brought all divine and human laws and an unlimited store of learning. Yet learned and unlearned alike ought to raise the Royal blood's outcry to heaven; those sitting in the best or worst seats equally should exclaim, "Arise, arise, God of vengeance, and avenge this parricide horrible and shameful to the Christian world."

What of the fact that I undertake to perform what unbeknown a great Man? For I hear those fantastic gaspers blustering to Salmasius that whole pages swell with bombastic charges, that he imports arguments dipped in bitterest gall more for emotional attacks than for enlightening discourse; that this is not disputation but brawling; and, finally, that Christians should behave otherwise between themselves, that this vehemence agrees not with Christian mildness. It is therefore worthwhile for me to show that others, whom I vouch to be far more numerous and better than myself, agree with that vehemence of Salmasius.

I affirm, I say, together with all good, prudent men, that one had to do thus with the Parricides, those most feally evil monsters of all; and that his vehemence sins not in excess, but want rather; and
that whom he calls Molossian dogs ought to be called Heli-hounds.

Salmassius obviously had a whole thesaurus of words, the universal instrument of speech, which he never used with more felicitous brilliance. But the skillfullest knight avails nothing beyond his horse's strength and spirits, nor the greatest Rhetorician beyond the fit aptitude of the tongue whereby, as on a horse, he is conveyed. Words fail, the most plenteous torrent of eloquence subsides under a crime of this size. Nor is it surprising that we have no Latin words to signify a crime unknown to Latius when the Latins had the power to regulate correct speech. One does no better if he calls for help on Greek, Hebrew, or the more recent tongues, for what race would have fitted words to a crime unseen, unheard-of by any nation?—Unless, of course, we imitate the Hebrews, who, if unable to equate word and thing, double that word and call it יַּעֲרוֹן, that is, "measureless evil"; for in this crime we do have indeed evil heaped on evil, accumulated impieties, treasons, and parricides. Nor could Salmassius match this impenetrable mass of crimes with his extensive resources of the richest Latin, alas! too simple for this multiplicity of crime.

Who therefore will accuse Salmassius of "injury" because of this vehemence? Who save a dullard would touch these criminal prodigies without curving? After so many centuries, nobody reads of Nero's parricide without loathing it at once. But what if it had been committed yesterday, or nearby, or if the parricide had been celebrated with sacrificial rites, and had appeased God with a mother's blood? What, moreover, if upon the pious reader's Religion a great stain had
thence been cast, the Church accused of a strange crime, and God himself made a party to the crime? Lo, the World now groans under a weight of evils such as Nero's crime did not impose on consciences. Do the Parricides expect all men's innate sense of justice to be so shocked that no offense will follow this offensive crime? We foreign-born, visibly sensing how Law, Religion, the Church, and lastly our Heads are oppressed with the heaviest disgrace for our adherents: will we so much revere a heathen merit lately begotten of parricide that we are paralyzed by the splendor of so much merit—or reverence for such sanctimony—and dare not even mutter against it? Shall we, forsooth, hear that author's cry, pronounced enough for a command, "What bad interest have you in what the English do among themselves?"

Yet what our interest is, they have learned, and shall learn still more—not, I daresay, without their own hurt. And while their deserved crosses and sacks are being prepared for the Parricides, we will satisfy our justest indignation with curses and return upon its impious authors the horrible injury heaped upon Reformed believers.

Nor ought we fear moving emotions at the cost of reason. For a long time now, reason has had its rights in this matter; the Royal Defender finished this task with such rich exactness that nothing could add to such fulness. Since indeed the law is not only written but inborn and drawn from Nature's purest sources, that "it is wrong for subjects to turn against their prince," I personally think too much is conceded the Parricides by arguing with them. Aristotle declares (I. Top. cap. 9) "Not by Reason but Torments must they be taught who
doubt whether God should be worshipped and Parents honored." That Great Genius of reason feels that reason, a sacred thing, is profaned by argumentation with those who have sworn off sanity and extinguished the lights of natural justice in themselves. In the judgment of all, the Royal Defender most excelled when with invincible reasons he demonstrated a matter best known by nature, and confirmed it by divine and human authority, that Royal Majesty is ἁρπαζόντων, and nothing is permitted subjects against the sacred heads of Kings. In my own judgment, he did still more what the subject demanded when with clubs he took those men who foreswore manhood, and with bruising heels trampled them as poisonous vipers baneful to human kind. This wrath, this vehemence burning with Zeal for God, is welcome to God and men; it attacks the weak spot of the parricides' cause, and leads those robbers forth to be denounced and stoned by the whole Christian World.

And just as the sacred attack of Phineas ended the sinful Epidemic at Baal-Peor, which the admonitions of Moses could not: this matter has sunk so far that the one hope of checking riotous madness, stubborn against rights of divine and human laws, must be expected from a sacred attack ready to burst into the justest, flaming demunciation, soon even into vengeance of arms.

Should one object falsely that Kings and Commonwealths can regulate with arms only, but anybody can denounce and stir up ill-will at a crossroads, I reply that not everything suits everyone. A mere girl will best a Hercules with her vicious tongue; but so to denounce that the spirits of Kings and Commonwealths become inflamed to a just, angry
vengance against public enemies belongs to our French Hercules, who leads conquered Princes and Peoples in the chains of his speech. This the Royal Defender accomplishes, not because he can swear, but because he is Salmacius; not any crossroads rabbler could do this. "If anything befits Phoebe, it doth not, Chloris, quite suit thee."

But I hear those enemies of Kings, and letters as well, in a huff-snuff; and us Booksellers, why, in your writings you'll twist us as Warmongers whom you ought to run through. I repeat, anybody can use a sword, but very few the pen—end pens what swords. Try out sometime, you loathsome beasts, what pens can do, what blasts our writings arouse whencesoever, by which the packed phalanxes of traitors are dissolved as if by a heaven-sent thunderbolt; you'll have men to deal with who prefer action to words.

But now they must be satisfied who deem that we sin excessively against Christian meekness by this excess, that we ought not treat Christians so. However, I think it suits Christian meekness, most bitterly to prosecute Parricides who blot out meekness from Religion; as he would say who heard a negligent Prince heaped with praise for goodness, "How will he be good to the good, who is not evil to the evil?" Whoever has reckoned the cruel monstronsities these Hell-hounds have committed does not wish to tell us, "I seek kind words."

I will report a few of many instances of savagery which, besides that against their own King, they displayed against Neighbors and Compatriots.

After the battle of Naseby, all women who had followed their
men, fleeing the tyranny of the traitors, were put to the sword in huge numbers.

After the slaughter at Preston, tired of killing and butchery, they starved several thousand Scots to death, imprisoned in grassy pens where with grass and plucked roots they prolonged hunger rather than life for some days.

Others captured in the same battle, both English and Scots, they sold like beasts of burden to slavers. By these transported as captives to the American Isles and employed on sugar plantations, they were made to do Negroes' work; until, when a great avenger of wrongs assisted them, they shook off the horrible yoke and seized the lush Isle of Barbados from the Tyrants.

To these, add their cruelty to the Presbyterians surviving the battle of Dunbar. They delayed killing them so they would thus linger on in Durham prison so as to realize they were dying. For how few from so many thousands survived that jail? Add, too, the late shambles at Worcester. This noble city, because it had opened its gates to Charles II, its legitimate King, was miserably plundered. Its walls were levelled to the ground, and the soldiery glutted its anger with murders, and its greed with rapine. Neither sex nor age was spared. As for captives taken in the battle, the English, laden with chains, are set apart for the death penalty by the Tyrants and immediately led forth; but the Scots they keep out of doors night and day until, consumed by hunger, frost, and dysentery, they are carried off in whole troops.

The pious generosity of the Londoners had freely supplied the naked
with clothes, the needy with coin; but such kindness was the robbers' 
booty, for soon the savage guards robbed the miserable of both clothes 
and coin. Usually they intercepted even the food sent to the prisoners. 
After eating their fill, the guards overturned pots full of meat, and 
when the famished captives picked at the morsels pitched forth in the 
mud, they were clubbed back and swine invited to the scraps. The more 
mercifully treated captives are sold to traders to be sent to American 
workhouses. But few buyers appear, and few survive briefly to be sold, 
so consumed are they by daily hunger within sight of a wealthy and 
vanily kind city. And, for variety in their deaths, sixty were placed 
on a poorly ballasted ship; the anchor once hoisted, the boat capsized 
and the river swallowed them up.

But cruelty and perfidy were crowned by the utterly shameful 
murder of the most Illustrious Count of Derby, contrary to a promise 
made at the battle of Worcester; and even as he was averting this in 
Parliament, Cromwell, the impious butcher, was promoting it in the 
army. Such a hainous crime will, perhaps, be avenged someday by the 
Princes of the French blood Royal, with whom the Count's heroic widow 
is connected by closest kinship. How small a part, too, is this of 
the savage deeds wherewith the new Tyranny distinguishes itself? And 
will anyone confer eulogism on cruel deeds? Why not, say they, since 
Christ commands his own to bless all enemies ever? What if the 
enemies are Christian? Would that they were indeed! Who, to be sure, 
will believe they have put on Christ who have put off humanity? But 
whatever they finally be, let us bless the men and curse the crimes.
We will sincerely pray for our enemies, and repay them good deeds for evil should they ever come into our power.

Finally, since the Law's second table yields place to the first, if we shall have demonstrated that the Most High God is summoned by this murderous scum to defend horrible crimes; that great infamy for His Gospel is created by damned men; that the foulest stigma is branded on the Reformed church; that by their crime this church is terribly jeopardised; there will be no cause to accuse us of violating charity, if we have asserted God's glory and the good name and safety of all good men against a few robbers. Particularly so, if we shall show that this baneful reproach, heavier than death itself, and not just threatening but (alas!) clinging to our heads, could only be plucked and cast off by this most bitter detestation and vehemence. Certainly none of the Reformed will condemn it, save those who have inspected the matter superficially, or have not what they ought—a sense of their own shame and danger.

It lies upon us, therefore, to demonstrate two things: "What crimes the Parricides have committed at home"; and "What injury is done through these misdeeds to God, Kings, and to all Churches abroad." Thence it will be evident that everybody at home and abroad ought to attack these monsters of crime with words and deeds as strongly as possible and appeal to God the avenger.

We will begin with the very crimes whereby they have violated three principal things at home: the King, the People, and the Church.
CHAPTER II

The Parricides' Crimes against his Royal Majesty

We infringe not on your province, Great Salmacius; You have defended the Royal rights; You have pleaded the Royal cause; who, after you, would dare? You are acting as its Defender, we as its plaintiffs, any reader soever as Judge. Since, therefore, the case is tried in the open court of public right, let me display before my Readers' eyes this horrible tragedy of a crime too public.

One who would recapitulate from the beginning the injuries done to the glorious King and Martyr ought to start with the first year of that unhappy Parliament, when the King, wearied with the most unfair demands, was soon driven from his home even by riots, threats, and finally arms, whilst a mad populace was aroused by a madder Senate that was already flying against Royal authority and Majesty.

Thence (so to speak), the restraints of laws and shamefastness being broken, the torrent of rebellion surged forth and equally flooded three kingdoms with one deluge. In this tidal wave, O Greatest God, thy faith! what have they done—or not done? Tributes, taxes, and Royal crops have been intercepted and turned against their Lord, Citadels captured, the Purse seized, the Fleet occupied, Arms assumed; and those refusing to bear them against their King have, in extreme punishment, served as an example for all those preferring life to conscience, to consent peaceably to the rebellion. Next, as the fortune of war would have it, the Royal Letter-case was captured and divulged and the
great Royal seal broken up, so that all could plainly see the Royal
Authority was smashed.

The Queen herself, the Royal blood of France, was--O wonderful--
proscribed and accused of treason, and at last driven into exile; while
the King, broken by many battles and having escaped besieged Oxford in
disguise, barely got through by-ways and enemy forces, finally to cast
himself on the just-as-unfriendly Scots army, like a stag fleeing the
dogs into the hunters' nets. Meanwhile, all roads were blockaded, and
the Senate decreed that, under pain of immediate death, nobody should
harbor the King without at once informing on him. His subjects no more,
they stopped calling themselves such in those supremely shameless con-
ditions they forced on the King in his Scotch captivity. Redeemed
thence from the Scots, this best of all Kings exchanged masters, not
slavery; but was dragged by the English to another imprisonment. And
this was the Presbyterians' last power against the King.

Now because I embrace them as our friends, even as I search how
to free our dearest brothers from odium for the injuries done that day
to their legitimate King, this only occurs to me; that mixed with the
greater, Presbyterian part of the Senate was an Anabaptist ferment
which from the very start leavened nearly the whole lump, so that many
yet did even what they disapproved, for a good end winking at bad means;
and that meanwhile the Independents, those craftiest of men, were sug-
gest ing that all great public actions have some injustice afterwards
compensated by public utility; and it would be very easy, the whole
thing finished, to mend at will anything done before with less fitting
justice: Thus were the Presbyterians misled, until unawares—and unwilling, too—they carried the business so far that retreat meant reproach.

For Public factions are like ships which, once out on the deep with their passengers aboard, must go not where will directs, but where wind and wave lead; and very few are so determined that they would leave a ship for a skiff, to row against tide and winds—especially if, as they oppose the factious torrent, their property, their very family and life are endangered.

Of course, the more judicious sniffed Anabaptism in that English Parliament the very first year, when laborers and the entire drags of London came, on summons by the lower house of Parliament, to the upper house, rather as besiegers than pleaders; and that very Lower House sent their demand on to Lords, that "the Chamber of Peers being dissolved, Lords should sit in the House of Commons and they should consolidate the two, so that, with the Commonwealth levelled, they might with preparation go on to introduce parity into the Church" (for the Bishops still remained). If this be not accounted pure Anabaptism, I know nothing. And the thing was done by this model with a success exceeding their prayers: Lords were abolished, Monarchy toppled, and the Republic went over to a parity of Ministers, so that it is evident the same spirit throve then which eight years later finished the affair with the King’s impious parricide.

This poison so horrible, so evident, Faugh! how did so many good men then in the Senate concoct it? Obviusaly they swallowed it,
whether blinded by the heat of contention, or whether some knew not what others did in this most loudly confused of all tumults; or whether—chosen for this purpose—the populace, raging and menacing at the door, exulted the spirits of the very few Independents in Parliament, but broke the others.

However much, therefore, the Presbyterians acted their part in this drama of rebellion, yet to the Independents do the crime's whole first and last act belong. They, before their intentions were clear, breathed ruinous counsels into the Presbyterians; they did everything by their judgment even while the Presbyterians prevailed and seemed to rule. Doubtless, the Presbyterians' plans so excelled in their boldness that they had to make them according to that already done, before the Senate had deliberated whether a thing should be done! For however the Presbyterians sat in greater number in the Senate, yet the Independents were in the Army always more powerful in martial strength and counsel, and finally in number, too; and six years ago this Tyranny was (to use your word, Great Salmasius) a pure "stratocracy." For either soldiers' nods directed Senators' votes, or daring dissenters were unseated by the troops; and late did the miserable Presbyterians learn how unsafe men are, wishing to be wiser than God, who forbids us "to do evil that good may come, and needs not the help of man's crimes to advance his kingdom; nor add we sought to God's glory, steadfastly to be good." Than this fallacy, indeed, Satan has tried no reward more potent to drive good men to the evil part, has advanced no device more certain to topple the Church. Be these things said freely and lovingly
to our Presbyterian brothers. Let them know that we neither wrongly
assent to their deeds, nor change our love toward them.

Let us quarrel with the Independents, whose rule then truly
began when they received the King, taken from the Presbyterians' cus-
tody, into theirs, doubtless a freer one at first. The King's children
were fetched, his servants admitted, the Camp became a Court, and
promise of Restitution was shown him; but meanwhile as King and Cava-
liers were salved with such hope and the odium of harshness to the King
cast back on Parliament, the army was respected as the King's liberator
and the asserter of peace by Londoners and everybody.

Soon, when by these and other ruses, but principally by force
and moving up the army, they controlled the citisenry and armory of
London, and had made Parliament theirs by expelling and heavily fining
the Presbyterians, their hatred of the King, poorly hidden before,
suddenly become open. His confinement was closer, access more diffi-
cult; throughout the army there were harangues for killing the King,
and glaring, hateful guards were chosen for him, practically glaring
murder. When, meanwhile, the one who stirred up this anger, Cromwell
that basest of bipeds, was most pretending fear for the King's safety
and increasing the danger near the King to a greater one—a Soliary
rioting, disobeying its leaders, and thirsting for the King's blood—
the King fled in this pressing danger and betook himself in the dead of
night secretly to the Isle of Wight, there to stay in its well-fortified
castle until these storms abated.

This basest tormentor cast fear into this best King, even as he
was vexed by a greater fear lest the King retire to London (which, conveyed by a helpful stream, he could have in four hours) and there the citizens become his followers, refusing the new tyranny and hating the army's yoke. Besides, the King's mind had been decided by the simplest promises, which in that last assembly this murderer spared not, equally bland and treacherous in speech, known equally for promises and perfidy, a consummate hypocrite; he seized the King's hand when advanced for him to kiss, cried over it, swore and promised by his and his children's safety not to rest until he had restored the King to his pristine dignity; only let him go yield to this blast, he would soon return with peace and dignity.

The holy King went, therefore, wherever his fate was leading, and confined himself there whence he was nevermore led forth but to his prepared death. Those gallows-birds dared not, in the very center of the realm almost in sight of the capital, decree anything about the King's life, since the state was not yet subdued, the Senate very firm, nor the Army united enough, and the People—aroused by the newest promises of the Leaders—aspired to the King's liberty and their own. Consequently they wished to hold the King in their power, enclosed by the shores of a little Isle, where approach was shut off and custody easy, and his fate could be decided by the judgment of a few.

Why he was not thereupon killed by dagger or poison, their deeds explained later. They wished to destroy not only the King but the Royal name, and to take over the Royal power; therefore he must not die uncondemned. But, as things then were, that scene had not yet
docile actors or submissive spectators.

Now entered the Island fortress, the King found the Governor's obedience prompt; but soon, whom he had thought an attendant and friend, he found his keeper, the Senate, already taxed by Cromwell, thus ordering it. Having a looser confinement at first, he writes to the Senate, demanding that peace conditions be negotiated at a conference which he would attend. They, fearing nothing more than peace and conference, send him four conditions which they wish conceded prior to entering a conference. But they wished nothing less than for the King to concede anything, and so they had prepared conditions which he would have to reject.

These were, "that hereafter the King should divest himself of the control of the Militia; that all the King's edicts against Parliament should be void; that all whom he had raised in dignity after his rift with the Senate should be reduced in rank; that Parliament, without awaiting Royal authorization, could assemble at any time ever." This certainly was (as I might say among Logicians) to proceed to the Conclusion itself before the Premisses were settled; for to what purpose were a conference on Royal Rights if the King had ceded all his Rights before its setting up? The Scots Legates, indeed, resisted these conditions with the greatest effort.

Since therefore this miserable choice was left the King, "either to be abdicated by others or to abdicate himself," he preferred dying by another's crime to a death by his own. He replied that "He could not concede those things whereby he would lose the faculty of ruling
and protecting his people; he owed the Kingship to his heirs, and would not strip himself and them of it; even if he quite approved these conditions, they would yet be invalid, conceded by a King no wise free, and secured by his seal accorded under duress; as for the rest, conditions which the Conference should treat ought not be concluded before it; that this meet as early as possible, he demanded again in a letter written to this end, which he handed sealed to the Senate's Delegates."

But with what intent the conditions had been sent to the King, the Delegates made clear before moving a foot from the Isle. For immediately they opened the King's Letters to the Senate, saying this was in their instructions. After perusing them, they ordered the King brought into harsher confinement; his old attendants were removed, unfriendly ones installed, the windows barred, and stern watch set up around his cell. And no delay, as Cromwell, that kind asserter of Royal safety and liberty, moved in the Senate that "Hereafter there be no conversation between King and Parliament; no messenger be sent to him, none received from him; that it be illegal for anyone to approach him without the Senate's permission; and he doing otherwise pay the penalty for treason."

But before this monster was thrust upon the Senate, around fifty leading Senators, whom they despaired of being able to draw into such a crime, had been sent out to raise funds for the army. And yet the horrible measure did not easily become law: it was argued from early morn almost to bedtime, until many, tired by delay and consumed by hunger, left, and a few more stubborn fellows, possibly fortified
against hunger (as they familiarly said) by their "dessert," sat tight
and passed the motion.

And these happened in the Lower Chamber; for the Upper could
hardly be brought to such an evil, until, with two Legions sent against
the Palace, a few Lords, after many slipped away, were compelled by
threats and terror to approve the ordinance. For such merit, six mili-
tary Tribunes were sent to the Lords and promised on the whole army’s
word, they would defend all Rights and Privileges of the Upper Chamber.
How they did this, we shall soon see.

The infamous Decree was followed by a prolix accusation against
the King, circulated by the Senate’s authority, and to be read by all
clergymen from the pulpit, which sought to justify so direful a deed
to the people. And Emissaries were suborned to arouse Schismatics in
every county to thank the Senate for such a crime and demand the King’s
punishment. But the vilest mandate found neither obedience among
Ministers of the Gospel, nor, after the Emissaries had scraped together
the whole dregs of England, did they accomplish more with their three
beggar libels thanking the Senate for the King’s wrongful captivity,
or demanding his punishment. Nay, the People—even those who had
followed the Senate’s arms—was thence stirred, as if from Lethargy,
through the entire realm with virtually one voice to demand, to urge,
that conference with the King be started and the Soldiery discharged.
In huge number, nearly all the Counties streamed from deserted boroughs
to the doors of Parliament to demand these; until the Senators (who
let nothing be demanded from them but what they had specified) by
setting the Militia on them slew a great many—suppliants, rustics, unarmed, sighing for peace and liberty. Slain, they were despoiled by the soldiers as if by right of war; the Senate thanked the Militia for such a famous crime.

The other Counties, however, even more remote ones, flocked together in great droves, in just such wise that you had thought that country had migrated into city, other cities into London. Yet the Scots anxiously demanded their King, taking it very ill that they were denied access to their high and mighty Prince. But all sang their song to the deaf: the English were mocked with delay and ambiguities that had befitted a Delphic Oracle; the Scots received with even contempt and threats.

At last trampled patience flared out into fury. England would not bear the yoke of a new and cruel Tyranny; Scotland the injuries of a neighboring race. Everywhere murmurs, groans, and anger already open; and nearly everybody was aroused to avenge the repulse with arms. First, seventeen navy ships deserted the Tyrant; the Scots openly prepared for an invasion; in diverse Counties the English fomented secret counsels for war.

But what should I marvel at the mere—the Royalists' misfortunes, or their enemies' craft? There were differences of every plan, both of Royalists and Presbyterians (for both would often secretly join forces)—which ruined the Royalists. For anyone who had followed the arms of Parliament easily feigned penitence, joined the Royalists, found out and betrayed the party's plans. Using these tools, the Independants
penetrated the Royalists' minds, and forced their unready endeavors
(as it were) to abort by premature birth; herein carefully working it
so that the Provinces take up arms, not together but separately, that
hence they themselves might have, with the pot just on the stove, men
ready to suppress the unready; and laboring finally that all who under-
took arms should vainly waste their efforts before the Scots invaded,
leaving them single units only to manage. All these they ordered so
well through pretended deserters that the Royalists apparently had
disjoined time and trial so as to hand their enemies an easy victory.

When therefore the members of the Royalist party had been broken
at leisure one by one, they gained a major victory, almost bloodless,
from them; it being God's will (whose judgments are hidden, punishments
just, and decrees unchanged) that the holy King should fall into crim-
inals' hands, and all that undertook his just defense be involved in
equal misfortune. This was not the first time a most just cause lacked
a happy outcome. Yet one who has blamed men's injustice will likewise
look to the justice of the cause; and many who could not aid the King
will appease his ghost with the Parricides' blood.

Naval affairs followed Fortune ashore. For the minds of sailors,
having (so to speak) tides reciprocal with their sea, were turned once
more to the Senate, following the Count of Warwick, their Admiral and
friend, who, after so notable a victory gained for the Senate, was left
stuck in the mud as the tide of favor quickly receded.

Amidst these broils, while Cromwell and the army were away, the
Senate—led by the whole Realm's complaints and even frightened by the
comotions which, though presently suppressed indeed, at some future
time might erupt (like fiery blasts held in underground caverns) into
a huge earthquake—turned its mind to saner counsels. And now weari-
ness of Cromwell had possessed the Senators, and they were ashamed to
vote at the soldiers' nod. Those recently expelled from the Senate
were recalled, and the number of those wishing for the King and Peace
prevailed. At once the Edict for consulting the King no further was
rescinded, and conversations with him begun. But this on the Isle of
Wight. Why not in mid-England, if they wanted a free King and con-
tented People? What to do? The King was not in the Senate's power,
but that of the Army. Among the soldiers hardly anyone was faithful to
the Senate—almost to a man they adored Cromwell's star. It was no less
ridiculous than pitiful to see the Senators debating matters controlled
by another, King and Kingdom, of course; rather as if they had voted on
an Ottoman Prince held by the Janissaries.

The King's prison, however, was unbelted, and he permitted to
enjoy the open air, but with a stipulation prohibiting him to leave
the Isle for forty days after the Conference's end. Lest he do this,
he was nobly provided with an inflexible guard of soldiers.

I am not minded to trace every act of that Conference, for I am
not composing a History; I will recount a few things contributing to
this best King's renown and his enemies' perpetual infamy. So few
Presbyterians returned, the Independents' party was more powerful, not
in number, to be sure, but purpose. And the very ones who were in-
flamed with great hate of this party, were too unfriendly to the King
and quite alienated from the Royalist party, the favorers of which had already been moved from the Senate six years before and replaced by others. From these men, therefore, not even hatred of the Independents or love of personal safety could wrest conditions fair to the King.

Yet, beyond the hope of all, the King approved very many most unfair conditions, with this reservation, however, that "Nothing in that Conference be held ratified without final agreement as to all conditions."

For this Conference the Senate had chosen for itself six from Lords, ten from Commons, and some especially noted Theologians; for the King, only a few whose advice he should use, and these admitted with much wariness on the part of the Senate. None of these, however, was permitted to assist the King when in Conference. The King alone, against all whom the victorious faction accounted its most skillful and learned, filled the part of both Politician and Theologian, even more copiously than all his adversaries. His enemies were stupefied at the King's prudence, learning, persuasiveness, keenness in discussing things with tireless patience, intellectual strength, and incredible self-possession. But they marvelled the most at his Heroic generosity, so controlled by pious gentleness that though he would allow his own rights and revenues to be diminished, yet not for threats or the most pressing danger of death would he suffer anything to be extorted whence loss to Religion or to the dignity of his Posterity might come. And in that Conference he held two things more venerable than his Realm or Life—Honor and Conscience.

The Love for his People of this Best King, who wished to repair
public losses at personal expense after so many calamities, had made
the Senate's delegates from enemies into friends; and they poured forth
secret groans and poorly hid tears forced by pity, as they thought on
what a King they had crushed and were going to lose, how miserably they
were wasting labor in treating about Seals, Religion, and Treaties with
a King set in the power of monstrous brutes, and destined for assassins'
swords.

The Senate had demanded, "that all the King's Edicts against the
Senate should be rescinded; that the Episcopal Order and the Anglican
Liturgy should be abolished; that the King should give up the power
of Militia and choosing of Magistrates for twenty years; that admin-
istration of Ireland should be in the Senate's power; that it should
have charge of paying public debts; that dignities conferred by the
King since the war started should be without effect; that a new Seal
should be struck; that London's Privileges should be confirmed; that
the Court of Wards be abolished, to be compensated by annual payment of
£50,000 English."

For such hard conditions—which the very Soldiers, even while
they were softening the King, had scorned as being unfair—the King
showed himself most ready. He conceded all, these only excepted:
"He wished the Episcopal Order to remain; he permitted Senate payment
of public debts, provided they render biennial accounts; as for aboli-
tion of the Court of Wards, he demanded £100,000 yearly."

By these concessions the Senate now seemed to have obtained its
wish; whence there were dismay and alarm for not a few Senators. For
whither should they turn if occasion for complaint should be cut off? Therefore a great quarrel was stirred up for the King about the Episcopal order, to which they well knew the King would cling by the teeth. Here indeed that sacred hero's innate piety and unshaken firmness in Religion shone forth the most; for he who had restrained himself many years in affairs of war and peace and had given up his greatest revenues, now seemed (unmoved in point of religion) so greatly mindful of God, to have forgotten himself and his children. That, however, you shall marvel in this firmness at his equal courtesy and wisdom—he suffered the abolition in Episcopacy of "whatever was not entirely of Divine Right," namely "Episcopal Jurisdiction and the Archeepiscopal Grade." But to concede that Presbyters and Deacons could be created without a Bishop, he never could be brought, just as it was impossible in the Anglican Church before to confer Holy Orders on Bishops without Presbyters. But since the quarrel was whether this Power belonged especially to a Bishop of Presbyters (which would not take a day to judge), and the peace-makers urged the very-present sword of necessity, the King conceded that the Bishops not exercise this power for three years without the Presbyters' consent, while Theologians chosen on both sides for this business decide something certain about Ecclesiastical Discipline. Accordingly they should try Presbyterian Discipline during the next triennium.

Soon they sharply tormented the King's benevolent mind about the Lands and Revenues of the Bishops, especially with this argument, that "a good part of them had been sold in parcels by the Senate, the money
disbursed for public uses, and it would be hard to regain the lands from their new possessors." Sitten from both sides with horror at the Sacriclege, the pious King could not be compelled by any arguments or necessity to suffer the Church Lands to be sold. This, however, he yielded to necessity, that "the Lands be farmed out for ninety years, with a small rental reserved annually as a testimony of Hereditary Right and Bishops' Alimony; when that time should be over, they would revert to the Crown's right, to be spent for the Use of the Church." Those who knew the most religious King's intent swear he had decided to redeem those Lands with his personal wealth, and restore them to the Church.

Besides the foregoing demands, the Senate pressed for the King to punish most severely all who had helped him in the war. In a long, malicious list they had noted who should lose their heads, be stripped of all their fortunes, fined a part of their goods, or deprived of every office in the Commonwealth and benefice in the Church. How hateful this was to the Best King, I leave any man to judge. Since, however, he could not oppose alone such a torrent of iniquity, he permitted many moderate penalties to be imposed on some—that some should be prohibited from court, some exiled from the kingdom, others for three years lost the right of sitting in Assemblies; that none be tried for treason, or executed, or stripped of fortunes; and that the Senate could bring any Royalist to trial, if he had done anything against the Laws passed before this war.

In this last condition the King must took counsel for his own;
for by the Laws no one could be prosecuted for bearing arms for his
King. And once restored to his solid dignity, the King could have
mitigated the other penalties.

The matter already looked to an agreement, and there was
discussion of recalling the King—either to London or one of the
Royal houses—and passing a law of amnesty. The Senate had now indeed
assented that the King should get all revenues and emoluments of the
Crown, and that just compensation be repaid for the Royal rights which
the King had permitted to be nullified.

But here the Soldiers, at the name of peace, raged, menaced,
and complained; nothing had been accomplished by so many labors borne,
so many enemies defeated, so many difficulties overcome by their virtue,
should the King recover the dignity he had lost with arms, by a willing
surrender of the Senate and Army; the Soldiers would perish unless the
King did. The victorious army therefore flew to the gates of London,
and whereas before they had requested an end of the Conference and
punishment of all defendants, now they bluntly demanded the King’s
head for punishment, payment of their wages from the Royal wealth, and
sale of the Church’s lands for the same end. These they asked, now in
the people’s, now in the army’s name—oh, the impudence! since not even
a thousandth part of the people had assented.

The Senate, after setting aside the Soldiers’ petition, per-
sisted in seriously treating with the King just the same. But the
Soldiers were vexed and thought it superfluous to seek from others what
was in their hand. Consequently men were sent to the Isle of Wight to
take the King in the middle of the conference and remove him to Hurst Castle—a sordid, cramped, unhealthy place, set in the very sea, and nigh inaccessible. The Army pitched its camp between the cities of London and Westminster; every place near the Senate was occupied by the Soldiery. And they doubted not that, with the King captive and the Army occupying the very entrance to the Senate, all the Senators who wanted the King and Peace would fall away, and the rest vote at the Soldiers' dictation.

But this hope deceived them; for the Senate both assembled in greater number and expressed itself more freely on an ultimate concord with the King, though arms rattled on all sides; for the Independents would vainly "confine" the Senators until all their own forces had arrived. But finally, having bid farewell to those quibbles which—out of the fretful pedantry of the kind itself and the ungoverned obstinacy of that faction—had been able to hold them so long, they got down to a decision that "The Royal Concessions afford a suitable basis for peace." There were two hundred votes for the decision, scarcely sixty for the other side.

And the Senate had indeed been able to deliver this verdict and maintain it once delivered, so long as the army was far off, engaged with the Scotch or Royalists, and there were faithful, firm troops at hand for the Londoners. They had been able, I say, had their judgment not been foolish and their hatred of Royalists more important than their own welfare. But "Phrygians are wise late"—unless, perchance, you'll deny they're wise, because late!
The Upper Chamber agreed with the Lower. Men were sent to
express the decision to the General and Leaders of the Army. But the
Army expressed its own opinion to the Senate at its next sitting, and,
of course, like a dragoon. For they barred around two hundred Senators
on the way in; even looked up forty of them in jail; and certain ones
they hardly approved of, who by then had secretly sneaked in, they
forcibly extracted and thrust out. O Divine wisdom! O justice mar-
velous, fearsome, adorable! Behold these lights of the Senate, these
glories of the Militia, these national leaders who with might and coun-
sel had reduced their King to extremities, now treated disgracefully
by their own soldiers, and from the Senate they had defended with so
many crimes, cast into chains and weakened by the stench of long im-
prisonment. These were wages worthy of so many turbulent crimes, paid
out by those whom they were hiring for rebellion, and whom they had led
by force and guile into deceit and the crime of damnable high treason.

Now the Senate, which should consist of five hundred Senators,
had been reduced to forty—worthless men, and (so to speak) the dregs
sticking in the jug with the Senate emptied out. For who born in
honorable station, who with any virtue or nobility leaping in his
fibers, would have wished to sit in a Senate which was going to vote
on the King's head? The Noble and the Honorable fear to violate the
King, as being the Fount of Nobility and Dignity. You must scrape up
cobblers, butchers, tuppence rascals—and pick the worst of the lot,
too—if you want to name the King's Judges.

Of such scum were those few remaining Senators, and of them the
great part military Tribunes; and their Leaders the basest of men who, simultaneously members of Senate and Army, would report the Soldiers' orders to the Senate. For the Name of Authority was in the Senate, but the Authority itself in the Army.

And so in the new Senate new laws, a new form of Empire is hammered out; the most ancient foundations of English government are quite uprooted. From this sacred tripod it is pronounced that the People hold the whole power of Empire, Assemblies hold the People's power, the House of Commons that of Assemblies and the House of Lords besides; that to start a war against this House of Commons is high treason; and that the King, because of the arms he assumed against such Majesty, should be tried for treason and undergo the death penalty.

No sooner said than done. They set up a Court and call it Supreme, wherein to decide the King's fate. To it, they name six Lords only, some regular Judges of the Courts, and some from Commons quite deaf to the King. Some are added from London's drags and the Anabaptist neighborhood. Of these, one or so is a cobbler, the others brewers, goldsmiths, and joiners. Why mention Bankrupts who had quit the mart, Extortioners, Embezzlers, Gluttons, Loafers, and the best-known Whoremasters, those foulest slaves of strolling lust? Of these new-made Judges, a good many from the army had been chosen already sworn against the King's life.

Yet a more packed House of Lords convened; it condemned the election to pick the King's judges, and perceived its own welfare at stake and all the branches of honor cut off in the King, as from the
root and trunk of dignity. Lo, penitence at last—alas, how late!
For they had brought things to the point whence not even they hoped to
retrieve it by their votes. However, they did what they could—they
branded perpetual infamy on so horrible a decree.

Strongly aroused, the conspirators at present, however, decided
on nothing harsher than expunging all Lords from the number of Judges
chosen against the King. Those most like Justices of the Courts were
erased, that is, those who, when consulted about the point, had replied
that "It was against the Laws of England for the King to stand judg-
ment."

Behold, then, a Court of judges without judges, without Law, and
without the appearance of them. This sordid and scandalously Court is
headed by a President its equal, a most obscure and saucy rogue; an
orator his peer is chosen to accuse the King. Whence, as I recall the
deed and its doers, it seems less marvalous for such a horrible deed,
hateful to God and man, to be accomplished, than for the men found to
undertake it to go ahead. Of course, a very many, now from the Senate
and now from the number of Judges, got away and hid while this mon-
strous Tragedy was acted out.

Meanwhile, nearly all the pulpits of London thundered against
this ruinous madness; and all the pastors with practically one voice
prayed, asked, and implored with orations, letters, conferences, and
pleading tracts, that if they respected the Commonwealth, Religion, their
plighted Word, and finally God (the Protector and Avenger of Kings),
they shed not the King's sacred blood, which would weigh grievously on
their own heads and the whole Realms. The many, many promises and holy professions sent out publicly by the Senate are urged, that the King’s safety would be its care, and its sincerity towards him absolutely honorable. Laws of the Kingdom, the Authority of Scripture, the Law of Nations, Notions of Right and Good innate in all mortals, the disgrace everywhere to the Reformed Church, its danger, even, abroad—all are adduced. Why say more? All things were employed which could have moved hearts of iron. But not these,

For whose misdeed ev’n nature found no name,
Nor with hard metal could express its blame.

Hugh Peters, a demagogue unequalled in the whole kingdom, continually inflamed the Senate and Army from his pulpit for the King’s execution. But who is this man? One who long ago abandoned the Ministry, of all scoundrels the boldest liar, the most depraved buffoon, the foulest adulterer, one who even now drives a noble man among us to exile while he abuses the man’s wife at his pleasure.

But even as the King is pleaded for in England, the Scots manage with greater confidence. They demand that the King, as more their own, be saved and returned; and all but order it. They add the treaties entered and solemnly sworn at the start of the war, whereby fine guarantees was given for Safety of the King and his Posterity, and for keeping in good repair the rights of sovereignty in either nation. They recall more recent promises of the Senate, when the Scotch handed over the King to the English, that “the King was going to be held in
the greatest honor, and enjoy a real security"; and finally the Senate's newest profession of all, hardly four months before, when Delegates from the Scotch Senate, treating with the English Senate about the King and his Rights, bore hence this reply: "They did not wish to change the form of the English Kingdom, wherein the King reigned, and shared his counsel with a Senate consisting of two Chambers, one of Lords and the other of Commons." What said the Senate now? "Then it had not wished to convert the Kingdom to a Popular Government, but did now; it had absolute freedom both ways, willy-nilly, as the Commonwealth's safety demanded."

This trick of these foulest gallows-birds, of course, subverts all compacts, all faith in commerce among men, and the moral sense itself. For one's word is not given or required about present, but future things. If any King negotiated through his Envoys with a neighboring King about securing peace and restoring destroyed property, he would accomplish nothing if agreements could be cheated by this shift: "Then it pleased me, now it doesn't, and past agreements put no necessity on my will for the future." Thus, there would be no agreements except as to the past, for whatever we say is past even then. Certainly, with these monstrous beasts that thrust out reason and faith, there remains one way to deal—Force of Arms. The Scots therefore resolved on this, and would that the whole world had, too: for monsters which banish faith from man's affairs should be attacked with the collective strength of all.

The most powerful Orders of the Federated Belgians, who labored
nightly with entreaty and ransom offered through their Orators to 
redeem the King's sacred head, had been able to do no more. English 
Nobles even pledged their life for the King's, ready to suffer punish-
ment if the King had sinned at all. The people, however, rage on all 
sides, nor merely mutter at the injury; but openly protest, force upon, 
grow angered at, even menace (alas, how vainly!) the soldiers stationed 
everywhere. And yet the clamor of the People was not checked by the 
fierce looks, words, and blows, too, of the armed men; let them return 
their King—the People had not undergone so many burdens, paid so many 
taxes, to the end that this most beloved King should be killed before 
the People's eyes. If they fought for the People, they should not, 
against popular wish, remove the King and Kingly Power from their 
midst; all wished for, all sighed for the King.

But the only thing achieved by the People's roar was for the 
unspeakable parricide to be hurried on. And so, surrounded by an armed 
guard, King Charles, that Sacred and August Head, is produced before 
this novel court, unheard-of by any century. He is accused in the name 
of the English People of high treason, Tyranny, Murders and Rapines, but 
principally of a war begun against Parliament—woe, polluted men!— 
which, indeed, by their own confessions they had started. Yet this same 
People, in whose name he was accused, gazed on wailing, and by its tears 
cast the lie on his accusers; even as the King—his face displaying his 
inmate Majesty and by the serenity of his countenance showing a com-
posed mind—seemed to address the grieving People with his eyes:

"Grieve not over me, but grieve over yourselves, and over your children."
The accusation once read, the King asked the newly-mad Judges:
"By what authority did they judge their legitimate King, and this against a public promise, just given by either Order? By what authority?" he asked. "For it was not unknown to him that a good many powers prevailed everywhere relying on no laws, as those of pirates and footpads. Let them only show by what right they arrogated themselves this power—he was prepared to reply; but if they could not, let them avert this crime from their heads and the people's. Certainly, he was determined not to betray the province entrusted to him by God, and descended to him by a most ancient lineage."

To the President, who growled that he was called to Justice by authority of the English People by whom he had been elected King, the King replied: "In no wise by election, but by a succession of over a thousand years had the Kingship devolved upon him; he asserted the rights of the English People more fully and better by refusing an authority illegitimate and set up at pleasure, than they by adding to it. But if they would show the authority of Parliament, nobody was here to be seen" (he looked over the remaining assembly) "of the order of Nobles, without whom Parliament could not be constituted. A King also ought to be there to judge a King. But truly, neither one nor the other House of Parliament, nor any tribunal in the world, had any right to degrade a King of England, much less some counterfeit judges, pretending for themselves the authority of the Lower Chamber which they themselves had trampled. Let them produce their Authority then—it would be the same as a crime for him to yield to a Tyrant, and resist
a Legitimate Power." The President frequently contradicted the King as he spoke, and ordered him taken like a prisoner into custody.

The King, fetched a second and a third time by the Parricides and ordered to reply to the charges, otherwise soon to hear the death sentence, ordered "them in turn to justify the power usurped against their King; he accounted his Life worth little compared to his Reputation, his conscience, the Laws, and the People's Liberty, all which would be shaken by their defense before such Judges. For what power have Subjects to name Judges for their King, power sanctioned by what Laws? Not, certainly, by Divine ones, which teach that obedience is to be shown to Princes; not by human and national laws, for English Laws order that all actions of the Law be done in the King's name; but to the Lower Chamber they allow not even the least power to punish the lowest subject, to say nothing of the King. If the People should have this power fully, and they truly have it from the People, surely they would have first consulted the People on such a matter; but not each tenth man had been consulted"; he could have said, each thousandth.

The President, utterly insolent, interrupted the King, and ordered him to be mindful of his place; he quite forgetful of his own. The Chamber well knew its Right, and did not wish to hear reasons calling its Authority into doubt. "But what, or where," inquired the King, "is that Court wherein there is no place for reason?" The King persisted in calling this novel Authority to the test of Law and Reason, until that distinguished President ordered the prisoner removed. But the King said, "Remember it is your King, from whom you turn your
ears," Then, turned to the People: "See what Justice Subjects must expect from these men who will not hear their King."

Summoned now a fourth time, the most August King is brought before this tribunal of wretches; there "the Judge, admired in Tyrian red," very bitterly scolds the King's contumacy, orders the King to submit to the Court, to reply to the charges; if he obeys not, to hear at once the sentence of death. The King recognised the Court's authority as he should, and steadfastly refused to plead his case before them; he asked leave to impart to the Senators of either order some things concerning the People's welfare and the peace of the Kingdom. The President of those murderers refused; for thus delays would be continued, and justice delayed. The King retorted that "a delay of one or two short days should better be undergone than a sentence hurried up, whence a perpetual tragedy of woes would rise for the whole Realm and children yet unborn; he could, if he should seek occasions for delay, plead his case and protract it at length, and at least delay the foul sentence. But he preferred dying as the Defender of Laws and Right, and the Martyr of his People, to prolonging his life by prostituting these; but he entreated liberty to speak very briefly before the dark and foul sentence was pronounced, which it would harder to retract once delivered, than even to prevent."

But claiming that brief liberty of speech for himself, the Parricide's President started a long harangue which I leave to their own Historians to recount; a speech how fierce, lying, and shameless, this criterion alone will indicate; this King, the mildest and kindest
of all who have ruled England, he compares to Caligula, saying that he had wished the whole English People had one neck he could shorten at a blow.

At last the sentence was read: "Since Charles Stuart, accused by the People of Tyranny, Treason, and Misdemeanor, said nothing for himself, he is held guilty of the crimes charged, and contumacy besides; he is condemned to die, and his head to be severed from his body."

After the sentence had been pronounced, the remaining Judges, ready to approve it, stood at invitation of the President, they being in number sixty-seven though the Senate had picked 150; but horror at the crime drove many away, among them Fairfax the General. With a look expressing not anger, but pity, the King called them "unhappy souls who would dare the same against their Leaders, if hired for a pittance." The Anabaptist Soldiers spat on his clothes as he passed; one even spattered his august face with spit, which he, the more joyful for his conformity with Christ, meekly wiped off saying, "Christ suffered much for my sake." It will not be ours to praise the King's patience, sacred indeed, through those who applauded the Soldier's wicked impudence; for the moment it was done, a military Tribune who had sat as a Judge against the King, told the thing to his like, with great commendation of the noble Soldier.

And so, that Charles might suffer many things like Christ, the Soldiers redouble their mockeries of him. They blow Tobacco fumes, which they know annoy him, in his face, and throw fragments of tablets before his feet as he walks; they call him a Tyrant, rail at him, club
to death those daring to salute him as he goes by, and slay at his feet one man even as he prays God to pity him.

Let those good Judges say, who punish killing even in a King; what inquiry was held into this murder committed by a common soldier? Particularly since the King was innocent, the soldier was plainly criminal. If they were to say it was not safe for the Judges to punish the Soldier while the army, in arms and aroused, surrounded them, let them admit that the same force prevailed in the King's condemnation; and the whole thing was done not by law but arms. But if it were a great crime, payable by death, to pray for the King they condemned and openly wished sent to Hell, and if, like another Phineas, that Soldier-assassin performed a prompt and laudable work: alas! how many thousands of men, bound for the same crime, have they condemned to death! For though the whole People should pray for the welfare of its King destined for the ax, if the People had one neck, these would have lopped it off in that man. But if, in the confusion of things, an inquiry into that killing could not be held while the Soldiers' minds were provoked, why, in the profound quiet that followed after they were reduced to order, did no vengeance of justice follow so public and cruel a crime? We, however, are perhaps ridiculous, who from parricides against so sacred and public a head demand vengeance for a private murder, nor suffer a homicide to hide under the parricide.

And so I return to the King. Doomed to die, in St. James's Palace (formerly his Court and now his prison) he completely applies himself to the duties of piety, having with difficulty obtained the
ministry of *Juxon*, Bishop of London; who formerly had conducted his private worship, a most pious and prudent man, less hated by the Senate and People of London than the other Royal Theologians because he had discharged the office of High Inquisitor of England with kindness and integrity; even too often obliging to the Londoners. Him, therefore, the King selected as the helper of his last fortitude and piety; with him to spend the time in nightly Discourse and Fasting, to fortify himself with the viaticum of the Eucharist, to strengthen his mind by sacred reading and religious conversation, he who would shortly grapple with death.

Yet he was not allowed to enjoy that real freedom of Religion usually not denied those condemned to death; at his last, thus far did the wicked insolence of the profane Soldiers rage: night and day they break into the Royal chamber, mock the praying King with jarring laughter, pursue him with jeering sarcasm, disturb him with quibbles; though he, with marvelous self-control and a contempt that helped his patience, dissimulated their taunts and fleers; and by his Royal gravity and right reason so deflated the ill-timed babble of the Anabaptists, that very many, stupefied and defeated by their captive, retreated.

It has been reported by men quite worthy of credit, that it was discussed in the Military Council what tortures and disgraces should be added to capital punishment, for they thought it too little for the King simply to die; and that the clamency of the godly parricides finally prevailed, that he should be decapitated on a scaffold erected for the woeful scene inside an area they call *White-Hall*, hard by a
great dining-room set aside for state dinners and receiving Ambassadors, much the finest in the whole Realm; that where his Majesty had done the most, he should be supremely disgraced. And because they had heard the King would not submit his neck to the ax of his subjects, the scaffold was fitted with iron hooks wherewith the head and shoulders of the struggling King would be held.

Though these stem from the greatest hate for the King, yet that it may be plain that they burned with a greater hatred for Royal dignity and that Charles was hated less than "King," we must not omit that the day before he departed this life, the Soldiers came to him with certain conditions whereby, if he would sign, he would preserve both his Life and the name of King. The King rejected them on first or second reading, saying that "He would have to go to a thousand deaths before his Honor and the People's Liberty would be prostituted thus."

At last, on the fatal day (less, indeed, for him than for the whole Realm), the holy King was conducted from St. James's Palace to White-Hall; and making the half-mile journey afoot through the intervening enclosure, with his brisk look and quick stride he seemed to fly rather than go to his death, repeatedly chiding his armed guards for tardiness, and reminding them that he was now preceding them, though about to struggle for a heavenly crown—less troubled now than formerly when he led his soldiers, ready to join battle for an earthly diadem.

Conducted to a bedchamber, he passed the space of an hour in prayer. Thence he was brought out on a scaffold draped with a black cloth; the ax was in sight, two Masked Executioners, and, lower than
the planking, some cavalrmen ready to use force if the King should
cause too much trouble. These were enclosed, and dense squadrons of
horses kept the People far off, lest the King be heard. Therefore,
if he had planned any oration to the People, he suddenly changed plan,
compelled to make his speech to his enemies and the Parricide's Minis-
ters alone, whom he thus addressed:

"I would have preferred to make no speech before you, except
I feared that my silence would be drawn by some into an argument for
my guilt, and my suffering of punishment into an awareness of the
crimes charged.

"As a witness of my innocence, I call on God, at whose tribunal
I soon must stand, that it never entered my mind to diminish the just
Privileges of Parliament, nor did I conscript an army before they had
prepared forces hostile to me; this indeed will be established by
examining the order of history, and the Calendar of Diplomatic and
State Papers.

"Meanwhile I acknowledge, and, with the greatest submission of
mind, venerate Divine Justice, which through an unjust sentence in-
flicts a just punishment on me, because I did not free an innocent man
when he was oppressed by a most unfair sentence."

He was referring to the Earl of Strafford, Lord Deputy of Ire-
land who, accused of high treason seven years before because of a great
conspiracy of the English Parliament, Scotch Army, and Irish Lords, had
been condemned though the King resisted most stubbornly; nor could the
King be brought by the collective prayers and might of three Kingdoms
to assent to his condensation, until Theologians of great repute persuaded his mind, weary of Rule, that "the People's voice was God's, and that three nations would equally flare into a dire war, unless one man, to become a victim of public hate, should be surrendered to their demands; that it was better for one to perish, than all." Unequal to such violence of all against one man, the King at last gave a sign and ordered it to be done then as they wished. However, if therefore you divide among its authors the guilt of his blood, no share will belong to the King, and the Senate which condemned the King took the entire blame on itself. Yet this consent, though extorted from him by every force and ruse, oppressed the King's soul at the last, and he acknowledged God's Justice for a sin, indeed more of others, and yet his however, in this unjust judgment of assassins. Let this serve as a warning to all, that "there is no just excuse for sin; persuaders to crime indeed do draw another's sin to themselves, but do not withdraw it from those whom they have driven into the evil part; that it is most unsafe through sin to resist harm; finally, that even those things which, though well augured, we do wrongly, stain us with sin and infix a thorn that will remain in the wound."

I say, however, that both this confession of the King in the last act of his life, and the whole affair from the start as men are now, redound absolutely to the King's praise. For if that condemnation—which, though done by every Order of the Realm, his authority so long prohibited, but at last permitted when he had been grimly "requested" by the Scots army and deafened by the clamors of England,
Scotland, and Ireland—yet called his soul even to his last plight, so as that, even when holding his neck under the ax, though wrongly condemned he paid due honors to the dead by this recognition: what a King will you think he was—how upright, how holy? For just as a field is level, wherein there slightly projects a molehill, hardly to be seen in unequal soil; thus is that soul pure, whose blemishes seem as tumers, and that forgets not its least faults, which in others would lie hid among greater ones. For how few princes cast not their faults upon their Ministers? But this one does not even cover his permission under the will of Assemblies and the voices of three Kingdoms, remembering that he ought to have protected justice against them. But what mortal could have resisted that torrent? whom would that headlong tide not have carried off? If through his lust or wrath (for which, license of rulers loves to let slip the reins) he had plundered his people or shed innocent blood, his conscience would not now—dragged, on this threshold of grim Death, in the too-harsh chains of guilty memory to the supreme Judge's throne—have dwelt on his permission to condemn one man, and that extorted by force.

But let us hear the holy Martyr speak: "With what charity," he said, "I embrace enemies raging against me, let that good man be my witness" (He was pointing to the Bishop of London). "I freely pardon them all from my inmost heart, and I strenuously beg the God of compassion that he deign to grant them a repentance at last, and forgive this crime.

"I cannot, however, so long as I even draw breath, not be
concerned about the peace of my Kingdom; since it has, as my fortunes are now, no fitter counsel, I will clearly show the way wherefrom it has wandered far, and by which you, Soldiers, must return it to virtue and peace.

"Herein I see you erring most grievously, in that you think to take the Sovereignty upon you by power of the sword and no shadow of the Law, not even the slightest; you strive to stabilise the Kingdom not by the authority of Laws, but of Victory. Yet you must hope for no law from victory, unless a just cause for war have preceded, whether for repulsing injuries, or recovering rights wickedly withheld. But indeed, if Victors stretch their Victory beyond the just and good and measure their Right by their success, what cause were there to prevent Kingdoms which are set up from being, and being called, Piracies? Which we read a Pirate once retorted to Alexander.

"But no other way can the erring return to the right path of Peace, by no other counsel, believe me, can they avert divine wrath, than by rendering to God, King, and People, each its own. You have returned to God what are his, if you have restored his pure worship, and, according to the rule of God's Word, the right order of the Church, now long overthrown and violated: this a National Synod, duly called and free to determine, would most conveniently do. The rights of the King my successor will stand, if you have revived entirely what the Laws enjoин and declare. Finally, you will affirm to the People their Rights and true Liberty, indeed not by exalting them into the Society of Kingship, but by tempering the Prince's authority and People's
obedience with the law. Because I could no way be brought to assent that these be curtailed by the rule of a great sword, ie, here I am brought, to be the Martyr of my people."

The King had stopped a moment, when drawing near, the Bishop of London advised him to declare his thoughts on Religion, which though none called into doubt because well proved by the whole tenor of his life, would yet be useful to satisfy the People and custom on that score.

"For my part" (said the King, facing the People) "I have left a testimony of my faith with this good man" (namely the Bishop). "And I expect testimony on this point from all by whom my life and Profession were seen. As for the rest, I die in the Christian faith according to the same profession of the Christian Church, which my Father of most happy memory bequeathed me."

Then surveying the Tribunes, he thus spoke: "Relying on most merciful God, and most sure of the Justice of my cause, I both trust and desire that I am directly going to exchange this corruptible Crown for another one incorruptible, and that I shall cross over into another Kingdom quite free from all strife and tumult."

Then, leaning forward on his knees, having prayed briefly, he offered his sacred neck to the feresome ax; and in a moment, the foul blow equally decapitated three Kings in that August head.

They say that the King, a few hours before, had doubted whether to submit his neck to his subjects' ax. It seemed more Regal, with a sword plucked from someone or by seizing the ax itself, to kill one or
two of the assassins with his own hands, and to die in a most just
defense. But the Bishop of London, the mildest of men, persuaded him
to close this last Act with that gentleness and gravity he had acted
it so far. It was no unworthy for a King to offer his throat to the
knives of Subjects, than for Christ, the King of Kings, to carry the
cross imposed by His Subjects; nor should he lose in death that likeness
to Christ which he had already gained in his condemnation; not to fall,
by struggling with base souls, from that serenity of soul prepared by
festings and prayers, and necessary to one preparing himself for etern-
al rest. It was most noble to forgive his enemies: Blessed are they
who suffer. Nor, indeed, did the King's mind ponder long in this
doubt, better prepared for Christian patience.

The King now dead, these barbarous killers sport with his life-
less body; they dip their hands in his hot gore—destined to be on
their heads—and not content with their hands, they dabble their very
staffs in the Royal blood for a jest. That you might know, however,
they valued the King highly, they even sell his hairs, the blood-
stained sand, bloody fragments of the block on which the Royal neck
had lain for execution. The corpse is handed over for disembowelling
to some Quack and camp surgeons utterly bitter toward the Royal name,
with commands to seek carefully whether he was infected with Venereal
disease or any other vice; these tools well understanding the intent
of their likes, their masters—namely, they were told and ordered to
lie. But a more honorable Physician opposed the calumny; called upon,
he forced himself upon the dissection of the Royal corpse, and confirmed
that all was sound and healthy in that August body, promising the strongest health and a very long life, had not premature death cut them short.

When the King had been removed, the Bishop of London was put under guard, and the papers the King had handed him taken away. The King's clothes were torn up and his chests rifled so that no Royal writings would get abroad; no doubt but that they deprived the world of many fair examples of piety and prudence.

However, by the greatest kindness and providence of the Most High, there survived that heartless search a marvelous work, the Eikon Basiliké, or volume of Royal soliloquies, wherein he had spent the long time of imprisonment. Than this book, nothing more worthy of a Christian King has appeared since Apostolic writings. All generations will marvel at such serenity of mind in such calamities, at such patience, wisdom, and fortitude; at such eloquence in such simplicity, not painted with borrowed colors, but strong with the sharpest feeling of its very subjects, and of piety and prudence; lustrous with perpetual light. You may justly doubt which of these, indeed, stands out more in this Royal Work. For what holier than this piety, what more fervent or effective on the emotions? What wiser than this prudence of a King most skilled in divine and human law, and most practised by the long struggle of so many adversaries? Yea, all good men feel the benefit arising from so sacred a volume. The envy kindled thence by its enemies truly burns them to the quick, and will not quit burning until, with a fire lit on all sides by compatriots and foreigners, it at last
consumes them to ashes.

But thrust into jail, the Bishop of London was held for no plain cause. The King had been heard on that fatal scaffold repeating "Remember! Remember!" to the Bishop. Therefore they must extort from this great man what it was that the King, next to death, with such care ordered him to remember. The Bishop, brought before the Judges and huddled, with the most grievous threats, to tell it, was a long time silent. Ordered, finally, to speak the whole and simple truth, he said, "My Lord the King had ordered me, that if I could get to the Prince his son and heir, to bear him this last command of his dying father: that when restored to his Sovereignty and Power, he should forgive you, the authors of his murder: this, truly, the King ordered me again and again to remember." 0 King to be venerated even by his killers! 0 holy parent of his People! O true disciple of Christ, who would pray for his enemies even after his death!

The sudden light of undeserved compassion daunted the parricides, and admonished them for their crime. On the face of each were shame and guilty silence, as if too late they venerated whom they had just slain, and as if the very mention of the pity they had denied their king threw fear into those assassins. So ingrained, even for those who have abandoned equity and good sense, is a feeling of Justice, that those who have flown unchecked to injustice, at the name of pity greatly fear Justice. And so, having learned little, the Judges remand the Bishop to jail, whence his integrity and affability of manner afterwards brought this very Great Man unharmed.
Meanwhile, through all England, and the three Kingdoms equally, there were tears, sobs, hate of public business, neglect of private concerns, every word and deed those of angered or despondent men, and all but final despair. For what spirit would you think survived for judicious men, when the pious Father of his Country had been slain before the people's eyes, the Monarchy exterminated, Religion besmirched, the Church suffocated? Into what hope would they raise their children, to be utterly miserable slaves of the foulest tyranny, sighing under an Anabaptist yoke upon their consciences? Or what is worse, instead of Religion, to imbibe fanatic insanity? Why should they husband or increase a fortune to be plundered at the whim of soldierly insolence and employed against the legitimate heir of the Kingdoms, so that they would, in a way, have lost their safety by their own hands and go put out the one star of ruined sovereignty, which through hope might even inspire some sort of life into the great body?

The crime had indeed been huge, though the loss less, if they had slain Caligula or the likes of Peter of Castile or Demetrius of Russia. But woe, they have killed another Titus, nay, one far better than Titus, the people's Love, the Beloved of the Human Race. The entire series of British Kings shows not such justice, mercy, and piety; all Histories hardly show such in any man. What force of genius he had! what sanctity of manners! what moderation in prosperity! what fortitude in adversity! what reverence for the Most High! what love for his people! what care at the end for Religion and the Church, for which he even finally poured forth his life! His gentleness alone threw a
clog into his other virtues, a gentleness which preferred awakening sluggish souls to their duty through his full confidence, to holding them in their duty by force and Power, while he could; whence came ruin to him and his people; whom, indeed, he would have better coun-
seled for, if he had indulged them less.

Let Kings learn, that most things are denied the People with greater clemency than granted to them; that the Father of his Country ought rather to estimate what profits the people, than what they de-
mand. That Prince best looks out for public welfare who preserves his own, and commits himself to no power but his own, nor suffers another to do anything without him in his Realm: For an unaccustomed authority beyond their own sphere, crases and sets Subjects' minds beside them-
selves; for indeed those who do more than is right, do still more than they ought, and by the very ease of their considered crimes, they are not admonished beforehand.

The Father killed, the next task is his Son and heir. They had already declared him guilty of high treason; now, by public edict they make all traitors, who shall call him King, or pray for his welfare under the name of Charles II, or Prince, or King of Scotland, or the Royal first-born. They made it doubtful whether one could pray for him as a man! It was likewise decreed that no prayers be offered for the Duke of York or any Royal offspring, and the King's lineage by Edict is deprived of their Royal right and all their fortunes.

By another Edict, Monarchy is abolished, the House of Lords terminated, and the most ancient Kingdom of England changed into a
Popular state. And that you shall be more indignant, all these are done by a paltry assembly of forty common rogues.

The Mayor of London is ordered to promulgate the Edict; but when he refuses and pleads his original oaths of obedience to the Royal lineage, he is deprived of his Magistracy, confined to the Tower of London, and fined £2000 English. Nor did this severity omit lesser officials and the city Senators who were horrified at this novelty; all were cast out, ejected, and fined; and those who had procured a Conference with the King for their own petitions were sought out also.

But lest it be said these assassins thirsted for Royal blood only, three Lords are added to the King, so that you should know that the Nobility and the King perished together. And to this relapsed that solemn profession of Parliament scarce six months before, that "they did not wish to change the form of the Kingdom." To this came those splendid promises made to the Lords by the army, that "it would protect the House of Lords and its Privileges."

Why should I detail now all the injuries against Charles II? whom they keep from his Kingdoms of England and Ireland; whom they persecute by sea and land; for whom they lay Scotland waste with a hostile army; for whom, as a traitor, they even prepare the ax, lest he miss his paternal inheritance in full measure. He who would examine their separate acts by the rule of justice would waste his time, where indeed "good and evil are interchanged." The crime grows daily, and knows no measure, and crimes heaped on crimes suite the heavens; and, spilled by sacrilegious hands, the sacred blood does continually
cry to heaven, "O Jehovah, strong God of vengeance, O strong God of vengeance, appear! Arise, O Judge of the earth, and return retribution to the proud! How long shall the wicked, O Jehovah, how long shall the wicked exult?"
CHAPTER III

The Parricides’ Crime against the People

We have now shown the fearfulest crime against the People, the most cruel murder of the King. For since a King rules not over himself but his People, he who violates a King offends the People more than the King. Therefore, it is a piece of the most infamous, crassed impudence to affirm that the King’s murder and the Monarchy’s abrogation were done for the People. To this end, three things have to be proved. First, of course, that the People have authority against the King; second, that by the People’s authority and will the King was punished and the Kingship abolished; and third, certainly, that from this emerges the profit to the People to compensate abundantly for the gravity of the harm and the misery of perpetual war.

But of the People’s authority against the King, imaginary in truth, a monster just invented by the English assassins, the Royal Champion has spoken brilliantly, and destroyed the rascally fiction. In the second of these propositions, I might seem to join two quite unrelated things, the People’s authority and its will, since the Tyrants by the People’s authority do everything against its will. But I am considering not what is done against right and reason, but what right and reason demand. For we are the authors of what we will and do and what others do by our will, not of what is done despite us. But if, however, they do not confuse the name of authority with the power, as the custom has prevailed, what reproach is this to a People’s power
which it has not, nor asks, even as they encroach on that power of the
People so that they obstruct the People's will? Is it to be borne,
that whatever dire, criminal, and hateful to God and men the Tyrants
do, be imputed to the People, that the disgrace and offense be cast on
the People while they themselves enjoy the profits?

What happiness is there from this for the People, wherefore all
are invited to embrace the crime of a few? Nay, what a Hydra of evils,
what an infinite mass of both crime and misery did the accursed wick-
edness of these assassins bring on the heads of the whole People?

It is pleasing to hear the People's voices, calling to a reck-
oning "their own" Delegates even as those abuse the name of Popular
power in a horrible way:

"When we chose you to represent us in Assemblies, ye most faith-
less Delegates, did we commission you to exercise, by an assumed power
the People never arrogated itself, judgment against our King and
Tyranny against us? Or were you commissioned to defend Religion, the
Laws, Liberty, and all our Rights? Which of them have you not violated
or destroyed?

"Chiefly, you have miserably defaced Religion by introducing
license for Schismatics and every error, removing all forms of prayers
and Sacraments, trampling the ordination of Presbyters, sending amongst
the people speakers of the foulest beliefs, without learning, without
expression, without legitimate mission—soldiers, weavers, cobblers,
and the whole mechanic drags now being admitted to the pulpit. That by
these Advocates you defend your cause among the People, not even you
can deny; for legitimate Pastors shun this evil task. What sanity have you left us? We have seen horses baptized with impunity; we hear daily that the Lord's Prayer and Apostle's Creed are untaught; in public letters from the army we read that there ought to be no regular calling of Pastors; the principal Temple of the capital city has been converted to a stable, others everywhere destroyed or violated; the Church's yields diverted. And what caps the matter, if we seek the nourishment of God's Word, it is corrupted; if Sacraments, they are denied, so that it now argues a man ill-disposed toward the Commonwealth to continue the practice of the Sacraments.

"Thus you handled Religion; how treat you the King, to whom we had sent you as subjects to plead for subjects? After he, out of his Royal kindness, had conceded us many more things than it was right for us to expect or ask, you persecuted him with a most wrongful war; you took from him the Governance of war and peace; you deprived him of all property, his wife, children, friends, liberty, and the benefit of divine worship; and finally after the long stink of the jail, when he had so long been miserably harassed, and tried before you, you beheaded him with the fearful ax, you utter scoundrels!

"What injury have you done to Royal Majesty, and even our Laws—for, by immortal God, what authority do the Laws give you, or us, against the sacred head of a King? You have undermined the foundation wherein the Laws stood, you have cut off the root from which they drew life, whence all laws are completely overturned, felled, dead. As soon, therefore, as the King was slain and the Monarchy ended, the
authority of the Laws lay prostrate, and now there reigns for King and Law only the will of our King's murderers. When the King flourished, we very often opposed his Royal will with the laws, and the King venerated the name of the Law, nor did he impose the ship-money before it had been approved by the Judges and expert lawyers. When by public Edict you were plundering us of the twentieth part of our goods, you replied to us, as we appealed to the Laws and citizens' rights, that 'Your Chamber was the oracle of the Laws; your will must be accounted the Law; there could be an appeal from the King (for Charles I then lived) to Parliament, but no appeal from Parliament.' And this Law—vague, uncertain, checked by no bounds, and just then born—that 'Parliament could do anything without the King,' progressed to such sinful madness that they feared not to take the King himself from our midst, and after removing the Laws, by what right or with what injury to take the life and goods of citizens at will.

"The Laws, therefore, being removed with the King, our Liberty and Rights collapsed. For who, in the whole Kingdom, dares to claim anything of his own? His Goods, his ancestral Lands, his Liberty, his Life? All these, by George! your power absolved from Laws can take at a nod, and did, far too often. For by what law were so many citizens clapped into chains, put to torture, for no other crime than refusing to bear arms against their King? By what law are all bound for the crime of high treason who dared feed their King, a starving fugitive? All who fought under him, of course, though relying on their forefathers' laws and doing their duty as Subjects, you punished by
death, jail, exile, and confiscation of their entire inheritance.
Others dealt with more leniently are compelled to redeem their lands
with several years' revenue.

"To this end, through all the Provinces were set up collectors' shops—or rather, butcher shops which disembowel and skin alive nearly all (for how few of them did not adhere to the King?) of the Noble families. To these Rhadamanthuses those defendants for loyalty to the King are recalled two or three times; nor do they quit being defendants before they are beggared. And so, whoever is dragged there,

'Does, crushed by blows, adore, and beaten, pray
That with some teeth he thence may get away.'

"Eminent families lie mutilated and bloodless, while a few wretches, of the lowest drags, stroll about, sleek from the sap of Nobles and public bloodshed, and the madness of these most monstrous Cyclopes

'Is fed by victims' guts and darkened blood.'

"But these" (you say) "are our enemies, whose sinews, last they finally rise against us, prudence orders to be cut, and bones broken. It were a marvel, then, if you think not the whole People an enemy, whom you, good 'guardians of Liberty,' miserably flay. For what riches of two Kingdoms, what cruelest exactations against the People, were enough to satisfy your greed? The hope was declared that, from the King's very ample patrimony and the revenues of Bishops and Deans, the
People would gain immunity from all tax burdens; this was quite enough for wars, garrisons, and ships, and would remain so. Anything the Bishops and Deans possessed, you possess. Furthermore, you have accumulated immense riches from the sale of private inheritances. Never did Laverna favor any thieves more. Where now is that immunity from public taxes which you were promising us? You fairly provided—which was your benevolence toward us—that no profit should come to us from those ill-gotten gains. To yourselves you took the blame for the rapines, to yourselves the excessive profit, ye most kindly pirates!

But while you cram your foul maw with so many rapines, alas, we must scrip and cheat our inclinations, that we may be equal to the immense tributes which, with the greatest cruelty, you exact from us. Doubtless that we might know we have many Kings instead of one, we pay you more taxes than to ten Charleses, had so many reigned at once. Whence came such desperation among the People, whose bones you break and marrow you suck, that unarmed they often rose against armed men, burnt the publicans' lists, and even killed them, though soon to pay heavy penalties for their uncontrolled anger? So cheap is life to men whose means of life have been taken away.

Nor is it enough that our faculties are taken away—our children are taken also. Sons from their Mothers', Husbands are torn from their Wives' embraces; and these, too, by sheer force, to fight against King and country. Raw, ignorant youths are led into a deceit equally ruinous to their bodies and souls, so that your making us wretched is less than your making us wicked.
"You will allege the most inflexible sword of necessity: that war is being waged at home, in Scotland, in Ireland, the open seas must be protected from pirates, that neither is England defended without soldiery, nor a soldiery kept without pay; that in conscripting a soldiery, danger comes to few but safety to all, that in finances the magnitude of public danger must be estimated, and the common cause should be sustained with common riches.

"But how injurously do you object to us a necessity which you yourselves have created? 'Fixed by a beam—spike, necessity' compels us, indeed, as subjects to you, most savage Tyrants, to go whither you drag us. You, also, dire necessity compels to defend crimes with crimes; but we utterly deny that a common necessity with you is incumbent on us. Why so? Because after the King had been treated in the worst way, and no hope of pardon was left to the handful of leading traitors, it was, to be sure, necessary to behead the King, to end the Kingdom, and to persecute his legitimate heir by land and sea; was a sharing of both your crimes and dangers 'necessary' for us? It is doubtful whether it is crueler to impose, or to impute, this 'necessity'—of course—to a whole kingdom completely averse to your crimes, and obviously most desirous of that heroic youth, its own King. We threaten arms, or pay soldiers' hire against the King? We love, we want the King! But if you fear punishment from the King, there are other Republics to furnish you an Asylum, and a luxurious market for your wealth. Migrate there, free your country from war and yourselves from fear, give back the Kingdom its King and Peace. This were better,
and better advised, as you have a crumb of sense left, than with an iron yoke to repress a People raging and muttering threats, than by the murder of countless citizens to protect your tyranny, than to see every man as an enemy, than to walk among the curses and groans of your fellow-countrymen. To this indeed most burdensome hate, any good or prudent man would prefer the cross itself.

"But here you protest: 'O ye men born to slavery, who ascribe liberty to injury! You will finally, you slaves of Kings, suffer yourselves to be freed, though unwilling.'

"Thus we reply: We are indeed not your likes, we who might think ourselves born to govern. Then were we chiefly free, when proper laws stood for both king and citizens. For our Royal Commonwealth had been so tempered that neither should regal Authority subtract from Liberty, nor Liberty from obedience. You have, of course, come to liberate us, set in that happy balance. Liberator, hah! You might so prevail as with every care and labor you promote our Liberty and not your personal Domination, and had not seised the Principate from the King to transfer it to yourselves; late did the Democrats realise they had been imposed on by your promises of liberty by equal votes of the people. And at once after the King had been removed from our midst, by Writings and Conferences they were brought into a Government by Oligarchs.

"Truth burst from Rebellion's deepest pit, as men completely opposed to the Monarchy cried out and openly wrote that the Regicides had been wrong and supported by no laws, done by no just authority,
that the People had exchanged, not shaken off, their yoke. That they preferred to live under the worst King's Rule for a decade, to one year under the Tyranny of the godly. Their little finger was less unbending than King Charles's loins. When would there finally be an end to this Parliament? They had not undergone, for seven whole years, so many duties of the most difficult military service, to create a perpetual power for their fellow-citizens sitting in Parliament, or to hand themselves over as slaves to their own Delegates. After these complaints came arms, and there was a withdrawal by a sizeable part of the army. But those invited to a Conference were taken by a ruse of the Oligarchs, and the Democrats' leaders were condemned by a military verdict and executed.

"Thus indeed you have curbed the Democrats once or twice, but it is your daily labor to repress the Monarchists. Cavalry squadrons range everywhere to prevent the making of arms: For a free-born People continually shakes off the yoke of foulest slavery with almost complete impatience. Four times within a few months they have just recently resorted to arms in a premature and unhappy struggle; and finally public wishes have induced the King to the justest arms, to whom from all sides fly those pious and brave hearts who have love for the King and, from their hatred of slavery, a contempt for death—sworn with their incompressible King either to free their country from tyranny, or to find an honorable death; and, indeed, they tried it more gallantly than successfully.

"Meanwhile, among the Tyrants the courts sestro the with cases of
Treason; the jails scarce contain the defendants charged with Treason; the 'limitation on iron chains is unbounded.' Daily the ax and stocks defend this novel Majesty. For some time before this newest paroxysm, all who had formerly followed the King—that is, the many and better—were forbidden to go beyond five miles from home; hence each man's home is practically his jail, the roads are deserted, the towns empty of commerce. The tyranny's hirelings prowl about the crossroads, dangerous to travellers and rough to strangers—strewing widespread damage and fear, dragging away the arms, horses, and even their lords as captives. Hired spies steal into generous homes, injecting public affairs into the conversation to fish up treasons. Behold the face of England, behold its people's liberty, which you guard as chains do captives: such 'Guardians of the liberty of England,' are you indeed, that, not without some prediction, you have taken on the name of a tyranny. Alas, iron hearts, ye men born for your country's ruin; ye vipers who, with the father of the country slain, feed on the mother's viscera. Go, ruin, cast down, and after mangling your country, trample on its miserable remains—you who shall reign as impotently as briefly."

And these are the People's voices, this their far most miserable servitude, to have no end under these 'guardians,' who, without a perpetual and all-powerful army riding the People's neck, cannot keep their power, created by sheer force of arms—and admit it.

Meanwhile, this unhappy and noble People knows neither to shake off the yoke, nor champ the bit in silence. The very harshness
of this most criminal tyranny nourishes apt hopes, as does the royal
blood's outcry, finally sure to take divine justice and patience by
storm.
CHAPTER IV

The Parricides’ Injuries to the Church

We have already finished with the main crime against the Church, for we have heard the People complaining that its Religion is contaminated and taken off. That Religion is the ratifier of the Church, as a People loving Religion is the Church itself. What crimes, therefore, are committed against the English People, are also done against its Church. Nor did it occur to the impious minds of the Parricides what they were dealing with, when they cut down the King and the People—they were slaughtering the King of Israel and mangling the People of God. That Christ’s pure Gospel throng in England, most acknowledge, some deny. But the Army is the Lerna of all heresies, and the Rebels began every quarrel with the King and Royalists, not about doctrine, but ritualistic trifles. Whence, then, against a King and People professing holy doctrine, came such monstrousness?

Doubtless they never learned that divine saying, Isaiah lii.9,
"They shall not injure, neither shall they destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord."
Now though I well understand this is a promise of eternal rest, not a command or prophecy of the Church militant, yet no good or sane man will doubt but that the promise does entail the command. For truly, whoever hopes to have a place in that holy mountain of God, from which all ruin and loss are far away, ought, while enjoying this life, with the help of his divine knowledge to take care that he go not about to
trample and ruin any man having this holy knowledge, much less the earth full of it. Nor will he put on fierce intentions against the church of God, into whose heart descended that wine-like comparison of Isaiah, ch. 65, ver. 6; Thus saith Jehovah, "As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing is in it; so will I do for my servants' sakes, that I may not destroy them all." God withholds His avenging hand from the sinners of His People, for some new wine of holy knowledge and divine love left in them. Yet the Tyrants have raised their hands against those greatest souls in whom some wine of pietie gave off the sweetest odor. For, by immortal God, what pietie sweeter, what more fragrant than that of Charles, King and Martyr? You, foulest parricides, have crushed this new wine with your impious heels. You have practiced your cruellest madness against heroic examples of pietie toward God, loyalty to the King, and love of the fatherland. You have violated and trampled ministers of the Gospel, and the Ministry itself, you utter scoundrals. I say nothing of the crosses, jailings, confiscations, exiles, and gravest injuries done to other men. But why declare you war on the very Ministry, with fanatic rascals substituted for pious and learned Theologians--rogues never yet seen in a University, who never even met humane or holy learning at the door, who had received no εκπορώνεα from Ecclesiastical authority? The reason is at hand, Tyranny and its followers, whose minds seethe with the most monstrous crimes, grow pale and tremble at the approach of holy Truth's messengers, and at the sight of them think their parricide and saeculage is reproached. Nor, indeed, can
Truth's heralds keep from proclaiming repeatedly some Truth against these assassins; otherwise, they would preach neither justice nor meekness, which doctrines do indeed quite obstruct the Tyrants' affairs. These bothersome teachers therefore must be removed, this untimely wisdom eliminated: for what have the parricides to do with the Gospel, which agrees not with their Tyranny at all? Prophesiers, loud and obsequious to their masters, must be advanced, whose conscience is never troubled by an awareness of a wrong obedience. Let them bawl out to the People that now the age of gold has shone forth, and the Saints come, divinely sent to hold judgment on the nations, to bind Kings with their chains, and great lords with iron shackles; that the blessed age is nigh, when the godly shall wash their feet in the blood of the wicked and the meek possess the earth. The Kingdom of God would then at last be here, if the Scots were killed to extinction, the King beheaded, and the Monarchy abolished. Whoever recognised King Charles, refused Christ the King. Whence came this doctrine, "Those my enemies, who wished not for me to rule over them, fetch hither, and kill before me." This text we have seen prefixed, of course, to their Anti-monarchical books.

As for the rest, men utterly Θεολογοι busy themselves much indeed about the marks of Election, identifying a certain visibility of the invisible militant Church with themselves, and making Election itself obviously their own function—for they call none the Elect but those they elect. And furthermore, they object to their seeking remission of sins from God, however Christ ordered the contrary; for
this would be pointless repetition, and call their Election into
doubt.

No sacraments are administered by these men; prudently, too,
for they have no faculty to do so; but this is impious, in that they
order them omitted as unnecessary, forgetting there is no greater ne-
cessity than to comply when God orders. These men the new Republic
considers the most faithful Ministers of its Tyranny and, next to its
soldiers, the most useful as the messengers of its commands and the
heralds of its victories. Ill from these ulcers, these cancers, the
Church of England labors miserably, and she feels and groans that her
entrails are eaten up, as she calls for the aid of the supreme Physi-
cian to cure a supreme evil.

Equal is the injury to what they call the permanent Land of the
Church. When the Tyrants stripped the Bishops, Deans, and Canons, they
professed themselves unwilling to turn anything consecrated for pious
uses to profane ones. Thus the sacrilege was imposed on many pious
men of Episcopal grade, yet more on others' lands. It was expected
that the wealth seized from the Bishops would be disbursed among the
Pastors of Churches where there was great labor and no estate to sustain
the holy work—of which churches England had many. How many Hospitals,
how many Poorhouses were promised? But after the loot had been heaped
up, Tyranny was seen to be a thing of bigger profit if they considered
themselves next, and reckoned as put to pious uses what was put to
their own. Then—which is these men's piety—they did not wish to
summon God to a partnership in the theft; and so they devoured the
whole sacrilege themselves.

That, however, they might have many participants in the crime, they enticed the People with easy prices to buy the Church's Lands. The same with the King's patrimony: a sale which, with a price inviting bidders everywhere, adjudged the buyers to the Tyrants' factions—buyers not unjustly fearing that, upon the King's return to his own, they would lose their purchased lands, and with the loss even incur punishment.

Under this tyranny, of course, avarice—always a dire plague to piety—corrupts the Church. For the livelihood of the many necessarily depends on men who command on land and sea, and either possess all the Commonwealth's taxes and emoluments or distribute them at pleasure; wherefore, it is also impossible for these moving enticements of riches not to sway very many who either sympathize with the Tyrants, or pretend they do. Those who affect no party of the Commonwealth are not immune from this force, since nobody is free to carry on commerce, or prosecute a lawsuit, or take a trip, without his reliability being established by an oath to the tyrants.

Nor did this violence pass even the Rustics by. For men, troubled more about cattle and crops than their conscience, were pervaded by a fear that those who refused this oath would be granted no court action against theft. I omit the soldiers—vile souls who regard legality or illegality as of no importance, and measure human and divine law and religion itself by pay and booty.

This utter ruin of the Church, then, came from the rule of the
Tyrants, because by the love of their property and by the practice of civil commarce, many were swept away, as if by some torrent, into the evil part. We are ready to say with Nahum, "May the Lord pardon us as often as we incline ourselves in the House of Rimmon."
CHAPTER V

The Parricides' Injuries to God

What injuries the parricides inflicted at home on the King, the People, and the Church, we have thus far seen. Now for those done abroad to the Most High God, to all Kings and Peoples, and especially to the Reformed Churches.

First occurs the most holy divinity of God; and though He knows how to protect Himself and to repulse and avenge an injury done to Him, yet it becomes all who love and worship God to account the injury offered Him as done to themselves, and to receive it with the justest indignation. Nor, indeed, do we undertake to weigh the several sins against God—they have a Judge to call them to their reckonings. Let us not judge another's slave; let them stand or fall before their Lord. For my part, I pray for them a ripe repentance and a merciful Judge.

It pleases us only to pursue the injury to God, which is that of all good men, namely, that God is called to shares of the wickedness, that God is named the patron and author of the foulest crimes: which obviously is the chiefest offence of this Tyranny and the whole sect of the Independents. As nothing to this are the thieversies and homicides, whereby other men appease their avarice or anger, forgetting God and self.

"I'm less offended by a plainer thief."

Truly, for you to mention God in this very crime, so that you
seen to draw Him into its fellowship, for you to assign Him the guilt for the deed but yourself the profits, and to weave of piety a huge whole cloth of crime—this belongs to a man who has inwardly extinguished all sense of divinity, unready to do such a thing unless he should believe that God is an empty Morality, whose insubstantial name is safely bandied around; and that a belief in the divine presence and the precepts and warnings of justice are the bogey-men of empty minds. I am quite persuaded that the Tyrants and chief Independents are of this stripe: for indeed (though the closest old foxes) they openly avow this belief, that to have Religion is harmful; to feign it, helpful, for plebeian minds are taken by the handle of piety and drawn in any direction.

Hypocrisy is indicated by the contrarious enthusiasms of these men about Religion, whereby they equally destroy and adore her. For even as they show themselves guilty of the foulest crimes, as they give free rein to a deadly license of monstrous sects, while what Religion they profess or confession of faith adhere to, not even they can say: still, they always prattle sanctimony, and commit no crime without a most religious show, the saintly rabble! Both ways, Religion suffers from the Tyrants the same that Christ did from Pilate's soldiers, by whom he was simultaneously cuff'd to death and adored on bended knee. The language of their public Proclamations, stuffed with piety, and the similar epistolary style of Cromwell and his Tribunes will indeed move the bile and bitter laughter of anyone who remarks with what impudence these secret gluttons and open thieves disguise their offences with a
Religion which they long ago ordered their affairs to use.

Herein the Parricides truly wrong God twice, in that they make Him both the author and end of their crimes.

They make Him the author when they say the whole furtherance of their crimes was received from divine inspiration. Very often the army's wavering spirits were impelled in the direction Cromwell wished by Hugh Peter, or some alleged "Prophet" with a prediction come down, to be sure, from Heaven. When King Charles I of holy and august memory was held by the Independent army, shortly before his escape to the Isle of Wight, these religious bandits promised the King and Senate responses according as God should have next inspired them; it was imputed to these inspirations, so called, if what they had ratified one day was nullified the next. And the Most Gracious King was heard to complain that "he could expect nothing certain from these men, whose promises today, tomorrow's inspiration would change." And just so did Cromwell reply to those reminding how religiously he had promised the King restitution. "For my part," said he, "I absolutely hold to my vows, but as I was praying and demanding God's help for this work, my tongue stuck to my palate and my voice in my throat—God was suggesting my plan didn't please Him at all." Oh! how these men have God on call, on whom they cast perfidy and parricide, ready to force whatever wrong they do on God, as did that Lover in Terence, "God was my authority—He drove me to it!"

Hence pertains the fact that the utterly frightful parricide of the most August King was celebrated with many prayers and fasts,
that they might inspire the People to believe that the parricides had been led to perpetrate such a crime by the Holy Spirit. For, when asked, would God have denied his Spirit to such pious brigands?

To the same heading belongs the fact that a success beyond the parricides' wishes and a seldom interrupted course of victories are shown as a divine approval of parricide, of sacrilege, and of the whole robbery from the start. And as for us (they say), whom after all you don't recognise, ye adversaries, the busy God whom we zealously invoke maketh a way for us everywhere through opposing troops, He openeth town gates, and equally subdueth lands and seas. God it is who inspires and likewise protecteth us. Us—the darlings of heaven, the care of the Divinity—for whom He streweth the way to glory over the very necks of Kings!

Away with argumentation worthier of brutes than men! For thus, an Elephant will exceed men in divine favor to the degree that it is superior in strength. But because God's will is urged as favoring the victors, for my part, I acknowledge that God wills to be done, all things which are done. But it does not follow thence, that God approves all things which are done, or agrees with crimes which are committed. For the will of the decree whereby—with God either "will-ing" or "permitting" it—human actions are done, alters nothing into the will of a command. Nay, many things are condemned by the will of His command, which are done by the will of His decree. If you confuse these, you should commend the betrayal of Judas. For God willed that, and you will open the window to every crime; and all criminals will
have means whereby to escape their judgments and bind their judges' hands, as God's will excuses any crime.

But lest you measure the justice of human actions from their success, it is worthwhile to observe what issues, what crimes follow.

"This bore a cross, crime's price; but that, a crown."

Junius Brutus preserved his country by expelling its Kings; another Brutus lost it by killing a Tyrant. Yet perhaps the later Brutus, who slew a usurper, did justly; and the earlier one, who expelled a legitimate King, unjustly. So that one learns that God's providence, most clearly evident in the changes of kingdoms is not bound to the good or bad intent of his instruments in such a way that evil results always come from evil deeds, or good ones from good. Clearly, ensuing success does not make an evil deed good anew, or misfortune make a good deed evil. Consequently, those Christians who prove the justice of their arms by their victories should be sent to school to the Ethics, who opposed calling successful crime "virtue," or virtue's depending on fortune, and condemned Dionysius, who having escaped that cruellest storm after the plundering of the Delphic temple, declared the Gods favored the sacrilegious. Not unlike this are these temple-robers, parading their victories as the seal of divine favor for being energetic in destruction of King and Church. But the Ottomans have just such a seal, far more notable—an Empire widespread by prosperous wars through Europe, Asia, and Africa, and now somewhat confirmed by centuries. And they display this success as, to be sure,
a divine approval of the Mohammedan sect, and the reward for the extin- 
tinet or oppressed Christian faith.

Truly, one egg is not more like to another than Cromwell is to 
Mohammed. For each one—who feigned to be a Prophet and was bringing 
new light from the heavens; a destroyer of Religion and Laws by a pre-
tense of reformation—in his own nation by a parade equally of piety 
and war, used a sly sanctimony for the Church's ruin and erection of a 
new Power. Lest, while superstition transports men's minds and success 
stirs superstition, that "Mohammed redivivus" introduce to the Western 
world an ἐνίπτων πλάς just like the Oriental, may the Church's 
Preserver and Redeemer forbid great victories!

Here, indeed, the souls of pious and prudent men must be 
strengthened with every effort against this Epidemic and the very old 
fallacy of prosperous results. For after you have distinguished more 
clearly than the noonday sun the goodness of a cause from its success, 
the mob still embraces the mightier cause as the more just.

"It always follows fortune, hates the lost."

However, thus far the Tyrants' victories in England have ob-
tained a contrary effect. For with their power, the People's hate of 
them increases. Yet the Tyrants' followers are mere slaves of fortune, 
whom they worship as a God, and by whom they estimate justice and good, 
seeing that God, "whose hidden judgments are many, but none unjust" 
(as Augustine says), all the same very often permits a just cause to 
be overcome by an unjust. For men are not worthy of better dealing,
and just it is that the unjust be repaid with injustice. Wherefore
the Prophet (Ps. 109), pronouncing the justest threats against the
enemies of Christ and the Church, thus invokes: "Set thou a wicked
man over him, let the extortioner catch all that he hath." For God
uses evil instruments to ruin evildoers, or from evil to make them
good.

Yet there is no reason for those evil instruments, whereby God
inflicts just punishments or paternal chastisements, to please Him, or
for them to think their wickedness approved by God, because they have
obviously managed the matter successfully. But the Independents do
this, who usually write their αὐτογνωθήσεται thus: "In this battle,
God acknowledged us for his own; in another conflict, God witnessed us
as his people,"—pinning God's love and their own election on the out-
come of their battles. That Israel was the People of God by that
choice which includes whole nations, nobody doubts. Not only did God
acknowledge men as His own, but he approved their cause, too, in the
war against the ten tribes of Benjamin. For prior to advancing in
battle order, they had consulted God, who even drew up their line and
ordered Judah to be put in front. Yet twenty-two thousand Israelites
were slain. Dismayed, the people came again to the Ark of the Covenant
and asked, whether "I shall go up a second time to fight against my
brother Benjamin," God replied, "Go up against him." The second time,
however, eighteen thousand Israelites fell. What, therefore, if God
claimed them with words, but denied them by deeds? His was the People,
His was the cause at stake, His the power that determined it. Yet God
wished, because they were His, to chastise His people, whom He made more so by these disasters: the Israelites were strengthened by the two defeats, because taught humility and faith; but the Benjaminites were ruined by the two victories, for they were puffed up beyond repentance by vain self-confidence, and in the third conflict slain nearly to extinction. Let this be a lesson that God ordains punishments for crime by neither our condition nor our judgment, and that the justice of a cause and God's love or hate ought not be reckoned by the outcome of battles. For often men fight a war over one controversy, but God brings another one to judgment. Absalom was struggling with David his Father about Supremacy, but God punished David for his homicide and adultery. Often, too, those whom God approved the more, He humbled with great defeats, beginning their chastisement by their own children, while an enemy quite in the wrong, fortunate beyond desires and waxing insolent from victories,

"... did prepare aloft

A tower of many tiers, whence steeper got

The fall, a hideous, headlong drop to nought."

We must wait with silence and hope, until God's justice at last fixes an end to the unbridled license of the Independent assassins, whose very Piety makes a reproach to God, crediting Him with their crimes and dragging so many victories, so many dangers overcome, into an agreement of Divinity itself to their crime—as that bandit who, fresh from robbery and murder, slept under an old wall, and saw in his
sleep the image of a man arousing him and ordering him to go thence. 
Hardly had he awakened and left there, when the wall gave way. Escaped, 
the robber adored God not only as his deliverer, but as the patron of 
his crime too. Yet the next night the same image appeared to him as he 
slept, and warned him that he had not been led from the collapsing wall 
in order to get off unpunished and unharmed, but to be saved for the 
cross.

Another injury, and related to this, is that the Fuccicides, 
just as they make God the author of crimes, so make Him their end too. 
Well? all these prodigious crimes are committed to God's glory; to this 
end, is the King's sacred head smitten off with the ax, citizens massacred, the Church ruined, Religion all but extinct, an iron yoke and the 
necessity of perpetual war imposed on the People; and finally, robb-
eries, rapine, treason, perversion of divine and human laws—all are 
done to God's glory: oh, how holy, with what a religious show of 
prayers and prophesying!

We have the character of these men graphically drawn in Isaiah 
66: 5: "Your brothers who hated you, who drive you out for my name, 
keep saying, let the Glory be given to God." For indeed, to God's 
glory these men commit those crimes, through which God's glory is quite 
impaircd, indeed so far as possible with men. The source of this evil 
is disclosed in the third section of the same chapter, "These choose 
their own ways, and their soul delights in their own abominations." and 
further on in the fourth section, "They have done what appears evil in 
my eyes, and that wherein I am not pleased." For Religion and God's
glory are vainly pretended, when the ways enjoined by God are shunned, and forbidden ones chosen. Not by God's ways but theirs, do these fanatic men weigh out their pifty, butchering their own King with the same ceremony as if they duly sacrificed a victim to God. To God's glory also did those Jewish imitators of the Philistines burn boys alive to Moloch, accustomed

"To ask the gods for favor (speech too dire)
With gore, and lay small sons in altar fire."}

Is there anyone of so foolish a mind as to think that by horribly violating God's commands, his glory is looked after; that by parricides, perjuries, and robberies the Kingdom and Justice of God are established, that God himself is won over by crimes? Just as if you were to say that men are filled by starvation, or healed by disease, or grow young with old age. But we don't live in that Prophetic age, that bitter waters sweeten from injected salt, or logs catch fire from a drench of water. God indeed does advance His glory, which is His virtue and wisdom, through its contraries. But men may not seek God's glory, but by those ways which are agreeable to it.

The Independents, however, appear to tell God, "You indeed have ordered that by obeying your commandments, protecting the church, obedience toward Kings, love toward our brothers, fairness and faith toward all, we seek your glory. But another way pleases us, and we are ordered by our prophecies—far more powerful than your commandment—to kill Kings, ruin the Church, to be fattened with blood and
public spoils, to measure justice and faith by convenience, to clothe these crimes with the garb of pisty. This seems to us a greater short-cutt to your glory: truly, it becomes Thee, since we're unwilling to do what you wish, to will what we wish, and get you glory our way, because yours won't do."

Ah, in a matter so serious, so mournful one is disgusted to jest—the Prophet deals seriously with them: "Woe to them who say good is evil, and evil is good; who decree shadows for light, and light for shadows, bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. Woe to those who are wise in their own opinion, and perceptive in their own judgments."

Moreover, what kind of men the Prophet censures, the preceding words declare: "Woe to those who say, let God hasten, let Him speed His work, that we may see, and straightway let come the counsel of the Holy One of Israel, that we may try it."

These words, in fact, read in the most divine Prophet, cause me to reflect that there are some constellations, as of stars, so of human natures, recurring in the most diverse times and places, and certain appetites for vices, marked with their own characters, which untaught drive dangerously idle men over the same tracks anywhere and at all times. For though the Independents are a rare sample—who dared call the most monstrous parricide and foulest crimes "pisty," and stretch God's glory over their crimes—they have their pattern expressed by the holy Prophet two thousand four hundred years before. For what men have bawled out more, "Let God hasten, and speed His work"? Nay, they take on the work of God, they themselves speed His work, they wish it told
to their honor that they alone advance God's Kingdom. The plan of the Holy One of Israel had failed, of course, unless these murderers had put their hand to the work. But the same ones say "good is evil" and "evil good," so wise (with themselves the judges) that they assert they knew more fully and better than God what good is, and what conduces to His glory. So that it is wonderful how things quite opposed stay in one place—the greatest quarrel with God's laws, and the greatest passion for His glory.

It is, of course, the custom among men to encrust secret crimes with piety. But openly to bring out their crime and it a most frightful one, to call it piety as if to glorify a sacred thing—this truly is a monstrosity unheard-of to many centuries back, and peculiar to the Independents now. Alas, with what praises do they extol that heroic deed of theirs? What thanks, on days publicly set aside to it, do they tender to God for enduing them with virtue to dare and accomplish this! Yes, and that black day, destined to be unlucky for all centuries, on which by unspeakable parricide they had violated their own Best King, they have ordered in this very year 1651 to be observed throughout the Kingdom as a festival, and to be celebrated with public thanksgivings—one doubts whether to insult the whole People in its king's severed head, or to ridicule God's patience.

Tacitus notes (Annales XIV) that "every time the Prince had ordered banishments and murders, the Gods were thanked, and what had formerly been the signs of prosperity, then were those of public disaster." Who does not recognise in Nero's time the character of our
can? Except that ours are worse to the degree that it is baser to falsify crimes for good deeds, than disasters for successes. However, each was done according to its time. Of course, what was decreed by Nero's Senate with perfunctory adulation—that crimes be revered as good deeds—is seriously and sedulously bothered about by the English murderers. For Nero's matricide, thanksgivings were offered in all the temples; for Octavia, his murdered wife, gifts for the temples were decreed. These at Rome—what in London? For the utterly abominable parricide against the King's sacred life, thanks have solemnly been rendered to God. Because of the most shameful massacre of good citizens, a day has been proclaimed to be honored with an annual thanksgiving. Thus, what formerly were the signs of virtue and piety are now by a horrible perversion made those of the most infamous crimes; and the greatest ruin of the Kingdom and the Church are assigned first place even to England's prosperity. And, moreover, in this drama the Most High, like some Tragedy-god, is ordered to assume the character of a deus ex machina, and put on the mask of a champion of parricides.

O miserable age, which has suffered these prodigies! Miserable, we who see them! Miserable the assassins who do them, and know not their own misery—how grave, how horrible, how much more atrocious than all crimes and injuries since Creation it is, for them to make the Most High the culprit for parricides, and to refer to Him the beginning and end of their crimes!

This, precisely, is our quarrel with the parricides—that before any repentance for their crimes they dare even to name God's holy name.
Which indeed is God's own quarrel with them and all their likes: For to the wicked man, God saith, "What have you to do with my decrees, that you expound them, or with my Covenant, that you constantly talk of it, when you spurn my discipline, and cast my words behind your back?" Either do penance or abstain from any mention of His holy name. Because you name God, He is insulted; because you speak His Word, you pronounce your own condemnation; because you pray, you increase this, and your speech becomes a reproach unto you.
CHAPTER VI

The Parricides' Injuries against all Kings and Peoples

The Royal Patron has relieved us of this task, and has most brilliantly finished off the whole matter, so that we must either be silent or speak after him. We are not exceeding, then, the duty of our title. Together with the Royal blood, we shall cry out to heaven; but likewise to Kings and Peoples, which after Great Salmasius all should do; as in field or canton it is everybody's business to follow the ravaging wolf with his cry, even more to pursue it with collective arms, and finally to kill it.

Kings therefore must be warned again and again that an attack was made not against the King of England only, but against all Kings, by this heinous parricide. For the Parricides have shown the World that their King can be convicted as a defendant, condemned with the People as the Judge, and be decapitated. This indeed they themselves proclaim, and raise the battle-standard for Peoples to shake off their yoke, and murder their Kings. We have seen and shuddered at writings of these sacrilegious men, bragging "they had freed the World from the old superstition that Kings, liable to none but God, ought to be judged or punished by none but God; that they had given an example salutary to all Peoples, fearsome to all Tyrants." These words Cromwell wrote to the Scots after the battle of Dunbar, and many other tormenters of the same faction have written like words; with such sesame and poppy are sprinkled Milton's infamous pages, just burnt by the hangman of
Paris at the order of that city's supreme Senate—would that their
writer had been also!

The Great Chamber has perceived that France's interest is at
stake, that this neighboring example is agitating the minds of the
French commoners with a too-personal impulse; and that all is over
with the Kingdom and Peace and Justice, the sister of Peace, if the
fearful belief were to possess men's minds, expicable to revolution,
that this dire deed can be tried and achieved because done once; then,
prosperous crime and the great profit in outrage (which causes every
page in men's undertakings) would be, by this fresh example, stimuli
for the factious to attempt the same crime.

The most Eminent Senators, and all the most experienced men
around the King, cannot fail to perceive what secret stratagems the
English Parricides move among us, that no small part of our disorders
are owing to them; that the restless minds of the assassins watch un-
ceasingly that we have no peace abroad or concord at home, knowing that
their own fortunes are over and they must immediately plan on the gal-
loos or flight, if chivalrous France could ever use its forces to de-
mand punishment of the Parricides, and to avenge the injury done to the
blood Royal of France. They have at home the daughter of Henry the
Great, worthy of such a Parent, stripped of her dowry, banished, pro-
scribed, convicted of high treason, bereft of the King her husband
(killed through the worst crime), the Mother of orphans driven from
their patrimony, against whom war is made and the ax prepared. Of so
heroic a woman either the grief or family, certainly her virtue—equal
to her birth but above her sex—should move the King, Princes, Nobles, and all France to the justest revenge.

To you, O most insulted King; to you, O Princes of the blood Royal; to you, O Nobles, the pillars of French dignity and safety, this Royal aunt appeals. Pity her tears, have regard for her Widowhood, consider her ill treatment; let that most tender sense of honor of yours be stung to the quick with the sharpest points by this completely shameful injury done to the French Majesty and nation, if you especially prize the glory of France, the cause of Kings, and finally your own safety. If you thought the Prince of Mantua, because he was born in France and a suppliant to your King, worthy of being appropriated to his Principate with all the forces of France; what should the Daughter, Sister, and Aunt of your Kings not expect from your kindness and power—alas, a Queen and suppliant at the same time? Of which she procures the dignity of one, and pity for the other, for her demand.

It does not escape me that the duties of Kings are estimated by advantage to the Commonwealth, not by family necessities. Yet we have now shown, you more clearly realise, that this rebellion absolutely leads to the endangerment of France. Whether it be advantageous to either French dignity or security for Kingdoms to be abolished on neighboring shores, for Popular States to arise, for successful examples of parricide and desertion next door to be displayed to the French Commons—yours be the judgment. Willy-nilly, you will certainly be drawn into war by a necessary choice of commerce or war with a neighboring race of growing naval might, whose power to recognise or Envoy
to receive, the French spirit will never brook. It were wiser, then, to attack while they are scarcely well settled into the administration of their new-found dignity, are struggling with domestic hates, and impeded with the Scotch and Irish war; to attack while the King's gore, spilled by impious parricide, is still warm and the People, not yet trained to Tyranny, breathe the justest wrath and vengeance. Only let not the fact that she was born in a Royal household and mistress of a Royal husband prevent the wrong received by Henry the Great's daughter from being avenged by the military troops of her own kinsmen, an injury which in a private family kinsfolks and relatives, as nature and duty demand, would long ago have avenged with their collective forces.

To the injury against Kings is added no less an injury against Peoples. Assuredly, as the English Parricides have taught Peoples what they can dare against their Kings, what profit they can hope from this, they also have given Kings a lesson as to where the indulgence of Kings inclines a People—a People which is too powerful dares anything. A King is not loved by his subjects unless he is feared. A King's safety is ill trusted to a People, whose hatred of rulers is innate. How Peoples are disposed toward Kings is evident only when they have them in their power, and are incited by the ease of committing a crime; whereas some things true, some increased to a greater degree by dis-
taste for the recent crime, could change the paternal feelings of Kings toward their nations, and thrust Peoples into miserable slavery; as Princes, for the crime of another's subjects, adverse to demands of their own, deny their People lawful things lest they dare those unlawful,
and interpret to perfection all things which smack of the liberty of
free-born men,

I pass over the fact that the injuries which are done to a King
touch the People more. For truly, those who have taught Peoples to
shake off their Royal yoke and to violate their own Kings, have advised
them worst, and have shown them the way whereby, under a false pretence
of liberty, they are going to destroy their liberty and safety.

But what injury (say the Parricides) have we done to free
Peoples, unless the injury be to have given them allies for liberty?
And the Federated Provinces of Belgium are shown, free of their former
King, and doubtless ready to embrace neighbors following their own
tracks.

I, however, maintain that by this desertion and parricide the
Belgian Federation was injured most of all; especially since the In-
dependents are not ashamed to compare their own vilest parricide with
the Belgians' Heroic deeds for liberty. Did the Dutch (if the matter
be deeply considered) at any time have a King—or a Count? some fed-
erated Provinces had a Duke.

With a Count or Duke there is no supreme authority, and no power
of life and death, except as divided with the People. For as, when the
empire fell, the power of Counts or Prefects grew in; thus the minds of
the Provinces arose to liberty; and having gained the greatest immuni-
ties, the states divided Majesty with their Count.

This arrangement of the Commonwealth—confirmed by many centuries,
the inheritance of the Provinces (descended to Kings by a complex series
of marriages)—should not have changed. But Spanish pride knew not how to share power with free peoples, nor would the absolute King of the greatest nations bear to act as a Count with the Dutch or Frisians.

The King, then, thought to rule all his subjects in a Royal way, forgetful that all were not his by the same law; and not thinking that sailors and peddlers would be minded to weigh a Prince’s rights and People’s privileges in their scales instead of butter and cheese; much less that, against a King who encompassed the Rising and Setting Sun within the limits of his Empire, these narrow Provinces would contend for their liberty with arms.

But oppressed by a truculent tyranny, the Federated peoples—after many thousands had been killed according to no laws but at the mere will of Royal servants over the matter of Religion, while the Prince himself dwelt in other lands, immersed in other cares—finally decided with arms to defend their rights, Religion, Laws, Fortunes, and their Liberty, dearer than life; unconcerned about Treason, may, negotiating with him who, if he had any Majesty according to the constitution of the Commonwealth, should have divided it with them.

Neither Spanish power nor their own insignificance deterred them from such an undertaking. But what was right and what was theirs first having been ascertained, they seemed to themselves quite strong enough against the forces of Tyranny, as if their only business had been what would be just, not how they could find a way to protect it; so that it is less strange for such a thing to be completed than tried.

After the war started, the principal delay to peace conditions
was injected by their Religion, which the King neither could by the Commonwealth's laws put down, nor would allow different from the Roman. But the Federated peoples would not abandon their own, no divine or human law demanding this. And the Spaniard finally had this reward for his superstition and tyranny: that after a seven-years war, with Spain bereft of soldiers and both Indies exhausted of riches, he bought peace from the Federates with the loss of those very Provinces; and by his abdication, ordered the Federated peoples to be independent.

What is the madness of the English parricides beside this virtue, whether you estimate the causes of war, or its purposes and methods? Did they have a Count imposed on them? Or a King with no Majesty to divide with the People? The Parricides, of course, will have it so; but even this one thing proves the contrary; that Parliaments were called and dissolved at the King's will; for without Parliament, the King had sole and solid power; without the King, Parliament had none. Had the King seised the People's rights, had he forbidden the Reformed Religion, or, when asked, had he refused to repair the Commonwealth's damages? Nay, in one thing did the holy King sin against the People—that he conceded them too much, and by impairing his own rights lost his power of deciding well for his People. Indeed, by his fairness and affability he so moved the Federated Provinces, which he had chosen as witnesses to this discord, that around six years ago in a notable Rescript they praised the King's justice, and accused the Parliament-men of unfair demands and harshness. But when the traitors had indeed almost reached the summit of crime and the King's
judges had been chosen, what pains did not those most Potent Orders bestow to save the King's sacred head from the assassins' knives, with both prayer and a price offered also? The Federates struggled for their fatherland's laws—the English butchers against Laws. The former defend the Reformed Religion, the latter subvert it. The Dutch employ their liberty—with their former King willing, yes, praying—so that whatever sin against law and justice there had been in arms (which never protect justice without simultaneously violating it) is forgotten forever, and the full rights of Majesty are given to the Federated peoples by either cession, or donation, of the King. The only law unto the new-found "Majesty" of the English rebels, however, is license gained by the monstrous parricide of their holy King, which all ages will condemn, and all nations pursue with the justest denunciation.

Yet the most Potent Orders received Ambassadors from this latest Republic, as if sent by a legitimate power. But he who would strain the public commerce of the Federated peoples with these assassins into an approval or their crime or authority, knows the customs of Imperial or Royal or Popular states imperfectly. Not to mention that the somewhat narrow bounds of the Ethical discipline are broadened by the Political, ordering the People's welfare to be the supreme Law.

Obviously, all association in human affairs will perish, if one must deal with none but the good. The mutual and natural necessity, whereby God has (so to speak) connected nations by a common bond, does not expect legitimate Governments to exist wheresoever commerce is carried on,
Yet how unwillingly the most Potent Orders thought those butchers worthy of even a conference, the Parricides themselves made clear, complaining everywhere of the delays and interferences by which their Ambassadors, after waiting long and vainly on the treaty, were finally compelled to leave with the negotiations unfinished; the leaders in the supreme Council of the Federated peoples roundly declaring (as the Parricides themselves say and write) that they would not make a treaty with the English Republic to the detriment of King Charles; and at the same time these leaders argued King Charles had been negotiated with, as King of England. Next, the sending of Envoys to the new Republic was considered boldly, that it might be clear that negotiations were protracted on purpose by the Federates, and that they wished neither a treaty nor a war with these hangmen, even granting their good faith. If it is so, it showed the greatest prudence.

The Belgians' feeling toward the Parricides was more clearly shown by the People than by the Senate, whose advantage from pretending and need of dissembling was greater. Indeed, the Dutch People—who usually call a vessel a vessel, and a spade a spade—at once pronounced the Ambassadors and their hirelings to be thieves, traitors, and parricides. Joyful it was to see with what derision, what danger those gallows-bait Ambassadors were daily afflicted; not only by the English Royalists and French, but most of all by the Dutch, angry that assassins dripping with their King's gore dared clasp hands with them, and compare robbery of the most wicked sort to Belgian virtue and liberty. And though that nation, long used to the unusual, marvels not at new
forms of bird and beast from either of the Indies, the people flocked
in stupification to this monstrosity greater than all monsters—a Lega-
tion from the murderers of their own King had landed on the Dutch
cost; the Parricides were daring to show their shameless faces beyond
their own shores; they had come, with an aspect of Majesty, to lie
about atheism, Religions, and Robbery. The people longed to know
whether they were tigers or hyenas, or half-man and half-beasts born
of Incubuses and Vampires. The unrestrained indignation of the people
was hardly checked by the harshest Edicts, and by extra bodyguards for
the Envoys, from tearing those foulest butchers in pieces. No home was
quite safe for the Ambassadors, there were traps everywhere, whether
public hatred laid them or those souls seething with crimes fancied
them; and therefore they would suddenly change residences, but panic
and the lash of a torturing soul would accompany the guests to their
new guest-homes. Twice or thrice, homes were besieged; as they would
come forth, there were dire—and after oteries were forbidden by
Edist—silent threats, fierce glances, and hateful expressions.
Amazing, that Ambassadors—a sacred name among all nations—had need
to be defended by Proclamations and bodyguard in a free and hospitable
Republic wherein Turks and Moors securely go about, protected by public
honor. Yet the Belgians, French, English, Germans, and all the Euro-
pean nations which reside among the Dutch, would not bear for the sacred
right of embassage to be usurped by these dreadfullest parricides, and
for the enemies of all mankind to enjoy any international law. They
were grumbling, too, at the brigands' being rescued from public
vengeance and stoning.
CHAPTER VII

The Parricides' Injury to the Reformed Churches

We now must plead our case, whom this injury supremely touches. But the Parricides cry out, "We do an injury to you, whom we haven't even considered?" Yet we should have been considered. It would have been amazing, though, for those men to remember us, who forget God and themselves. We have already mentioned the principal wrongs done to God and Religion; truly, these injuries are done to us. What a stain they have put on the Holy Gospel, with how much odium the Reformed Profession labors because of their crime, everyone understands and we feel. It is well that the same thing is recognised and felt by the leaders who first fought with them. Of these, Edward Massey the Tribune, who now devotes outstanding efforts to his King, laments in print that "for these men's crime and hypocrisy our Religion is hissed out by neighboring countries, and reeks among our enemies; nay, Reformed Churches everywhere hide their face for shame." These are his words, and these all men admit, friend and foe alike, who have any prudence.

The Romanists, of course, greedily seize this opportunity to jeer that "Surely this is the Religion which brings the Reformation to heaven for us. These are the men who shout that the Pope usurps power against the crowns and lives of Kings—obviously so that they themselves may use a power seized from the Pope against their own Kings. When did Reformed piety appear with a greater show? When did
impity commit crimes worse than this piety?"

The Romanists would proffer these words with less ferocity, however, if they were to recall that those very few men who quit us went over to their camp and borrowed weapons of them, and that the Independents cannot be condemned, without their Jesuit Doctors being convicted as Regicides. They should remember also that the horrible parricide of Jacques Clement, the assassin of Henry III, was extolled by Pope Sixtus in a full Conglave of Cardinals, whence the doctrine of parricide is confirmed by the head of the Roman church and faith; yet all the Reformed Churches loathe the deed and doctrine of the English Parricides (who are extremely few)—which they have testified by public writings.

Indeed, our French churches looked out exceedingly well for the honor of Religion and themselves when, five years before commission of the Parricide, they cutlassed the sect of Independents by an express Canon of the National Synod. And we supremely desire this: that it be known to all, and it be our common talk, that for those malicious ones who ascribe the Independents' crimes to us, we have the most complete answer ready—"They are not ours, whom we expelled from a full Synod a long time ago as dangerous."

How hostile they are to the Reformed Religion, they themselves have made public, who condemned the King, a most constant Defender of the Reformed Faith, as an Heretic and a Papist. Yet the King at his very expiration professed the faith which we profess: For a difference in Discipline pertains not to the faith.
But even granting that they were our own men, ought our Religion be convicted of the crimes for which they are justly infamous? No more, certainly, than the Roman Religion should be of the slaying at Naples just recently of Duke Macinialle, and of every sedition in Italy, Sicily, and Spain. Roman affairs do not fare so well that Religion immediately makes all who profess her religious; and anyone takes an absurd way, who would judge of Religion by men’s wickedness, when he ought to convict man’s wickedness by Religion. Religion is not bad because men are evil, but men are evil because they have not faithfully imbibed good Religion. Since both Reformed and Romanists acknowledge these things, the man who burdens Religion with the crimes of men is trying not to declare truth but stir hatred, unless he likewise shows that the very principles of Religion pave the way to crime.

Whatever the Religion to which they devote their piety, the general complaint of all the pious should be that the savage minds of today’s men are not tamed by Religion; that the Gospel trumpet is unheard amidst the horns of war; that nowhere is there the Christian mildness which overcomes evil with good, wrests weapons from the angry, and gains the better victory from patience; that public quarrels are undertaken, not according to justice and goodness, but the ambition and profit of a few men; that with

"Guile, betrayal, crime, and lust and wrath"

everything burns; that everywhere the Majesty of Laws and the safety of Princes is endangered; everywhere a criminal war or treacherous peace.
These—since they should be assigned to the fate of the times and the natural fierceness and impatience of Western nations—you would attribute to Religions wrongly. Because every faction shows them, they all refer them to their own interests, and fit them to their private profits.

We, then, grant this favor and request it in turn, that man's crimes be not charged to Religion; certainly, that the crimes of the Independents be not forced upon the Reformed—for we do not fasten the Mohammedans' evil deeds to the Romanists. Nay, the Independents are hostile to us, nobody more; we in turn are alien and suspect to them, as ones who hate their parricide doctrine and fanatic excess "worse than dog or snake"; and we have made known by a public Canon that we have no dealings with them.

How insignificant they account us, or, rather, how they wish us utterly ruined, they have testified by their most infamous parricide. Even while they were preparing for the parricide, they were warned very often that the horrible project immensely displeased all the Reformed Churches, their different beliefs from which, the Romanists do not admit, but put all those differing from the Pope together in one bundle; they were warned that from so horrible a deed the utmost, unjust aversion would be formed for all the Churches abroad—for a good many, even danger; that everybody would charge the Reformed with ever-busy Mystagogues of divers rites, and credit parricide to the Genius of their Religion, as one hateful to the life of Kings, and hostile to all powers—what would those who beheaded the Defender of the Reformed
Religion do to a King of the opposite faith? We do not choose to press what acts were done by the malicious for too much silver in this matter, and of which these assassins were diligently reminded before the crime's commission. You would expect, of course, that those who had decided to slay their own King, would have consideration for men over seas. On that account indeed, it was most pleasing to the Parricides that the odium of a few men's crime extend to all; that there would be others at hand to carry such a burden of hatred with them—perhaps even some to turn the impudence of the deed into justice. What if, inflamed by a foreign parricide, Princes should take measures more oppressively against the Churches subject to them? This assuredly they do wish, that all churches by which they are accused of fanatic lust utterly perish: Nor do men who have ruined their own, wish other churches to be safe.

You foulest outcasts, are we, whom you have exposed to punishment and extirpation for your crime, thus worthy of you? Do we seem to you to have heads of squashes that we might produce as substitutes for your crime? Yet how great an evil you shall have brought on yourselves from those whom you have so miserably despised and laden, undeserving, with the hatred for your crime, you shall feel, O shameless Brigands, if ever our King—more advanced in virtue than years and now in his glorious ascendancy, and destined to avenge his family injuries and those common to all Kings—shall arm us for your destruction.
CHAPTER VIII

That all pious men should attack this parricide
with the utmost severity, and raise the Royal
blood's outcry to heaven

This, indeed, has already been shown. To have set these crimes
before men's eyes is enough for a decision as to the vengeance owed.
But somehow it might be objected that this vengeance is not our busi-
ness, and that this vehemence hardly agrees with Christian mildness;
and though I have already met the latter objection, I will frankly
declare here that this asperity is quite contrary to my disposition.
Not once, as I have run this course, has this consideration impeded
me: Why do I dwell upon the Church's sore? Why do I prosecute others'
emities? Is this gently to point the way to the erring? Is this to
cultivate brotherly love? Yet indeed after I have reviewed both the
matter and myself by the standard of Christian duty—which is contained
in the two commands, "Love thy Lord with all thy heart, and thy Neigh-
bor as thyself"—I find that I must love God above all things, nay,
Him only: my Neighbor, indeed, because of God; and that the second
command subserves the first, and yields to it when occasion demands.
Therefore, if any man wars on God and plainly opposes His word and
glory, if he destroys the Church, if he beholds the sacred Vicars of
God, if he perverts Religion to Parricide—him, truly, as an enemy, we
both may and ought to pursue and punish with all our forces. Thus
David—"Do not I hold those who hate thee, O Jehovah, in my detestation?"
Since, however, the first command of love obstructs not the second, rather, they support each other; we ought never to strain a quarrel for God so very far as to extinguish love toward our neighbor. For he who says "I love God," when he shall hate his brother, is a liar. Wherefore, a Judge ought to love even the criminals whom he condemns to death, and the soldier his enemies who stand in battle, with arms maintaining the most wicked cause; he not using force further than his own and public safety demands; as an imitator of God, who "in His anger, remembereth compassion."

And herein I am disposed to lament the dire plight of humanity, but most especially of the Church, which has need of these cautions, to love those it fights, and to slay and destroy those it loves; though how many are there who, in quarrels which are undertaken because of God or country, restrain themselves within this most unhappy moderation, and are not borne with billowing sails of hate against their adversary, though a brother in Christ? Thus Coke, the King's prosecutor, wished the holy King had ten thousand necks, that all might be foreshortened one by one; and often cursed him headlong into Hell, quite as if he would follow his opponent all the way to the Infernal regions, as Brutus did Aruns in Florus. Ah, someday, after Satan has at last been trampled under our feet and all enmity finished, brothers in Christ will mutually understand and embrace each other, and the God of peace will be all in all!

Now I who could seem too aroused in this cause, so exhale brotherly love—even while I attack those Parricides so immensely injurious
to God and the Church—as to pray God continually for their safety and conversion; and if anyone of God’s family lies hid in this scum, blinded by perverse errors, I beseech him to join with me in prayers to Christ, the common center of the faithful, and in exhalations of divine love.

But because the secrets of Election are hidden but men’s crimes open, it is not ours to abandon, lest we wound some unknown brother, the defense of truth and the Church, whereon through the parricides’ crime a great stain is cast; we must indeed prosecute them the more harshly because in the middle of their crime, even dripping with their King’s blood and falling upon their next one with the sword, they dare ingratiate themselves with us, and familiarly invite us to their side, as long-time sharers of the same doctrine. And the secondrely Milton bustles about this, whose expiatory madness I should have mentioned as it deserves, had I not scrupled to sally forth into the province of Great Salmasius, to whose victory over this truly great adversary should be completely left. How does one treat these assassins who, though they separate all churches from themselves (mere Independents as they are called) and load themselves with the gravest offenses despite everyone’s vain resistance, yet dare extend the odium of their crimes to their denouncers and opponents? Holi ye Independents, keep your crimes for yourselves, and ye who taste your wit by yourselves, be witness by yourselves too.

One must, of course, deal gently with the erring, so long as there is hope of returning to the way; and refutation of error ought to be
made without insult to the erring. You will mainly bludgeon, then teach with salutary precepts. By mildness you should make receptive and tranquil the mind into which you would induce the serene image of Truth; a mind, which you have previously upset with invective, hardly receives her.

It is another inducement to gentleness when evil grows, or something has been committed which cannot be undone, which, however, it were better to hide than to disturb. You will more advisedly cover the sores of the Church, than enlarge them by rubbing: There are plenty of adversaries to base and exasperate them. Truly, it does not become us to perform our adversaries' duty.

These two things I examined and diligently considered before directing my mind to this book. But neither of them enjoined upon us liberality or silence toward these parricides. That there is no profit by liberality the most August King discovered, slain by them, he who not only by liberal words but especially deeds animad this deadly madness, as patience usually adds courage to innocence. In vain were so many warnings of piety and right reason by Theologians and men of all orders before the crime was committed; After its commission, however, they took courage from the crime itself, and one crime imposed a long necessity of crimes. And so he wastes his pains who offers reason or mildness to the parricides, most disgracefully drunk with the sweet fortune of wickedness; and does not know the Anabaptist disposition, which assuredly the cross alone can recall to good sense, if anything can.
They have not left silence to us, themselves proclaiming their own crimes. Nor did they wish the parricide concealed, which they committed as the world gazed on, and, after its commission, protected with arms and writings, and commanded to all Peoples for imitation.

Since, then, we are not free to cover up these ulcers, but extenuation of the crimes would be to come into a partnership of crime; and they themselves try to rub off their crimes on us and add their misdeeds to the sacred truth which we profess; especially since the Romanists connect us with those monsters as equals, I, for my part, think that kindness toward them and silence about their most famous crimes is absolutely ἄλογον καὶ ἁπατήριον; truly, for us even shameful and ruinous. Enough has been conceded to brotherly love, enough to Christian patience, especially toward those who, that they may not see as brothers or Christians but depend on themselves only, have broken every chain of brotherhood and have drawn out the bowels of Christian compassion; not sparing their King, their fellow-citizens, nor lastly their God, whose name they most shamelessly abuse every day, adding to monstrous crimes a drama of hypocritical piety; trampling the Lord’s Vineyard with dirty feet and uprooting it; bringing disgrace to the Sacred profession, reproach to its doctrine, ruin to its Ministers, and destruction to the Ministry itself—assassins of Kings, corrupters of Laws, the ready destroyers (for they say as much) of all Monarchs of the Christian world. If any one of our brethren thinks we are dealing heartlessly with those ἱπποτρέποντες, —of all wild beasts the cruelest, the enemies of God and men—while they are attacked with the harshest
demninations, I say that he indeed is heeding neither the matter nor himself. For the business has come to the point that we either ought to admit our community with their deeds and doctrine, as the Romanists wish; or, by speeches and writings, we must banish the doctrine of these men as far as possible from us, avert it, and attack it with our entire detestation and finally drive it away.

When then? They are not simply parricides, but turn parricide into a doctrine; and they take this from an agreement of the Reformed Churches, but indeed they dare not defend it by the Reveal of them. "It was" (says the debauched Milton) "the opinion of even the greatest Theologians, who were the very authors of the Reforming Churches." He means, of course, one Scot, who kept himself in his own Scotland, whom his age did not put up with, and who in this matter was condemned by all the Reformed, especially the French. But that gallow-bird uses the plural number to extend the blame to all, and into the Reader ignorant of these things, to inject the suspicion that this monstrosity belonged to the reformation of the Church. It is well that they have but now testified their zeal toward Monarchy; and that, the right of Kings, liable to none but God, has been defended by Salmasius and Bochart, great names; which work Molinusus and Rivetus also did brilliantly before. What men! What lights of the Church! Why should I recall our other notable men who have thundered against these parricides with the justest wrath—Vincent, Harald, Forrée?

Men equally learned and prudent had recognised that our Church and Religion itself were oppressed by this most unjust and very grave
odium, and that neither could otherwise be defended than by denouncing
the horrible deed and hellish doctrine with supreme indignation. And
so they brought timely assistance to Religion and the laboring Church.
These and other decisive helps we await from the Most High God, who is
the Father of Kings and the avenger of His truth, who demands back his
temples and hears the outcry of innocent blood.

The Royal Blood cries out indeed; and until it calls down venge-
ance from heaven, through us it will cry out to heaven, it will cry out
with the voice of the whole Church militant, and the Church triumphant;
"Arise, God of vengeance, arise at last, kindle a seal for thy glory,
and awaken thine ancient compensations. Lo, wicked robbers ascribe their
parricides and thievries to thee; they call thee the author and end of
their crimes; they propitiate thee with the blood of their King; every
crime hateful to thy sacred eyes and forbidden by thy law, alas, they
glorify with the profoundest imitation of piety. They do not hesitate
to employ even thy purest Word, miserably distorted for the protection
of their impurity; next, condemned by thy Word, to feign the inspira-
tion of thy Spirit to patch up anew thy just, immutable, eternal laws,
and fit them to the profits of Tyrants. These things thou beholdest,
Most Holy Judge, and thou seest how great an approbrium adheres by
these deeds to thy truth, what occasion the profane seize therefrom to
call Religion a mask and Piety a farce; what opinion the weak form,
that these crimes are pleasing to thee, as being approved by good
fortune as by the seal of thy favor. Amidst these, all those whose
mind is sound and truly pious, and who are brought by a sacred ardor
to thy glory, unhappily groan, under a monstrous weight of horrible opprobrium, forced on thy name, Religion, and the Church; and waste away with hidden sorrow, oppressed by grieving hearts; some, impatient and rash, even break out into murmurs; Others, too, from thy patience with these crimes, wrongly learn to become habituated to crimes.

"And this anxiety, in fact, burns to the quick thy servants who are nothing concerned with England, burning with zeal for thy house, and bearing an unfair reproach for thy gospel. But for the English, however, to this grief has been added a Tyranny most dangerous to bodies and souls; a Church ruined at home, a Ministry well-nigh extinct, a King slain by unspeakable parricide, and, after the father's murder, the same ax destined for his son; Laws violated, Rights trampled, inheritances plundered, everywhere bloodshed, mourning, and the most miserable slavery; and while the gibbet, exile, and want are the rewards of virtue and faith, the traitors reign alone, and in the midst of thy sheep-folds the wolves safely glut their foul maw with the blood of the flock.

"But that this unhappy nation does indeed deserve these and all punishments for its sins, we have no doubt whatever. But thou, most Merciful God, art not wont to measure the punishment of thy people by the merit of the sin, but by the usefulness of that people; and not by the vice of culpits, but by repentance art thou delighted. Hear at last, O Lord, the groans of thy penitents, and to the end that their liberation may be speeded, ripen and perfect their repentance. Yet
the compassion which men's penitence cannot deserve, may the merit of
Christ obtain, and the consideration of thy glory win for a most
miserable people. For though men are worthy to die, yet worthy art
thou to be worshipped by them, and to be magnified for the miracles of
thy clemency; worthy also is Christ to exercise in England a salutary
reign, free from the fanatic excess of men dangerously idle, and the
power of Satan feigning to be an angel of light. Truly, as our great
and only hope for an ailing England, there remains the consideration
of thy glory, which, O supreme Judge, appeals to thy justice, sure some-
day to hear the outcry of a murdered King, of violated Religion, and of
the crushed Church; to break open the murkiest recesses of wicked hy-
pocrisy, and to drag [wickedness] forth to the fearful light of thy
judgment. Vindicte at last, O Most High, thy Word, Spirit, and Prov-
idence from so many crimes, whereof those Parricides blush not to make
thee the defender. Indeed, they make a pretext of thy Word and Spirit,
relying, however, on their victories' testimony alone, alas, too
effective on plebeian minds. Do thou therefore, O God of hosts, with
arguments drawn from the same source, prove that a pious enquiring
crimes utterly displeaseth thee; that evil findeth no place with thee,
thought painted with whatever colors; that thou dost abominate the bloody
and deceitful man; that thou art the parent of Kings, the defender of
Truth and Justice, the Father of the Church's household, and that the
outcry of innocent blood hath reached thee. At last may the inflexible
obstinacy of the traitors soften at the rays of thy Truth. May the
righteous rejoice at the brilliant glory of thy Justice. May men
everywhere say, 'Truly the just man has his reward, truly God is the
Judge of the earth.'

"And because Kings are thine, O Christ, the characters and
assistants of thy Glory and Justice; divinely endue, O King of Kings,
thy vicars Louis and Charles with wisdom, strength, and fortitude, and
the full Genius of thy Virtue.

'Those Youths to succor perverse times with help,
Do thou propitious bid . . . .'

"Let their enemies be shamefully confounded; but above them, may
the crown flourish. Make them everywhere magnificent victors, the
beneficent parents of their people, the avengers—equally loved and
feared—of Justice and Piety: may they reign by the power and virtue of
Christ, and Christ by their governance and ministry."

That we may protect our work with a good and great name, and
that this detestation for a horrible deed may be supported by a great
author, I have been pleased here to add some small pages from an
Epistle to Dr. Morey by our most illustrious Bochart who, being justly
cherished and looked up to by all, can, alone worth them all, speak the
consensus of the French Churches.
For our part, at the first news of the crime's perpetration, "cruel horror encompassed" us. Next we gave ourselves over entirely to tears and sadness, and with public and bitter mourning we paid honors to the soul of your King. It was disgusting to us for the greatest and holiest King—and one most favorably disposed toward us—to have perished by so unworthy a kind of death, in his prime, having suffered from his own subjects, after such large concessions liberally granted them, things which not even the cruelest enemies would have attempted. We were afraid, too, that the savagery of the deed committed by them, whom the vulgar think to profess the same Religion as we, would cast on our Churches a stain which no age would efface, and that personal vices would be attributed to our doctrine. That we might forestall this evil, the most renowned Pastors in the whole Kingdom of France, alike privately and from the pulpit, with one voice denounced this crime as diametrically opposed to the rules of the divine Word; diligently they warned their flocks to be on their guard against this ferment, and not to take for an example the crime committed by those whom, by an express Canon, our National Synod long ago outlawed. Some even unfolded their judgments in Latin writings, as the most celebrated Pastor of Rochelle, Vincent, and just recently our Herald, the distinguished pastor of Alençon. Another also of as great a name in England as among us, who in the French translation's Preface to the Petition of XLVII Pastors of London, says that "after the crucifixion of Christ, no more atrocious crime has been committed anywhere, and the whole Earth is shaken by it, and good men provoked to a grief destined to last clear to the end of
the world." But others as well, beside the Pastors, did not fail their duty. In this very matter, those most eminent men the Sieur de Petiville and the Sieur de Brieux, those most virtuous Senators—the former some time ago in Metz, the latter recently in the Chamber at Rouen—with the most elegant verses held due ceremonies for your King, whereby they heartily cursed the assassins' inhuman cruelty. And the Physician of Rouen Fovée, the most pleasing Interpreter πολλῶν ὑπέρ τοῦ ἀλλήλων of the Royal work, did the same most copiously in his Epistle to your King, and Preface to the Reader, prefixed to his version.

May, but a long time before the deed, the Pastor at Geneva, known everywhere, the Μακαρίτης John Deodati, had by an Epistle put out on the English affairs called on the Leaders of Parliament to show their King obedience. And David Blondel, marked no less by purity of habits than by nearly infinite reading, had reproached the Scots Pastors by name, in his Preface to the Rectors of Churches, to the Apology for Jerome, dated 15 March 1616, with these words: "Refute harsh words by Christian modesty, pacific counsels, and perpetual examples of the observance of your faith toward Royal Majesty." And likewise: "Convinced by repeated experiments, let the World confess that it is not true or necessary now, nor ever has been, that those who suffer Bishops unwillingly, more unwillingly suffer Kings; that those who admit no Bishops, do not willingly heed Royal power; for none more than those who have no Bishops as diocesan overseers and almost as Kings, have believed and do believe, and teach by their words and deeds, that their King is first after God, and thus second to no man, lesser than God.
only; and by this very fact set above all men of the Realm." And
finally, our Herald, whom the Londoners with difficulty had gotten
from us by their entreaties, when (having tried to repress seditious
voices and recall those estranged from faith and obedience) by that
liberty he had come to danger of his life, he was compelled with changed
sail to return anew to his own people.

I might offer more of this sort, but this is more than enough.
To Great Salmasius,

For the Defensio Regis,

A Thanksgiving

Ode

THUS let the Muse encircling all Earth's zones
And able well to speak with hundred tones,
On adamant, O Great Savassius,
Inscribe thy name and sing thy praise.

O where with crowns oppos'd on either side
The Skies intrepid mariners do guide,
Surpassing far, Great Muses' Priest,
The nearest to thee—fame increased,

Thou dost (a marvel!) make one hesitate,
If thou art Hero better or more great,
Whom kindly Godhead doth arouse,
With stupefied and anxious cause,

To this our Globe's prosperity defend
And rights of Princes with a Princely pen.
Whom Gallows-birds without a name
Have learnt, themselves not knowing shame,
What you could do by your own Mars, and where
Your Genius with Law's bolt might hurl a spear,
And how in championing Liege Lords
You charged into the shields and swords,

Ah, it rejoices one to see those fiends
With molars smash'd, a stout right's blow the means,
And, as the cestus' stroke falls worse,
Like knives to spit out bloody curses.

'Tis good to see those Hell-hounds clank their chains
To no avail, stiff necks resisting strains,
Whilst you drag them to hated light,
Displaying Herculean might.

How good before the Highest Judge to see
These crimes weigh'd in the scales of piety,
These enemies as culprits tried,
The age's wrack and ruin beside.

And so, 'twas time at last with such a shield
That potent Monarchs had to be conceal'd,
Whose wicked fury might consume
On Earth, as shown by Charles' doom.
Than who no lamp more splendid only late
Elass'd forth upon a world in evil state,
And in the Sky no Stars adorn
With purer light the Heaven-borne.

O let the luster of a tarnish'd name
Thee, Law and Order's Parent, now inflame!
Arise Avenger, and with hand
Grown crimson spear th' impious band:

In good cause bad tormentors thou dost main,
Who to their own professions prove a shame,
In pisty (alas!) they gorge
On crime that penance cannot purge.

Turn hither arms, here wraths, 0 Potentates
Who exercise the office of the Fates;
Turn ye away this pestilence.
Ye ought t'effect deliverance

From horrid monsters to a World that weeps
Bent double under crime's stupendous heaps;
Uproot, squeeze out this noisome pus,
The guilty Parricide, Earth's dress.
Ye spirits in high enterprises sage,
Ye spears (as pens keep spurring) vent your rage,
Until against the common foe
Public arms are made to go,

Now curses, Muse, now flames I leave behind,
And barbs with hooks to turn loose disinclin'd,
By which the Hell-hounds I send down
To Master Pluto, and confound

To mother Earth their sons, whom I! Enough—
I've branded crimes upon their foreheads rough:
With vinegar and many salts
Chaf'd painfully these cankerous faults:

And soon, with feet unbound, that stage I've done.
But potent and—the Hydra slain—alone,
O Great Saumaise, a triumph star,
Afoot we trail the victor's car.
Against that Deprav'd Wretch

JOHN MILTON
Of Parricides and Parricide
the Advocate

WHERE, where, O Fierce Isabics, do you speed,
Unbid on hurried foot? To crush, indeed,
The Giants' obscure spawn into the mire
As he with envy's tooth gnaws at the Sire
Of Letters, even Kings. I touch this bane?
This sore?—Faith, Sir, it does my conscience pain
That I be stain'd by touching gallows' fare
Whom, save with hook, the guard can scarcely bear—
Nose held—to touch or drag to Tower Stair?

Yet though I do abstain fastidious hand,
Let me not suffer thee, O scoundrel damn'd,
To 'scape reproach gain'd by thy villainy.
You, Floggers, seize this wretch of base degree
Straightway, and quickly truss him hand and foot—
I owe a solemn rite of lash and boot.
Do thou this people's crown and Senate's stay
First prick with goads along the destin'd way
For gallows' fruit; make soft his perjur'd pate
With club, and him to scourges designate.
By lashes make his back be one great sore:
You'd quit now?—Rather, cut him up the more
Whilst he in tears sheds bile, corruption, gore,

Then order thou this great politic Sage
(His back in wormlike welts from flogging's rage,
A tasteful, varied pattern left by switch)
Before Salmasius' feet with sobs to pitch.
May he smite thee with greater punishment,
Deprav'd buffoon! Just as th' innocent
(Unlike thee!) Lycus, crafty matron's side,
Was done by curse, as Tyrinth's hero made
That scullion dash on rock, his brains display'd,

So you will soon permit Salmasius' hand
To seise thee, save he loathe thee as quite damn'd,
A plague! then, with false gasconade,
O Idler, thou might'st foil a strong tirade.
What doom will great Salmasius perform on thee,
Infinitesimal Vaeuity?
Revenge in vain grasps what it cannot see.

Thou, dung-heap? Thou, Squash-head? Dost dare to gnaw
At great Salmasius and Monarchs' royal law?
Now mouse plagues elephant, a frog the pard,
On lion's same a shrew-mouse climbs aboard,
The monkey rides a bear, the gnat a kite,
As roaches drip on Jove's pure birds of white
And splash the God himself with chalky dew.
Why not, please Heaven, in Republic new,
wherein the sum of things to rascals comes,
To sixpence scoundrels, unmix'd drags o' rums
Or what's impurer than the vilest blight
Or blacker than their baleful Mother Night?
Forgetting God and self, indeed these treat
His crown as lowly footstool for their feet.
And acting honor's farce the slaves pray
That Saturnalian sport forever stay.
The King now slain by crime of size so grand,
They as Princes do themselves command;
The slain King's castles, purples, lands and gold
They portion out among assassins bold
As pay for murder done, and as they can,
Seek solace for tormenting fellow man.

Just as the profane cure without a post
Long to wet whatever dwarfs them most,
These dungi rogues rejoice to violate
Whatever's noble, good, immaculate,
And twist great truths that bear no other blame
Than having wealth or too much virtue's fame.

Here, Friends, does someone new to Britain say,
"What care you of Darius', Daunus' sway,
One man or mob?" Alone I check their stroke,
Prepar'd to bow my neck to any yoke?
Reply: No yoke do I go to gainsay

Last I love's holier bond cast quite away,
Or in my scale impiety approve.
Not if supreme authorities he'd move,
Did Paul teach people to afford their necks
And so the great Apostle forbade axe
And gibbet for the Parricides, and sacks,
If any rascals to the highest peak
By heinous parricide their way would seek.

Nor—whilst the holiest King stands without
His doors, by traitors' horrid crime thrust out,
And calls on Genius, Faith, the God of Laws—
Ought he whose fibers good and justice thaws
Withhold the exile from ancestral lands,
That he indeed not gratify brigands,
Those tyrants 'gainst whom all should clench their hands.

Yet I alone might bear all, save that God,
Yea, God would "suffer threshing of that pod."
For crime which greater is than sin's estate
Hides groaning world beneath its fearsome weight:
These gory, cruel, foul, tyrannic facts
And Charles' parricide—inhuman acts
(That no Sun saw perform'd in days of yore
And none will see for ages yet in store)—
These impious deeds, these crimes are boldly done,
With show of sternest pity begun,
(Alas!) on God as source and end they're laid,
And princes' juicy sacrifices made,
Crime's offering and murder's votive wish;
This baneful juice of inky cuttlefish,
The Church's sore, Religion's poison dire
Are longing for the triumph of Hell's fire,
Alike the horror, shame of true Profession,
Of heaven, earth the exclamation.
Yet there was found (Woe, God, to Thee!) a man,
Or shade of one, in lostsome Stygian land,
Who this immense disgrace thrown on the Lord,
At which the world froze, all good men abhor'd,
And which the gasing Sun in packers drew,
Would shameless its defense consent to do;
An obscure rabble, pus and unmix'd bile,
And sewer-filth steep'd soft in dark blood vile!
A paltry clown; what fame he can't obtain
By manly worth, through vice would seek to gain.
Fetch'd up 'gainst us from his Tartarean ha'nts,
The scribbler counted hundred of sycophants,
And plotted frauds, deceits a thousandfold,
Both good and bad lump'd into falsehood bold,
If anywise he might with curse dispaise
The holy Martyr King, and at Sauvaise
This mangy cur his feeble barks would raise.

Here, vile tormentor, words with you I need.

Didst thou to such a hope poor father lead
(Who stunted oft improvement of his parts),
That you might shun the milk of kindly arts?
Would not your fate have been a better still
To move a plow, brave ass, or turn a mill,
Or draw rude cart, mind turn'd to nothing ill?
Then, harmless to the mother of the land,
At least you could check blab with tighter band;
Nor had you written to an evil end
So you alone were he who might defend
By art and reason's force his King's sad fate,
Nor would the Parricides want Advocate:

For 'mangst those Zealots bestial even more
Than utter beasts and fiercer than a bear,
(With you remov'd) none other would there be
Who could make show of some Latinity
For Parricides and their enormity,
Thence you wax haughty, rogue, and teach Saumaise
To write his Latin now as peasant's brays
Tell Letters' Prince—a pig, forsooth, does guide
Athena, ill Thersites Nestor chides.

Can one have such a mental bankruptcy
Or such a stupid dolt and blockhead be,
That he would haste to ruin self and fame,
And to all of sound mind and learning's name
Would freely own himself to be fair game?

But though you're unrestrain'd by gibes' disgrace,
Things graver press; for wrath does gibe displace.
Lest horrid crimes against God's deputies,
So many wrongs, debauches, calumnies,
Crimes heap'd on crimes pour down in cataracts
A horror readers' minds now quite distract;
A wrathful heart, a tearful eye they form,
Such hate they have for thee, 0 gallows' worm,
That deadly madness borne by frothing cur,
Or serpents' poison black they would prefer,
Or even ugly witch from Demon's den,
Importing ruin to the shepherd's pen.

0 were you due men's fear as much as curse,
You'd be more dreaded through the Universe
Than Hercules; and mothers with your name
Would fright their young, tots quake at you the same
As if Lycaon ate boys to his shame.

'Tis well as public foe in threats you're dire
And worse than Sinon's guile, Buziris' ire,
Excited more than tiger seeking lair
And yet more cowardly than hastening hare.
Scorn'd more than ape whose chatter people goads,
You're lesser than a louse, fouler than the toads,
And even more defil'd than Rouns'ditch shore;
Those empty, farting thundegusts you roar
Nobody sets at tuppence—even sign—
Forebodings of a man's disorder'd mind.

Hence public wrath alone does daily grow
To where, O Nameless, save you pack up and go,
'Twill crush thee as a wolf, the curse of man,
'Gainst whom the rustics, troop'd on every hand
(Their hamlets left), with staves and rocks bring pain.
Soon you'll be shunn'd as lightning-stricken fane.
And like nam'd, if they taste of you enough,
That ill-star'd name with haste will soon swear off,
Lest they, poor men, pay price of other's crime
Or victims be of public wrath at any time.

O Thrice and four times wretched if you know—
But still worse yet, if your thought be so slow
You know not—how 'gainst People, God you've sinn'd,
Or what the crimes on holy Truth you've pinn'd,
How many ills you get your life and age,
Whilst you, recruited to hir'd brigandage,
Insanely offer now to risk instead
Of these (Of all monstrosities most dread,
And freely rushing on to dom)—your head,

What do you not drive mortal breasts to try,
O hateful lust for gain made on the sly?
From this, indeed, O greedy rogue; you vex
The greatest lords, whilst your mob reigns as Rex.

Up with thee; wretch! In season sow and glean,
Fill up the barn whilst fortune is serene.
At truth and good's expense bear thou thy fruit;
Buy wealth at cost of shame as prostitute;
And, as your heart has naught of reverence,
So much the fatter be your purse with pence;
Sell not your conscience for a paltry fee,
But oh! whatever you do, do rapidly.
If stern of speech, may I the future show—
King Charles is nigh (Ha! rogue, why tremble so?)
And Virgin bearing liberator's sword
And justice' scales, by tyranny abhor'd.
Thief, if you act, do what you're wont to try;
Whatever you can by ruses, fraud, and lie,
Or what, thus brave in new audacity,
You can by tricks of contriv'd piety,
By tuneful trifles, smoothly turn'd deceit,
If manhood is in you, with hands and feet,
Quick, there! I bend to redoubled efforts fleet.

Be more elusive than a potter's wheel,
More bold than robber slitting purse with a steel,
More vocal, lying than Agyrtas be,
Who fed snakes, and more vile than palmistry,
More base than Cromwell, worse than Ravillac,
And honor'd for these virtues, wretch, attack:
You tyrants, you Ambassadors of crime,
With hurried consultations fill your time
(Woe, faith of God and man that parricide
Dares send world embassies thus far and wide);
Go, flex your muscles, leave naught to essay,
But hurry it, for danger is delay.
This do, if any way you're given flight
From noose that chills your breast with fright
And in your gullet strangles guilty air,
And way for food denies, and quite impairs
Your sleep, its image prickling up your hairs:

But recent victory perchance does find
Cras'd minds to rouse with hope's new wine.
Enough! Fates soon will find their known path,
Nor Heaven's slothful rod defer its wrath
From speeding rascals; Vengeance dogs the band
And proper laws for punishment still stand.

To bring thee to the block will satisfy;
I leave thee there. May happy destiny
Come to the Realm; I yield those candidates
To thee, grim block, and hand them to their fates.

THE END
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35 Jean Clémence Du Moulin accepted the post at Jargeau after preaching
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Though Du Moulin's Paris period and controversies will be treated later, these characteristics stand out. They can be seen in the titles of his many works. See Chapter II, Note 147.

La France Prot., V, 801-802.

The DNB is incorrect (XIII, 1098) in saying that Du Moulin was appointed to Charenton.

La France Prot., V, 802.

DNB, XIII, 1098.

La France Prot., V, 802.

Mark Pattison vividly recounts the Cardinal Du Perron's adroit methods as a convertisseur in his persistent efforts to win Isaac Casaubon and his family to Catholicism. See Isaac Casaubon 1559-1614, 2nd. ed. (Oxford, 1892), esp. pp. 189-191, 213-216, 289-289, and 400-401. As a daft controversialist it was Du Perron who was chosen to crush Philippe de Moray at the conference of Fontainebleau in 1600, arranged by Henry IV after De Moray published his attack on the Roman Catholic mass, De l'Institution, Usage et Doctrine du Saint Sacrament de l'Eucharistie en l'Eglise ancienne...ensemble consent, quand, et par quels degrés la Mission s'introduit en sa Place... (La Rochelle, 1598). See Isaac Casaubon, pp. 135-135. Du Moulin was sent from Charenton to ask Casaubon not to attend the conference and thus play into the hands of De Moray's opponents (Pattison, p. 139). Of Du Perron, Pattison remarks that "The part of a learned man-of-the-world...has never been played with more success than by...Du Perron..." (p. 138). To the famous Casaubon, Du Perron adopted a tone of "learned unction" in religious discussion (p. 138). He "had learning," writes Pattison (p. 138), but with "the servile manners of a court chaplain...".

Du Moulin's fame increased as a result of his efforts to maintain Catherine de Bourbon in the Protestant faith despite conferences set up by convertisseurs to win her to Catholicism. See La France Prot., V, 802; Theatrum Vitorum Eruditionis Clarorum, Part I, Sect. III, 800.

Pattison states: "Fond of dispute and vain of his powers, he spent his life in discussion or controversies, or in writing attacks and answers. A man who maintained so much, and so dogmatically, was naturally obliged to be content sometimes with weak, sometimes with false, arguments. Casaubon, who had to hear his learned displays before his wondering and obedient flock at Charenton, could not help at times throwing out hints of the insufficiency of his glib references..."
to the fathers, or regrets at the levity with which Christian antiquity was set aside" (Isaac Casaubon, pp. 220-221). Again, "Du Moulin, with no reading worth speaking of, had come triumphantly out of many a dispute with catholic doctors. His favorite doctrine was, that scripture was so plain that it needed no interpreter but each man's common sense. If he looked into the writings of the fathers, it was not to use them—but to find expressions he could declaim against, as deviating from the standard of genevan orthodoxy" (Isaac Casaubon, pp. 403-404). Whatever Du Moulin’s view of the fathers, inspection of his works shows he was not unlearned in them. If one can quarrel with his approach to them, the fault would seem to lie with the arbitrary spirit of the Calvinism he was defending.

Isaac Casaubon, Ephemereses, ed. John Russell (Oxford, 1850), pp. 426, 523, 613, 866, and especially 671. The entries cover July, 1602; December, 1603; July, 1608; April, 1609; and May, 1609.

Isaac Casaubon, Ephemereses, p. 671.

Isaac Casaubon, Epistolae, ed. Theodore Jansen, 3rd. ed. (Rotterdam, 1709), p. 350. Du Moulin's attitude toward the Fathers was cavalier. In seeking to show that Transubstantiation was unknown to the early Church (Ch. XX), Du Moulin writes: "Après une si entière défaite de l'erreur; appeler les Pères pour les ouïs là dessus, n'est point les appeller pour aises au ciel, mais pour témoins de la victoire. Et ce que nous en produisons des passages n'est pas pour nous défendre, mais pour les justifier... Ils ont certes besoin de notre aide pour maintenir leur honneur, mais notre cause n'a point besoin de leur témoignage pour se défendre. Qui a pour foi la parole de Dieu ne mendie point les témoignages humains... Car l'Evangile est aussi fort seul qu'ainsi accompagné, & même estant defendu par autorités humaines, il part de son autorité. Prouver que Dieu a créé le monde, ou que Jesus-Christ est mort pour nous, pourquoi qu'Irénée ou Hierosme l'ont dit, c'est appuyer notre foi sur des festus & sous couleurs de défendre la vérité de Dieu l'innalider d'erreur."—Apologie pour la Sainte Cène du Seigneur (Geneve, 1610), pp. 181-185.

Du Moulin’s cocksure views of Scriptural interpretation and the Reformed religion are well expressed here: "Comme d’un point à un autre la ligne la plus droite est la plus courte, aussi en la religion la vérité tient tournier le plus court chemin. Cela paroistira par la comparaison de la brièveté & clarté de nostre doctrine avec l’embarrassemont & perplexité de celle de nos adversaires."—Ibid., p. 18.

Isaac Casaubon, Epistolae, p. 350. Casaubon wrote: "Non constat nihii & certissimun est, doctrinam Calvini de Sacra Eucharistia longe alia esse ab ea, quae in libro observandi. Molinae nostri continuatur,
à quae vulgò in Ecclesiis nostris auditur. Itaque Molinaeum qui
oppugnans, Calvinum illi non minus objiciunt, quia aliquis à veteribus
Ecclesiis Doctoribus. Si sic pergimus, quis tandem erit exitus?" See
also Ephemerides, p. 82n.

Casaubon, Epistolæ, p. 350. Casaubon thought Du Moulin, when
confronted with the problem of literalism raised in his eucharistic
doctrine, was evasive: "Quam dicere mihi hoc mirum videri," he writes,
"et eam appellare sacrorum omnium haeresin, atque exempli causâ
objicerem varias nostrorum de illis sententias, Hoc est corpus nonum,
ad eum librum de Eucharistia me rejecit, ubi ipse explicit ex hoc suo
dogmate, sed max a se discidet, et transit ad Calvinum, quem tamen
ipsum non plane sequitur."—Ephemerides, p. 82n. Calvin taught, in the
Institutes of the Christian Religion, 2 vols., tr., Henry Beveridge
(Grand Rapids, 1957), Bk. IV, xvii, 10, 11, 19, 32, 33, that in the
Eucharist the immortal, spiritual body and blood of Christ were present.
Calvin maintained that the presence was spiritual and real, and that
the believer feeds upon it by faith. Dismissing Transubstantiation and
Consubstantiation, he likewise strenuously rejected Protestant interpreta-
tions of (1) an empty symbolism, and (2) a notional presence (conceived
only by the intellect and imagination).

Du Moulin specifically held that in the Communion there is a
spiritual presence: "Car il y a diverses sortes de presence. Ce qui
est present à la veue n'est pas tousjours present à la main; & ce qui
est present à l'oeu ne l'est pas à la veue. Et ce qui est present
au corps n'est pas toujours present à l'esprit. Et les choses
presentes à l'ame sont le plus souvent absentes du corps. Car les
choses sont presentes selon qu'elles se font sentir à nos sens ou à nos
ames. Jesus-Christ don nous est réellement present selon qu'il se
fait sentir & se communique à nous. Or en ce Sacrament il se communique
& se fait sentir à nos esprits & non à nos corps, il est donc present
à nos esprits & non à nos corps, & sa presence est spirituelle & non
corporelle."—Apologie pour la Sainte Cène du Seigneur, pp. 17ff.
"Mais ceste communion avec Jesus-Christ estant spirituelle, & le S.
Esprit on estat le lien, il ne s'approchë de point par la bouche, mais
par la foi ... "—Ibid., p. 17. Du Moulin interpreted the Fathers
to say "that as Christ's divine nature hath united it selfe personally
unto his humane nature, so the same divine nature, by vertue of the
Consecration, is united to the bread of the Eucharist, by an union,
though not personal and hypothetical, yet mysticall, divine, and
infallible, by which the bread remaining bread, is made the body of
Christ ...... This opinion hath no foundation in the Scripture. Yet
I dare say, it is an error no way prejudicial to Christian Religion.
For that opinion changeth not the nature of Christ, and destroyeth not
his humanity ...... To be short, it was an innocent error, serving
to augment and encrease the peoples respect and reverence to the holy
Sacrament, which for that cause they call terrible and wonderful."—

Casaubon, Ephemerides, p. 753 (entry for 25 July 1610). Casaubon intensely felt the need for a middle course which would present the Christian Church and doctrine as it really had been—neither a Protestant construct (especially Calvinistic), nor a testimonial to the exclusive claims of Rome and the Papacy. This course, he thought, was especially needful against heresy. His protests about where Du Moulin's views might lead were futile. He wrote: "Pelagianismus sunt qui fugiunt, quos non animadvertant, se transire in partes Manichaeorum palam & manifeste. Fugiamus ills abrupsa. Non saltem moralis virtus; sed stiam vera pietas posita in medio. Qui deserunt, incidunt in Scyllam, cupientes vitare Charybdis. Ego ita comparatus sum, ut consensum primaeae Eclesiae magn faciam; illis longe dissimilis, qui seculare Cypriam Anabaptistam vocant; & dum postum hodiernae Pontificiae, veterem Eclesiae ferunt."—Letter to Petrus Bertus, 30 September 1611, from London; Epistolae, p. 133. Du Moulin had also made the bad slip of calling Cyprian an Anabaptist in the Apologie pour la Sainte Gene: "Serons nous avec luy sans & avec Justin Chilistes, avec Germanian Montanistes, avec Cyprian Anabaptistes?" (p. 183).

Casaubon goes on: "Postquam reverentia sublata est, quae debetur primum Eclesiae Doctoribus, non potest evitari, quin novae subinde pullulent opiniones adsunt. . . . Quoties audivi concionatores, qui dicerent: Omnis pervia esse; omnia culcis aparta; omnia potentibus aspirare Spiritum sanctum? Audivi Parisienses Ministros (i.e., Du Moulin) cantibus defendantem hanc thesin: Sacrum Scripturae nihil cujusdam interpretatione opus habere; quod stiam eftius significat in libro de Eucharistia. Quam obijicieris periculum et insanae sententiae conjunctum, nihil egis."—Epistolae, p. 133. Du Moulin, however, restricted his argument of biblical sufficiency to points of salvation: "Quoniam non nie point la dessus que la Sainte Ecriture est obscure & que plusieurs differens naissent sur son interpretation: Car toute l'Ecriture n'est pas obscure; & les obscurites mises a part ce qui reste de clair est suffisant a salut."—Apologie pour la Sainte Gene, p. 185. If one looks to the Fathers, Du Moulin asks, who can be saved? For who will arbitrate their disagreements?—Ibid., p. 185. One of Du Moulin's boldest statements of Scriptural sufficiency—its self-explanatory capacity—is contained in A Learned Treatise of Traditions, Lately Set Forth in French by Peter Du Moulin, tr. G. C. (London, 1611), p. 19: "These two Questions, the one touching the authority of the Scripture, the other as concerning her perfection, are linked together inseparably. These two properties of Scripture reciprocally embrace one the other, and afford to themselves mutuai succour. For the Scripture it selfe by her authorities maintaineth her sufficiencie, and her sufficiencie giveth her authority. And whosoever
withstandeth the authority of the Scripture, lighteth also against her perfection; for if the Scripture be sovereign Judge, it is deficient in nothing to judge well." And the problem of understanding it? "An illiterate man not instructed in the knowledge of God, receiveth the testimony of the Church of his own country, which telleth him that these books are canonical, as a probable testimony, and which he should not unwillingly contradict; but then he beginneth to have of it a divine testimony, and of sovereign efficacy, when the Spirit of God by the Doctrine contained in this Scripture, hath enlightened his spirit, and inflamed his heart with a secret verus, whereof it is in vain to dispute with those that feele it not; the which cannot serve for a Law to another but serveth to every one of the faithfull in particular, to assure his conscience." (Ibid., p. 257).

Cassabon was justified in his fear that the doctrine of Scriptural self-sufficiency would dissolve Christian unity, as later happened in the multiplication of English Puritan sects, ably discussed by William Haller, Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution (New York, 1955), pp. 44-55; see also Basil Willey, The Seventeenth Century Background (London, 1934), pp. 57-75. The Protestant mythos, of which Cassabon was aware, was—as Haller well put it—"the familiar story of the decline and fall from the pure dawn of the gospel, of the long night of corruption, ignorance, and superstition, of the reawakening of the true church at the Reformation, and of the present anticipation of new heaven and new earth" (pp. 50-51).

Milton presents such an account in Of Reformation touching Church-Discipline in England; and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it (1651). Significantly, Milton's book and the English translation of Du Moulin's Treatise of Traditions appeared in the same year, and have suggestive likenesses. Especially interesting is their similarity in the point of Scriptural self-sufficiency vs. patristic obscurity. With Du Moulin's statement above, compare Milton (Of Reformation, in The Works of John Milton, ed. F. A. Patterson et al., 10 volumes (New York, 1931-38), III, 1, 32-33: "... it may chance to be objected, that there be many opinions in the Fathers which have no ground in Scripture; so much the less should we follow them, for their own words shall condemn them, and acquit us, that lean not on them; otherwise these their words shall acquit them, and condemn us, But it will be reply'd, the Scriptures are difficult to be understood, and therefore require the explanation of the Fathers, 'tis true there be some Books, and especially some places in those Books that remain clouded; yet ever that which is most necessary to be known is most easy; and that which is most difficult, so farre expounds it selfe ever, as to tell how little it imports our saving knowledge .... The very essence of Truth is plainness, and brightness; the darknes and crookednese is our own. The wisdom of God created understanding, fit and proportionable to Truth the object, and end of it, as the eye to the thing visible. If our understanding have a film of ignorance over it, or be blur with gazing on other false glistening, What is that to Truth? If we will but purge with
sovrain eyesalve that intellectual ray which God hath planted in us, then we would believe the Scriptures protesting their own plainness, and perplexity ... ."

55Casaubon, Ephemerae, p. 753.
56Ibid., p. 760.
57The Defense will be discussed later in connection with Du Moulin's political controversies. La France Prot. (V, 809-810) lists the first edition at La Rochelle, 1610; others at Paris, 1612; rev. and augm., Geneva, 1621; English tr., London, 1610; Latin tr., London, 1614. The British Museum Catalogue (XIV, 102) lists a 1616 Paris ed.; and an Amsterdam (?) ed. of 1612. The 1610 ed. may have been the one which gave Pattison (Isaac Casaubon, p. 404) the impression the book was first published in 1610.
59Casaubon, Ephemerae, pp. 764-765.
60As Casaubon tells it, Du Moulin appears already to have heard that Casaubon had criticized his views of the Fathers and had made notations in the Defense. See Ephemerides, pp. 764-765.
61Pattison (Isaac Casaubon, pp. 271-288) gives a detailed account of Casaubon's welcome to England and to the Church and Court circle. Besides the pension, he was to have a prebendal stall at Canterbury Cathedral valued at £60, plus provisions (Pattison, p. 272); his son Meric later became a prebendary of the cathedral. Pattison dates Isaac Casaubon's presentation in 1610; but see J. Dart, The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Canterbury ... (London, 1727), p. 202, where Casaubon is listed as a canon in the Eighth Prebend, presented 16 January 1609. His invitation by James I and arrival, however, is noted as October, 1610.
63Ibid., pp. 292-294, especially p. 293.
64The full text of the letter (Latin) is given in Pauli Comonii ... Opera [incl. Selectae Clarorum Virorum Epistolae] (Hamburg, 1709), pp. 531-532. Pattison's cropped English translation is given in Isaac Casaubon, pp. 401-403. He discusses the affair on pp. 401-405, 220-222.
65Pattison, Isaac Casaubon, p. 405.
Colomesii Opera, pp. 531-532; Pattison, pp. 501-502. I have primarily used the Latin original. Casaubon had lost a lawsuit brought by Geneva authorities over his wife's dowry, and felt deeply wronged (Colomesii Opera, p. 531). That this bulked large in his memory is shown by an entry in May, 1609, in the Ephemerides, that he wished to be reconciled to Geneva, forgive all, and listen to its pastors, "si modo illi potesirint adduci ut injuriam mihi factam agnoscent, et redire ipsi quoque in gratiam mecum velit" (p. 671).

Da Moulin's real concern about Casaubon's deviation from orthodoxy is completely dropped from Pattison's English version of the letter. Cf. Colomesii Opera, p. 532, and Pattison, p. 403. Pattison's distorted version deepens his unflattering portrait of Du Moulin.

Casaubon's veneration for the Fathers was of course increased by his stay in England, and his aversion to their detractors—including Du Moulin—grew. See entries for March, 1611, in the Ephemerides, pp. 823-824. Casaubon dreads the effect upon private judgment of the doctrine that Scripture needs no interpreter, "sed omnia simpliciter, ut scripta sunt, esse accipienda" (Ephemerides, p. 824). Its results would be to disintegrate Christian unity and make its tenets unintelligible: "Sed nonne haec quoque nova sunt? Nonne haec ratione nuperi visum patefaciunt ad omnes haereses? Aut dubitat hoc opinione recepta religiones, quae nuper in tot capita est divisa, brevi in multo plura fore dividendas?" (Ephes., p. 825) For its consequences, see Note 54 supra. According to Casaubon, Du Moulin had often maintained the objectionable position in sermons, particularly about the Eucharist. When Casaubon protested the confusion likely to arise if the doctrine of literal acceptance is applied to difficulties in Scripture, Du Moulin waved away the niceties of theology as no concern of the simple: "Quid opus est idiotas sollicitos esse de vera interpretatione hujus loci?" (Ephes., p. 825) Casaubon's admiration for the Fathers was both nostalgic and pious: "Capit lectiones Patrum; admiror pietatem; novitates non sapient palato meo" (from London, October, 1611)—Epistolas, p. 133.

With a glance at the infamous practice of informers in Imperial Rome, Pattison (p. 405) calls the letter a "secret delation" and (p. 403) lists Du Moulin among spiteful delators—thus darkening his sinister picture of Du Moulin.
NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. G. H. Mollwain, ed., Introduction, *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge, Mass., 1918), pp. 1-11. J. N. Figgis in *The Divine Right of Kings* (Cambridge, 1911), pp. 5-6, states the theory of Divine Right of Kings in its completest form in four propositions: (1) monarchy is a divinely ordained institution; (2) hereditary right is indefeasible; (3) kings are accountable to God alone; and (4) non-resistance and passive obedience are enjoined by God.

2. The text of the Oath appears in *Political Works of James I*, pp. 73-74.


On the grounds that earthly matters are subordinate to man's spiritual welfare, Bellarmine taught that the Pope had no direct temporal power over secular governments or rulers; but that by his spiritual and supreme Apostolic authority, he did have an indirect power, for a nation's spiritual welfare, to direct and correct political power, and at need to take it from one prince and confer it upon another. Bellarmine taught that the power of Kings is said to come from God because of Divine will that there should be among men a political power distinct from the Church; but that God does not give kingly authority directly to specific rulers—it comes to them by the agreement and counsel of men, and can be changed the same way. Thus, in a better way God can work such changes and transfers through the Pope, his Vicar general over all. As pastor of the whole flock, the Pope must rule, direct, and correct everybody; as members of the flock, rulers are no exception to this. See Latin texts from Bellarmine's *De Romano Pontifice*, v, i-viii, and Tractatus de Potestate Summi Pontificis (1610), cap. v, conveniently presented by Mollwain, *Political Works of James I*, pp. xxii-xxiii. In his treatise *De Laicis*, ch. vi, Bellarmine held that, since man must be governed by someone for his survival, political power comes from the law of nature, which he identifies with the law of God. But political power is in all the people, and divine right gives it to no individual; the power can be transferred to one or many. Moreover, governmental forms—monarchy, aristocracy, democracy—depend on the law of nations, not of nature, for the form depends on the people's consent; and they can change their form of government. Bellarmine favors elective kingdoms. See illustrative excerpts from *De Laicis* presented by John C. Rager in *Political Philosophy of Blessed Cardinal Bellarmine* (Washington, 1926), pp. 19, 52, 53. See discussions of Bellarmine by J. N. Figgis, *Studies of Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius 1145-1655* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 195-197; and C. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the
Sixteenth Century (London, 1957), pp. 357-360. Of the doctrine of tyrannicide, Figgs (Gerson to Grotius, pp. 146-147) agrees with Lessen that the Jesuits should not be entirely identified with Mariana's teachings.

As Figgs (p. 147) and Allen (Political Thought, pp. 360-361) point out, Mariana differs significantly from other Jesuit writers. In part, his De Rago et Regis Institutiones (Toledo, 1599) is a tutorial manual for princes; it is also a philosophical treatise on the origin and nature of the state, and a study of the Spanish constitution. It grounds a theory of political authority on a concept of the state of Nature which foreshadows Rousseau and Locke. On this point, cf. G. K. Hallisage, "Juan Mariana," Jesuit Thinkers of the Renaissance, ed. Gerard Smith, S.J. (Washington, 1939), pp. 175-176. Mariana asserted a popular origin of power, arguing whether "Reipublicae et Regis maior potestas sit"; "as tenem autore, quando Regia potestas, si legitima est, a ciuis ortum habet, ipsis concedebus primum Reges in quaque república in rerum fastigio collocati sunt: ea [potestates] legibus & sanctionibus circumscriptae ne esse ninda affectat, luxuriet in subditorum perniciem, degeneretque in tyrannidas."—De Rago (1599), I, viii, 86. The King is not free from the law; on the contrary, "... sit Principi persuasum, lege sacrosanctas, quibus publica salus stat, tum demum fore stabiles, si suo ipse eas exemplo sancto... Cùm enim fas iusque legibus contineatur in omni vitæ parte, qui leges violat ab aequitate dissedat, & a probitate necesse est, quod nulli conceditur, Rege multo minus..." At need, the Prince may pass, interpret, or soften the laws, but to pervert them to self-interest is tyranny (De Rago, I, ix, 101). What is a tyrant? "Tyrannus est eum qui imperat limitis, qui armis reipublicae libertatem opprimit, qui non populi vitilitati praeceptum servat, sed num emolumentum & arrepti imperij amplificationem respect..." (De Rago, I, ix, 104).

The book gained notoriety from its doctrine of tyrannicide, but despite the sensational interpretations given it, Mariana's program for dealing with tyrants was not irresponsible. Warning that, to avoid civil disturbance, Princes should not easily be resisted, he outlined a system for dealing with tyrants. If by spoliation, contempt for laws and holy religion, vicious life, pride, and impiety, he is ruining the commonwealth, the Prince should be compelled to abdicate, preferably by a public, deliberative assembly. He should be admonished, and if he refuses to amend, be deprived of his power by public sentence. Because war will break out, the assembly must raise arms and public support. If the commonwealth cannot be defended otherwise, he should be executed as a declared public enemy. The citizen has the same power of execution. If there can be no assembly, if the country is falling and the tyrant brings public enemies into a province, anyone may justly kill him. "Ita facti quasestio in controversia est," Mariana admits, "quod merito tyrannus habeatur; iuris in aequo, fas fore tyrannum perimere. Necesse est periculum," he adds hopefully, "et multi eo exemplo in Principium vitas saeuis ac quasi tyranni sint. Necesse enim id in culuisqua
primi arbitrio penitus non in multorum, nisi publica vox populi
adit, viri eruditi & graves in consilium adhibentur . . . . Quod
caput est, sit Principi persuasum totius reipublicae maiorem, quam
ipsum vnius auctoritatem esse neque pessimis hominibus credat
diversum affirmandibus gratificandi studio: quae magna pernicies est.
---De Rige, I, vi, 75-76. Mariana favored tyrannicide by secretly
administered poison. Not only would there be greater chance of success,
but to force a tyrant to take his life by dagger or poison would be to
incur the guilt of suicide (De Rige, I, vii, 83-85). See further
Allen, Political History, pp. 333-336; Figgis, Gerson to Grotesus, pp.
119-126. The relationship between Mariana's doctrine of dethroning
tyants and the later trial of Charles I, especially in the Puritan
party line, is obvious. See the discussion of delegated power, tyrants,
deposition, and tyrannicide in Milton's Tenure of Kings and Magistrates
(1649), ed. William Haller (New York, 1932), pp. 7-23 ff., 100-11, 54-

5The 1599 edition of De Rige (here quoted) praised Jacques
Clement, assassin of Henry III, as "the eternal glory of France"; as a
result, Aquaviva, General of the Jesuit order, had the passage ex-
purgated in the second edition (1603). After the assassination of
Henry IV, "le tyran de Béarn," the book was burnt (1610) by the hang-
man; and in 1611 Aquaviva forbade the teaching of tyrannicide. See

6Mallwain, Political Works of James I, pp. lvi-lxii; Pattison,
Isaac Casaubon, pp. 310-312.

7Mallwain, Political Works, p. lxi, Note.

8Ibid., pp. xlix-lxi.

9Ibid., pp. liii-lxii.

10Ibid., pp. lxxx-1x.

11Ibid., p. lix.

12Ibid. Mallwain gives the Jacobean translation of the Papal
Brevae on pp. 73-75, 80-81, and of Bellarmine's letter to Blackwell on
pp. 82-85.

13Ibid., pp. lx-lxxi.

14Ibid.

15Ibid., p. lxi.

16Ibid., pp. 122-128.
23"I freely indeede confess," writes Du Moulin, "that in an Elective kingdom, when question is made of choosing a new king, they to whom that charge belongeth, ought in no wise to choose a king that is an Infidell or an Idolater. But it is one thing to speake of a king who is chosen by his subjects; and another, of a king who is a lawfull inheritour, and who is beholding to his birth for his Crowne, and to whom over and abowe, his subjects have taken the Oath of Allegance.

And therefore the Argument which Bellarmine draweth from the one to the other, to prove that Subjects are at no hand to endure a king that is an Heretick or an Infidell, doth not follow vpon good consequence."—Defence of the Catholicke Faith (London, 1610), pp. 68-69. Of Bellarmine's theory of the Pope's indirect power to depose, Du Moulin observes that "Such like a May-game do we find in Bellarmine, and in all their late Divines, who willing to cloake their foulle Fact, have inanted new terms to express the same thing."—Defense, p. 61. And, with an eye to the Huguenots: "...indeed seem in humane policy, and without any relation to the commandements of God, it is not expedient that subjects should shake off the yokes of their Prince which is of a different religion . . . . ." (p. 69).

24Chapter VII (pp. 105-128) is a list of examples from English and European history to substantiate the chapter heading, which I have summarized in the text above.

25In his later treatise Backler of the Faith, 2nd. English ed. (London, 1623), Du Moulin wrote: "We on the contrary maintaine, that obedience due to Kings and Magistrates proceedeth from the divine Law, & is grounded vpon the ordinance of God. To that end all the places of Scripture set down do serve, to show that God commandeth obedience to Kings and Soueraigne powers, as to those whom he both established, whom no man may resist without resisting God." (p. 557). Writing later, he further declared: "L'obeyssance aux Souerains est une chose juste & necessaire. Trouver en sa religion, ou en celle de son Roy, occasion de rebellion, c'est à faire à des braves gens qui defendent la religion par des voyes condamnees par ceste mesme religion, qui estans incommodes en leurs affaires particuliieres, esperent trouver guerison par le mouvement de la Piscine, & se sauver parmy confusion. Jamais
la cause de Dieu ne s'avança par là . . . Le suis de ceste opinion, qu'êses choses civiles il est plus expédiant à vn people d'avoir vn mauvais Maistre que de n'en avoir point du tout . . . Mais où il n'y va que de la perte des biens & de la vie, vaut mieux subir ce joug injuste que pour s'en exempter troubler la paix publique par vne re- bellion contre son Souverain. Car la force des loix humaines ne gist pas en ce qu'elles sont justes, mais en ce qu'elles sont loix, & faites par celui qui a authorité. Combien qu'elles ayant quelque chose d'injuste, si est ce qu'il est juste de leur obeyr . . . Ceste paix à prosperité se trouvera tousours plus forte & durable en la Monarchie, qu'en toute autre forme d'estat; Car c'est le seul gouvernem- ment civil, qui imite le gouvernement du monde universel, où il n'y a qu'vn maistre, & tous les autres Estats quand ils sont fort accrus, y reviennent par necessitá . . . Bref j'ose dire, que la principale cause de la haine qu'on nous porte, est parce que nous defendons par la parole de Dieu les droits de nos Roys, contre les usurpations des Papes . . . "—Lettres Des Sieurs du Moulin & de Balsae (La Haye, 1633), pp. [9-10.]
Un paragraphe de texte dans une langue française.
Tout ce tourment que se donne ce Cardinal prouvait de ne vouloir s'arrêter à L'Écriture sainte, & de chercher d'autres juges que la parole de Dieu, envoûtenant par ce moyen les esprits en vn labyrinthe sans issue. Car les escrits des Pères sont livres Grecs & Latins à d'vnse légère à multitude infinie, & dont le peuple ne peut avoir aucune connaissance . . . . Et on dispute du sens des passages des Pères autant ou plus que du sens de l'Écriture sainte. En laquelle contestation si l'Église Romaine est juge du sens des Pères, sans doute elle gagnera son procès. Et les Pères à tout propos se discordant entre eux. Et on ne nous dit point qui sont ceux auxquels il faut plutôt croire, ni combien il faut de Pères pour établir vn article de foi."--Ibid., Preface, Sig. "iiijv".

---

La France Prot., V, 803; DNB, XIII, 1096. The DNB speculates that Du Moulin was brought over, upon recommendation of Sir Theodore Mayerne, to help James with his Regis Declaratio pro Jure Regis.

75 Baird, op. cit., I, 81-82; Le France Prot., v, 811-812.
76 La France Prot., v, 811.
77 See Le France Prot., v, 811-812 for details.
78 Ibid.
79 La France Prot., v, 812. There was a Geneva edition in 1625, and an Oxford edition of 1626 bound with a sermon Du Moulin gave before King James at Greenwich.
80 La France Prot., v, 812-813 provides a list.
81 La France Prot., v, 812.
82 Baird, Huguenots and the Revocation, I, 162.
83 Ibid., pp. 162-163.
85 Du Moulin's line of attack is that "examinons à la perle de Dieu les charges de Pape & de Cardinal, d'Evesque & de prêtre, nous trouvons la charge de Pape & de Cardinal estre vne pure usurpation, & invention humaine; & les charges de Prêtre & d'Evesque de l'Eglise Romaine estre entièrement corrompues & destournées de leur vray usage, dont les naus qui en naissent sont si grands, que par ce moyen le Royaume spirituel de Jesus Christ est changé en vne Monarchie temporelle, & vn autre sacrifice; brev, vne autre Religion introduite que celle qui se troue en l'Escriture sainte."—Vocation des Pasteurs, p. 65. Moreover, "L'Empire Romain Papal est vne Monarchie temporelle sous omble de gouvernement spirituel, laquelle ayant succédé à d'Ancien Empire Romain, & estant bastis de ses ruines, aussi le contrafais elle, à imite tout ce que cest Empire a eu de plus splendide, & de plus apparent." (pp. 84-85). "Tout Evesque est Prêtre, & Sacrificateur du corps de Christ, & l'Eglise Romaine n'en fait qu'un membre ordre. Et par consequence les messmes raisons qui ont esté apportees contre l'ordre de Prêtresse, servent aussi contre l'Episcopat Romain. Mais l'Episcopat à ceci de plus, que d'une charge spirituelle, elle est devenue vne dignité temporelle, dependante mesmes du Pape, & vne espece de primauté de l'Empire Papal." (p. 100) Cf. p. 183.
Furthermore, in attacking avarice as the reason the Roman clergy "corrupted doctrine" for riches, Du Moulin reminds one of the charges English Puritans were currently making against the Established Church: "Il n'y a rien qui ruine davantage la religion que l'avarice. Par cette porte sont entre les vices en l'Eglise, & par les vices les erreurs. La corruption des moeurs a corrompu la doctrine . . . . C'est ce vice qui courbe la regle de la vraie doctrine pour l'accomoder au gain de peu de Prelats qui vivent de l'aumeuglement public, auxquels la devotion ignorante de peuple est tributaire. Combien cela despriant au fils de Dieu, appert par la remarquement des tables des changeurs qu'il fit au temple, reprouvant aux Sacrificateurs que d'une maison d'oraison ils aient fait vne cauverne de brigans."—_Vocation des Pasteurs_, pp. 161-162.

87 Ibid., pp. 1b-15.
88 Ibid., p. 17.
89 Ibid., pp. 29-30.
90 Ibid., pp. 41-42. Cf. p. 66.
91 Ibid., p. 66.
92 Ibid., p. 69.
93 See Chapter III, Note 36.


95 In his first letter to Andrews, Du Moulin restated it thus: "... non esse juris divini, nec caput fidei, sed res esse circa quam vetus Ecclesia usa sit sua libertate et prudentia, judicant præeminentiam unius esse accommodatorem ordinii tuendm et paci conservandas: et posse inter Ecclesiæ super hoc re discrepantes sartem esse integrasque concordiam."—Andrewes' _Opuscula_, p. 176.

96 Ibid.
97 Ibid., pp. 176-177.

98 _Vocation des Pasteurs_, p. 16: "Du temps de nos pères, quand Dieu du milieu de la Papauté s'est suscité des serviteurs qui
descouvrissent les abus de l'Eglise Romaine; et lieux où il a employé les Euseques de l'Eglise Romaine à cette oeuvre excellente, comme en Angleterre, le nom à le degré d'Euseque est demeuré."

Andrewes, Opuscula quaedam, p. 177.

Andrewes wrote: "Necus hic, tam quid dixeris, respicit Rex, quas quorundam quas quid iniquosius qui aliqui, qui aperit nos hic, iniquiores sunt in hunc ordinem; perinde oculis ista dicit, quasi et res quaeque. Quam anim beae, aut quid attinet, in distinctissime rerum, de confusiones vocum verba facere? Nomen fere non vellicet, nisi qui rei ipsi non omnino beae vult."—Ibid., p. 180.

Andrewes reflects a growing Anglican insistence on Episcopacy. Norman Sykes gives an excellent account of this trend in Old Priest and New Presbyter (Cambridge, 1957), pp. 58-117. Whereas the Elizabethan divines were frequently divided toward presbyterian politics, in the face of insistent Presbyterian Scriptural claims "... it was not sufficient to appeal to the royal supremacy, and to rest episcopacy upon the will of the godly prince" (p. 60); "this new emphasis upon episcopacy was the result of the dual attack upon the church of England by Romanist and presbyterian opponents," but "the Anglican asserters of episcopacy generally stopped short of unchurching the foreign reformed churches and of denying the validity of their ministry and sacraments" (p. 69). Thus, Episcopacy "... was held to be not of dominical but of apostolic appointment, and as divine jure only in that sense; as necessary where it could be had, but its absence where historical necessity compelled did not deprive a church of valid ministry and sacraments. It was necessary to the perfection or integrity of a church, though not its essence ..." (p. 81). The Andrews-Du Moulin correspondence is discussed, pp. 73-75. It was with the Act of Uniformity of 1662 that the community with the Reformèd ministry was broken (pp. 116-117).

Andrewes, Opuscula quaedam, p. 187.

Andrewes, Ibid., pp. 187-188.

Andrewes, Ibid., pp. 193-201.

Andrewes, Ibid., pp. 202-216.

The full title was Bouclier de la Foy, ou Defense de la Confession de Foy des Eglises Reformees du Noyaume de France, Contre les Objections du Sr. Arnaud Isautur. Laure auquel sont decidées toutes les principales controverses entre les Eglises Reformées, & l'Eglise Romaine. Par Pierre du Moulin ... (Charenton: Abraham Focard, 1613). Of the many French editions of this popular work, a second appeared at Charenton in 1619, others at Sedan (1622), Geneva (1630, 1635), Paris

107 Differences between the English and early French editions are explained above.

108 Buckler of the Faith, Sig. η ν.

109 Ibid., p. 344.

110 Ibid.

111 Ibid., p. 345.

112 I know that under the pretence that the Church of England hath another form of discipline than ours is, our adversaries charge us that our religion is diverse. But experience confuteth this accusation; for we assemble with the English men in their Churches, we participate together in the holy Supper of our Lord; the doctrine of their Confession is wholly agreeable unto ours. England hath been a refuge for our persecuted Churches, who, notwithstanding the difference of Ecclesiastical polices, have not received less favours than those who have not.

113 Buckler, p. 345.

114 Du Moulin seeks to show the good faith of this statement by observing that "in England, there God hath used Bishops to strive against and to resist Papistry, and where God hath given them sovereigns Princes, which maintained and upheld them by their power, Episcopall order continueth, and flourisheth at this day. And God hath here raised vp and still doth, excellent Bishops, both for learning and piety, which courageously maintain Gods cause, both by word of mouths and writing; and some of them also have received the crowns of martyrdom for the confession of the Gospell."—Buckler, p. 347.

115 And even as equalitie is receiued among vs to shunne ambition and tyrannie, so England hath rejected this equalitie, to anoyd confusion and contempt of the Ministrie. They [Anglican theologians] say, and that with good reason, that no societie, no familie nor common-wealth, can prosper without some degrees of superioritie; and that it is so among the Angels, and in the government of the universall world."—Buckler, p. 347. Cf. Lettres Des Sieurs du Moulin à de Balsac, quoted in Note 25.

116 The title page sets out the purpose: A Letter of a French Protestant to a Scottishman of the Covenant. Wherien one of their chiefest pretences is removed, which is their conformitie with the


119. For text of the oath and account of the Synod's proceedings, see La France Prot., V, 803-806.

120. Dr. Peter Du Moulin, in A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion in the Point of Obedience to Sovereigns, 4th ed. (London, 1679), records that "my Reverend Father especially, who being eminent and respected in the party, was a principal means to keep the Protestant Churches on this side Loire in peace and duty to their King, for which his Majesty sent him a considerable sum of money, which he refused to take, saying, that he would be loyal to his King without being bought."—p. 37.


122. Ibid., p. 158. The delegates were Du Moulin, Chamier, Chave, and Rivet. See John Quick, Synodicon in Gallia Reformata; Or, the Acts, Decisions, and Canons of those Famous National Councils of the Reformed Churches in France (London, 1670), p. 11.

123. La France Prot., V, 613-614.

124. Ibid., pp. 803-804.

125. Ibid. With a grim piety, the Synod of Alais, after a violent condemnation of Arminius' doctrines, made the Dort canons binding upon all pastors, and their acceptance a prerequisite for any employment in churches or universities; and ordered that ministers not pray into God's secret mysteries, "and that they would so order their discourses and sermons concerning Predestination, that it may promote Repentance and Amendment of Life, console all wounded Consciences, and excite the practice of Godliness; that by this means all occasions of Disputes and Controversies may be avoided, and we may abide united in one and the same Faith with our Brethren of the Netherlands, and other Churches of our Lord Jesus without the Kingdom . . . ." (Quick, Synodicon, p. 38). Then comes the Oath taken in the National Synod and administered to all members of the Provincial Synods. The Canons of Dort are said to agree perfectly with the Word of God, and the swearer promises never to deviate from their dogmas. The Oath continues: "I declare also and I protest that I reject and condemn the Doctrine of the Arminians,
because it makes God's Decree of Election to depend upon the mutable will of man, and for that it doth extenuate and make null and void the grace of God, it exalteth man, and the powers of Free Will to its destruction, it reduceth into the Church of God old, ejected Pelagianism, and is a Mask and Visard for Popery to creep in among us under that disguise, and subverteth all Assurance of Everlasting Life and Happiness. D.A. Moulin's signature as moderator is first on the list. Adopted at Alais, the Canons of Dort were incorporated by the French Reformed Church, printed by the Synod of Charenton (1623), and made binding on all churches and universities. (Ibid., pp. 126-128) Having fled France (v. infra), D.A. Moulin was not at this Synod. Apart from its theological rigor, one can see the Synod of Alais motivated by a wish for the strongest possible Protestant bonds of doctrine, and a fear of infection by Papistry. Its action reflects the even grimmer Synod of Dort, as a result of which Oldenbarneveld was executed and Hugo Grotius, D.A. Moulin's former student, imprisoned. In Holland, the Arminians reacted against severe Calvinism; a similar movement was going on in England, especially at Cambridge, and Andrews was associated with it. See W. H. Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1558-1625) (London, 1924), pp. 303-315. The Dutch Arminians favored more freedom than the severe Dutch Reformed Calvinists; and in their reaction against Calvinistic theocracy, for self-protection developed political theory whereby the instrument of power should be placed in the civil magistrate, not the clergy. For an excellent discussion of Anglo-Dutch Arminianism, see Rosalie L. Colie, Light and Enlightenment: A Study of the Cambridge Platonists and the Dutch Arminians (Cambridge, 1957), pp. 7-21.

126 Pierre D. A. Moulin, The Anatomy of Arminianism; Or, The Opening of the Controversies of These Times (formerly handled in the Low-Countries) concerning the Doctrine of Providence, of Predestination, of the Death of Christ, of Nature and Grace, &c. . . . . . (London, 1635), Sig. A3v-4r.

127 Ibid., Sig. A8v.

128 Ibid., Sig. A(6)v.

129 Ibid., Sig. A(7)v.

130 Ibid., p. 109.

131 Dr. Peter D. A. Moulin provides an English translation of the letter in his Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion, 1st ed. (1664), pp. 30-34; 4th ed. (1679), pp. 30-44. He also alludes to his father's letter in Letter of a French Protestant, pp. 45-47, after first pointing out that in 1615 and 1616 the persuasions of the elder D. A. Moulin kept "all the Churches on this side Loire . . . in
the Kings obedience; for which the Queene Regent gave him thanks." (p. 46)

139Ibid., pp. 190-192.
140Ibid., pp. 157, 192, 268.
141Ibid., pp. 201-202.

136DNR, XIII, 1098; Le France Prot., V, 806. According to Quick, Du Moulin wrote the letter to King James "... (who had a value and kindness for this Learned Minister) in which he informed His Majesty, how that not only the Eyes of all the Reformed Churches of France were upon him for help in this the day of their Exigency and great distress, but the Eyes also of all other the Reformed and Protestant Churches in Europe." (Synodicon, p. 105) The letter came to the King, but fell into Buckingham's hands, who sent the original to Louis XIII. When Louis issued warrants for Du Moulin's arrest, they were executed so slowly he was warned and able to escape (Ibid.). William Bates, Vitas Selectorum Aliquot Viatorum (London, 1681), says that the royal council hoped Du Moulin would inculminate himself by going to Rochelle from Alais; instead, he went to Lyons, where a letter from Drelincourt at Charenton warned him. Thence he returned to Paris by night, took Lord Herbert's advice, and fled to Sedan.

137DNR, XIII, 1098-99; Le France Prot., V, 806. Opening 1 September 1623, the Synod of Charenton sent deputies to Louis XIII to ask that Du Moulin be allowed to return to the kingdom and resume his duties at Charenton. The King personally refused them. (Quick, Synodicon, p. 106).

138Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, James I, 1623-25, p. 9k.
140Ibid., pp. 332, 337, 373, 385.
141Ibid., p. 333.
142Ibid., p. 394.
143Ibid., p. 448.
144DNR, XIII, 1099; Le France Prot., V, 807.
145Ibid.
146La France Prot., V, 807.
There is no one complete bibliography of Du Moulin's works. However, the most satisfactory listing of them, chronological and sometimes annotated, is in Le France Prot., v, 806-823. There is a less accessible account in Quick's Synodicon, pp. 105-107. For a fuller account of editions and translations, these must be amplified with the British Museum Catalogue, XIV, 99-106; and Bibliothèque Nationale Catalogue, XLIV, 506-833.
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NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. DNB, XIII, 1097; La France Prot., V, 824.
2. La France Prot., V, 824.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. DNB, XIII, 1097.


7. Ibid., pp. 39, 40.
9. Ibid.
10. DNB, XIII, 1097; John and J. A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses (Cambridge, 1926), I, iii, 197; Joseph Foster, Alumni Oxonienses (Oxford, 1891), III (Early Series), 1042.

11. Joseph Foster, ed., London Marriage Licenses, 1521-1869 (London, 1887), p. 949. La France Protestante (V, 827) constructs a pedigree which traces the descent of Lt. Gen. Pierre-Louis Du Moulin, one of Frederick the Great's most trusted officers, to Louis Du Moulin, a supposed son of Peter Du Moulin. The account is accepted by DNB (XIII, 1096). Peter Du Moulin, however, appears to have died childless, and the Louis Du Moulin mentioned above was the son of either Dr. Louis Du Moulin or Gyrus Du Moulin. Henry Wagner reproduces the will of Dr. Peter Du Moulin, dated 7 October 1608, and proved in the Consistory Court of Canterbury on October 13 by his niece, the verdinary legates and sole executrix, Theodosia Du Moulin (Archaeologia Cantiana, XIV, 56-37). The will leaves "to my nephew Louis Du Moulin . . . two messuages in the City of London," and books and pictures to such friends and kinsmen as Dr. John Maximilian De L'Angle, William Longville, Mrs. Elizabeth Tamer, and Mrs. Elisabeth Pilkington. There is no mention of any surviving children.

pp. 128-172, has given the classic account of the popular preaching
which spread puritanism, and which (pp. 112-113) by developing Pauline
images of wayfaring and warfaring, infused a kind of Puritan spiritual
epic into its listeners.

13Cal. State Papers, Dom., Charles I, 1635, pp. 200, 201, 215;

14Haller, Rise of Puritanism, pp. 249-253, gives a vivid account
of the scenes and its effect.

15See Haller, Rise of Puritanism, pp. 313-323, for a discussion
of how the Church's frustration of Milton's plans for a pulpit career
eventuated in Comus and especially Lydian, and how Puritan preaching
paved the way for Milton's poetry.

p. 154.

17The details are succinctly presented by Trevelyan, pp. 154-160.

18The degree was received 10 May 1640, with Du Moulin identify-
ing himself as the rector of St. John's. There is no reason to think
he falsified.—Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugdunensis Batavae, p. 313.
The degree was incorporated at Cambridge on 11 June 1640 and at Oxford
on 10 October 1656.—Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, III (Early Series),
10b2.

19For a complete discussion, see Sykes, Old Priest and New
Presbyter, pp. 71 ff., and especially pp. 85-117.

20David C. A. Agnew, Protestant Exiles from France in the Reign

21Agnew points to the "fraternal" interest which the Huguenots
felt in the British troubles. "And even King Charles I," he observes,
"though his education, his tendencies, and his connections [including
the Catholic Queen Henriette Marie] might alarm them, succeeded to all
the loyalty and devotion which the refugees in England felt" for former
British kings (French Protestant Exiles, p. 12). A "change of atti-
tude" by Laud "injuriously affected the relation of English Prelacy to
foreign Protestantism .... The one true religion .... [had not
been] an insular monopoly, but a European common property." (Ibid.)
Laud's behavior also affected the refugees. He ordered three foreign
congregations—at Canterbury, Sandwich, and Maidstone—in the Norwic
diocese of Bishop Richard Montague that (1) the English-born children
of foreign Protestant immigrants should attend English parish churches;
and (2) that the foreign churches their parents attended should, as of
1 March 1636, use the Anglican liturgy translated into their own
tongues. The congregations protested first to Montague, their petition being received by Laud Feb. 21 (n.s.), and similarly appealed to Laud himself, this petition being received June 26. Laud answered, ordering them to conform, on 19 August 1635. Prynne cited these circumstances later in the Archbishop's trial. —Agnew, French Prot. Exiles, pp. 13-15, where documents are substantially reproduced.

22 The concern aroused in Holland by the early stages of the English troubles can be seen in the correspondence of the Dutch humanist Gerhard Johann Voss, a friend of Laud. Voss writes Laud uneasily in mid-1629 of the dangers of doctrinal disagreements (Gerardi Joan. Vossi et Clarorum Virorum ad Eum Epistolae, collectore Paulo Colonensio . . . (Augsburg, 1691), Letter 103, 1, 152). In May, 1635, Voss writes from Amsterdam to Hugo Grotius, then Swedish ambassador at Paris, that Puritans are defacing the English Church because it venerated Antiquity and drew upon ancient dogma and ritual. How dangerous this is to the Kingdom anyone could find out from the zealots in Holland. Voss speaks of the royal decree that children born in France and Belgium but raised in England must join the national church. He is horrified at the courses and lies with which zealots have, in his hearing, assailed many of the best English priests, whom he knows personally. The talk that Laud is thinking to restore the Papacy is false.—Letter 258, Epistolae, I, 290-291. From Amsterdam on 21 March 1635, Voss writes Laud of his great surprise at the Scots rising against their King; and of his grieved anger that wicked men blame, not those wanting only novelties in the Church, but the English priestly order on the grounds that it is returning to Papal idolatry.—Ibid., I, 364. The same year he thanks Marie Cauwor for a first-hand account of the English quarrels, because now he can better dispel the accusations that the Royalists are bringing back Romish superstition and tyranny. In October, 1640, Voss writes Laud that documents Laud has sent him (Constitution and Canons of the Council of Canterbury and York, and an account of Laud and the Jesuit Fisher) should blunt the calumnies against the Church, its Bishops, and Laud. Voss prays for the King, Laud's safety, and the concord of England and Scotland.—Letter 395, Ibid., I, 400. In January, 1641, Voss writes to Grotius of his horror at what London Puritans are writing about Laud, and at the Archbishop's arrest and the accusation of treason.—Letter h01, Ibid., I, h07. From the Hague, Voss writes Laud in April, 1641, a disturbed letter of sympathy, turning to God's will for consolation.—Letter h07, Ibid., pp. h13-h14.

23 I have used copies in the Folger and Newberry Libraries. It is evident that Puritan propaganda of the sort reflected in Voss's correspondence was going on in France.


Du Moulin seems to have adopted the episcopal theory maintained earlier by Andrews and now (1640) being asserted by Bishop Joseph Hall: "... the power which Bishops and Priests have under their Universal Bishop Jesus Christ, is equal, as they are Priests. A preeminence and authoritie indeed they have, as Bishops, and that by Apostolical, and therefore Divine institution. But the power which Christ in the Evangelists immediately gave to Pastours, concerneth only the preaching of the Word, and administering of the Sacraments, and the power of binding and loosing in suo interiori; Herein they are equal, and all Vicars of Christ..."—Ibid., pp. 5-6. Again, "... to have Bishops is a commandement, and none of the least; for it is an Apostolical order; Suppose then that the French break it... it is necessity not choice, that keepeth them from Episcopall order."—Ibid., pp. 5-6.

Hall was at least partly moved to write Episcopacie by Divine Right by the recantation of their office by two Calvinistic bishops, Alexander Lindsay on 29 November 1639 had resigned the bishopric of Dunkeld, and on 11 February 1639 George Graham quit the see of Orkney. In his dedication to Charles I, given in Divers Treatises Written upon severall Occassions (London, 1662), 121, Bishop Hall alludes to the resignations. His temper may be gained from his startled re-proof of the erring prelates: "Good God! what is this that I have lived to hear? That a Bishop, in a Christian Assembly, should renounce his Episcopall function, and cry mercy for his now abandoned calling! ... Say therefore, I beseech you, before God and his elect Angels, say what it is... say what it can be that induced you to this sinfull, to this scandalous repentance, and take me with you. How wearie should I be of this Roast, if you can shew me that Episcopacie is of any lesse than divine Institution?" (Treatises, III, 121). Hall summarises a part of the elder Du Moulin's third letter to Andrews,
praising Episcopacy: "Let me (not without the professions of my dear respects to my ancient and worthy friend D. Molinaeus) tell you what he heartily writes to our late admirable Bishop of Winchester . . . . " (Treatises, III, 127). Hall developed the theory of Apostolical, hence divine, institution of Episcopacy, in Part I, Sects. vii-xi, grounding this on Church history and the Fathers (Sect. xiv). Church government was begun by Christ "in a manifest impartial," and so the apostles, infallibly guided by the Holy Spirit (III, 1/2), decreed that Episcopacy be the Church's form (Part II, Sects. xi-xv). For discussion of the prelatical controversy, see Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, pp. 124-130, especially his appraisal of Bishop Hall (p. 327); for Milton's activity in the quarrel, see pp. 342-363. There is a further discussion of Hall's writing in Haller's Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution (New York, 1955), pp. 32-40; for Milton's anti-prelatical tracts, see pp. 41 ff. Consult also Don M. Wolfe, ed., Complete Prose Works of John Milton, Volume I (1624-1642) (New Haven, 1953), pp. 55-56, 76-86. Hall again cites the elder D. Moulins's third letter to Andrews in his A Defense of the humble Remonstrants (1641), written in the Remonstrant controversy: "... learned and worthy Doctor Moulins shall tell thee, that the restoration of the English Church, and eversion of Popery, next under God and our King, is chiefly to be ascribed and owed to the learning and industry of our Bishops, some whereof being crowned with Martyrdom subscribed the Gospel with their blood . . . ."--Treatises, III, 219. To this, Milton makes a tart rejoinder which is historically debatable and does not reflect the exact sense of Hall's statement: "Moulins says in his book of the calling of Pastors, that because Bishops were the reformers of the Church, therefore they were left remaining: This argument is but of small force to keep you in your Cathedrals. For first it may be deny'd that Bishops were our first Reformers, for Wickliffe was before them, and his egregious labours are not to be neglected; besides our Bishops were in this works but the disciples of Priests and began the reformation before they were Bishops . . . . and lastly, Moulins argument directly makes against you, for if there be nothing in it, but this, Bishops were left remaining because they were the reformers of the Church, by as good a consequence therefore they are now to be remov'd, because they have been the most certaine reformers and ruiners of the Church."--Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defense against Smectymnuus (1641), Prose Works, I, 734.

37 For a succinct account of Haller's treatise, see Don M. Wolfe, ed., Prose Works, I, 48-52; for his activities, see Haller, Rise of Puritanism, passim.


39 Consult ibid., pp. 78-80, for concise account of the pamphlet. Also cf. Haller, Liberty and Reformation, pp. 34-40. As Haller
The Saeot,-wma• • to Ball’lblnonnrwe derid ita priAOipll iapol’tanoe • • troll to the position of auUiors and the bod., of men tb.-(p. 3$). See Arthur L. Barker, Milton and the Puritan Dilenna 1641-1660 (Toronto, 1942), pp. 22, 126-127, 341-342. Barker points out that the Saeotymans wanted reformation, not revolution.

The work is analyzed, pp. 61-64.

A thorough review is given by Wolfe, Prose Works, I, 107-128, 193-210. Barker (Milton and the Puritan Dilenna, p. 35) points out that Milton entered the controversy both because of his frustrated plans for the ministry and his belief in his own divine inspiration as a poet; since he was technically excluded from the ministerial class (to which the Saeotymans belonged), "His insistence on the equality of all Christians ... was very largely the expression of his self-esteem ... He entered the controversial arena on the side of Puritanism because the reformation of the church seemed to promise the long-sought fulfillment of his powers; but the view of reformation he adopted was modified by his high view of his poetical function." See general discussion, pp. 27-54. Also cf. Haller, Rise of Puritanism, pp. 339-346, 352-363, which further raises Milton's Utopian idealism as a motive; see also Liberty and Reformation, pp. 41-54, 55.

The usual biographical sketch is in DNB, XIII, 1097. However, the most sympathetic treatment of Lewis Du Moulin is by Douglas Nobbs, "New Light on Louis Du Moulin," Proceedings of the Hague Society of London, XV (1933-1937), 489-509. Nobbs corrects Wood's description of Du Moulin—given full value by DNB—as "a fiery, violent, and hot-headed independent, a cross and ill-natured man ... ."

The usual biographical sketch is in DNB, XIII, 1097.

See Haller, Liberty and Reformation, pp. 6-8, 21-22, 105-106. The Puritans failed to create a comprehensive national church, he explains, "because the movement they had promoted had already brought into being a mode of religious organisation, elastic, protean in its adaptability to changing folk experience, and in the event quite ineradicable" (p. 107). After reviewing the conflict between Presbyterian and Independent of the Westminster Assembly in 1643, Haller observes that "all attempts in 1644 to impose a presbyterian frame upon revolutionary Puritanism served simply to evoke the many-headed Hydra of English dissent" (p. 112).

The title page makes the work's intent clear: Homo nuper in Regno Scotiae Historia, Seu verius Commentarius, Causas, occasiones, progressus horum motuum breviter & peripatens proponens, simul cum synopsi concordiae, quantum hactenus intita est ... . Addita est.

[16th.]

16 There was another edition of the same year (n.p.) which had on its title page, instead of "In qua aperitur . . . redivivum," the clause "In qua Dissertatur de Motibus & controversiis super obortis in Anglia, circa Religionem . . . ." The content is substantially the same. I have examined both copies at the Folger Library.

17 La France Prot., v. 800. André Rivet, after ordination in 1595, had been chaplain of the Duc de la Trémouille at Thouars; and after the Duke's death, had been mainly sought by Du Plessis-Mornay for the Academy at Saumur. In 1620 he took the chair of theology at Leyden. In 1632, he left Leyden for Breda, where he was curate of the school and college of Orange. He is mentioned with great approval by Dr. Peter Du Moulin in Glasor ad Coelum, and was naturally sympathetic to the English Royalists. See account in Nouvelle Biographie Générale, xiii, 301.

18 Epistola, ad Renatum Variaenum, pp. 10-11. In contrast with what Dr. Peter Du Moulin was saying, Lewis Du Moulin (p. 61) seeks to free the elder Du Moulin from accusations of favoring Episcopacy too much in his correspondence with Bishop Andrews.

19 Epistola, p. 69.
20 ibid., p. 29.

22 Du Moulin wrote: "Quis non lugest vicem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, quæ sola inter reformatas de his minutulis disputat, & lites movet, uose ad sanguinem? Vacua crederetur esse cerebro in Galliâ aut Belgio, qui quæstionem moveret circa honores, quo est solenda mensa, ubi collocanda, an tapetitius ornanda?"—Epistola, p. 62. This reverses the two-edged argument which Peter Du Moulin had advanced in the Letter of a French Protestant.

23 Epistola, p. 12.
24 Vox Populi, pp. 1-2.
25 ibid., p. 2.
26 ibid., pp. 2-3.
27 ibid., p. 3.
58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., pp. 7-8.
60 Ibid.
61 Ibid., p. 8.
62 Ibid., p. 7.
63 Ibid.
64 Ibid., p. 9.
65 Ibid., p. 11.
66 Ibid.
67 Ibid., p. 10.
68 Ibid., p. 11.
69 Consilium de Reformanda Ecclesiae Anglicanae, p. 15.
70 Consilium, p. 16.
71 Consilium, p. 11.
72 Automaria, pp. 4-5. The specific date given is 27 February 1650.
73 Automaria, p. 3.
74 Ibid.
75 Ibid., pp. 72-73.
76 Ibid., pp. 70-71.

77 The Gentleman's Magazine, XLIII (August, 1773), 349, an item submitted as a curiosity by "J.D." It is an introduction, in Du Moulin's handwriting, inserted "in a copy of his Histoire des Noveaux Presbyteriens Anglais et Ecossois, Secunde Edition, 1650, presented by him to the library of Christ Church, Canterbury," of which Du Moulin was a canon. (Ibid.) The title Du Moulin had originally given the book, as he listed it on an inserted leaf, we have quoted above. La France Prot., V, 525, describes the original Apologie as an octave, published in 1650. Du Moulin's account, quoted above, goes on: "This French book was translated into English by some ingenious traveller.
[usually identified as Matthew Playford], who yet hath showed sufficiently that he had not the genius of the French tongue, and he changed the title, and intituled it History of the Presbyterians, although such an history was not treated or intended in the book, but occasionally. About eleven years after this French book was printed, it came into the hands of the Reverend Doctor Cosins // at Paris, who carried it to the king [Charles II], then at Colomb near Paris. Having read before his some pages of it, he said to his majesty, 'Sir, you shall never do enough for the author of this book;' and advised him by all means to get it printed, as most conduitle to the present posture of his affairs. His majesty, though short of money gave him sixteen Levises to reprint it, which was done at Paris by that Doctor's care, who altered and inserted several things in it in point of history, wherein he, living in France in the time of the rebellion, was not so well informed as who then lived in England. Two months after, his majesty came into England. And when I had the honour to kiss his hand, I found him as good as his royal word.—Gent. Mag., pp. 369-370. I have quoted from the 1659 translation. Alterations made in the book because of the King's death also followed (as we shall see below) publication of Salmannus's Defensio Regis in 1660, and are sensible enough that we must consider the History along with (Clamor ad Coelum (1652), which it often parallels. Since both works have the same purpose, to render the Puritans infamous abroad, the changes in the History still leave it representative of Du Moulin's original intention.

78. The English version was entitled The History of the English & Scotch Presbytery, wherein is discovered their Designs and Practices for the Subversion of Government in Church and State, written in French, by an Eminent Divine of the Reformed Church, and now Englished. (Villa France, 1659).

79. The Declaration is a Latin version of various documents concerning the jurecute of Scots and English in an expedition into England in 1664. The title page avers that the declaration was promulgated by Parliament and by the General Assembly of Scotland in that year. The translation was more Puritan propaganda for a foreign audience.

80. Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, III (Early Series), 1602. For a good review of the general temper of England at this time, see G. H. Trevelyan, England Under the Stuarts, pp. 225-229.


82. Ibid., p. 228.

83. Ibid.
For the Heads of the Proposals, see Sources Const. Hist., pp. 507-511.

The substantial text of the act is given in Sources Const. Hist., p. 516. The language of grounds cited for Charles's trial already assumes his guilt. Trevelyans's appraisal (England Under the Stuarts, pp. 239-240) is also worth noting.

When the poem was republished in his [APEND'A, Posamentum Libelli Tres (Cambridge, 1670; augment, 1671), it provided the title for Book II. The title page stated "Proximo post piaculare Regicidium mense, Londin primum editi." The work will be discussed in connection with Du Moulin as an Anglo-Latin poet.

History of the English and Scotch Presbytery, Sigs. a-e5v.

Du Moulin published his treatise The Power of the Christian Magistrate in Sacred Things (London, 1650), which also discusses the relationship of the Church and civil power. Peter Zagarin, in A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution (London, 1954), p. 71, finds the book "distinguished by its unequivocal employment of the Hobbesian doctrine of sovereignty to justify its power"; and asserts there is "no doubt that Hobbes was one of his masters." Du Moulin's book is worth quotation,
for it is a reasonable plea for toleration which still admits the real
problems of ecclesiastical administration in an age of state churches.
Du Moulin bases allegiance on possession of power: "... the Law
hath always provided, that Allegiance should be given him to whom the
Imperiall Crowne of these Realmes shall descend, by which Imperiall
Crowne, the Person is not principally meant, but the Realme; ... none
will, I think, understand the lawfull Heires and Successours of the
Crowne, but him, or them that are actually in possession of the Govern-
ment; ... for sure, unlawfull possession of a Crowne doth not exempt
subjects from the same Allegiance that the most lawfull Sovereigns can
challenge; for even I should much doubt, whether Subjects may call any
Supremacy of power unlawfull, or whether a Supreme Governor is not a
lawfull Governour; however, possession is the great condition required
for the duty of Allegiance ... ." (pp. 28-29) Furthermore, "God
having equally entrusted" the Magistrate "over all persons, and causes,
in a Christian Common-wealth: In the discharge of which trust, it
were to be wished, that all Christian Magistrates would governe with-
out that distinction of Powers, Ecclesiastical, and Civill" (pp. 150-
151). Whatever their claims of preaching inspiration, ministers—
here he seems to glance at the Presbyterians—should be advisors and
not share the reine of government: "But that the Pastours ... are
not the fittest to have a Supreme Jurisdiction over persons and
causes, they call Ecclesiastical, reason, and the sad experience of
former times teacheth us; for were they endowed with knowledge by
Revelation; or had Ecclesiastical Assemblies compounded merely of
Divines, a non erring gift not communicable to any other Assemblies of
men; I should willingly, and necessarily admit that Divines ought to
be assisting the Christian Magistrate ... as Judges coequal to them,
yea, Superiors in that Jurisdiction, which they challenge to them-
seves; but the gifts of Government, being not inseparably joined with
those of preaching, and the Ministers not being endowed with infalli-
bility ... , I do not see but that their proper place is to be coun-
sellers to the Sovereine power in matters belonging to the Kingdom
of heaven ... ." If "there is but one power of Legislation and
Jurisdiction ... belonging to the Supreme Magistrate, I conceive
that then Bishops & overseers set over many Congregations ... will
much ease the Supreme power of the care they must take in ordering
persons and causes nearer concerning the Kingdom of heaven ... ."
(pp. 108-110). But in case of divided civil and ecclesiastical juris-
diction, a "few Bishops set over Presbyters, and being Independent from
any other power, have a greater opportunity to Lord and tyrannise over
the Christian peoples, then a numerous company of Presbyters ... can
have," (p. 111) But because man is social, "I see not, but the meet-
ings of congregations of those called Independents are very commendable,
and not to be eschewed after by the Sovereine Magistrate, nor by
Synods which cannot be proved to be of Divine institution, but have
taken their original from those kinds of naturall and innocent
meetings ... ." (p. 74).
In the 2nd ed., rev. and corr., Du Moulin gives a metaphorical account of the work's composition. Dedicated to Richard Boyle, now Earl of Burlington and Cork and Lord High Treasurer of Ireland, the book is offered as "fruits grown and ripened at the rays of your favour, and as characters of those virtues whereby you have wrestled out the difficulties of an age of Iron and Fire." (Sig. A3) Referring to his stay in Ireland, during which the book was probably started, Du Moulin says: "Some years ago being cast by the storm upon a remote coast, and judging that it would have been to no purpose for me to quarrel with the tempest, I sate upon the shore to behold it calmly; taking no other interest in it, but that of my sympathy with those friends whom I saw yet beaten by the wind and waves. And to that calmness my condition contributed very much, because former tempests had left me little occasion to be much concerned in the present agitation, or to fear so much those which might come after. "There I found my self invited to husband that uncertain interval of unexpected rest, to meditate by what means I might possess every where, and in the very storm, the Peace and Contentment of my Mind; And to try whether I could be so happy, while I got peace for my self, to procure it unto others. "For that Contemplation I made use of four Books, the half wild Country where I found my self affording but few more. The first and chief was the Holy Scripture . . . . My second Book was the great Volume of Nature. The third was the lessons of Divine Providence. And the fourth that which every one carrieth along with himself, and that is Man . . . ." (Sig. Al. a7)

Though witchcraft and the New Science are to be treated in the next chapter, the witchcraft prosecutions of the Interrogations are of concern here. Wallace Notestein, A History of Witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1718 (Washington, 1917), p. 195, points out that Hopkins and Stearns in fourteen months sent to the gallows "more witches than
all the other witchhunters of England can be proved... to have hung in the 150 years of the persecution. Why? For one thing, England "was in a state of judicial anarchy," with prejudiced local authorities, eager for convictions, in control (pp. 200-201). Furthermore, one must "face the unpleasant facts that the witch persecution coincided in time with the Presbyterian rule and in place with Puritan communities. It is very hard to get around these facts." (p. 196; pp. 195-200) There was also the agitation of the war; its unusual conditions made the crusade possible (p. 205). But by 1653 "the equilibrium of England had been restored. Cromwell's government was beginning to run smoothly. The courts were in full swing... It is not surprising, then, that the Protectorate was one of the most quiet periods in the annals of witchcraft." (p. 219)

110 Du Moulin's book appeared when there were several acquittals and few convictions for witchcraft. See Notelein, pp. 410-411. The Restoration literature to which the Divell of Mascon belongs will be discussed in our next chapter.

111 N.B. XIII. 1097.


113 Foster, Alum. Oxon., III (Early Series), 1062.

114 Letters of Denisation and Acts of Naturalisation, p. 68.

115 Ibid., p. 70.

116 On 8 November 1651, the Council of State considered a petition of Lewis Du Moulin for a patent for payment with arrears of the pension of £100 a year granted by Parliament to his father and charged on Goldsmiths' Hall. On 17 November 1651, the committee to which it had been referred favored payment from June 21 (Cal. State Papers, Dom., 1651, p. 392). On 12 December 1651, the Council ordered the pension paid with arrears (Ibid., p. 409). On 13 April 1658, the Council, with Cromwell present, advised the Treasury Commissioners to pay the same pension as to his father (Cal. State Papers, Dom., 1657-58, p. 365); and on 1 July 1658, the Council ordered that instead of the £100-a-year pension advised on April 13, one of £250 be advised, "on his relinquishing his interest in a donative valued at £150 a year." (Cal. State Papers, Dom., 1659, p. 365).
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV


2 Ibid., p. 11, 11, 320-323.


5 The dual restoration is discussed by G. M. Trevelyan, England Under the Stuarts, pp. 276-290.

6 Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1660-1661, p. 11.

7 Ibid.; Dart, History and Antiquities of Canterbury, "The History of the Canons of Christ Church," p. 200. Peter Du Moulin vainly sought to help his now-unfortunate brother Dr. Lewis Du Moulin by transferring to him the rectory of Llanrhaidar in County Denbigh. The diocesan bishop, claiming that the rectory was in his gift, soon took it away from Lewis Du Moulin. In August, 1660, Peter Du Moulin filed a petition for restoration of the rectory to his brother Lewis, together with the place of history reader at Oxford University (the Camden professorship), taken away from him by the visitors of the University after the Restoration. Both attempts of Peter Du Moulin were apparently unsuccessful because of Lewis Du Moulin's seal for the Puritan cause in the Interregnum.--Cal. State Papers, Dom., 1660-1661, p. 230.

8 Dart, Canterbury, p. 175.

9 A native of Reading in Berkshire, of which his father was mayor and alderman, Turner had been a Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and a pupil of Juxon, and was later domestic chaplain to Archbishop Laud. He died 8 October 1672 and was buried December 17 in the Chapel of the Virgin Mary. He was 61. See Dart, Canterbury, p. 190; John Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Angliaeae ... (London, 1716), p. 10. Dated 2 January 1663/4 at Oxford, there is a letter from King Charles I to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury dispensing Dr. Turner from a personal installation because of the danger of the times, and ordering the chapter to admit him by proxy.--Archaeologia Cantiana, XLII, 118.

10 Dart, Canterbury, p. 203. Aside from the usual DNB account,


In general, the material in this chapter is based on my own reading of primary sources. I have tried to give due credit to the foregoing scholarly works where it has seemed especially pertinent.


In general, the material in this chapter is based on my own reading of primary sources. I have tried to give due credit to the foregoing scholarly works where it has seemed especially pertinent.


13 Ibid., p. 57.

14 Ibid., p. 51.

15 Ibid., p. 58.


23. Ibid., p. 64.


26. Ibid., p. 70.


28. This is, of course, the pervasive theme of White's *Warfare of Science with Theology*, where it is perhaps best exemplified in his account of the Roman Church's abuse of Galileo, 130-170. See also Wolf, *History of Science, Technology, and Philosophy*, pp. 8-9, 35-38.


31. For a complete account of the founding and growth of these institutions, see Martha Ornstein [Brenfenbrenner], *The Role of Scientific Societies in the Seventeenth Century* (Chicago, 1938). There are also sketches in Wolf's *History of science*, previously cited. See also Hall, *The Scientific Revolution*, p. 20k.
32 Jones, Ancients and Moderns, pp. 236 ff; Bradveld, Intellectual Milieu, pp. 47-65; Cope, Joseph Glanvill, pp. 32, 46, 120, 136; Cope, Introduction to Sprat's History of the Royal Society, pp. xii-xxii.


34 Ibid., p. 150.


38 Bradveld, Intellectual Milieu, pp. 53-58.


40 Sprat, The History of the Royal-Society of London, For the Improving of Natural Knowledge (London, 1667), p. 26. I have used the copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington. For convenience of the reader, however, this is the edition reproduced by Cope; page numbers correspond.

41 Ibid., p. 345.

42 Ibid., p. 377.

43 Ibid., pp. 377-378.

44 Ibid., p. 82.

45 Ibid., pp. 82-83.

46 Ibid., p. 374.

47 Ibid., p. 360.

48 Ibid., p. 374.


50 Ibid., pp. 28-39.
For against the undoubted virtues of Boyle, Glanvill drew a picture (pp. 76, 120-125) of Aristotle as an unscrupulous literary pirate and sinister character.

65Plus Ultra, pp. 92-110.
67In addition to frequent references to his ill-health in Casaubon's own works, there is a poignant treatment of the subject in Peter Du Moulin's Latin poem *Schola Morbi*, discussed in the next chapter.

68Letter to Peter Du Moulin, p. 1.
69Ibid.
1nac1., pp. 1-2.
2nac1., pp. 5-6.
3nac1., p. 7.

See the suggestive remarks by Basil Willey, The Seventeenth Century Background, pp. 3-7, concerning the differing qualities of explanations required with shifts in attitudes and interests, e.g., from satisfaction through a theological explanation to a need for one in terms of material causes and effects, according to what sort of mystery needs clearing up.

74Letter to Peter Du Moulin, p. 2.
75nac1., pp. 3-4.
76nac1., p. 36.
77nac1., p. 25.
78nac1., p. 25.
79nac1.

80Willey, Seventeenth Century Background, pp. 31-40; Schulte, Milton and Forbidden Knowledge, passim.

81Letter to Peter Du Moulin, p. 25.
82nac1., p. 30.

83Men that are much fixed upon matter and secondary causes and sensual objects, if great care be not taken, may in time, (there be many examples) and by degrees forget that there be such things in the world as Spirits, substances really existing and of great power, though not visible, or palpable by their nature; forget I say, and consequently discredit supernatural operations: and at last, that there is a God, and that their souls are immortal. This is a great precipice; and the contempt of all other learning an ill presage."—nac1., p. 30.

84I cannot tell what should make the Metaphysics, that noble science, so despicable unto them: them I mean, who have declared themselves and their opinion of it. Indeed, they have nothing to do with the senses, and may be called Notional; but real though, and the more abstracted from the senses, therefore more divine. What a coil hath been kept with Cartesius's Ego cogito: to prove the immortality of the soul thereby? How much more effectually may it be proved by the
capacity men have of Metaphysical contemplations, or the consideration of Ens quattuor Ens, so abstracted from all that is sensual and material? For my part, I profess, (next the mysteries of our faith) I never have been more sensible of the immortality of humane souls, then when I had the happiness to be conversant with that noble science."

---Ibid.

95Ibid., pp. 30-31.
96Ibid., p. 6.
97Ibid., pp. 9-10.
98Ibid.
99Ibid., pp. 20-21.
100Ibid., p. 17.
102Ibid., pp. 17-18.
103Ibid., p. 17.
104Ibid., p. 18.
105Ibid.
106Because of the relative civility with which Casaubon had treated him in replying to Plus Ultra, Glanvil suppressed a reply to the Letter to Peter Du Moulin.--Cope, Joseph Glanvill, p. 30.


99See Chapter V, Note 39.
100Ibid.
101Boyle, Works, V, 594.
102Ibid.
The poem praised Gunning's personal character and constancy to the Anglican Church during the period of Puritan military rule; moreover, it addressed him by his first name throughout.—NAPEP:A


106NAPEP:A, Incrementus, pp. 52-54.

107Jones, Ancients and Moderns, p. 354, n. 62.

108For example, in Cowley's ode to the Royal Society prefixed to Sprat's History, or Dryden's Annus Mirabilis (Poetical Works, ed. Noyes, p. 140); GLX-GLXVI, and his Epistle to Dr. Chariton (Works, pp. 17-18), II, 1-32.


110The best account is by Bradford, Intellectual Milieu, pp. 20-46.

111Ibid., p. 40.

112Ibid., pp. 35-36.

113I have quoted the influential English version of De la Sagesse, Of Wisdom Three Books Written in French by Peter Charre Deo's of Law in Paris, Translated by Sampson Lennard (London, [1612]), p. 127. I have used the copies in the Newberry Library, Chicago, and the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington.

114Treatise of Peace & Contentment of Mind, Sig. A[5].

115Ibid., Sig. A[7].

116Ibid.


118Ibid., Sig. A[6].

119Ibid., Sig. A[7].
Hobbes wrote: "From this ignorance of how to distinguish Dreams, and other strong Fancies, from Vision and Sense, did arise the greatest part of the Religion of the Gentiles in times past, that worshipped Satyres, Fames, Nymphs, and the like; and now adayes the opinion that rude people have of Fayries, Ghosts, and Goblins; and of the power of Witches. For as for Witches, I think not that their witchcraft is any reall power; but yet that they are justly punished, for the false belewe they have, that they can do such mischieves, joined with their purpose to do it if they can; their trade being nearer to a new Religion, than to a Craft or Science."—Hobbes's Leviathan, Reprinted from the Edition of 1651, with an essay by W. G. Fugleson Smith (Oxford, 1932), p. 17. Cf. the similar remark by Selden in The Table-Talk of John Selden, ed., S. W. Singer and W. S. W. Anson (London, Rad.), p. 231.

128 His A History of Witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1718 (Washington, 1911) remains, despite such later treatments of the subject as those by Kittredge and Sussman, the best balanced and generally satisfactory account of the witch mania.

129 Misusing his discussion of religion as superstition, arising from man's concern about and desire to know the future (Leviathan, pp. 81-83), Hobbes says that later prognostics were added "Sometimes in the insignificant Speeches of Mad-man, supposed to be possessed with a divine Spirit; which Possession they called Enthusiasme; and these kinds of foretelling events, were accounted Thesomancy, or Prophecy; Sometimes in the aspect of the Stars at their Nativity; which was called Horoscopie, and esteemed a part of judiciary Astrology; Sometimes in their own hopes and fears, called Thumomancy, or Presage; Sometimes in the Prediction of Witches, that pretended conference with the dead; which is called Necromancy, Conjuring, and Witchcraft; and is but juggling and confederate knavery . . . ."
Upon the recommendation of Archbishop Ussher, the book was communicated by Sir Robert Cotton to Cassaubon for editing and printing, and was in very imperfect condition. Following Dr. Dee's death in December, 1608, Sir Robert bought the remnant of Dee's library including the MS. of the book and Dee's magic table. Since the book had been buried in the earth for some time, it began to molder and perish despite excellent care after its rescue. Therefore, Sir Thomas Cotton, the son and heir of Sir Robert, had it copied, and from this copy the book was printed. Cassaubon believed it was the only copy extant. A True Relation covers the activities of Dr. John Dee from 20 May 1583 to 7 September 1607; in its fragmentary form, the biggest gap occurs between 4 April 1587 and 20 March 1607. (Cassubon, "Preface" to A True Relation; Sig. F[2]r).

Dee and Kelly visited the Emperor Rodolph 3 September 1588, and King Stephen of Poland on 23 May and 27 June 1585. Both potentates must have been startled by the messages passed on from the spirit world by Kelly and Dee. The Emperor (pp. 230-231) was rebuked for his evil deeds by the "Angel of the Lord"; while to King Stephen, the Angel Uriel gave an exhortation to leave off his foul sins, become a valiant soldier for the Lord, and thus to prosper with Divine blessing (pp. 405-406).


Cassubon's treatise Of Credulity and Incredulity in things Natural, Civil, and Divine (1668) was reissued in 1672 with the addition of only a new title page which perverted the emphasis of the book into sensationalism: A Treatise Proving Spirits, Witches, and Supernatural Operations, by Frightful Instances and Evidence; Together with otherThings worthy of Note. As the subtitle of Credulity and Incredulity indicates, Cassubon sought to discredit atheism by using the material of demonology and witchcraft as proofs; to discuss the relative dangers of credulity and incredulity to faith; to discredit Hobbes and his atomistic and deterministic teachings; and to promote ancient learning against innovations. The Treatise Proving Spirits, Witches, and Supernatural Operations, except for the new title page, is in every regard identical with the 1668 book Of Credulity and Incredulity. The Folger Shakespeare Library copy of the Treatise, which I have used, is...
signed "George Whitchcote" on the title page.

In his preface "To the Reader," Casaubon wrote (Sig. A(7)F) that ill health had prevented completion at the time (1668) of the promised third part of Credulity and Incredulity, that dealing with divine matters. It was, however, completed in 1670 with Of Credulity and Incredulity in things Divine and Spiritual.

Casaubon admitted that "whereas my title promises the consideration of both equally, Credulity and Incredulity; and most of my examples will be found of Incredulity, or such as tend to the reproof and confutation of it, I may be thought to have dealt partially, as though I favoured, or less blamed Credulity, than the contrary vice. But that doth not follow, neither had I any such respect, in the choosing of my examples . . . . But I must confess, the business of incredulity did more run in my head at this time, because of the times so set on Atheism, which of all kind of incredulity, is the most horrible, and damnable, and most unworthy of a rational man. Now one prime foundation of Atheism . . . . being the not believing the existence of spiritual essences, whether good or bad; separate, or united; subordinate to God, as to the supreme, and original cause of all; and by consequent the denying of supernatural operations: I have, I confess, applied my self, by my examples, which in this case do more than any reasoning; and (the authority of the holy Scriptures laid aside) are almost the only convincing proof; to the confutation of such incredulity . . . ." (pp. 7-8) For his attacks on skepticism, the Royal Society, Descartes, and the atomistic philosophy, see respectively pp. 155; 296; 224; 14-15; 133.

The evils proceeding from the extremes of credulity and incredulity, Cassaubon stated thus: "From ungrounded belief, gross superstition, by which true Religion is not only infected and adulterated, but profaned; but, from the contrary, right down Atheism (whether openly professed, or palliated, as the fashion is;) by which all sense of pious, all sense of immortality, being taken away, and nothing left to man, but what is common unto brute . . . man may truly be said, to be metamorphosed into another creature" (p. 2).

134 In Joseph Glanvill: A Study in English Thought and Letters of the Seventeenth Century (New York, 1960), Ferris Greenlaw says that Glanvill "had no complete and consistent system of ideas, in the sense that Descartes or Spinoza had. His sympathetic and harmonizing intention sometimes led him into capricious scepticism. His philosophy, like a chameleon, took some shades of color from the ground it was upon; now sceptical with Sextus Empiricus, anon Pythagorean with More, rationalistic with Descartes, or experimental with Bacon, it finally culminated in a reasonable and broad-minded Platonism" (p. 89). Of Glanvill and witchcraft, he declares that "Whether it be from the remoteness of the subject to our thoughts, or from the peculiar character of the evidence involved, or from subtilly, adumbrating, unsettling causes innate in the idea of the supernatural, Glanvill, in writing of witches, is not quite himself. That his reasoning should
not be clear and convincing as in his other work is doubtless the effect of the first two causes. But there is likewise a strange dullness of his literary sense and faculty, which . . . is best referred to the last." (p. 159).

Not perceiving that scientific skepticism is the key to Glanvill's attitude toward witchcraft cases, Greenelett throws up a verbal smoke screen to conceal his bafflement: "How is a belief in witches and ghosts—for to Glanvill these were kindred phenomena—to be reconciled with his careful scepticism, and to his sympathy with the scientific pursuits of the Royal Society? . . . it is possible to oppose certain considerations which make this peculiar admiration of his faculties less dark and unintelligible. In all ages the subtlest philosophical minds have had a keen interest in 'occult' or unexplained phenomena . . . . As we have already seen, despite his Pyrrhonism, Glanvill had this type of restless, adventurous intellect, eager to dwell in haunted places and to embrace fair immaterial forms. His imagination, having prised into natural phenomena beyond the point reached by most men of his time, and yet having found no bottom, was the more ready to believe, hypothetically at least, in deeper things beyond" (pp. 145-146).

135Ours, Joseph Glanvill, pp. 97-98.

Of his addition of stories and Scriptural evidence for witchcraft in A Blow beyond what had appeared in his Considerations, Glanvill wrote: "That there MAY be WITCHES and Apparitions in our days, notwithstanding the Objections of the Modern Sadduce, I believe I have made appear in the CONSIDERATIONS following; in which I did not primarily intend direct proof, but DEFENCE, as the Title of the first Edition, which is restor'd in this mention'd. But I have now added the evidence of the Divine Oracle, and two Relations of Fact, that are clear and unexceptionable. I have no humour nor delight in telling Stories, and do not publish these for the gratification of those that have; but I record them as Arguments for the confirmation of a Truth, which hath indeed been attested by multitudes of the like evidences in all places, and times . . . ." ("Preface," A Blow at Modern Sadducism, Sig. A[7]Puat).

137A Blow at Modern Sadducism, pp. 93-126.

138Ibid., pp. 126-136.

139Ibid., pp. 137-160.

140I THINK there is nothing in the instances mention'd," Glanvill wrote, "but what may as well be accounted for by the Rules of Reason and Philosophy, as the ordinary affairs of Nature. For in resolving natural Phenomena, we can only assign the probable causes, shewing how things may be, not presuming how they are. And in the
particulars under our Examen, we may give an account how 'tis possible, and not unlikely, that such things (though somewhat varying from the common mode of Nature) may be acted. And if our narrow and contracted minds can furnish us with apprehensions of the way and manner of such performances, though perhaps not the true ones, 'tis an argument that such things may be affected by creatures, whose powers and knowledge are so vastly exceeding ours" (A Blvd, pp. 15-16). In the spirit of scientific hypotheses, Glanvill offered what he thought were possible explanations, in terms of natural causes, of the transportation of witches, the separability of the soul, and the physical effects of witches' supposedAonting of themselves before taking flight (Ibid., pp. 13-14). Of the scientific skepticism which enabled Glanvill to believe in witches, Moody E. Prior gives a convincing summary: "It was however, a skepticism which took the form, not of the classical epoch— the suspension of belief—but of the tentative suspension of disbelief that was for Glanvill a necessary element of the scientific attitude. Hence the paradox that Glanvill believed in witches because he was a skeptic. Nor is this to be wondered at; for seventeenth-century scientists—impressed by the difficulty of discovering causes for natural phenomena; willing, as a result of striking reversals of old views by new discoveries and the restoration of older theories that had once been discarded; to entertain any hypothesis until they were convinced that it was untenable; and ambitious enough to consider all obscure, trivial, or extraordinary events worthy of their attention—allowed their opposition to dogmatism to lead them to an extreme of scientific skepticism that at times verged closely on credulity."— "Joseph Glanvill, Witchcraft, and Seventeenth-Century Science," MP, XXX (1932-1933), 192-193.

1bdNetterstein, History of Witchcraft, pp. 294-295.

1bdPrefixed to the fourth edition (Oxford, 1669) was a letter from Robert Boyle, commending the translation by Du Moulin. Using the copy in the Newberry Library, I have cited the fifth edition (Oxford, 1679), which also includes a letter from Du Moulin to Boyle revealing that the translation was undertaken at Boyle's request.

1bdThe Devil of Mascon, Sig. A2.

1bdTidd., Sig. A2v.

1bdTidd.

1bdTidd., Sig. A3.

1bdTidd.

1bdTidd., p. 30.
159 See Note 133.

157 Cope, Joseph Glanville, p. 19.


155 Webster, Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft, p. 36. Cope (Joseph Glanville, p. 100) treats Webster severely: "... Webster's book was both inconsistent and unimpressive. He fared no better than his predecessors when he tried to hurdle Scriptural passages on witchcraft, because they were plain for all to read, and no amount of rationalising could change the words of the English Bible. When he came to disprove witches, he attempted to retain spirits, but in his attempt he finally reduced all the spiritual phenomena with which he dealt to pseudo-physical explanations." A mild example of Webster's inconsistencies, we may add, can be seen in his rejection of evidence for witchcraft offered by Glanville and his acceptance of the account, or most of it, of spirit visitation in The Divell of Mascon. But this is saying no more than that Webster belonged to his times. Admitting the justice of Professor Cope's strictures, many readers, struck by the occasionally surprising modernity of Webster's utterance and effectiveness of his reasoning, will prefer the verdict of Notestein: "He was no philosopher ... nor was he more than a country scientist, and his reasoning against witchcraft fell short ... of scientific rationalism. That was a high mark and few there were in the seventeenth century who attained unto it ... He was by no means consistent but he struck sturdy blows. He was seldom original, but he felled his opponents" (History of Witchcraft, p. 298). Further: "... the most effective of the seventeenth century assailants of witch persecution in England. He had this advantage over all who had gone before, that a large and increasing body of intelligent people were with him" (p. 302).

"Preface," Sig. a2"-a[3]."
Rumors had been circulated that the story of the Tedworth drummer in Glanvill’s New at Modern Sadducism had been discredited, and that Boyle had disowned the story of the Devil of Mascon as “a clear imposture.” Glanvill, probably in 1677-1678, wrote to Boyle asking if there were any truth in the report, and again thanking Boyle for information that the scientist still endorsed the story as a true occurrence (Boyle, Works, V, 629). For a succinct account of the Tedworth drummer, see Cope, Joseph Glanvill, pp. 13-15; Netstein, History, pp. 273-276. For Henry More’s edition of Sadducismus Triumphatus, see Netstein, Op. Cit., pp. 287-290; Cope, Op. Cit., p. 101.

Space does not permit an extended discussion of the many revisions by which More, using Glanvill’s papers, completed the revision of A New at Modern Sadducism (1668) into Sadducismus Triumphatus (1681). It tried to put the story of the Tedworth drummer in convincing form, and added new material from Robert Hunt’s “Book of Examination of Witches,” his own record of the cases over which Hunt had presided as justice of the peace when “an hellish knot of them” was tried in Somerset in 1664 (See Netstein, History, p. 273, for account of the trial). Also added were twenty-eight other relations of witchcraft trials, apparitions, and private accounts of witches. More also added a long Postscript (pp. 19-57) dated 25 May 1678 which, concentrating on Webster’s treatment of the Biblical narrative of the Witch of Endor, sought to demolish The Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft.

But the profusion of Sadducismus Triumphatus came too late. As W. E. H. Lecky remarks: “It may be the result of a controversy which has conclusively settled the question, establishing to the satisfaction of all parties a clear preponderance of argument or fact in favour of one opinion, and making that opinion a truism which is accepted by all enlightened men, even though they have not themselves examined the evidence on which it rests . . . . It is possible, also, for an complete a change to be effected by what is called the spirit of the age. The general intellectual tendencies pervading the literature of a century profoundly modify the character of the public mind. They form a new tone and habit of thought. They alter the measure of probability.”--History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe, 2 vols. (London, 1855), I, 9-10. The times had altered; and if he did so dogmatically and clumsily, it was John Webster who was here the Janus-face turned toward the future.
NOTES TO CHAPTER V


2 Peter Du Moulin, Vindication of the Sincerity (1679), Preface, Sig. B-C2v, pp. 1, 53 ff. I have examined the 1654 edition in the Newberry Library, Chicago, but since the two editions agree in substance, have quoted the 1679 edition.


4 Vindication, p. 53. Because of the parallel between Jesuit doctrines and those championed by Milton in The Tenure of Kings and Magnates (1649), Titus Oates in A True Narrative of the Morbid Plot and Conspiracy of the Popish Party Against the Life of His Sacred Majesty . . . (London, 1679) accused Milton of being in collusion with Rome by frequenting a Popish club. From this grew the fantastic and widely accepted tale that Milton was a Jesuit in disguise, a story used by Tories to discredit their Whig opponents. See the entertaining account of this legend in George F. Sensabaugh, That Grand Whig Milton (Stanford, 1952), pp. 74-75, 115-125.

5 Vindication, pp. 53-54.

6 Ibid., pp. 55-56.

7 Ibid., p. 57.

8 Ibid., pp. 59-67.

9 Ibid., p. 59.

10 Ibid., pp. 65-66.

11 Ibid., pp. 59-60.

12 Ibid., p. 60.

13 Ibid.

14 Ibid.


17 Vindication, p. 61.


19 *Ibid*.


30 *Ibid*.

31 There was also a Cologne edition of 1672, as well as a second edition published there in 1677.


Du Moulin (Sig. A3) describes the years in which he enjoyed Boyle's company "in ameno secessu" as the happiest of his life, probably referring to time spent in Ireland. He cites (Sig. A3)
Boyle's appreciation of his verse as a reason for publication.

The dedication reveals that Du Moulin had begun the composition of his Hymns in the mountain country of Northern Britain, but that their composition had been interrupted by the outbreak of the Civil War. Salmantius had reviewed the first five Hymns and encouraged Du Moulin to continue writing (Sig. A[6]-A[7]?). In the third book of IIAPET*', "Syllva Variorum," pp. 130-132, Du Moulin included a playfully laudatory poem "In Magni Bocharti historiam animalium." The volume Du Moulin refers to is the monumental Sac. Bocharti Hierosolimit. Sue de Animalibus S. Scripturae Compendium ... (Francaker, 1590). I have examined the abridged edition published at Francaker now in the Library of Congress. The first edition, published in London in 1664, was entitled Hierosolium sive bipartitum opus de animalibus sacrae scripturae.

... For a convenient discussion of the work, see LA Franc. Prot., II (1879), 655-656. The Hierosolium quotes an impressive muster of authorities sure to be relished by any seventeenth-century humanist, and is weighted with philological qibbles. The range of animals covered—from reptiles to rabbits—is amazing. Bochart, however, is fascinated by the humble ass, and gives five chapters (XIII-XVIII) to a discussion of the animal. Du Moulin was especially proud of his kinship with Bochart, a first cousin and son of Du Moulin's aunt Esther Bochart. For the relationship, see Archaeologia Cantiana, IV, pp. 31, 34. He warmly praises Bochart again in Osmar ad Coelum.

N.B.—In describing the various poems in IIAPET*, I have given book and page numbers.

1See Chapter IV, Note 5. It is unknown why Du Moulin happened to go to Dunkirk, aside from the account in his poem.

2The angry tone of the poems, Du Moulin protests, does not really reflect his habits or disposition. He admits that their heat scarcely becomes a retiring man who hates nobody, and that he had been criticised for the poetry's inconsistency with the religious and philosophical tranquility professed in his "best-seller," A Treatise of Peace and Contentment of Mind. In language that closely parallels preliminary statements in Horti Sanguinis Clamor, he confesses he was overcome by a seal for the Lord, and that the insane frenzy and perversion of justice and right by the Civil Wars made his tocs aside his usual spiritual repose. He was particularly aroused, he says (Cf.
Regii Sanguinis (Clamor) by the way in which Puritan criminality was cleared under a seal for God's house and thus imputed to the Almighty himself; and by the reproof thus cast on Christ's whole church. (Sige, Pl.-F[8]). Whole passages of the preface seem almost lifted bodily from Regii Sanguinis Clamor.

It lyeth in us, as we incline our minds, to be pleased or displeased with most things of the world. This may be exemplified in things material and of less importance, which may be presidents for things spiritual and of greater moment. One that hath fed his eyes with the rich prospect of delicate Countries, as Lombardy and Anjou, where all the beauties and dainties of Nature are assembled, wilt another time take no less delight in a wild and rugged prospect of high bare mountains, and fifty stories of steep rocks, as about the grand Chartreuse, and the bottom of Ardenes, where the very horror contributes to the delectation. If I have bin delighted to see the trees of my Orchard, in the spring blossomed, in summer shady, in autumn hung with fruit; I will delight again, after the fall of the leaf, to see through my trees new prospects which the bushy boughs hid before; and will be pleased with the sight of the snow canried about the branches, as the flowers of the season. This is better then to consider in deserts nothing but their hideousness and barrenness, and in winter nothing but the rheumatic weather.---Treatise of Peace and Contentment of Mind, pp. 82-83.

Institutes, I, xiv, pp. 156-157.

The other poems in the "Boylee" group include Clifford's Nobilitas, an epideictic piece praising the virtues of Henry and George Clifford, whose family had been united with the Boyles by the marriage of Elisabeth, Countess of Cork, to Richard Boyle, Viscount Dungarvan and later Earl of Burlington (See G. E. Cokayne, The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom, Ed. Vicary Gibbs et al., 13 vols. (London, 1910-1940), II, 430-431; III, 569-570); lines to Du Moulin's former pupil entitled Honoremissime Domino Carlo Baronii Cliffordii, Discipulo quondam suo and Dissidentia (see Charles Boyle, Baron Clifford (1539-1694), see Cokayne, Complete Peerage, II, 431); and lastly an Epideicticum Hanoni Cliffordii Comuniae Comitii (for Henry Clifford, Earl of Cumberland (1591-1663), the Royalist general on whose death the earldom of Cumberland became extinct, see Cokayne, III, 569-570). Also consult L. T. More, The Life and Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle (London, 1944), passim.

The chief sources for information about Du Moulin's associates at the Cathedral are Darts Canterbury, the BNID, and John Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae . . . (London, 1715). Fotherby, Barker, Castillion, and Gunning all were canons of Christ Church; Gunning later (1674) was Bishop of Ely, and Castillion was Dean of Rochester. Oddly
enough, Du Moulin did not compliment Dean Thomas Turner with a poem, though as his funeral sermon on Turner's death shows, the Dean had done him a considerable kindness.

Poetry delighteth much, So one take little of it at once, for it is luminous meat, too much of it brings weariness and leathern. It is more delightful to read than to compose, herein like music, which delighteth the hearers more than the Musicians. As then it is better to hear a set of Violins than to make one in it, it is better to hear Poets than to augment their number. I had rather that others should make me sport, than I them.—"Treatise of Peace and Contentment of Mind," p. 167. Du Moulin's sentiments on moral poetry can be gathered from his discussion of romances, wherein he says: "Whoso will keep himself holy in body and affection, and preserve his soul serene and free from the tempest of turbulent Passion, must avoid the reading of such books whose proper office is to raise those storms in a man's blood and appetite. And I know not whether it be more dangerous to read dissolute books which make of carnal love a jigg and a matter of sport, openly showing the ordure and the folly of it; or doleful amorous fables which make of it a grave and serious study... Indeed one cannot follow the fancies of Romance without straying from right sense; Neither is there any thing that makes the heart more worldly and carnal, and brings it further from God."—"Treatise," pp. 227-228.


169The letter is reproduced in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, LII, 120.

50Cross, *History of the Walloon Church*, pp. 133-137.

51*E. Sinkins, "Ecclesiastical History, Part II," The Victoria History of the County of Kent, ed. William Page (London, 1925), II, 94-95.* The Kentish clergy suffered severely during the Commonwealth. The Parliamentary ordinance of 1651, "for the ejection of scandalous, ignorant and insufficient ministers and schoolmasters, has made it impossible for clergy obnoxious to the Commonwealth party to earn a living even by teaching or obtaining chaplaincies..." Sinkins
(Ibid., p. 98) remarks. Full details of the appalling condition in which the Puritans had left the great Cathedral are contained in a document drawn up by the Dean and Chapter, reproduced in Archaeologia Cantiana, I., 94-98.

52 Ibid., p. 95.
53 Ibid.
54 Ibid., p. 97.
55 Ibid., p. 98.
56 Ibid.

57 Du Moulin, A Letter Concerning the Fines, p. 3. The document by the clergy of Canterbury mentioned above shows that collections were made with moderation, that "in charity and consideration of the poverty of many of them ["our Tenants"] and their families, we have remitted, to some the whole, to others the greatest part, to many of them a very considerable part, of their Fines, to the foregoing of some thousands of pounds; whereas we are as farre from repenting us, that . . . we thinks our charity well bestowed . . . ."—Archaeologia Cantiana, I., 97.

58 Letter Concerning the Fines, p. 4.
59 Ibid., p. 4. Though Canterbury "was more entire than most Cathedrals in England when we came to it," Du Moulin wrote (p. 5), repairs by 1664 had cost 12,000. Destructive fanaticism lingered on, however, for on 5 October 1683 the Dean and Chapter of Rochester Cathedral wrote to its bishop, Dr. Warner suggesting that he might like to add a suitable fence around a new baptismal font, without which the font, given by Dr. Warner, would "soon become the prey of the fanatical and sacrilegious rabble." The chapter clergy had placed a wooden fence around it for protection. The original font, given in 1639, had been destroyed by the Puritans.—Arch. Cant., XLII, 121-122.

60 A Sermon Preached in the Metropolitical Church of Canterbury, October 17, MDCCLIII. At the Funeral of the very Reverend Thomas Turner, B.D., Dean of the same Church . . . (London, 1672).

61 A Sermon Preached, p. 23.
62 Against John Durall, Lewis Du Moulin had written the Patrum Bonae Memoriae, In Causes Puritanarum, Contra Hierarchiae Anglorum . . . (London, 1672), in which he attacked Episcopacy and tried to exonerate the Puritans of charges of disloyalty to the Crown. There is an echo of one of Pierre Du Moulin's favorite contentions in his Jugulum.
Causae, Seu Nova, Unica, Compendiaria, & una propagandio periodi, Ratio: Par quam obvius doctrinarum Romanensium complexus, de quibus sis act
inter Protestantem & Pontificem; sive Papes, suisque imperium,
undius eventurur ... (London, 1571). This treatise of 376 pages
seeks to undermine the Papacy chiefly by proving that it is an earthly
monarchy like any other, and that it has sought to conceal its own
self-aggrandisement under external show and pretensions of a spiritual
er power. Dedicated to Charles II, the text of the book is preceded by
no less than sixty commendatory letters to such figures as the Duke
of Buckingham, the Earl of Bridgewater, Robert Boyle, Sir Edmund Berry
Godfrey, Edward Stillingfleet, Richard Baxter, Conrad van B-endin,
Isaac Voss, Henry Oldenburg, Dr. Peter Du Moulin, Sir Thomas Overbury,
and to Charles Louis, the Count Palatine of the Rhine, Elector, and
Duke of Bavaria. Perhaps the last work of Lewis Du Moulin deserving
mention is its Moral Reflections upon the Number of the Elect, Proving
Plainly from Scripture Evidence, &c. That not One in a Hundred Thousand
(nay One in a Million) from Adam down to our Times, shall be Saved ... (London, 1680). Written in the last year of his life, the work is
dedicated to the Marchioness of Regnies; it anticipates that Du Moulin's
death is not too far off. By wofully considering the thimbleful of
men that might be saved, it seeks to awaken lethargic sleepers in sin
to a fervent pity.

63 The quotation is found (pp. 80-81) in the pamphlet bound up
with A Short and True Account, entitled A True Report of a Discourse
Between Monsieur De L'Angle, Canon of Canterbury, ... and Lewis Du
Moulin ... (1679). A Short and True Account and A True Report are
consecutively paginated.

64 A Short and True Account, p. 4.

65 For the pedigree of the Rev. Samuel De L'Angle, see Archaeologia
Cantiana, XV, 31-33. For another summary of the De L'Angle family, see
in full the will of Canon Samuel De L'Angle, Index Vol., 193-195. For
a character of Du Moulin and epitome of his controversies with Stilling-
fleet, Durell, Patrick, and De L'Angle, see Agnew, Index Vol., 119-120.

66 A Short and True Account, pp. 71-72.
67 Tidd, p. 81.
68 Tidd, p. 71.
69 Tidd, p. 86.
70 Tidd, p. 85.
71 Tidd.
The Last Words of Louis du Moulin: Being His Retraction of all the Personal Reflections He had made on the Divines of the Church of England. (In several Books of [his]) Signed by himself on the 7th and the 17th of October, 1680. (London, 1680).

Richard Baxter, A Second True Defense of the Near Nonconformists, Against the Untrue Accusations, Reasonings and History of Dr. Edward Stillingfleet ... With some Notes on Mr. Joseph Glanvilles Zealous and impartial Protestant, and Mr. L. Moulin's Character ... (London, 1607), p. 183. See also Reliquiae Baxterianae: Or, Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times. Faithfully Publish'd from his own Original Manuscript, by Matthew Sylvester ... (London, 1696). Despite his writing against Du Moulin, Baxter (Reliquiae, x. 110) found him to be "one of those Friends who are injurious to the Honour of their own Understandings by overvaluing us, and would have spent his time in translating some of my Books into the French tongue." Discussing Du Moulin's political writings, which he thought Erastian, Baxter said that "The good Man meant rightly in the main, but had not a head sufficiently accurate for such a Controversy ... ." (Reliquiae, XII. 85).

Du Moulin is thought to have died some time before 1680. See biography and bibliography in La France Prot., v. 829-839; also Agnew, French Prot. Bristol, Index Vol., p. 1197; Arch. Cant., v. 35.

The nephew, usually known as Peter Du Moulin, Esq., is given an excellent study by K. E. D. Haley in William of Orange and the English Opposition 1672-8 (Oxford, 1953), p. 226. Through a "fifth column" he operated for William of Orange, Du Moulin exercised an important influence on Dutch diplomatic policy toward England. He is
thought to have been a son of Cyrus Du Moulin.

I have counted fifteen editions in English, French, and German between 1657 and 1765. See also *La France Prot.*, V, 825.

*DNB*, XIII, 1098; *La France Prot.*, V, 825.
NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1 The Latin correspondence of scholars and churchmen shows there had been considerable interest in events leading up to the wars, trial, and execution, of which the correspondence of G. J. Voss with Archbishop Laud (Chapter IV, Note 22) is a good example. Marie Casaubon also wrote to Laud. The enthusiasm which Salmasius aroused is illustrated by the Paris physician Gui Patin (Lettres de Gui Patin, Nouvelle Edition . . . par J.-M. Revellée-Paris, 2 vols., Paris, 1825), whose mentions of Salmasius are very frequent. On 25 December 1649, Patin writes A.M. Belin he would prefer Salmasius's learning and spirit to "tout ce que prétend savoir la miøre troupe des disciples du Père Ignace, qui ne save que leur métaphysique, encore ne la savent-ils pas bien . . . ." (Lettres, I, 69). "O l'excellent et incomparable personnage!" he writes Charles Spon on 26 October 1643 from Paris (Lettres, I, 301). Of Salmasius's literary controversy, Patin writes Spon from Paris on 12 September 1645: "Si ce grand héros de la république des lettres allait son grand chemin, sans se détourner pour ces petits docteurs; s'il faisait comme la lune, qui ne s'arrête point pour les petits chiens qui l'aboient, nous pourrions jurer de ses plus grands travaux, qui nous feront plus de bien que toutes ces menues controverses . . . . Si l'on y met Aristote avec lui, c'est une bibliothèque complète . . . ." (Lettres, I, 360). Again to Spon on 11 September 1643: "M. Salmasius est ici. Je ne puis m'empêcher d'admirer la grandeur de l'esprit de ce grand personnage, qui sait tout et qui antend tout . . . ." (Lettres, I, 297). Jesuit animosity followed Salmasius into Holland; on 29 October 1644: "On dit qu'il sera ici fort persécuté par des jésuites quand il y sera." (Lettres, I, 121). Of Salmasius's death in September, 1653, at the Spa: "Oui! seulement su que ce grand héros des belles Lettres mourut en deux jours." (Lettres, I, 190). For a biography of Patin, see F.R. Packard, Guy Patin and the Medical Profession in France in the XVIIth Century (New York, 1925).

2 For these editions, see F.J. Nadan, "Milton, Salmasius and Dugard," The Library, N.S., IV, No. 2 (Sept., 1923), pp. 119-115; "A Revised Bibliography of Salmasius's Defensio Regia and Milton's Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio," The Library, 5th Series, IX, No. 2 (June, 1940), 101-112. My copy is No. 1 listed by Nadan (p. 105).

3 The editions are listed in articles cited in Note 2. Much correspondence, books, and documents relevant to the Salmasian Controversy were covered by David Masson, The Life of John Milton, new and rev. ed., 7 vols. (London, 1881-1894), but his account suffers from being scattered among other subjects. Of generally available accounts the controversy, the best balanced is that by James Holly Hanford, A Milton Handbook, 4th ed. (New York, 1945), pp. 109-115, which is notable for its fair treatment of More. See also Hanford's John Milton,
Englishman (London, 1950), pp. 166-177, which establishes (pp. 171-175) the connection between the impact upon Milton of Du Moulin's invective in Regii Sanguinis (Miseror) (his first reaction on reading the Miseror was one of surrender) and his rise from the nadir, through the impassioned Defensio Secunda, to inspired recovery in the personal utterances of Paradise Lost. A similar point is made by E.M.W. Tillyard, Milton (London, 1951), pp. 184-201, who finds that "the serious beginnings of Paradise Lost are to be found in the state of mind that prompted the Defensio Secunda" (p. 196), since the two works were evidently under way at the same time. Though Mark Pattison's Milton (London, 1923) has its essential facts right, its perspective is warped by Pattison's zest for epithets. Much background material otherwise inaccessible was included by John Mitford in his "Life of Milton," prefixed to The Poetical Works of John Milton, 2 vols. (London, 1851), I, lxviii-xliv, clxiv-xlvi, clxv-clxix, and his "Appendix" and "Addenda." Mitford, however, confuses Pierre Du Moulin and Dr. Peter Du Moulin, p. lixvii, n. 8. In discussing Milton, Perez Zagerin, A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution (pp. 106-120) does not treat both sides of the controversy, a weakness found also in G.P. Gooch, English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century, 2nd. ed., ed. H.J. Lea (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 195, 200-207. See, however, Zora L. Pink, The Classical Republicans: An Essay in the Recovery of a Pattern of Thought in Seventeenth Century England (Evanston, 1945), pp. 101-105.


1I have used the copy in the Newberry Library, Chicago. The Tragedium Theatrum's connection with Regii Sanguinis Miseror will be discussed in an Appendix. See Salmasius's view of the execution as a drama in the Defensio Regia, p. 336.

2For an account of the various editions and translations of Bate's Eleneus, see articles by F.P. Nadan: (1) "Milton, Salmasius, and Dugard," pp. 119-145; (2) "A Bibliography of George Bate's Eleneus Motum Muperarum in Anglia," Library, 9th Series, VI, Nos. 3-4 (November, 1951), 189-209; and (3) "A Revised Bibliography . . .," p. 121 (see Note 2). I have examined the 1699 edition mentioned above, but cited the Browne edition (Nadan [2], p. 191) in the Newberry Library.

3Defensio Regia, pp. 18-36.

4Ibid., p. 201.

5The arguments cover Chapters II-VII, pp. 36-84. The following is a sketch of some of their points: Ch. II (pp. 36-72) discusses
whether there is any law, human or divine, by which the King's trial and execution can be defended. It considers by whom, by what authority, of what crime, and by what judgment Charles was condemned. It seeks to prove that a king or tyrant may do what he will, and not be deposed or executed, because he is liable to God alone. Ch. III (70-78): The teachings of the Jews, God's chosen people, enjoining obedience. Ch. IV (98-132): Shows that the practice of the primitive Church agreed with Old Testament doctrines of obedience (p. 127—the Papacy brought collision with the secular power). Ch. V (132-171): Argues from pagan sources that the doctrine of obedience to kings was the same among Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Egyptians, Jews, Greeks, and Romans. Kingship has always been the form of supreme government by an individual. Ch. VI (171-201): A King has always possessed his own rights and powers, with reference to no other. He has always been greater than the people, and responsible to none, Ch. VII (201-242): A King has no peer or superior in the kingdom; there is no law by which to judge him (p. 219).

J. Neville Figgis, in his classic account of the theory, The Divine Right of Kings, puts the doctrine "in its complete test form" in four propositions: (1) Monarchy is a divinely ordained institution; (2) hereditary right is indefeasible; (3) kings are accountable to God alone; (4) non-resistance and passive obedience are enjoined by God (pp. 5-6). The theory was formulated out of a need for a sanction which would free political life from theocracy, and make secular government "as much a part of the Divine plan for mankind as is theology or the organisation of the church" (pp. 258-259). Against Papal claims of overlordship, it was a counter theory of a separate, equal right necessarily placed in kings, partly for their prestige. "It would have failed in its object, had it attempted to give to Parliament rather than to the King the sovereignty which it denied to the Pope" (p. 257). England having refused to surrender the right and liberty of the crown even to "splendid imperiousness of the medieval Papacy . . . It was not likely she would allow a similar claim, presented in the less lovely form of the Presbyterian discipline" (p. 198). Of Papal and Presbyterian claims, Figgis says that "opinion may differ as to which of the two systems was the more meddlesome and irritating tyranny. But there can be no doubt that, with whatever difference in degree, both are alike in kind. Each puts forward a claim by Divine Right to subject the secular power to the spiritual, to make the clergy the ultimate arbiters of political action" (p. 198). "The Presbyterian system," he points out, "while asserting national independence of Papal sovereignty, would have yet set up within the nation an organisation which would have dwarfed the State and hindered the growth of the nation's life . . . . Even Independency, which seems to leave the whole matter free, implies a denial of the right of the nation as a whole to an ecclesiastical organisation. Had it ever become universal, there could not have been a single religious communion claiming to represent the nation on its spiritual side" (p. 207). For England, the Divine Right theory would have accomplished its work only when "the danger was part of a relapse into Popery or Presbyterianism" (p. 199); at the Restoration, "the last
chance of Presbyterianism becoming dominant in England disappeared. The Revolution [of 1689] finally removed all danger from the side of Rome. Only then did the theory of the Divine Right of Kings cease to be useful" (p. 262).


10Ibid., p. 16. Cf. Nikos Basilikis, Or the King's Book, ed. Edward Alcock (London, 1906), p. 261: "When they have destroyed Me, (for I know not how farre God may permit the malice and cruelty of My Enemies to proceed, and such apprehensions some mens words and actions have already given Me) as I doubt not but My blood will cry aloud for vengeance to heaven . . . .

11Defensio Regia, p. 329. Other references linking the Papacy and Jesuitic to Puritan political doctrine are found on pp. 131, 169, 365. On Papal absolution of subjects from oaths of allegiance, about which Pierre De Moulin, Bishop Andrewes, and James I had written against Bellarmine, see p. 133.


14Defensio Regia, p. 36.

15Ibid., p. 179. Salmassius's discussion of the polity covers pp. 176-181. It had a strong effect on De Moulin's Regii Sanguinis Clemor.

16Ibid., Chapter VIII, pp. 253-289. In Ch. VII, pp. 201-202, Salmassius had developed the theory that the King has no superior in the kingdom, and that there is no law by which to judge him.

17Ibid., Ch. IX, pp. 289-328. Professor Zora Fink's observation on this point is worth quoting: "There were many points at issue between these two controversialists, but not the least of them was whether England was in its proper constitution a mixed state or an absolute monarchy with the indivisible sovereign power residing in the king. This was . . . a central issue of the whole controversy. Salmassius, as Milton understood him, based his case on two main points: that sovereignty is indivisible, and that it resides in the king. To prove that it resides in the monarch, Milton saw him resorting to the law of God,
the law of nature, and the theory of divine investiture, and an analogy between the state and the family, if not indeed to the theory that the
king is absolute as the inheritor of those divinely instituted, absolute parental rights, out of which, by way of the expansion of the family
into the state, government was supposed to have originated. That sover-
eignty was indivisible Milton did not dispute, but to the contention
that it resided in the monarch by divine and natural law, he replied
with the doctrine of popular sovereignty and the social compact and with
his own interpretation of the law of God and the law of nature. Sal-
masius's argument implied that a mixed state was the negation of all law
and government. Milton replied with the flat assertion that a pure
tyranny or unmixed state such as Salmasius talked about neither had ever
existed or could exist. He was . . . so far from abandoning the theory
of mixed government as to assert, not merely that the best governments
are mixed, but that all governments can never be anything else. The
central issues in the Milton-Salmasius controversy were well chosen.
However absurd his argument may appear to us today, Salmasius knew what
he was about, and Milton leaped to meet him on the issues which he had set.18—The Classical Republicans, pp. 101-103.

19Ibid., Ch. XI, pp. 362-365.
20Ibid., p. 367.
21Ibid., p. 369.
22Ibid., p. 373.
23Ibid., pp. 375-376.
24Ibid., pp. 381-383.
25Ibid., Ch. XIII, pp. 385 ff.
26Ibid., p. 387.
27Ibid., pp. 379-380.
28Ibid., p. 381.
29Ibid., pp. 387-390.
31Ibid., pp. 392 ff.
32G. Robert H. Scheidler, Milton in Holland: A study in the literary
relations of England and Holland before 1730 (Amsterdam, 1932), pp. 114-13. See also Chapter III, Note II, supra.

33Scheffers, Milton in Holland, pp. 39-40, 55-56.

34Vondel's poems Graamaat van 's Konings Stathouder in Yrlandt (1631), on Strafford's execution; Henriette Marie Koningin van Groot Brittanje, Franckrijk en Yrlandt, t' Amsterdam, and De Huyan van Oranje en Brittanje (both 1652) on the occasion of the British Queen's trip to bring the Princess Mary for her wedding to Prince William, and to seek help for the English Royalists; and for satire hiting Sabba-
tarians and Presbyterian in 1641.—Scheffers, Milton in Holland, pp. 44-50.

35Miscell Heinsii Dan Fil. Posmata . . . (Leyden, 1653), p. 163.

36In his Posmata (1653), Heinsius relates the incident and reproduces the verses in his preface (Sign. "3v-4r"). The panegyric is found on pp. 137-138.

37Their reactions, especially as feeling developed after Milton's replies and his attacks on Alexander More, can be found in Masson and Mitford. As early as 1639, G. J. Voss (Epistolae, I, 377) had written to Hugo Grotius deploring a feud and name-calling between Salmasius and Daniel Heinsius (the father of Nicholas).

38Lettres, II, 416. But on 18 November 1650 Patin quotes to Falconet a letter stating that Salmasius had begun the defense at the request of Charles II (Lettres, II, 569-570). Other letters (I, 165, 169) merely contain information about successive editions.

39See the sketch of Salmasius's reputation in Masson, IV, 162-165. Even such a practical politician as Cardinal Richelieu admired him as one of the three most learned men alive; and Cardinal Mazarin, unable to persuade him to return from Holland to France, sent him the order of knighthood and other honors. Masson relied substantially on the Latin biography of Antoine Clement, in Claudii Salmasii, Viri Maximi, Epistolae Liber Primus, Accedunt De Laudibus et Vita Episcopi Proeliosorum (Leyden, 1555), pp. iii-xii. Clement is the source for Richelieu's remark. Salmasius came from a good family of the minor nobility of Burgundy (Ibid., pp. xvi-xvii). For various honors conferred upon him, including knighthood from Queen Christina of Sweden, see Ibid., pp. xvi-xli. He was honored despite such anti-Papal, anti-
episcopal books as Valonis Massalini de Episcopis & Presbyteris Disseratione (1641) and De Primatu Papae (1645), which brought a protest from the Papal nuncio in Paris (Ibid., pp. xlvii-xlii). Louis XIV, through action of the Queen Mother, gave him a non-resident pension of 6000 livres a year; see the royal diploma, Ibid., pp. lxix-lxx.

Though he championed the Royalist cause in England, Salmasius
evidently had some appreciation of republicanism, for, Clement writes, "Satanism tam es in parte praemnierat Anglia praesentatem Horum noster, quod majorum semper in Republica qua in Regno libertatem esse judicaret" (Ibid., p. xli).


Dated 6 May 1649. Ibid., p. 204.


Saravall Epistolas, p. 224. Written 18 February 1650.

Ibid., p. 232.

Dated 9 April 1650. Ibid., p. 232.

Dated 12 February 1650. Ibid., p. 224.

Defensio Secunda, ed. Eugene J. Strittmayer (New York, 1933), p. 12. This, as all other works of Milton cited, is in the Columbia edition.

The traditional verdict on Salmassius—a patriotically English one—is summed up by Mark Pattison: "Salmassius was a man of enormous reading and no judgment" (Milton, p. 106). This recalls Pattison's memorable picture—equally tart and unfair—of Pierre Du Moulin quoted in Chapter I.

Through subsequent accounts of Salmassius have run echoes of early lives of Milton. The Life of Milton by his nephew Edward Phillips, which M. Y. Hughes calls (Poems and Prose (1957), p. 1025a.) "the fullest and least unreliable of the early biographies," gives a doubly biased account; calling Salmassius "the great kill-cow of Christendom," Phillips goes on: "... there could no where have been found a champion that duret lift up the pen against so formidable an adversary, had not our little English David had the courage to undertake this great French Goliath, to whom he gave such a hit in the forehead, that he presently staggered, and soon after fell" (Ibid., p. 1034). The Anonymous Life of Milton, attributed to both his nephew John Phillips and Cyrilack Skinner, which also (Ibid., p. 1041-1042) insists upon More's authorship of the Life, adds: "... there could no where have been found a champion that duret lift up the pen against so formidable an adversary, had not our little English David..."
(as E. Phillips had done), sets the pace for much subsequent English criticism of Salmasius: Milton showed "better reasoning," he writes; "For Salmasius being a foreigner, and grossly ignorant of our laws and constitution (which in all nations are the respective distinguishing principles of government), either brought no arguments from thence, or such only (and by him not seldom mistaken or misapplied) as were partially suggested to him by those whose cause he had undertaken... Nor had he given proof of deeper learning... politics, while he made use of trite instances, as that of the government of bees, and such like to prove the pre-eminence of monarchy; and all along so confounded it with tyranny (as also he did the Episcopal with the Papal government), that he might better have passed for a defender of the grand Signor, and the Council of Trent, than of a lawful king and a reformed church" (Ibid., p. 1041). Such observations, especially when taken with seemingly corroborative criticism by Salmasius's enemies, have been far too readily accepted, sometimes, perhaps, because of the sharpness with which they were stated. The result has been to depress Salmasius's reputation as much as it was formerly inflamed. Structurally, Salmasius could not understand the value of brevity. His position on Episcopacy and Divine Right was substantially the same as that of Du Moulin and many other Huguenots. And rather than being misapplied, his arguments from English law and history were practically the same as what George Bate and other English Royalists were saying, to say nothing of Peter Du Moulin. The argument of an alien's misunderstanding does not hold up.


53 Pro Populo Anglicano, pp. 1-10.
54 Ibid., pp. 23-25.
55 Ibid., p. 281.
57 Ibid., pp. 453-459.
58 Ibid., p. 379. The argument of popular sovereignty is further developed on pp. 380-383.
59 Ibid., pp. 378-381.
60 Ibid., p. 393.
61 Ibid., pp. 360-363.
62 Ibid., pp. 532-533.
63 _ibid._, pp. 485-489, 507 ff.
65 _ibid._, pp. 508-509.
67 _ibid._, pp. 28-29.
69 _ibid._, pp. 36-41.
71 See _ibid._, p. 106. See his discussion, pp. 102-106.
71 _Pro Populo Anglicano_, p. 505.
72 _Milton in Holland_, p. 23.
73 _ibid._, pp. 55-56. Cf., pp. 32-40. Salmasius's _Defensio Regia_ had been favorably received, selling 2,000 copies in a fortnight by February, 1650. To suppress it had become a point of English diplomacy, for on 29 November 1649 the Council of State passed an order for searching of ships from Holland for the _Defensio Regia_. On 16 November 1649 (O.S.), Walter Strickland, the Parliamentary Resident at The Hague, applied to the Estates of Holland and West Friesland for suppression of the book, then in press and expected to appear soon. After much debate and three attempts by Strickland, the two Estates issued on 17 January 1650 an order to suppress the _Defensio_, which, however, was already in wide circulation (Nadam, "A Revised Bibliography," pp. 102-103). The penalty for printing, publishing, buying, or selling the _Defensio Regia_ was forfeiture, 500 guilders' fine, or other penalty ( _ibid._, p. 112). See copy of the proclamation, p. 111). Because of Dutch political factionalism, Salmasius necessarily incurred unpopularity, for Leyden, where he lived, was located in republican South Holland. Holland had received Strickland diplomatically, though the Estates had refused. Whatever popularity Milton had must have been strongest in the republican provinces of Holland and Friesland. The death of Salmasius and new turns to the controversy left the matter suspended. Later references to him by Milton ( _Defensio Secunda_, _Pro Se Defensio_ ) are to household scandal involving Alexander More, and the salacious nature of such titillative obscures what effect he might finally have had.

The astuteness of Salmasius's line of attack—the danger of the Independents, the blame that might attach to Reformed Churches favoring them, the bad odor of Charles's trial, and so on—can be seen in the way they are further amplified by Du Moulin and Milton as the controversy moves on. Consequently, though his _Response_ was not published
until much later (1660), Salmasius continued to exercise an appreciable influence through works following the lines he laid down.

In France, there is some evidence that Salmasius’s book—perhaps because of his favoring Papists over Independents—made him some enemies, but their number is uncertain. See Masson, *Life of Milton*, IV, 345.


77Defensive Secunda, pp. 98-109. One suspects that the flattering reports reaching Milton gave rise to his extravagant praise of Christina.

78Steele Seaton, *Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1935), p. 109, asserts that “The revolution of favour against Salmasius in the Swedish Court seemed to be complete,” for Christina had “cold-shouldered him” and praised Milton “as did also the learned, and the courtiers in their discourses.” Her account is based partly on the Journal of the Swedish Embassy, ed. Reeves, II, 317, 439-440. Clement, however (*Vita G. Salmasii,* p. lxxi) makes Salmasius’s return to Leyden a matter of obligation to the University, and shows that his departure from the court was deeply regretted: “Hoc est tandem valitudinis redditus, cogitare ceptic de redit; Regina contra obtare, & offerre ei lautissimas & amplissimas conditiones, que suas illi operam perpetuo addisceret. Verum obstrictus hujus Academica curaribus, quibus & fidem dedaret se reversurus, manere ultra non potuit. Discendentem vero quanta liberalitate, quot officii cumulatur, quam agret se ad dimiserit, paucis absolvere non possumus . . . .”

A letter from Christina to Hess. Salmasius after the scholar’s death (given by Clement, pp. lxxi-lxxii) is significant: “. . . vous avez quel estoit l’estime, dont j’honourois son merite; et vous este estaimoy, que j’avois pour luy des sentiments de tendresse aussi veritables, que je les avoirs peu avoir pour un Pere . . . Salmasius, que j’ay aymé comme un Pere, et dont j’honoreray toute ma vie la memoire. Le m’ay souvientz toujours, & je feray voir en vous, & en ses enfans l’aitié & l’estime que j’ai portee au defunct; il ne tiendra qu’a vous de me faire savoir en quoy je vous favoriser, & soyez certains qu’il n’y a rien que je ne fasse pour votre satisfaction . . . .” Three other noted scholars left Sweden about the same time as Salmasius—Friesheim, Boeclarius, and Houchon—and a letter from Grenovius on 17 October 1651 from Deventer to Nicholas Heinius at Venice (Masson, *Life*, IV, 343-344) attributes the departures to either exhaustion of Christina’s finances or Swedish dislike of foreigners. See Masson also IV, 345-346. There is, of course, always the Swedish weather.

One of the best compendiums of information about Salmasius is that by Miltford (*Life of Milton,* iv-xlviii; xxxiv-cxlii; “Addenda,” cxxi-clxii; “Appendix,” cxvii-cxlii). A sympathetic biographer of Milton, Miltford showed discernment and fairness in his treatment of the Salmasian Controversy. With critical perception he digested many
contemporary sources of importance for the controversy. His judgment
on the supposed eclipse of Salvius seems to fit the facts better than
any other I have seen. He says that "from a careful perusal of the
correspondence connected with this subject, I am convinced that the
effect said to be produced by Milton's defense on Salvius, and on his
reputation has been prodigiously overrated" ("Life," p. lxii, n. 5). The
tale "that he was disarmed with contempt, or considered as defeated
with dishonour, rests upon no valid authority" (Did., p. lxviii). And
finally: "It has been said that Salvius lost the favour of Christina,
at whose court he was residing, when Milton's answer appeared; and
that his death was caused by the bitterness of his supposed defeat by an
antagonist chiefly unknown. The truth of either of these assertions,
too hastily ascribed by biographers of Milton, is more than questionable.
It is not at all improbable that the capricious Queen of the North may
have vexed this old scholar with commendations of his enemy, and that
she may have joined in the voice of general praise; but Salvius left the
court of Stockholms, not from the frowns of the Queen, but driven
away by the severity of that iron climate" (p. lxxviii-lxxix). His ill
health and gout were notorious (p. lxxii). Mitford points out that "The
biographers of Milton have taken their account of Salvius chiefly
from his, Salvius, without keeping in mind that Heinsius was his bitter
and implacable enemy" (p. lxxvii).

77 Masson, Life, IV, 344-346.

78 Seaton, English Literary Relations, pp. 108 ff. The language of
the epigram leads one to suspect that Worsley had seen More's dedica-
tion to Regis Sanguinis Gloror.

79 For an account of the Apologia and the reply to it by Milton's
nephew John Phillips, see Masson, Life, IV, 387-388, 470-471. I have
used the copy ofikon Aklastos, which belonged to Mark Pattison, in
the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington.

80ikon Aklastos, p. 471.

81 The Responsio ad Apologian is reprinted in the Columbia Milton,
XVIII, 425-459.

82 See also Du Moulin's discussion of this "vehemence" in Chap-
ter I, Regis Sanguinis Gloror (translation), and his apology for himself
in EAPETERS, II, Siga, 66 ff. It is a commonplace in seventeenth-century
politics.

83 The source is identified by Du Moulin as the ELOGENs mutum
imperiorum in Anglia, then anonymous and later revealed to be the work
of George Bates ("To the Christian Reader," translation following). The
style of this epistle, by Du Moulin, and the rest of the book are con-
sistent, contrasting strongly with the Senecan Latin of the Dedication
supplied by More.
The Puritan government had assumed the pompous title "Custodes libertatis Angliae," which appears in Latin versions of some of its public documents. Salmans had mocked the title in the Defensio Regis, "Praelectiones," p. 12.

This is the theme which runs angrily through his poems in Ecclesiæ semitum. Its preface to the reader (II, Sigs. F6-F[8]) in language and thought is almost an epitome of the arguments in Regii Sanguinis Clamor. So very similar is the style, vocabulary, and content, that a comparison unmistakably shows them to be the work of the same man.

Dr. George Morley (1597-1661), Bishop of Worcester (1660) and of Winchester (1662). Marendon's sketch of him is conveniently available in Selections from The History of the Rebellion and The Life, ed. G. Ruskin (London, 1855), pp. 298-299. A chaplain of Charles I, he was in exile in Holland during the Interregnum. He figures in the Salmassian Controversy as the royal chaplain, mentioned without name by Milton, who was alleged to have conveyed the hundred Jacobuses from Charles II to Salmassius for the Defensio Regis. While stoutly denying that he had received a fee, Salmassius identifies the messenger from the King as Morley in his Responsio ad Milcomum (1660), p. 21. Dr. Morley delivered the official sermon at the crowning of Charles II. "A Sermon Preached at the Magnificent Coronation of the Most High and Mighty King Charles the

Dr. Morley delivered the official sermon at the crowning of Charles II. "A Sermon Preached at the Magnificent Coronation of the Most High and Mighty King Charles the

At the Collegiate Church of S. Peter Westminster (London, 1661). In his latter years he wrote controversial works against doctrines of the Roman Church.

The excerpt from Bochart's letter mentions Jacques Neumant de Brieux [Mosansus Brocilius] (1611-1671) of Caen, who had been a counsellor for the Parliament at Metz. Of the Huguenot nobility, he was educated in France and England, and was a friend of Bochart, Mest, Mainsius, and Chaplain. He was a well-known neo-Latin poet and helped organise a literary academy at Caen (Nouvelle Biographie Générale, XXXIV, 177). Louis Hérald, the son of Didier Héraul, studied theology at Alençon and later became pastor of the Walloon Church at London, but returned to France on the death of Charles I. He resumed this post upon the Restoration, and was made a canon of Canterbury (Ibid., XXIV, 269-270). Philippe Vincent, the son of a minister at Sessay, began his career as a pastor at La Rochelle in 1626; in 1628 he was sent to England to seek help, and negotiated with Richelieu in 1628. He died in 1651 after some rather lively disputes with his colleagues about passive obedience (Biographie Universelle, LXX, 167). Jonas Porée translated the Eikon Basilike into French in 1649; it went through at least three editions, according to the British Museum Catalogue. For David Blondel (1590-1655), the historical scholar and Reformed controversialist, see La France Prot., II (1679), 622-630. Blondel succeeded G. J. Voss as professor of history at Amsterdam, assuming the chair in 1650 and
remaining there until his death. At the end of Chapter Eight of Regii
Sanguinis Clamor, Du Moulin quotes his apologia pro sententia Hieronymi
de episcopis et presbyteris (Amsterdam, 1656), which seeks to prove the
term bishop and priest in the primitive Church designated the same
function.

89TAPEPA, II, Sig. A6r.

90The Gentlemen’s Magazine, XLIII (August, 1773), 369.

91Ibid.

92The passage foreshadows the drift of Clamor; “And of late the
most enormous actions of the English drew from Mr. Salmasius, Prince of
letters, and the Honour of France, a defence of the right of Kings;
God was so pleased to raise up the learnedest pen of these times to
defend the best cause of the world. In which this great person hath
highly honoured his Country; But to speak right, he more honoured his
self, and the Church wherein he was Educated. For if hereafter these
maulers are to be so bold, as to say the Reform'd Churches approved
their Actions, they shall produce this book which condemns them, and
defends the right cause with such wisdom, and efficacy of spirit . . . .”
(tr., History of the English and Scotch Presbytery (1659), Sigs. a3Rv.

93Ibid. Mag., XLIII, 369.

94Ibid. See also the title page of Ecclesiæ Genitus in TAPEPA
(1671 ed.) which dates the poem’s publication in February, 1649.

95Though space forbids reproducing a long tabulation I have made,
the portion of Regii Sanguinis Clamor drawn from Bate runs, in my 12mo
copy (See "Note on Translation") from pp. 3-100. The debt is greatest
in Chapter Two of Clamor, which is largely narrative. In the chapter’s
earlier portion, Du Moulin adapts Bate freely, as is easily seen in
his rewriting of Bate’s account of conditions exchanged during negotia-
tions between Charles I and the Puritans. The pages that correspond
are: K chic h u s: 63, 64-65; 70: 71; 80-83; 77: 64: 90-91, to Clamor: 37,
38: 55-57: 55-57. As Du Moulin draws near the cli-
matic portion of the chapter, he reflects more closely Bate’s munces
and phraseology (Clamor, pp. 52 ff.). Du Moulin follows Bate closely
in his treatment of the trial’s aftermath, including the anecdote of
the murdered soldier (Clamor, pp. 70-71; K le ch u s, pp. 99-100; Cf.

Because of the pervasive influence of Salmasius’s Defensio
Regis, a comparative tabulation with Regii Sanguinis Clamor would be
a hopeless task here. The influence is too obvious to require demon-
stration. However, the following passages of the Defensio seem espe-
cially to have influenced Clamor: pp. 27, 29, 30-35, 129, 156, 157,
(158, 176, 227, 229, 311, 333, 335, 384, (372, 384, 381, 382,
aside from interpolated material on Strafford and Juxon, Du Moulin follows Bate's account of the King's speech closely.

77Mme. de Mol, pp. 75-76.
78Mme. de Mol, pp. 80, 84-86.
80Mme. de Mol, pp. 87, 94, 279, 389, 390, (337.).
81WAPPEA, III, 118.

102Hassen's account of More, and most of those derived from it, are heavily colored by Milton's charges, as supposedly corroborated by the scandal recounted in the letters of Nicholas Heinsius and Isaac Voss, which Milton, Appendix to "Life of Milton," pp. xx-xii, conveniently extracts. Of two responsible works of Genevan origin that discuss More's stormy career there, neither mentions personal immorality. Isaac Spon, Histoire de Geneve ... avec Les Actes et Autres Pieces Servant de Preuves à cette Histoire, 2 vols. (Geneva, 1780), I, III, 510-511 and notes, supplies an impartial, dryly factual account of More's career which shows a gifted but provoking personality. A more detailed analysis of More is given by Jean Seneblier, Histoire Littéraire de Geneve, 3 vols. (Geneva, 1786), II, 200-201, but again, no immorality is mentioned, though existence of some evidence for it would have relieved Seneblier of the need to make an apology for the mistreatment suffered by More at Geneva.

103While it is not the purpose of this study to concentrate on the quarrels of Alexander More, a reading of correspondence to, and about, More, as well as studies of his life made without partisan reference to Milton, leave one with the feeling that More has been badly wronged—even by W. Y. Hughes, who re-echoes the Miltonist party line. In one place (correctly) calling More the "author" (p. 817), and in another (incorrectly) the "editor" (p. 821) of Regni Sanguinis Clamor, Hughes avers that "in 1652 [More] had just lost the chair of theology at Middleburg under a cloud which seems actually to have been as dark as Milton suggests that it was . . . . . ." And again: "His career in Holland had been through the influence of Salmius in 1651, after he had resigned the chair of Theology at Geneva in the face of serious charges of heresy and immorality. The facts on record at the time seem to support all of Milton's specific criticisms of his character . . . ." (p. 821, n.1). Though carefully worded, Mr. Hughes' remarks are venturesome. Because of his capacity to make enemies, More found himself, wherever he went, surrounded by enemies ready to use any means to
discredit him. As a sample of how far such vicious, loose talk could go, consider Salmasius's circulation of lies about Milton's personal activities in Italy (given in Mitford, Appendix, oo-oii).

The mania for orthodoxy is nowhere better demonstrated than in Geneva at this period, and the atmosphere in France and Holland was to some degree comparable. Senebier, an historian sympathetic to Geneva, but one who gives a Continental, not a Miltonist, view of More, apologetically cites his persecution there as a classic demonstration of the hateful bigotry of the Genevan clergy at this period, and laments that they had yielded to a mad seal of intolerance (Histoire Littéraire, II, 195-197). Senebier aptly characterizes More thus: "Morus est de l'esprit avec les vices qui l'accompagnaient quand la raison ne sait pas le règler; il fut léger, imprudent, orgueilleux; s'il excita l'envie par ses talents, il appela la haine par sa hauteur; son savoir était vaste, mais superficial; il croyait avoir tout fait quand il avait montré de l'adresse ou tissu des phrases sonores" (Ibid., p. 201). Moreover, Frederick Spanheim may have seen in his a dangerous rival at preaching, and therein arose their feud. Despite Milton's charges and his editors' insinuations, there appears nothing forced about the testimonials obtained at Geneva by More, in the sense that there was any distortion of fact in his favor. The fetid atmosphere of Geneva at this time makes it unlikely. Consequently, the documents may stand, it would seem, as a clear vindication of his life and character there.

The extent to which "orthodoxy" or "heresy" could be used to cover the hateful possibilities of human nature appears shockingly in the execution, by strangling and burning at the stake, of Nicholas Antoine on 20 April 1632, not too long before More came to Geneva. Renouncing Christianity because he could not accept the Trinity Trinitarian dogmas, he was condemned and executed as an apostate. See full account with documents in Spon, Op. cit., I, 111, l95-l09 and notes. In trying to excuse the hideous seal of the Genevans, Spon (p. l95) says they considered Antoine "comme un Seduciteur pernicieux, & un parjure qui prêchait sa fausse doctrine contre le serment fait en sa reception." The very pathetic eccentricity of his public behavior, however, makes it difficult for any but a mind calloused by theology to conceive the poor fanatic as "un Seducateur pernicieux." Such was the atmosphere in which More found himself. As he discusses the rest of More's career, Senebier gives the sanest account of his misfortunes. Spanheim, his arch-enemy, preceded him to Holland (Leyden). The baleful disposition of Spanheim may be seen, for example, in a letter (23 March 1638) from Leyden to O. J. Voss concerning More, darkly hinting that Spanheim knows how More extorted testimonials, and eliciting the amiable Godfrey (Vossii Epistolae, pp. 325-326). Also writing to Voss (nad.), Godfrey tells how More had discredited attacks "doctrinam partim sanctitae, partim morum innocentiae," and praises More's character in the highest terms and with obvious sincerity (Ibid., p. 329). He is distressed at these needless quarrels (Ibid., pp. 323-324).

The letters of Sarrau reveal something of More. There are ten letters to More, from 26 December 1639 to 5 November 1649, and there
are a number of letters to Salmassius discussing More. Nearly all of
them contain literary chit-chat, and show Sarrau’s consistent regard
for More, as well as balanced judgment about him. An early letter to
More, of November, 16h5, reveals that More’s gifts even then had drawn
opposition, though he was still on good terms with Spanheim (Sarravii
Epistolas, p. 36). On 5 November 16h9, Sarrau writes More at Middle-
burg a letter of congratulation on his post there, which recalls that
it was through him that Salmassius and More had met; “Nece tibi desem
Salmassius noster . . . .” (Ibid., p. 216). His letters to Salmassius
contain interesting details about More’s call to Middleburg through the
influence of Salmassius (Epistolas, pp. 271-273), and about the testi-
monials granted to More. Written in the spring of 16h8, the letters
afford no hint that the testimonials were extorted. Generally, the
letters confirm Sarrau to have been a man of good judgment, a friend
but no blind admirer of More. His impression of Spanheim is worth some-
thing. To Salmassius in January, 16h8, he writes, “Il est fâcheux que
cesse de vous aye encore Mr. Sp.[anheim] pour ennemi. Mais il est impos-
ssible de vivre avec cette sorte de gens sans se brouiller, si on ne se gâte
avec eux, quod absit” (Epistolas, p. 272). Evidently More became part of
a factional war upon going to Holland by means of Salmassius. A
rumor had been circulated that he had bothered Salmassius to find him a
place in Holland, and More, through Sarrau, conveyed a request that
Salmassius write Godfrey at Geneva to put a stop to the tale.
Sarrau realized that More was moving into an atmosphere of bit-
terly squabbling professors and ministers. More left for Middleburg in
July; in August, 16h9, Sarrau with misgivings wrote to Salmassius:
“Gratulator tibi Mori in Batavian adventum; munquam enim dubitavi
placitorum Salmassius & populo. Ut tamen siem illi conveniat cuus
Professoribus & Ministriis, qui ut plurimum invident sociis praeestantium
[including Salmassius?] . . . . Sed non est vastraeus Provinciarum proprii
haec labes. Etiam Genesae [Saroe was writing from Paris] & alibi haec
pastis gessatur, quam prudentia, fortitudine & patientia vincere
opertur” (Ibid., p. 210). With perhaps an eye to the future, Sarrau
asked Salmassius on 20 August 16h9, “Quid si de eo [More] vocando egestat
Amsteladenses in locus Vessii. Sed vereor ut isti non par sit.
Vest enim ingente & eloquentia potius, quam multiplici & varia
eruditione. Cumine unus Mundellius noster dignus est tanti viri
successor” (Ibid., p. 213). More’s only English biographer, the Rev.
Archibald Bruce (A Critical Account of the Life, Character, and Dis-
courses of Mr. Alexander More (Edinburgh, 1813), p. 22) sums it up:
“Some through an excess of zeal might be disposed to carry their sus-
pications too far; or if personal antipathies subsisted, they could be
conveniently indulged, and covered under the specious pretense of ortho-
dodoxy.” Further: “As his talents were not of the ordinary sort, and as
he himself did not keep within the line of cold mediocrity . . . toward
others, so they, in their turn, observed no medium toward him” (p. 6).

LOMAPEPA, III, 141.
The text of the letter is given in Fides Publica, pp. 19-21.

Writing from Westminster on 23 June/3 July 1654, Mompesson told More that when two friends of his who knew Milton had relayed More’s disclaiming letter, "... il avoit une impression si forte, que ce n’estoit nul autre que vous; qu’ils ne l’avoient en aucune maniere souu disseuoir, seulement qu’il leur avois requoit de nous assurer, qu’il ne laisseroit rien sortir de sa plume indescent ou aucunement prejudiciable à l’Estat des Provinces Unies..." (Ibid., p. 20).


As an eloquent preacher, More delivered the funeral sermon for the Stadholder William II. It was later translated by Daniel la Fite, rector of Wivelavington in Sussex; A Sermon Preach’d at the Hague, At the Funeral of the late Prince of Orange (Father to his present Majesty King William III.), Who died in the year 1650. Wherein the Life and Actions of his Present Majesty are Prophetically foretold (London, 1694). It is the work of an adroit pulpit dramatist. There is an interesting allusion to the Stadholder’s widow, the Princess Mary, daughter of Charles I: "But all Words fail us when we come to cast our eyes upon the desolate young Princess, young, a Widow, and with Child, and sooner a Widow than a Mother; how many Swords have pierc’d her Soul? How many calamities have beaten upon her, like so many crowing Waves one upon the back of another? What Deeps hath she seen rolling over her, and ready to swallow her? Which way would you have her turn her self? To the Continent? They are not concern’d at it; To the Isles? She there sees her Shipwreck round about her, she there perceives nothing but a black Image of Death and Despair! She has nothing to direct her eyes to, but to Heaven; for she can..."
never so little cast her eyes down to the Earth, but she
finds her self obliged to groan for horror and sorrow of
heart; a Mother in Banishment, a Brother in Trouble, a
Father upon the Scaffold, and to fill the Measure brimfull,
a Husband in a Coffin9 (p. 28),

116 I have used here my own translation of the Defensio Secunda,
pp. 30-33, to retain Milton's pun,

115 Ibid., pp. 33-35.

116 Ibid.

117 Def. Sec., pp. 35-37. Her name (see Hughes' ed., Poems and
Prose, p. 823n.) was Elisabeth Guerret (or Gerret). The Synod of
Utrecht, in a suit brought by More against her to clear his name, ruled
in his favor by declaring the evidence too slight for the Leyden church
to bar More from its pulpit. If, as Hughes observes, the record does
not show that Spanheim had any part in the trial, it is hard to believe
that he was not somewhere in the background. Bruce (A Critical Account,
pp. 67 ff.) blames Mrs. Saumaise for the scandal. "Mag-like," she
plotted with Pontis to trap More into marriage, and failing in this,
stirred up accusations. The suit resulted, he says, in More's tri-
umphant vindication.

118 Def. Sec., p. 36. I have used my own translation to preserve
the word-play on More's name in the Latin couplet:

Galli ex concubitu gravidas te, Pontis, Mori
Quis bone moratam, morigeramque naget?

119 Ibid., pp. 39-41.

120 Ibid., pp. 39-43.

121 Ibid., pp. 169 ff.

122 Ibid., pp. 175 ff.

123 Ibid., pp. 209-217, 219-222.

124 Ibid., pp. 103-109.

125 Ibid., pp. 157-161.

126 Ibid., pp. 111-114.

127 Milton's sermon to Cromwell is found in Ibid. on pp. 222-233,
and his exhortation to the people on pp. 239 ff.
Du Moulin recalls the gratitude of Charles II for Du Moulin's writings at Breda (Gent. Mag., XLIII, 369).

There were two witnesses mentioned (unnamed) in More's answer to Milton, the Fides Publica, who knew his identity and could reveal it if asked, Du Moulin adds.

If he revealed Du Moulin as the author, More must have done so after the Supplement to the Fides Publica. Until a better explanation appears, it must go to his credit that he never publicly broke the confidence in spite of the abuse heaped on him.

His friends almost prophetically warned him, More says: "Tu modo conquiesce, dura; non aetatem foret infelix Miltoni partus. Qui respondebis autem? Nam si respondaris ut te decet a locum tuum, conviensi certamen detectare videberis, ad quod ille te vocat: si verò descendes in hanc arenam, gladiator imbellis cades; provincias cepisti dures, non artes didicisti, non calles; mendacia cumulare mendasiis, ex ruinis aliorum ad famam gradum struere; in obviam quasque graviori; gloriari non necessariis, etraheri falsis; sine fine, sine modo persuaderi; verbis rem parvam magnam facere, Candida de nigro et de cendebantibus ara; Hae Miltono sunt artes: architectus est ille prorsus ad eam rem unicus. In eo sibi placet, se circumspectet, se jactat, coelum digito sibi videtur attingere. Tu si quid responderis, orabrum iritaveris. Falsitati convicisti perseverabitis, ne videatur coepisse sine causa; te indignas sequae dignas contumelas non cessabit dicere" (Fides Publica, pp. 45-47). And so it proved.
143. ... nam si mea propria tantum res ageretur imponere fitulam ori meo, & omne necesse poteram exemplo Domini mei: sed universus ordo noster, quem tu, licet obliquè, stigmate notas, & Ecclesia Dei, cui mea onda tempora conceyeri, per meum petitur istus; cujus Ecclesiae tu pars aliqua videri vis, & strenuè adversum agis. Nam quid hostile magis ab ulla Ecclesiae Orthodoxae adversario designari potuit? (Fides Publica, p. 48).

144. Ascendit quod ii qui diversum à nobis in religione sentiunt, ex ista fabula Ecclesiae nostris insultandi anam arripiens, quasi patiantur ipsae quæla vulgè turpis dictu sacrificulis & Pontificibus objiciuntur suis. Quæ tu populo Romano ludes exhibes, dum tuus defendis scilicet? quæ spectacula præses, dum nos pro delectamento habes, & sacra nostra sannis & ludibrio exponis? quæ ipsi Satanæ triumphus paras, dum scandalum creas infirmioribus, indicis gaudium, sociis dolemus, fidei damnum, cujus interea non minus quæm populi defeensor videri vis? (Fides Publica, p. 53).

145. After enumerating such reasons as those above, "... propterea non utar eorum consilio, qui mihi silentium indiscernent, & autores arant ne luto ludere, tibique sordes tuas regerendo manus mea coniungare. Nam sic temperabo stilm, ut non tæm quid te, quæ quid me digna sit respiciam. Tu quidem nihil prætermittis, ut me pertreas in hanc certaminis arenam" (Ibid., p. 54).

146. Ibid., pp. 6-7, l2-lh.

147. Ibid., pp. 10-11.

148. Ibid., pp. 18-19.

149. Ibid.

150. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

151. There was in the library of Christ Church, Canterbury, a copy of Regii Sanguinis Clamor with the Dedication "through every page of which ... a line is drawn, and before it, in Dr. Du Moulin's handwriting are the following words, Epistola quæm ait esse Alexandri Mori, quæ mihi valde non probatur" (Cant. Mag., XLII, 369, n.).

152. Fides Publica, pp. 31-32.


154. Ibid., pp. l7-l8.

155. Ibid., pp. 59-60.
157 Ibid., pp. 60-61.
159 Ibid., pp. 72-73.
160 Cf. Note 103.

161 Ibid. The execution of Nicholas Antoine in 1632 showed that
the frame of mind which had brought Servetus to the stake still
persisted.

162 I have used the copy in the Newberry Library, Chicago. See
Masson's accurate account of the edition and its contents in Life of
Milton, IV, 625-633; V, 150-162.

163 Defensio Secunda (Hague ed., 1654), Sigs. t3r. It will be
remembered that Du Moulin had sent his early poetry to Salmisius for
criticism.

164 Ibid., Sigs. tgrv.

165 See J. Milton French, "Milton, Needham, and Mercurius
Politicus," SP (1936), 236-252.

166 Revelatory passages from their Latin correspondence are pro-
vided by Mitford in the Appendix to his "Life of Milton," pp. cxxvii, etc.

167 Pro Se Defensio, ed. E. J. Strittmayer (New York, 1933),
pp. 15, 37-45, 69.

168 Ibid., pp. 201-213.

169 Ibid., pp. 195-201.


172 Ibid., pp. 208-209. This is supported (pp. 210-212) by a
letter of C. de Graaf and Simon Van Hegew, Curators of the Church,
praising More.

173 It is published in the Columbia edition, pp. 228-295.

174 Sansbéier, Histoire Littéraire de Geneve, II, 200-201; Spon,
Histoire de Geneve, I, 111, 510-511, notes.
175 *A Sermon Preached in the Metropolitical Church of Canterbury*, pp. 22-23. I have used the copy in the University of Chicago Library.

176 The portrayal of Juxon is mentioned by Du Moulin in his *Epicedium*, which addresses Juxon as "Magne Heros, Musa dux dum dixit pedestris, Heros dicitque mini moestâque Camoenâ..." Du Moulin further refers to Regii Sanguinis Glâmor in a marginal note in his *Vindication* (1679), p. 49, pointing to the fact discussed in *Glâmor* that the Dutch had always been governed by a count rather than a king. The point was first raised by Salmassius, *Defensio Regia*, pp. 438-439. It was from this that Du Moulin originally took his observation.

177 I have used the copy in the Newberry Library, Chicago.

178 Some points are of interest as they look forward to the Whig arguments and the legend of Milton the Jesuit. Salmassius mocks Milton's assertion that the English Parliament was set up by the people, that its jurisdiction was derived from them, and that the English King was in effect only a minister of Parliament, created to do its bidding, and that the English monarchy was not hereditary (Responso, p. 52). Will Milton dare to say, asks Salmassius, that the first reformers of the Church taught that a worthless king or tyrant could be driven out or punished freely? No, Milton gets this doctrine from the Jesuits, who teach that, if he cannot be disposed of otherwise, a King may be removed by open force or poison (Ibid., pp. 70-71).

179 I have used the copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington. Jane remarks that as "For the Authors profane Antagonist (John Milton, one of your Majesties grand enemys) I shall leave him under the rod of correction, wherewith God hath evidenced his particular judgment by striking him with blindness, and the writings of the learned Author to solid and rational understandings to censure..." (Epistle, Sig. A2rav).
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A Second True Defense of the Neer Nonconformists, Against the Untrue Accusations, Reasonings and History of Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, Dean of St. Pauls, &c . . . . With some Notes on Mr. Joseph Glanvilles Zealous and Impartial Protestant, and Dr. L. Nouline Character. London: Nevil Smythe, 1701.


Bruce, Archibald. A Critical Account of the Life, Character, and Discourses of Mr. Alexander Morus, a Celebrated Preacher, and Professor of Theology, &c. in Geneva and Holland; Afterwards Minister of the Church of Paris. In Which The attack made upon him in the Writings of Milton, is particularly considered . . . . Edinburgh: J. Ogles, W. Blackwood, Dickson & Easton, 1813.
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*Of Credulity and Incredulity, In things Natural, Civil, and Divine. Wherein, Among other things, the Sadducees of these times, in saying Spirits, Hatches, and Supernatural Operations, by pregnant instances, and evidences, is fully confuted: Epicurus his cause, discussed, and the malice and false dealing, lately used, to bring His, and Atheism, into credit, clearly discovered . . . .* London: T. Garthwait, 1666.
• Of Credulity and Incredulity: In things Divine & Spiritual; wherein, (among other things) A true and faithful account is given of the Platonick Philosophy, as it hath reference to Christianity: As also the business of witches and Witchcraft, Against a late writer, fully argued and disputed. London: T. N. for Samuel Lowndes, 1670.

• A Treatise Concerning Enthusiasme, As it is an Effect of Nature; but is mistaken by many for either Divine Inspiration, ... London: R. D. for Thomas Johnson, 1699.


Ed. A True & Faithful Relation Of What passed for many Years Between Dr. John Dee (A Mathematician of Great Fame in L. Ellis. and King James their Reigns) and Some Spirits: Tending (had it succeeded) To a General Alteration of most States and Kingdomes In the World ... London: D. Marwell for T. Dartmouth, 1659.


Patronus Bonae Fidei in Causa Puritanorum, contra Hierarchos
Angliae... in quo agitur de Authoribus nuperorum motuum in

The Power Of the Christian Magistrate in Sacred things.
Delivered in some Positions, sent to a Friend, upon which a returne
of his opinion was desired... London: G. Dawson, 1650.

Rerum Nuper In Regno Scotiae Gestarum Historia, Sen verius
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APPENDIX A

A POSTSCRIPT ON SALMASIUS AND MORE

Whatever difficulties might have existed between Salmasius and Alexander More concerning the alleged seduction of Bontia, More remembered the great scholar with some affection. A skillful writer of neo-Latin verse, More published, sixteen years after Salmasius's death, a volume of familiar poems, *Alexandri Mori Poëmatata* (Paris, 1669). Feeling, perhaps, that the dead scholar's reputation could still enhance his own, More inserted (p. 121) some brief elegies by Salmasius entitled "In Effigiem Viri Summi Alexandri Mori Theologi & concionatoris Eruditissimi." The volume also includes two poems by More in elegiacs praising Salmasius: "In Effigiem Illustris Viri Claudii Salmasii" (pp. 121-122), and "Claudio Salmasio" (pp. 123-124). Possibly inspired by the fine engraving of Salmasius prefixed to Clément's edition of his letters, the first poem to Salmasius was written after his death and recalls the honors which Queen Christina had paid him. The second poem hyperbolically praises the *Defensio Regia*, and was evidently composed shortly after the *Defensio*'s publication in 1649.

Milton fostered, in his *Defensio Secunda* and *Pro Se Defensio*, the legend of a serious estrangement between Salmasius and More over Bontia. Since More, Sannazaro plainly disliked More, she doubtless would have enjoyed such a situation. But More's inclusion of these verse panegyrics in his volume of poetry suggests that there was no permanent breach, and that More had only the fondest memories of his one-time sponsor.
APPENDIX B

FETER DU MOULIN AND THE TRAGICUM THEATRUM (1619)

Besides the Defensio Regia of Salmasius and the Elenchus motuum
superorum by George Bate, the year 1619 saw publication of another
book about the English revolt, the Tragicum Theatrum Actorum, & Casum
Tragicorum Londini Publice celebratorum, sometimes (erroneously)
attributed to Peter Du Moulin. The book has been discussed in Chap-
ter VI, pp. 199–200. A comparison of the Tragicum Theatrum with rele-
vant portions of Du Moulin's Regii Sanguinis Clamor, and with an
acknowledged source for Clamor, the Elenchus of Bate, shows that, on
grounds of style and probability, the Tragicum Theatrum was not writ-
ten by Peter Du Moulin. Among other things, the Tragicum Theatrum provides
a full Latin translation of Charles's scaffold speech. Comparison of
even a portion of the speech in its versions from Bate, Du Moulin,
and the Tragicum Theatrum shows that Du Moulin adapted Bate's Latin
with relatively little change, and that for vocabulary, structure, and
style, their Latinity is far closer than that of Du Moulin and whoever
wrote the Tragicum Theatrum. Bate (Elenchus (1650 ed.), p. 102) gives
the opening of the King's speech thus:

Nihil vobis coram jam dicerem, nisi Silentium meum in
restus argumentum traherent nonnulli, Neque eximiarum sà
conscientià crimina exprobata in Me admittere, qua patientià
poenae succumbo.
Innocentiae meae testem Deum invoco (prae cujus
Tribunali brevi sistendus sum) mihi nunquam in mentem
venisse justa Parlementi Privilegia imminuere, neque
prius Exercitum conscrpsisse, quia illi hostiles in me
Copias parassent; quod, et Coeptorum utriusque ordine &
Diplomatuum Programmatum; fastis, inquirenti liquidè
constabit.

Interim agnosco, & demississimè amplor Justitiam
Divinam, quae per iniquam hodie Sententiam justum mihi
inflirict supplicium, quod olim innocentem virum (Hiberniae
Pro-Regem intelligebat) liberare non erim, cum iniquissimo
Decreto oppressurur.

Du Moulin (Glamor, pp. 74-75) adapts it to this:

Maluerim coram vobis pressere, nisi metuerae ne silentium
meum in reatus argumentum à nonnullis traheretur, &
supplicii patientiam verterent in criminae objectorum
consccintiam.

Innocentiae meae testem Deum invoco, ad cujus tribunal
brevi sistendus sum, mihi nunquam in mentem venisse justa
Parlementi Privilegia imminuere, neque non ante exercitum
conscripsisse, quia illi hostiles in me copias parassent;
quod quidem rerum gestarum ordines, & Diplomatuum Pro-
grammatique Fastos perquirendi, liquidè constabit.

Interim agnosco, & summi animi subjectiones veneror
Divinae Justitiae, quae per injustam sententiam justum
mihi infligat supplicium, quod innocentem Virum non
liberaverim cum iniquissimo judicio opprimeretur.

Here, however, is the account in the Tragicum Theatrum (pp. 186-188);
I have omitted material not mentioned by Du Moulin or Bate):

. . . Equidem tacere possem, nisi vererer, ne multi ex
silentio meo conjecturam facturi essent, me crimen,
quorum accusatio mea mentionem facit, conscium esse.

Verum eas esse partes arbitror prefectas ex debito,
quo Deo & Patris meo obstrictum novi, ut me virum integrum,
Regem bonum, & Christianum verum praestem, & me talem esse
toti mundo re ipsa patetaciam. Primum ab innocentia mea
sermones meum exordiar, quoniam ut multis eam declareas
non opus est, utpote quae toti terrarum orbis satis notituit,
Nemini autem hominum ignotum est, Deum cui ratio mihi
reddenda est, testem invoco, quod bellum hoc Parliamenti mi
debellandi causa non susceperim, nec tuto meae vitae
curriculi illud privilegium suis demudare enimus sit . . . .

Saepe numero enim Deus Sententia injuste pronunciata
justum judicium exercet, quod ita velim intelligitur, me
injusta sententia Hiberniae Prorogem condemnari permittentes
nunc iterum injusta Sententia morti adjudicari. Eo usque
innocentiae progressus sum.
Aside from this evidence, circumstances make it improbable that Du Moulin wrote the *Tragicum Theatrum* which, along with Bate's *Elenderus*, appeared in 1649, as we have seen. Du Moulin was evidently at work on *Clamor ad Coelum* in 1651, for he was writing "nunc triennio fermé post patrum facinus, ne res sicariarum, heu nimium prosperé fluentes, & divinæ vindictæ moræ, infirmis animabus aliquam flagitii assustudinem inducant" (*Clamor*, "Lectori Christiano," Sig. A[11]F). If he had really composed the *Tragicum Theatrum*, when he wished to quote the King's speech, Du Moulin would much more probably have used a convenient and available translation of his own, than have gone to the needless trouble of adapting Bate's version. There is also the fact, noted above, that the King's speech in the *Tragicum Theatrum* includes material not found in the *Elenderus*. Wishing to display the martyr King to the best advantage, Du Moulin, if he had composed this account, would perhaps have retained it so that the King might speak at more persuasive length.